



2020 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

WORKSHOP 1

Wednesday, April 10, 2019

Time: 10:00 AM to 11:00 AM

Location: Kern COG Board Room
1401 19th St. Suite 300
Bakersfield, CA 93301

A TELECONFERENCE NUMBER WILL
BE PROVIDED UPON REQUEST.



TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

- RTIP Project Nominations
- KCOG 60/40 RTIP Policy
- Current Project Needs
- CTC Fund Estimate
- CTC STIP Guidelines
- Status of MOU projects

Questions or comments?
Please contact:

Joe Stramaglia
jstramaglia@kerncog.org
661-635-2914

Kern Council of Governments
2019 RTIP Project Nomination Application Instructions

Part 1 - Project Information - The project information form should be completed by the nominating agency. The most important element is the purpose and need statement, project location and limits, and work description. If the purpose and need statement won't fit into the form, then attach a separate document to complete it. Keep it descriptive but succinct and to no more than two pages. This effort is collaborative and a member agency should request assistance from Kern COG and Caltrans if needed.

Part 2 – Project Cost Estimate - Project estimates for this RTIP nomination process will be planning level estimates. Nominated projects are not expected to have a completed Project Study Report. STIP Guidelines require the completion of a Project Study Report only when nominating a project to the CTC for inclusion into the STIP. The project sponsor shall include Caltrans support costs for each phase estimate. A minimum of 10% for each phase should be used to estimate support costs. Rights-of-way costs may prove to be more difficult to estimate. Use the cost estimate form provided in the nomination package. Also provided is a cost per unit reference list by construction types. Other estimate options include: researching cost of similar projects delivered elsewhere in the state, or collaborate with Kern COG and Caltrans to find the best option.

Part 3 – STIP Required Project Output Data - The key point for this section is that each RTIP nominated project requires a succinct purpose and need statement and work description, enough to set limits for the project so that a cost estimate can be developed and so that a description of infrastructure outputs can be described for the project.

Part 4 – Required STIP Infrastructure Output Information - The STIP output reporting items can be identified once the project is suitably described. So things like lane miles rehabilitated, lane miles added, interchange added, ramps reconstructed, miles or feet of new sidewalks, new bike lanes, new storm drains added, etc. all should be estimated as part of the purpose and need statement and development of the work description. The state uses this required information to support statewide goals set forth in a variety of state infrastructure asset management plans.

Part 5 – RTIP Screening Criteria and Ranking Performance Measure Outputs - Screening Criteria – the nominating agency should also answer the screening criteria questions, either yes or no. All screening criteria in order to move forward will be validated through the data analysis process. **At this point, the nomination process would be deemed complete in order to turn in a regional project nomination.**

Part 6 –STIP Required Performance Measure Outputs that Require Calculations – Calculations are required for many performance measure outputs needed to rank the project and required by STIP guidelines. Calculations will be developed by Kern COG staff. Kern COG modeling outputs will use a baseline model, a future year model with the project and without the project, in order to compare results and determine benefits. The modeling data will help inform calculated outputs for many of the required outputs.

Part 7 – Development of Ranking Points and final Prioritized list of Regional Projects - Kern COG staff in collaboration with the peer review team, the TTAC and Caltrans planning and engineering staff will provide oversight of the development of the final prioritized list. Once approved, Kern COG staff will then develop a financial plan for use in future updates to the Regional Transportation Plan and future RTIP and FTIP programming.

On the following pages, several tables taken from the Kern COG guidance that reflect output listings, are further expanded to explain what metrics and formulas will be used to calculate final output values. In some cases, manual input and calculations are required. A spreadsheet tool will be used for that purpose. For other cases, the Kern COG transportation model will be used to calculate these values.

Kern Council of Governments
2019 RTIP Project Nomination Application Instructions

Cover letter – The nominating agency should provide a transmittal letter on agency letterhead with a listing of the recommended regional project nominations. The cover letter should also include a response to the required screening criteria questions. For each of the project nominations, there should be a set of completed forms for each project.

Part 1 – Project Information - The project information form houses the purpose and need statement and other details to establish the project limits and the work description. The instructions below describe the suggested elements for the statement.

PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT / PROJECT LIMITS / WORK DESCRIPTION
State the problem and the intended project objective
Establish evidence of need or deficiency
Provide specific multi-modal focus of deficiency
Describe problem that is fixable or solvable
Provide specific deficiencies for safety & access
Provide support for work description / solution
Provide specific data to support all deficiency claims
Describe multimodal solution to problem

Part 2 – Project Cost Estimate – The Project Cost Estimate Form should be used for the nomination package. The sponsoring agency should decide how to develop the cost estimate. A minimum of 10% for each phase should be used to estimate support costs. Once the cost estimate is developed, it will be used to develop the benefit cost ratio.

Part 3 – STIP Required Project Output Data - The key point for this section is that each RTIP nominated project requires a succinct purpose and need statement and work description, enough to set limits for the project so that a cost estimate can be developed and so that a description of infrastructure outputs can be described for the project. The elements listed below are taken from the adopted KCOG Project Delivery Guidelines and adopted CTC STIP Guidelines. The nomination package includes a Part 3 form to fill out.

Description of Project Output Required by CTC STIP Guidelines	Quantity
State Highway - new general purpose lane-miles	
State Highway - new HOV / HOT lane-miles	
State Highway - lane-miles rehabilitated	
State Highway - new or upgrade bicycle / pedestrian	
State Highway - operational improvements	
State Highway - new or reconstructed interchanges	
State Highway - new or reconstructed bridges	
Mass Transportation - new transit miles or vehicles	
Mass Transportation - miles of new track	
Mass Transportation - rail crossing improvements	
Mass Transportation - station improvements	
Local Streets - new lane miles	
Local Streets - lane-miles rehabilitated	
Local Streets - new or upgrade bicycle / pedestrian	
Local Streets - Operational Improvements	
Local Streets - new or reconstructed bridges	

At this point, remaining project evaluation data will be developed by Kern COG in collaboration with the peer review team, the nominating agency and Caltrans. On the following pages, further explanation is offered as to what data will be manually calculated and what data will be developed by the Kern COG model.

Kern Council of Governments
2019 RTIP Project Nomination Application Instructions

REGION WIDE PERFORMANCE REQUIRED BY ADOPTED CTC STIP GUIDELINES		
Does the RTIP further goals of region's RTP and SCS?	KCOG	Yes or No
What is the VMT Per Capita for entire region?	KCOG	baseline output
What is baseline % of congested VMT at or below 35 MPH?	KCOG	baseline output
What is the baseline % of commute mode share to work or school?	KCOG	baseline output
What is the % of distressed state highway lane-miles in Kern County?	CT / KCOG	baseline output
What is Pavement Condition Index in Kern County for Local Streets and	KCOG	baseline output
What is the % of bridge lane-miles in Kern County requiring repair?	CT / KCOG	Sufficiency Rating of 80 or below
What is the % of transit assets to surpass FTA useful life period?	KCOG	baseline output
What is the average extra time commuters add to their normal trip time?	KCOG	baseline output - reliability
What is the region wide fatality and injury rate for Kern County per Capita?	KCOG	Fatality and Injury Index - per capita
What is the region wide fatality and injury rate for Kern County per VMT?	KCOG	Fatality and Injury Index - per VMT
What is the % of transit access within 1/2 mile with 15-minute headways?	KCOG	Percentage of households
What is the average travel time to work or school?	KCOG	regional baseline output
What is the change in acres of agricultural land?	KCOG	regional baseline output
What is the change in CO2 reduction per capita?	KCOG	regional baseline output
What is the accessibility and on-time performance for rail and transit?	KCOG	regional baseline output
What is the regional fare-box recovery ratio for Kern County?	KCOG	regional baseline output

FIGURE 3-D: SUMMARY OF DATA NEEDED FOR RANKING PROCESS		
OUTCOME DESCRIPTION	DATA SOURCE	OUTPUT
SAFETY		
Fatalities/capita/year and Injuries/capita/year (3-year average)	SWITRS	project vs. no project
Fatalities/VMT/year and Injuries/VMT/year (3-year average)	SWITRS	project vs. no project
ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY		
Change in accessibility (metric TBD)	KCOG	Project vs. no project
Change in on-time performance (metric TBD)	KCOG	Project vs. no project
SYSTEM RELIABILITY		
Highway Buffer Index – delay trip time	KCOG	project vs. no project
CONGESTION REDUCTION		
VMT / person / daily	KCOG	Project vs. no project
Percentage of VMT 35 MPR or less	KCOG	Project vs. no project
Percent mode share - work or school.	KCOG	Project vs. no project
COST EFFECTIVENESS		
Project cost-effectiveness vs. regional	CT B/C tool	Project vs. Regional
Project Benefit Cost Ratio	CT B/C tool	Build vs No Build
Project Life Cycle Cost	CT Calculator	Build vs No Build
Project GHG Impacts	ARB / EPA tools	Build vs No Build

PROJECT NAME: SR ### - PROJECT TITLE			
PROJECT INFORMATION			
DATE:		PM BK	PM AHD
RTE:			
PROJECT SPONSOR / LEAD AGENCY			
PM CONTACT		TELEPHONE	E-MAIL ADDRESS
PROJECT TITLE			
PHASE	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY		
PA&ED			
PS&E			
ROW			
CON			
PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT			
LOCATION, PROJECT LIMITS, DESCRIPTION, SCOPE OF WORK			

PROJECT NAME: SR ### - PROJECT TITLE
PROJECT INFORMATION
SUMMARY OF PROJECT BENEFITS
GOOGLE EARTH GRAPHIC OF PROJECT AREA

PROJECT NAME: SR ### - PROJECT TITLE					
PROJECT INFORMATION					
DATE:		PM BK	PM AHD	PROJECT SPONSOR / LEAD AGENCY	
RTE:					
PM CONTACT		TELEPHONE		E-MAIL ADDRESS	
PROJECT TITLE					
PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF COST					
ITEM	ITEM DESCRIPTION	UNIT	AMT	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT
COMPLETED BY:		DATE:	SUBTOTAL		\$ -
CHECKED BY:		DATE:	CONTINGENCY ____%		\$ -
			CON ENG ____%		\$ -
APPROVED:		DATE:	TOTAL		\$ -

Construction Cost Estimates

<i>Description</i>	<i>Unit</i>	20 years old <i>Unit Cost</i>	10 years 3% Yr
2-Lane Conventional Highway (PCC)	mile	\$2,670,000	\$3,695,904
4-Lane Conventional Highway (PCC)	mile	\$4,450,000	\$6,159,841
6-Lane Conventional Highway (PCC)	mile	\$6,300,000	\$8,720,673
2-Lane Conventional Highway (AC)	mile	\$2,790,000	\$3,862,012
4-Lane Conventional Highway (AC)	mile	\$4,610,000	\$6,381,318
6-Lane Conventional Highway (AC)	mile	\$6,370,000	\$8,817,570
2-Lane Freeway Widening (PCC)	mile	\$2,670,000	\$3,695,904
4-Lane Freeway (PCC)	mile	\$4,630,000	\$6,409,003
6-Lane Freeway (PCC)	mile	\$6,330,000	\$8,762,200
8-Lane Freeway (PCC)	mile	\$7,920,000	\$10,963,132
2-Lane Freeway Widening (AC)	mile	\$2,790,000	\$3,862,012
4-Lane Freeway (AC)	mile	\$5,010,000	\$6,935,012
6-Lane Freeway (AC)	mile	\$6,780,000	\$9,385,106
8-Lane Freeway (AC)	mile	\$8,470,000	\$11,724,461
			\$0
2 ft. Shoulder Widening (Both Sides)	mile	\$110,000	\$152,266
4 ft. Shoulder Widening (Both Sides)	mile	\$220,000	\$304,531
8 ft. Shoulder Widening (Both Sides)	mile	\$440,000	\$609,063
			\$0
New Ramp	each	\$2,500,000	\$3,460,585
Modify Ramp (Minor)	each	\$1,000,000	\$1,384,234
Modify Ramp (Major)	each	\$2,500,000	\$3,460,585
Auxiliary Lane	each	\$2,500,000	\$3,460,585
2-Lane Overcrossing (0.4 miles)	each	\$3,000,000	\$4,152,702
4-Lane Overcrossing (0.4 miles)	each	\$5,000,000	\$6,921,169
6-Lane Overcrossing (0.4 miles)	each	\$7,000,000	\$9,689,637
			\$0
Diamond Interchange	each	\$15,000,000	\$20,763,508
Partial Cloverleaf Interchange	each	\$20,000,000	\$27,684,677
Full-Quadrant Cloverleaf Interchange	each	\$25,000,000	\$34,605,847
Signal	each	\$250,000	\$346,058
Left Turn Lane (400 ft.)	each	\$200,000	\$276,847
Right Turn Lane (200 ft.)	each	\$100,000	\$138,423

Legend:

PCC = Portland Concrete Cement

AC = Asphalt Concrete

Notes:

These cost estimates are for roadway construction only and do not include right-of-way, engineering, environmental, or administrative costs.

DRAFT Regional Improvement Program 60/40 Formula Apportionment
(Programming After 2016 RTIP)

Project Description	Balance	Non - 60/40	Metro	%	Non-Metro	%
1998 RTIP Augmentation	\$6,177,000		\$3,706,200	60%	\$2,470,800	40%
Cecil Ave; Albany St-Browning Rd	\$5,646,000				\$531,000	
7th Standard; Rte 99-Santa Fe Exp.	\$5,070,000				\$576,000	
Wheeler Ridge Rd;Le Gray Rd-Rte 223	\$3,970,000				\$1,100,000	
Rte 14; old Rte 58-Phillips Rd	\$3,550,000				\$420,000	
Rte 46; SLO Co. line-Keck's Corner **a	\$3,185,000				\$365,000	
Rte 46; Wasco Rte 43 N.-Jumper Ave	\$2,185,000				\$1,000,000	
Rte 58; in Tehachapi at Dennison Rd	\$1,685,000				\$500,000	
Rte 119; in Taft, Cherry-Tupman	\$868,000				\$817,000	
Rte 184; Rte 223-Panama Lane	\$254,000				\$614,000	
Rte 395; Inyo Co.-Olancha/Cartago	\$139,000				\$115,000	
1998 Balance	\$139,000^{ab}		\$0	0%	\$6,038,000	98%

2000 RTIP Committed Programming^{*c}	\$7,426,000		\$4,455,600	60%	\$2,970,400	40%
Rte 14; old Rte 58-Phillips Rd	\$2,000,000				\$5,426,000	
Rte 46; SLO Co. line-Keck's Corner **a	\$1,000,000				\$1,000,000	
Rte 46; Keck's Road to I-5 **a	\$0				\$1,000,000	
2000 Balance			\$0	0%	\$7,426,000	100%

2002 RTIP Committed Programming^{*c}	\$37,008,000		\$8,766,000	60%	\$5,844,000	40%
STIP PPM	\$36,510,000	\$498,000				
Westside Parkway ^{*d}	\$14,610,000	\$21,900,000				
Rte 14; near Rte 178	\$13,086,000				\$1,524,000	
Rte 46; Keck's Road to I-5 ^{*a}	\$8,631,000				\$4,455,000	
Rte 46; Rte43 N.-Jumper Ave	\$8,221,000				\$410,000	
Rte 58; in Tehachapi at Dennison Rd	\$7,186,000				\$1,035,000	
Rte 99; White Lane Soundwall	\$6,436,000		\$750,000			
Rte 119; in Taft, Cherry-Tupman	\$5,436,000				\$1,000,000	
Rte 184; Weedpatch Hwy	\$4,096,000				\$1,340,000	
Rte 395; China Lake Blvd to Rte178	\$3,296,000				\$800,000	
Rte 395; Mono Co.- Highpoint Curve	\$3,165,000				\$131,000	
Rte 395; I-15 to Rte 58	\$1,165,000				\$2,000,000	
West Ridgecrest Blvd	\$165,000				\$1,000,000	
7th Standard Road (East) - Wings Way	\$0		\$165,000			
2002 Balance			\$915,000	6%	\$13,695,000	94%

2004 RTIP Committed Programming^{*c}	\$72,132,000		\$24,643,800	60%	\$16,429,200	40%
STIP PPM	\$71,773,000	\$359,000				
Westside Parkway ^{*d}	\$41,073,000	\$30,700,000				
Rte 14; old Rte 58-Phillips Rd	\$22,960,000				\$18,113,000	
Rte 46; SLO Co. line-Keck's Corner **a	\$22,160,000				\$800,000	
Rte 46; Rte43 N.-Jumper Ave	\$21,500,000				\$660,000	
Rte 119; in Taft, Cherry-Tupman	\$21,000,000				\$500,000	
Rte 178; at Fairfax Rd	\$6,000,000		\$15,000,000			
7th Standard Road Interchange	\$3,500,000		\$2,500,000			
7th Standard Road (East) - Wings Way	\$1,000,000		\$2,500,000			
7th Standard Road (West) - Shafter	\$0				\$1,000,000	
2004 Balance			\$20,000,000	49%	\$21,073,000	51%

DRAFT Regional Improvement Program 60/40 Formula Apportionment

(Programming After 2016 RTIP)

Project Description	Balance	Non- 60/40	Metro	%	Non-Metro	%
2006 RTIP - Respreading Budget^{*c}	\$13,014,000		\$7,733,400	60%	\$5,155,600	40%
STIP PPM	\$12,889,000	\$125,000				
Rte 58; in Tehachapi at Dennison Rd	\$11,720,000				\$1,169,000	
Rte 395; China Lake Blvd to Rte178	\$11,280,000				\$440,000	
Rte 395; Inyo Co.-Indep. Mitigation	\$11,200,000				\$80,000	
7th Standard Road (West) - Shafter	\$0				\$11,200,000	
2006 Balance			\$0	0%	\$12,889,000	100%
2006 RTIP Augmentation	\$20,592,000		\$1,843,200	60%	\$1,228,800	40%
STIP PPM	\$19,772,000	\$820,000				
Westside Parkway ^{*d}	\$3,072,000	\$16,700,000				
Rte 46; Keck's Road to Rte 33 ^{*a}	\$2,622,000				\$450,000	
Rte 395; Inyo Co.-Independence	\$687,000				\$1,935,000	
Rte 395; Inyo Co.-Olancha/Cartago	\$0				\$687,000	
2006 Augmentation Balance			\$0	0%	\$3,072,000	100%
2008 RTIP Committed Programming	\$164,761,000		\$61,756,800	60%	\$41,171,200	40%
STIP PPM	\$161,598,000	\$3,163,000				
Westside Parkway ^{*d}	\$28,398,000	\$58,670,000	\$74,530,000			
Rte 46; SLO Co. line-Keck's Corner ^{*a}	\$27,098,000				\$1,300,000	
Rte 46; Keck's Road to Rte 33 ^{*a}	\$0				\$27,098,000	
2008 Balance			\$74,530,000	72%	\$28,398,000	28%
2010 RTIP Committed Programming	\$54,477,000		\$31,620,000	60%	\$21,080,000	40%
STIP PPM	\$52,700,000	\$1,777,000				
Westside Parkway	\$2,700,000		\$50,000,000			
SR 99: South	\$0		\$2,700,000			
2010 Balance			\$52,700,000	100%	\$0	0%
2012 RTIP Committed Programming	\$16,318,000		\$9,232,800	60%	\$6,155,200	40%
STIP PPM	\$15,388,000	\$930,000				
Rte 14; near Rte 178	\$9,868,000				\$5,520,000	
Rte 395; Inyo Co. Olancha/Cartago	\$7,700,000				\$2,168,000	
West Ridgecrest Blvd	\$1,500,000				\$6,200,000	
Challenger Drive Ext.	\$0				\$1,500,000	
2012 Balance			\$0	0%	\$15,388,000	100%
2014 RTIP Committed Programming	\$5,803,000		\$3,123,000	60%	\$2,082,000	40%
STIP PPM	\$5,205,000	\$598,000				
Rte 119; Truck Climbing Lane	\$0				\$5,205,000	
2014 Balance			\$0	0%	\$5,205,000	100%
2016 RTIP Respreading Budget^{*c}	\$38,398,000		\$22,560,600	60%	\$15,040,400	40%
STIP PPM	\$37,601,000	\$797,000				
Rte 46; Lost Hill Rd to E of I-5; 4A	\$33,501,000				\$4,100,000	
Rte 58; Westside Parkway Connector	\$500,000		\$33,001,000			
Rte 395; Inyo Co. Olancha/Cartago Arch.	\$0				\$500,000	
2016 Balance			\$33,001,000	87%	\$4,600,000	12%

DRAFT Regional Improvement Program 60/40 Formula Apportionment
(Programming After 2016 RTIP)

Project Description	Balance	Non- 60/40	Metro	%	Non-Metro	%
2018 RTIP Cycle	\$79,440,000		\$47,094,600	60%	\$31,396,400	40%
STIP PPM	\$78,491,000	\$949,000				
Rte 14 Freeman Gulch-Segment 2	\$76,531,000				\$1,960,000	
Rte 46; Lost Hills Rd to E of I-5; 4A	\$75,405,000				\$1,126,000	
Rte 46; Brown Mat.-e/o Lost Hills Rd;4B	\$73,005,000				\$2,400,000	
Rte 58; WS Pkwy Conn Mainline Ph1	\$42,795,000		\$30,210,000			
Rte 58; WS Pkwy Conn Intchg Ph2	\$12,795,000		\$30,000,000			
Rte 132 Expressway, Phase 1	\$9,295,000				\$3,500,000	
Rte 395; Inyo Co. Olancha/Cartago	\$0				\$9,295,000	
2018 Balance			\$60,210,000	77%	\$18,281,000	23%
<hr/>						
End Balance* ^e			\$241,356,000	64%	\$136,065,000	36%
			<u>\$226,452,600</u>	<u>60%</u>	<u>\$150,968,400</u>	<u>40%</u>
			\$14,903,400		-\$14,903,400	

Notes:

*^a As per \$45 million total commitment.

*^b Carryover included in the next RTIP fund estimate because no project was ready to utilize for any phase of development.

*^c The 2006 RTIP and 2016 RTIP do not offer any new programming dollars instead existing unallocated programming from previous RTIP cycles has been respread.

*^d \$145 million of 1998 RTIP funds were dedicated to the former Kern River Freeway in the Metro area at the beginning of SB45 and before the 60/40 policy adoption. The "End Balance" is calculated without the \$145 million.

*^e "End Balance" analysis consists of the sum of committed programming. Kern COG staff was careful not to double count any commitments. Please bring any corrections to the attention of Kern COG staff.

2020 RTIP - WORKSHOP NO. 1 APRIL 10, 2019

2020 RTIP - QUICK LOOK AT PROJECT NEEDS FOR PROJECTS ALREADY IN THE STIP				
PROJECT	PHASE	STATUS	FUNDING NEEDED	YEAR READY
SR 46 WIDENING SEGMENT 4A	CONSTRUCTION	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	NONE	---
SR 46 WIDENING SEGMENT 4B	DESIGN	DESIGN IN PROGRESS	NONE	---
SR 46 WIDENING SEGMENT 4B	RW	RW IN PROGRESS	NONE	---
SR 46 WIDENING SEGMENT 4B	CONSTRUCTION	NOT YET PROGRAMMED	\$ 52,000,000	---
SR 14 FREEMAN GULCH WIDENING 2	RW	NOT YET PROGRAMMED	\$ 8,000,000	2021-22
SR 14 FREEMAN GULCH WIDENING 2	CONSTRUCTION	NOT YET PROGRAMMED	\$ 37,000,000	2022-23
SR 14 FREEMAN GULCH WIDENING 3	DESIGN	NOT YET PROGRAMMED	\$ 5,000,000	FUTURE
SR 14 FREEMAN GULCH WIDENING 3	RW	NOT YET PROGRAMMED	\$ 7,000,000	FUTURE
SR 14 FREEMAN GULCH WIDENING 3	CONSTRUCTION	NOT YET PROGRAMMED	\$ 49,000,000	FUTURE
TOTAL NEEDS			\$ 158,000,000	

60/40 calculations	current as of 2018 STIP	\$ 79,478,000	2020 RTIP	CUMULATIVE
metro	64%	\$ 44,507,680	56%	60%
non-metro	36%	\$ 34,970,320	44%	40%

Estimates of future phase costs are from 2017. New estimates will be required for final programming recommendations.

The needs listed above do not include the Bakersfield Metropolitan area.

The amount of new programmed RIP / STIP funding received for the **2018 RTIP Cycle: \$79,478,000.**

If the same STIP Fund Estimate amount were identified for the 2020 RTIP cycle, and we applied the KCOG equity policy, there were be an estimated target amount of \$44 M for the Metropolitan Bakersfield area and \$35M for Countywide non-metro projects.