

# CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

---

JERRY BARTON, VICE CHAIR  
EL DORADO COUNTY  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
530.642.5260 - [jbarton@edctc.org](mailto:jbarton@edctc.org)

LISA DAVEY-BATES, CHAIR  
LAKE COUNTY/CITY  
AREA PLANNING COUNCIL  
707.263.7799 - [daveybates@dow-associates.com](mailto:daveybates@dow-associates.com)

NEIL PEACOCK, SECRETARY  
AMADOR COUNTY  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
209.267.2282 - [neil@actc-amador.org](mailto:neil@actc-amador.org)

## FINAL

### RCTF AGENDA

May 20, 2011

12:30 – 3:30

Caltrans HQ

1120 N. Street, Room 2116, Sacramento

Call In Number: (713) 576-2028

Participant Code: 167338

Agenda items may be taken out of order to accommodate discussion.

- |    |   |                                    |
|----|---|------------------------------------|
| A. | Self Introductions/Information Sharing                    | All                                |
| B. | Approve Minutes of March 18, 2011                         | Neil Peacock                       |
| C. | State Budget Update                                       | Athena Gliddon<br>Mitch Weiss      |
| D. | 2012 STIP/Fund Estimate                                   | Athena Gliddon<br>Mitch Weiss      |
| E. | Local Assistance Update                                   | Denix Anbiah                       |
| F. | Caltrans Federal/State Legislative Update                 | Dan McKell                         |
| G. | CTC 10-Year Statewide Transportation Needs Assessment     | Bruce De Terra/<br>Kathryn Mathews |
| H. | Census Transportation Planning Product (CTPP) Overview    | Diana Portillo                     |
| I. | Local Streets & Roads Needs Assessment                    | Mike Woodman                       |
| J. | Project Initiation Documents                              | Marlon Flourney                    |
| K. | Mass Transportation Update                                | Kimberly Gayle                     |
| L. | Rural Blueprint Update                                    | Marilee Mortenson                  |
| M. | Proposal To Allow Toll Credits for On-System HBP Projects | Dan Little<br>Gary Antone          |
| N. | RCTF Topics of Significance                               | All                                |

#### Agenda Attachments:

Item B – March 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes

Item H – CTPP

Item M – HPB Project List



enough to ensure sufficient rural representation and that regional modelers may be warranted in exercising caution in applying state-wide results to their particular regional context.

Follow-up reports will be provided.

**C. State Budget Update**

**M. Weiss**

Mr. Weiss noted that the sales tax swap reenactment passed and that, while this has provided a measure of clarity regarding certain transportation related revenues, the State's budget is still unknown and there is not much to report at this time, but that all should stay tuned. Specifically, it is unknown if the State's budget will include the Governor's proposed tax extensions or not and if not, what impacts may result to transportation funding. He highlighted the significant pressures the State's General Funds are under and the implicit risk to transportation funding under conditions of such fiscal stress. In that the State budget is unknown at this time, follow-up reports will be provided.

**D. 2012 STIP/Fund Estimate**

**M. Weiss**

In the absence of a CTC representative to present on this item, Mr. Weiss began a brief overview of this item. It was noted that draft budget assumptions were presented to the CTC with a staff recommendation and options for the Commission's consideration. The Commission is to choose which alternative they wish to use for the STIP Fund Estimate and subsequent 2012 STIP Allocation Capacity. It was asked if CTC and Caltrans staff assumptions were consistent and the answer was given that, yes, they are consistent with only one minor variation. It was noted that these assumptions are subject to change, pending the potential tax extension issue, passage of the State budget, and Federal Highway Bill Reauthorization. Mr. Weiss stated that he essentially thinks the CTC may choose an assumption that the State will see a flat level of near-term revenues with an economic recovery taking place in FY 13/14. It was also stated that the issues of debt service and Reauthorization have a larger impact on the potential availability of transportation funds.

More specific and technical discussion took place regarding variable affecting transportation fund cash flow issues, such as payments for Advance Construction projects, the Federalization of State & local projects, and Motor Vehicle Account Transfers; all of which affect the State's Allocation Capacity.

A question was asked if the Federal Toll Credit program was supposed to free up State funds and increase its Allocation Capacity, but the answer was given that, no, the Toll Credit Program only frees up local matching funds.

It was noted that based on budget constraints, inadequate Allocation Capacity, and competing priorities for limited Bond Sale revenues, funding for many programmed projects is anticipated to be delayed to subsequent Fiscal Years.

However, even in light of these challenges, local agencies are encouraged to develop and deliver their project as building up Advance Construction helps with getting Federal funds through reimbursements to completed Federalized projects and any available August Redistribution funds.

**E. Federal Programming Update**

**L. Green**

Ms. Green provided the Federal Programming update. She indicated that an amendment for the FSTIP was finalized by the new authorization letter signed by the Governor and approved by the FHWA. It was also noted that FSTIP amendment requests should no longer be sent to Penny Grey, as she has transferred to a new position as Director of the Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit, and that they should now be sent to Lilibeth Green. It was also noted that they are working on their next Amendment and that any quarterly amendment requests should be sent by the 1<sup>st</sup> of the month and agencies should anticipate a 60 day turn-around from submittal to approval and

that should be taken into account in terms of the scheduling for any anticipated Requests for Authorization for which FSTIP inclusion is a requirement.

#### **F. CTC 10-Year State-Wide Transportation Needs Assessment**

**De Terra/K. Mathews**

A brief overview of this effort was provided; the intent of the Needs Assessment is to develop a 'big picture' of the State's transportation financing needs that the CTC and other key people can take to the Governor's office and new legislators to discuss statewide transportation funding issues. The effort will help develop a unified, statewide vision to advocate for the state's needs with regard to reauthorization in Washington DC. A committee was formed by the CTC, with staff and consultant support, and the focus of the effort is three pronged approach focusing on system preservation (including transit, streets and road, ports etc.), then system expansion, and system management and operations (for all modes of transportation).

It was noted that most local agencies have responded to the survey on their transportation funding needs, but that some (mainly rural) agencies have yet to respond. Mr. De Terra and Ms. Mathews encouraged those present to respond to help with the survey's assumptions and for those agencies that focus their resources on maintenance and/or rehabilitation, that there is a response option for 'System Preservation'. It was noted that agencies which are in the middle of RTP update can simply send what they have and that the tool will become more accurate over time.

A spreadsheet identifying which agencies have responded and which have not was circulated and the Chair Committees to resending the original survey request to RCTF members. Lastly, it was requested that all send their responses as soon as possible in order to meet the deadline. February.

#### **G. Regional Council of Rural Counties Update**

**M. White**

Ms. White noted that the Gas-tax swap was passed and thanked all those that may have aided in garnering the support needed to do so. She also noted that "use it or loose it" provisions regarding Prop 1B extensions were included in trailers to the bill. She also noted that related Prop 42 Highway User Tax Act restructure have relaxed eligible uses, but that not all the desired budget issues got passed. Concerns still exist regarding Prop 22 and protections for transportation funds.

Ms. White also discussed the Federal Secure Rural Schools Act related to school and county roads funding provided as a replacement for lost forest timber sales receipts. It was noted that while the Federal Government has been intent on ramping down this program, the impact to local budget remains significant because revenue from Federal timber sales remain non-existent. She unveiled the lobbying effort RCRC is participating in with the Partnership for Rural America. She distributed an informational flyer discussion both the historical perspective and current budget crisis that would result from the program's elimination. It was noted that resistance is anticipated in Congress to continuing the program by those who view it as "mandated spending" and/or Congressional "earmarking". While this will be a difficult issues, they have been receiving support in their effort and she encouraged those affected to submit local anecdotal stories from their region as the adverse impact such cuts would have to services and quality of life.

It was noted that the messaging of this issue is very delicate, as it is related to the potentially conflicting constituencies of resource-based economies and environmental protection preservation groups. In order to gain as much support as possible, it is recommended to narrowly focus the lobbying effort to the importance of these funds and the services they support rather than opening the issue of timber harvesting and environmental policy related to the Federal Forest system. Pending Congressional action, final payment are will be made and the program is set to expire in January, 2012.

## **H. Local Street & Roads Needs Assessment**

**M. Woodman**

Mr. Woodman noted that the 2012/14 Local Streets & Roads Needs Assessment has been initiated with a goal that it could be used to coordinate maintenance and rehabilitation needs with the 10-Year SHOPP program up-date. Oversight Committee coordinators have developed an RFP and circulated it for proposals, with a contract to be executed pending successful acquisition of needed funding. Because a consensus did not emerge regarding an “off-the-top” proposal related to using RSTP funds for this purpose, the group has assembled a Partnership Planning grant application for the project and is seeking Letters of Support from interested agencies. It was asked of the group if the RCTF would be willing to provide a Letter. After noting that several member regions would be submitting their own Partnership Planning grant applications and there was concern regarding increased competition, it was agreed that the RCTF, as a group, would not submit a support letter, but that anyone interested could do so.

Lastly, it was requested that the funding request and Letter of Support request that would be sent around for participation by those interested include a clear description of the benefits the effort would provide.

Project contact info ([www.savecaliforniastreet.org](http://www.savecaliforniastreet.org)) was provided for those interested.

## **I. Local Assistance Update**

**B. Sandoval**

Mr. Sandoval noted that the Highway Bill has been recently extended to the end of the Federal Fiscal Year and that Continuing Resolutions will be providing short-term Obligational Authority for related Federal funding. He noted that they are now awaiting on approval of exchange funds for the second half of current available apportionments and last years remaining apportionments.

He noted that Local Assistance has received concerns that it is difficult to find comprehensive and up-to-date information related to the LA Procedures Manual on their website. Mr. Sandoval discussed the “Office Bulletins” provided by LA as topic-specific updates to the Procedures Manual and that they will be consolidating all recent Office Bulletins into an update of the Manual. For example, he noted agencies should be aware of the recent Bulletin circulated on programming High-Cost Bridge projects, which will be included in the updated Procedures Manual.

In regards to the Federal Bridge programs, local agencies should be made aware of new project delivery milestone requirements and that a new status report format is now in effect to help track the progress of various projects. It was also noted that agencies should expect to receive pending E-76s by the end of the month. He also said that since the FSTIP amendment mentioned earlier has passed, agencies should send in Requests for Authorization as soon as possible.

## **J. Project Initiation Documents (PIDs)**

**A. Clark**

Ms. Clark provided a brief overview of the PID Strategic Plan effort and highlighted the fact that Caltrans is working with partners to streamline cost associated with project development. She discussed significant staffing reductions, and State budget language that indicated a direction for spending state funds on PIDs for locally developed projects. Also, a Working Committee comprised of the PID managers from various functional units, Local-Regional Agency Representatives and a Steering Committee will be comprised of all the Division Chiefs and Deputies in District Offices, and there will be an Executive Committee was formed to work on the issue. The committee has been working on recommendations for the Strategic Plan including improvements to the PID guidance and oversight. As a result of their work, the PID program has re-prioritized its workload allocation to focus on the SHOPP program, limited to projects mandated due to court settlements, ADA improvements, storm water, etc. They are limited in their ability to do reimbursable work and interested agencies should work with their Caltrans district representatives immediately to address any concerns. She referred to a letter

from Director McKim and the PID implementation guidelines developed by the Oversight Committee that describes the situation in more detail.

It was noted that the PID Strategic Plan, anticipated to be available in April, will establish the three year PID plan of projects to be developed and will provide a basis for the Department's future budget requests for PID support activities.

The question was asked if the Committee is looking at a lesser standard of project development document needed to simply program funds for subsequent Preliminary Engineering and the group generally commented on the difficulties local agencies have with the significant costs and delays associated with Caltrans oversight of locally initiated PIDs.

#### **K. Mass Transportation Update**

**K. Gayle**

Kimberly Gayle provided the Mass Transportation Update. She noted that applications on the 5310 program should be in by now and are being reviewed by RTPAs, who are responsible for summarizing and ranking eligible projects, which are due May 6<sup>th</sup>. Pending the Department's review and recommendations, it is anticipated that the CTC will authorize awards in June.

Related to the 5311 program, she noted that only 5/11<sup>th</sup>s of the available apportionment will be allocated, which might create cash-flow problems for recipients with Caltrans only being able to give out partial payments on grant awards. It was noted that 5311 recipient agencies should look closely at their financial situation and contact the department, if needed.

Under miscellaneous items, Ms. Gayle noted that; the Federal Toll Credit program is now being applied to applicable transit projects; a recent a FTA Audit contained 10 findings of which 4 are still outstanding, one of which is that the Division's Management Plan needs to be updated; and RTAP scholarships and related training opportunities are now available for application.

Ms. Gayle gave a congratulations to Del Norte County for their recent work related to transit's role in a Regional Emergency Preparedness project and noted the unique timing of the project taking place when a tsunami struck the North Coast.

A question was asked in regards to the recent one-time STA apportionment, specifically if the three-year exemption on restricting use of funds for operating was removed. Due to a lack of clarify, it was promised that Gordon Aruda would follow up on the question.

She noted that the State procurement contract was out to bid and an award was expected in May.

Ms. Gayle noted that revenues from the November Prop 1B bonds would be made available for payments on FY 7/8 and 8/9 balances and that FY 9/10 awards will be funded next. The next round of allocation requests are due June 1<sup>st</sup>.

Lastly, she noted that a pilot program that is providing transit information for the Google Transit Update in initiating its next phase, concentrating on the foothill and central valley counties. Related agencies should be expecting to receive participation surveys and information requests as a part of this next step.

#### **L. Rural Blueprint Update**

**M. Mortenson**

Ms. Mortenson expressed thanks to recipients of prior year Blueprint awards for active invoicing, but she noted that some contracts have high balances and she wanted to make sure everyone is making sufficient progress on their projects. She noted that Caltrans staff will check in with recipients on their status, so expect a call soon, as they will be investigating whether or not certain projects will need to be extended or de-obligated due to in-activity. She will provide a general report on any significant general trends affecting project delays.

She noted that this year's awards are expected to be made in April and that most applicants "will be pleased". She also said that while Caltrans staff is committed to advocating for continued funding, the availability of net year's program funds in not yet known.

She will be taking road trips across the state to visit with recipients in order to better understand their local contexts and that technical assistance workshops will be held this year. She also pointed to the Strategic Growth Council's "Healthy in All Policies" guidance that agencies infuse health considerations in relevant policy recommendations. Workshops will also be held to provide input the Council on what State agencies can do to improve healthy community, such as emphasizing active transportation mode choices. Anticipated meeting dates were discussed and it was noted that those interested should visit Caltrans website and/or contact program staff for more information.

**N. North State Super Region Update**

**J. Bulinski**

Ms. Bulinski provided a brief information update on the activities of the recently formed peer group. She noted an interregional GIS mapping platform the group anticipates using to address SB 375 related challenges and how it could potentially be utilized by others. She thanked those who participated in recent Letter of Support for member's grant applications and discussed how the group has been used as a forum to discuss RCTF issues of importance.

She noted that the CTC is anticipating holding a Town Hall meeting in Chico in its next north state rotation and that it is her understanding that the CTC is looking for a rural representative as its next appointment.

Lastly, she noted that more information about the group can be found at their website; [superregion.org](http://superregion.org) and that their next meeting is May 25<sup>th</sup>.

**O. Housing Element Working Committee**

**L. Davey-Bates**

Ms. Davey-Bates noted that RTPAs who undertake Regional Housing Needs Allocation processes for their region face new challenges related to SB 375 and its linkages to the RTP Update process. She discussed the Housing Element Working Committee that was formed to help agencies address these challenges and noted that they are seeking a rural representative, so she volunteered her services. She noted that although the group has a predominate focus on the needs and challenges of the MPOs, she feels her participation is valuable and promised to share any valuable information her participating comes up with, and the group is anticipated to expand its focus beyond SB 375-specific issues and some of that may prove valuable for rural agencies.

**P. RCTF Topics of Significance**

**All**

A brief discussion on Transportation Concept Reports was initiated by noting the TCR guidelines are being updated with a new emphasis on community acceptance as a part of long-range system planning efforts. Also noted was the fact that the Interregional Strategic Plan is being updated and this plan will guide strategic investments of Interregional Transportation Improvement Programs funding into the future. It was recommended that those interested should provide input, starting with what has been accomplished and what still needs to be done to improve key interregional gateways. It was also noted that after the State-wide Blueprint is completed and available for review, more input opportunities will be made available.

3: 30 Adjourn

# California Census Transportation Planning Product (CTPP)

## Description

The Census Transportation Planning Products (CTPP) is a program of custom tabulations and data products for the transportation community from the US Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS). ACS, which replaced the decennial census long form, requires accumulation over multiple years for tabulation. CTPP also includes training, technical assistance and research.

CTPP includes tabulations by place of residence, place of work and flows between home and work.

## Purpose

The CTPP Program provides State Departments of Transportation, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), and their partners with special census data products for transportation planning and programming. The CTPP program has three main tasks:

- Task 1: Acquire Data and Develop Census Transportation Planning Products
- Task 2: Conduct Training, Capacity Building and Research
- Task 3: Manage CTPP Program, including all activities associated with Tasks 1 and 2.

## Pooled-Fund Contributions

The CTPP pooled fund for California is \$720,140 of which the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) contributed \$139,100 and the MPOs contributed the remaining \$581,040. The CTPP is sponsored by The Federal Highway Administration and The American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) through an inter-agency agreement with the US Census Bureau. AASHTO consolidated the national CTPP fund to purchase all CTPP related activities.

## CTPP Oversight Board

The **CTPP** Oversight Board reports to the AASHTO **Standing Committee on Planning** and provides strategic direction, technical assistance, data and research reviews, overall guidance, and monitoring of on-going tasks related to the CTPP consolidated purchase. The Board is a technical representative for state departments of transportation, and metropolitan planning organizations.

## CTPP Uses and Applications

In January 2011 AASHTO delivered the 3-year (2006-2008) CTPP data products and data access software to Caltrans and MPOs. This data product includes geographies with populations 20,000 or greater. The data will help planners answer such questions as:

- How many people live here and work there?
- How many or what percentage of workers use transit in my Metropolitan Statistical Area
- What proportion of transit users are automobile owners?
- What percentage of work trips are made in carpools?
- What proportions of people telecommute?

CTPP data can be used for many planning needs:

- Travel forecasting, especially calibration and validation
- Environmental justice
- FTA New Starts/Small Starts
- Travel demand management
- Corridor planning
- Air quality modeling
- Trend analysis
- Descriptive statistics

The 5-year (2006-2010) CTPP data products are due in 2013.

## 2008/9 - 2013/14 Highway Bridge Program

(Local Assistance Projects)

Municipality	# of Projects	# of projects "on system"	Local Match <sup>1</sup>	Fed \$ <sup>1,3</sup>	Population <sup>2</sup>
Alpine County	2	1	\$ 255,494	\$ 2,612,406	1,175
Sierra County	3	0	\$ 232,932	\$ 4,332,068	3,240
Modoc County	4	0	\$ 139,987	\$ 5,569,001	9,686
Trinity County	7	2	\$ 487,732	\$ 16,148,107	13,786
Mono County	1	1	\$ 3,728	\$ 28,772	14,202
Mariposa County	4	1	\$ 283,914	\$ 8,033,724	18,251
Inyo County	4	0	\$ 131,135	\$ 5,270,540	18,546
Plumas County	12	0	\$ 462,358	\$ 18,107,142	20,007
Colusa County	7	1	\$ 82,355	\$ 6,270,645	21,419
Glenn County	7	0	\$ 76,000	\$ 23,843,100	28,122
Del Norte County	2	0	\$ 1,927,000	\$ 7,170,000	28,610
Lassen County	6	1	\$ 236,286	\$ 11,515,848	34,895
Amador County	5	2	\$ 281,912	\$ 4,893,238	38,091
Jackson	3	0	\$ -	\$ 5,729,474	-
Sutter Creek	2	1	\$ 354,652	\$ 4,657,746	-
Amador City	1	1	\$ 347,082	\$ 2,678,918	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>\$ 983,646</b>	<b>\$ 17,959,376</b>	<b>38,091</b>
Siskiyou County	4	3	\$ 672,240	\$ 7,877,538	44,900
Dunsmuir	1	0	\$ -	\$ 306,900	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$ 672,240</b>	<b>\$ 8,184,438</b>	<b>44,900</b>
Calaveras County	18	3	\$ 1,752,046	\$ 60,758,805	45,578
San Benito County	7	3	\$ 3,371,087	\$ 40,861,341	55,269
Tuolumne County	6	1	\$ 1,087,870	\$ 17,767,348	55,365
Lake County	8	1	\$ 364,271	\$ 8,342,125	64,665
Tehama County	10	8	\$ 6,812,811	\$ 59,784,572	63,463
Yuba County	9	3	\$ 489,642	\$ 14,208,058	72,155
Mendocino County	14	5	\$ 2,340,215	\$ 35,128,286	87,841
Willits	1	1	\$ 173,148	\$ 1,336,425	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>\$ 2,513,363</b>	<b>\$ 36,464,711</b>	<b>87,841</b>
Sutter County	3	1	\$ 259,004	\$ 2,938,096	94,737
Yuba City	1	1	\$ -	\$ 26,959,260	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$ 259,004</b>	<b>\$ 29,897,356</b>	<b>94,737</b>
Nevada County	5	0	\$ 1,297,772	\$ 12,233,508	98,764
Nevada City	1	1	\$ 214,489	\$ 1,655,511	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 1,512,261</b>	<b>\$ 13,889,019</b>	<b>98,764</b>
Humboldt County	6	2	\$ 1,256,937	\$ 14,129,539	134,623
Napa County	1	1	\$ 381,378	\$ 2,943,623	136,484
City of Napa	1	1	\$ 110,506	\$ 639,494	-

<b>Total:</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$ 491,884</b>	<b>\$ 3,583,117</b>	<b>136,484</b>
Madera County	6	2	\$ 396,136	\$ 9,406,030	150,865
City of Madera	1	1	\$ 19,384	\$ 149,616	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$ 415,520</b>	<b>\$ 9,555,646</b>	<b>150,865</b>
Kings County	4	1	\$ 162,874	\$ 5,142,126	152,982
Imperial County	6	4	\$ 2,187,602	\$ 20,759,198	174,528
Shasta County	13	6	\$ 1,692,122	\$ 22,166,258	177,223
Redding	12	8	\$ 3,392,217	\$ 27,163,783	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>\$ 5,084,339</b>	<b>\$ 49,330,041</b>	<b>177,223</b>
El Dorado County	15	5	\$ 3,346,449	\$ 81,762,816	181,058
Placerville	3	1	\$ 549,757	\$ 9,063,443	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>\$ 3,896,206</b>	<b>\$ 90,826,259</b>	<b>181,058</b>
Yolo County	6	0	\$ 51,042	\$ 11,790,834	200,849
Sutter	1	1	\$ 134,773	\$ 1,040,228	-
Davis	1	1	\$ 228,024	\$ 1,759,976	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$ 413,839</b>	<b>\$ 14,591,038</b>	<b>200,849</b>
Butte County	7	3	\$ 3,820,428	\$ 36,360,572	220,000
Chico	3	0	\$ -	\$ 6,635,000	-
Biggs	1	0	\$ 13,764	\$ 741,236	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$ 3,834,192</b>	<b>\$ 43,736,808</b>	<b>220,000</b>
Marin County	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	252,409
Golden Gate Bridge	1	1	\$ -	\$ 59,060,990	-
Novato	1	1	\$ 206,587	\$ 1,594,516	-
Larkspur	3	3	\$ 2,957,580	\$ 21,198,220	-
Ross	1	1	\$ 17,205	\$ 132,795	-
Faifax	3	0	\$ 143,949	\$ 2,772,252	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>\$ 3,325,321</b>	<b>\$ 84,758,773</b>	<b>252,409</b>
Merced County	4	2	\$ 1,014,493	\$ 12,721,237	255,793
Santa Cruz County	5	1	\$ 403,973	\$ 11,300,027	262,382
City of Santa Cruz	1	1	\$ 1,474,099	\$ 11,377,681	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$ 1,878,072</b>	<b>\$ 22,677,708</b>	<b>262,382</b>
San Luis Obispo County	14	8	\$ 2,808,595	\$ 45,101,572	269,637
Arroyo Grande	1	0	\$ -	\$ 3,050,800	-
City of San Luis Obispo	1	1	\$ 527,620	\$ 4,072,380	-
Cal Poly SLO	1	0	\$ 27,299	\$ 782,701	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>\$ 3,363,514</b>	<b>\$ 53,007,453</b>	<b>269,637</b>
Placer County	16	1	\$ 4,001,424	\$ 80,042,576	378,432
Roseville	2	1	\$ 568,912	\$ 7,641,088	-
Lincoln	1	1	\$ 782,057	\$ 6,036,223	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$ 5,352,393</b>	<b>\$ 93,719,887</b>	<b>378,432</b>
Solano County	6	3	\$ 2,047,585	\$ 25,580,415	413,344
Vallejo	2	2	\$ 1,492,454	\$ 11,519,347	-

<b>Total:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>\$ 3,540,039</b>	<b>\$ 37,099,762</b>	<b>413,344</b>
Monterey County	14	3	\$ 3,822,354	\$ 45,617,050	415,057
Santa Barbara County	15	8	\$ 4,302,496	\$ 59,131,315	423,895
Carpinteria	1	1	\$ 326,895	\$ 2,523,105	-
Lompoc	1	1	\$ 14,338	\$ 110,663	-
City of Santa Barbara	6	4	\$ 4,689,968	\$ 43,432,942	-
Solvang	1	1	\$ 88,434	\$ 682,566	-
Goleta	3	3	\$ 1,378,685	\$ 10,641,238	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>\$ 10,800,816</b>	<b>\$ 116,521,829</b>	<b>423,895</b>
Sonoma County	18	4	\$ 6,518,867	\$ 68,188,447	438,878
Petaluma	1	1	\$ 177,785	\$ 1,372,215	-
City of Sonoma	1	1	\$ 189,685	\$ 1,464,065	-
Healdsburg	1	1	\$ 2,506,769	\$ 23,619,804	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$ 9,393,106</b>	<b>\$ 94,644,531</b>	<b>438,878</b>
Tulare County	14	1	\$ 2,510,554	\$ 33,934,030	442,179
Porterville	2	2	\$ 1,540,246	\$ 10,943,754	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$ 4,050,800</b>	<b>\$ 44,877,784</b>	<b>442,179</b>
Stanislaus County	20	7	\$ 7,876,451	\$ 103,998,878	514,453
Modesto	1	1	\$ 1,375,916	\$ 10,061,884	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>\$ 9,252,367</b>	<b>\$ 114,060,762</b>	<b>514,453</b>
San Joaquin County	17	8	\$ 7,916,058	\$ 81,497,692	685,306
Stockton Port District	1	1	\$ 1,541,322	\$ 10,705,900	-
Tracy	1	1	\$ 4,380,665	\$ 31,513,735	-
Stockton	3	2	\$ 925,997	\$ 7,846,314	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>\$ 14,764,042</b>	<b>\$ 131,563,641</b>	<b>685,306</b>
San Mateo County	2	1	\$ 107,818	\$ 13,832,182	718,451
San Mateo	1	1	\$ 103,230	\$ 796,770	-
Redwood City	3	3	\$ 84,717	\$ 653,883	-
Woodside	3	3	\$ 334,491	\$ 2,581,733	-
South San Francisco	2	2	\$ 310,407	\$ 2,395,843	-
Half Moon Bay	1	1	\$ 864,494	\$ 6,672,506	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>\$ 1,805,157</b>	<b>\$ 26,932,917</b>	<b>718,451</b>
San Francisco County	1	1	\$ 683,387	\$ 5,274,652	805,235
San Francisco County Transportation Authority	9	1	\$ 12,625,186	\$ 97,446,179	-
Peninsula Joint Powers Board	5	1	\$ 1,070,907	\$ 20,735,684	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$ 14,379,480</b>	<b>\$ 123,456,515</b>	<b>805,235</b>
Ventura County	4	1	\$ 339,663	\$ 2,771,650	823,318
Simi Valley	2	2	\$ 61,938	\$ 478,062	-
Oxnard	2	2	\$ 305,297	\$ 2,356,404	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>\$ 706,898</b>	<b>\$ 5,606,116</b>	<b>823,318</b>
Kern County	3	1	\$ 89,466	\$ 3,300,534	839,631
Bakersfield	2	2	\$ 957,745	\$ 7,392,255	-

<b>Total:</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$ 1,047,211</b>	<b>\$ 10,692,789</b>	<b>839,631</b>	
Fresno County	12	4	\$ 1,771,166	\$ 19,142,250	930,450	
Reedley	1	1	\$ 2,106,670	\$ 15,293,330	-	
Clovis	1	1	\$ 115,262	\$ 889,638	-	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>\$ 3,993,098</b>	<b>\$ 35,325,218</b>	<b>930,450</b>	
Contra Costa County	8	4	\$ 2,409,311	\$ 28,835,214	1,049,025	
Concord	2	2	\$ 570,417	\$ 4,402,708	-	
Martinez	1	1	\$ 10,375	\$ 80,075	-	
Orinda	3	2	\$ 218,802	\$ 2,953,512	-	
Pittsburg	1	1	\$ 103,230	\$ 796,770	-	
Pleasant Hill	2	2	\$ 693,189	\$ 5,350,311	-	
Antioch	1	1	\$ 2,107,782	\$ 15,417,200	-	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>\$ 6,113,106</b>	<b>\$ 57,835,790</b>	<b>1,049,025</b>	
Sacramento County	16	7	\$ 7,764,615	\$ 84,813,883	1,418,788	
Elk Grove	1	1	\$ 965,086	\$ 7,448,914	-	
City of Sacramento	7	6	\$ 3,739,908	\$ 29,076,092	-	
Folsom	2	2	\$ 1,267,894	\$ 9,786,106	-	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>\$ 13,737,503</b>	<b>\$ 131,124,995</b>	<b>1,418,788</b>	
Alameda County	2	1	\$ 83,874	\$ 647,376	1,510,271	
Oakland	8	8	\$ 7,513,994	\$ 55,912,324	-	
San Leandro	1	1	\$ 94,628	\$ 730,373	-	
Union City	2	2	\$ 791,932	\$ 6,112,443	-	
Fremont	2	2	\$ 1,301,496	\$ 9,301,787	-	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>\$ 9,785,924</b>	<b>\$ 72,704,303</b>	<b>1,510,271</b>	
Santa Clara County	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	1,781,642	
Palo Alto	1	1	\$ 283,883	\$ 2,191,118	-	
San Jose	2	1	\$ 608,942	\$ 7,006,308	-	
Sunnyvale	2	2	\$ 3,442,032	\$ 26,566,968	-	
Los Altos	2	2	\$ 449,452	\$ 2,854,673	-	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>\$ 4,784,309</b>	<b>\$ 38,619,067</b>	<b>1,781,642</b>	
San Bernadino County	8	7	\$ 3,967,549	\$ 30,978,138	2,035,210	
Colton	9	4	\$ 3,941,189	\$ 30,159,365	-	
Highland	3	2	\$ 5,001,550	\$ 45,087,579	-	
Loma Linda	1	1	\$ 26,851	\$ 207,251	-	
Rialto	1	1	\$ 4,309,853	\$ 33,265,148	-	
City of San Bernadino	2	2	\$ 4,950,470	\$ 38,209,689	-	
Victorville	1	1	\$ 622,431	\$ 4,804,159	-	
Yucaipa	5	4	\$ 1,349,462	\$ 10,285,538	-	
Barstow	3	3	\$ 450,198	\$ 3,774,803	-	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>\$ 24,619,553</b>	<b>\$ 196,771,670</b>	<b>2,035,210</b>	
Riverside County	1	1	\$ 4,414,230	\$ 34,070,771	2,189,641	
Indio	6	6	\$ 858,992	\$ 6,630,043	-	

Lake Elsinore	1	1	\$ 455,794	\$ 3,235,400	-	
La Quinta	1	1	\$ 1,325,321	\$ 10,229,350	-	
Murrieta	1	0	\$ 127,740	\$ 7,446,960	-	
Palm Springs	5	5	\$ 17,452,230	\$ 134,349,970	-	
Perris	1	1	\$ 137,640	\$ 1,062,360	-	
Rancho Mirage	1	1	\$ 4,518,033	\$ 34,871,967	-	
Temecula	1	0	\$ -	\$ 6,250,510	-	
Moreno Valley	1	1	\$ 379,044	\$ 2,590,956	-	
Cathedral City	3	3	\$ 5,868,626	\$ 45,296,375	-	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>\$ 35,537,650</b>	<b>\$ 286,034,662</b>	<b>2,189,641</b>	
<b>Orange County</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>3,010,232</b>	
Huntington Beach	6	1	\$ 354,613	\$ 15,551,544	-	
Laguna Niguel	1	1	\$ 416,935	\$ 3,218,066	-	
Mission Viejo	1	1	\$ 1,019,801	\$ 6,960,549	-	
Newport Beach	1	1	\$ 206,243	\$ 1,368,758	-	
Rancho Santa Margarita	1	1	\$ 143,260	\$ 1,105,740	-	
Santa Ana	1	1	\$ 1,350,078	\$ 10,420,433	-	
Irvine	1	1	\$ 105,868	\$ 817,132	-	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>\$ 3,596,798</b>	<b>\$ 39,442,222</b>	<b>3,010,232</b>	
<b>San Diego County</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>\$ 2,253,200</b>	<b>\$ 45,309,267</b>	<b>3,095,313</b>	
Carlsbad	2	2	\$ 249,473	\$ 1,925,528	-	
Del Mar	1	1	\$ 168,666	\$ 1,301,834	-	
Oceanside	3	2	\$ 5,189,647	\$ 38,442,813	-	
City of San Diego	8	7	\$ 23,501,889	\$ 177,932,145	-	
San Marcos	1	1	\$ 1,523,273	\$ 11,757,227	-	
Santee	1	1	\$ 32,116	\$ 247,884	-	
Chula Vista	1	1	\$ 2,150,551	\$ 14,906,867	-	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>\$ 35,068,815</b>	<b>\$ 291,823,565</b>	<b>3,095,313</b>	
<b>Los Angeles County</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>\$ 20,593,978</b>	<b>\$ 164,901,277</b>	<b>9,818,605</b>	
Agoura Hills	1	0	\$ -	\$ 1,140,000	-	
City of Los Angeles	22	22	\$ 61,356,550	\$ 540,291,084	-	
Long Beach	3	0	\$ -	\$ 70,000	-	
Norwalk	1	1	\$ 1,189,737	\$ 9,182,863	-	
La Canada Flintridge	1	1	\$ 162,637	\$ 1,162,348	-	
Pasadena	1	1	\$ 994,528	\$ 7,676,165	-	
San Dimas	1	1	\$ 274,133	\$ 2,115,867	-	
Santa Clarita	4	2	\$ 882,676	\$ 16,737,974	-	
Santa Fe Springs	2	2	\$ 24,546	\$ 189,454	-	
Santa Monica	2	1	\$ 1,938,847	\$ 20,586,637	-	
South Gate	1	1	\$ 1,093,435	\$ 8,439,565	-	
Vernon	2	2	\$ 1,835,200	\$ 14,164,800	-	
Culver City	1	1	\$ 871,111	\$ 6,723,582	-	

Carson	1	1	\$ 157,713	\$ 1,217,288	-	
Port of Long Beach	3	3	\$ 28,898,506	\$ 213,754,120	-	
Burbank	2	2	\$ 2,974,171	\$ 22,955,829	-	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>\$ 123,247,768</b>	<b>\$ 1,031,308,853</b>	<b>9,818,605</b>	
Department of Water Resources	23	15	\$ 1,046,982	\$ 8,851,018	-	
<b>Grand Totals:</b>	<b>719</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>\$ 390,861,142.00</b>	<b>\$ 3,867,621,373.00</b>	<b>37,238,956</b>	

NOTES:

All data from 5/2/2011 Reports, Caltrans Division of Local Assistance

<sup>1</sup>Totals include Bridge Preventative Maintenance Program for each jurisdiction. The Bridge Preventative Maintenance Program is considered "on system."

<sup>2</sup>Population totals from 2010 US Census and population grand total is for only counties in this list (may not include entire state).

<sup>3</sup>Includes total funds for "on" and "off" system projects.
