

# 2015 California's Five-Year Infrastructure Plan

Edmund G. Brown Jr. Governor, State of California



This page intentionally blank to facilitate double-sided printing.

# 2015 FIVE-YEAR INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Infrastructure Plan</b> .....	<b>11</b>
Judicial Branch .....	11
Transportation Agency .....	14
Department of Transportation .....	15
High Speed Rail Authority .....	17
California Highway Patrol .....	19
Department of Motor Vehicles .....	21
Natural Resources Agency .....	23
State Conservancies and Wildlife Conservation Board .....	25
California Science Center .....	26
California Conservation Corps .....	28
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection .....	29
Department of Fish and Wildlife .....	32
Department of Parks and Recreation .....	34
Department of Water Resources .....	36
California Environmental Protection Agency .....	39
Air Resources Board .....	40
Health and Human Services Agency .....	41
Department of Public Health .....	41
Department of Developmental Services .....	42
Department of State Hospitals .....	45
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation .....	48
Education .....	53
K-12 School Facilities .....	53
State Special Schools .....	57
Higher Education .....	59
University of California .....	60
California State University .....	60
California Community Colleges .....	61
Hastings College of the Law .....	63
General Government .....	64
Office of Emergency Services .....	64
Department of Technology .....	66
Department of General Services .....	67
Department of Food and Agriculture .....	69
Military Department..... .....	71
Department of Veterans Affairs .....	74
<b>Appendices</b> .....	<b>77</b>
1 – Proposed 2015 Five-Year Infrastructure Funding .....	77
2 – History of California Bonds by Program Area .....	81
3 – History of California Bonds by Date of Authorization .....	85
4 – Authorized and Outstanding General Obligation Bonds .....	89
5 – State Public Works Board and Other Lease Revenue Financing Outstanding Issues .....	91
6 – Authorized but Unissued Lease Revenue Bonds .....	93

This page intentionally blank to facilitate double-sided printing.

# INTRODUCTION

Since 1999, the California Infrastructure Planning Act has required the Governor to submit to the Legislature a five-year infrastructure plan for consideration with the annual budget bill. The 2015 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan (Plan) presents the Governor's proposal for investing \$57 billion in state infrastructure over the next five years.

Consistent with most states in the nation, the fiscal challenges created by the Great Recession resulted in California deferring many important infrastructure and maintenance investments. The 2014 Plan was the first infrastructure plan released since 2008. The 2014 Plan addressed the shortcomings of the prior plans by including a funding source for projects proposed in the Plan, discussing the importance of maintaining the state's infrastructure, and proposing additional funding towards deferred maintenance. The 2015 Plan continues the emphasis on deferred maintenance and improves the Plan by including project specific information, such as project status and project phase information.

---

## **AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

Chapter 1016, Statutes of 2002 (AB 857), developed infrastructure planning priorities to promote equity, strengthen the economy, protect the environment, and promote public health and safety. It requires that any infrastructure proposed for funding in the state's infrastructure plan be consistent with these planning priorities:

## INTRODUCTION

- Promote infill development and equity by rehabilitating, maintaining, and improving existing infrastructure, and reusing previously developed underutilized land, particularly in underserved areas.
- Protect environmental and agricultural resources.
- Encourage efficient development patterns by locating new infrastructure in an area appropriately planned for growth and served by adequate transportation and services, and minimizing ongoing costs to taxpayers.

The vast majority of projects proposed in the Plan will rehabilitate existing state infrastructure, which is consistent with the goals of AB 857.

---

## OVERVIEW OF THE PLAN

The investment in physical infrastructure is a core function of state government. Infrastructure and capital assets allow for the delivery of key public services and the movement of goods across the state—both essential components in fostering the state’s long-term economic growth. Despite tens of billions of dollars invested over the past decade, there continue to be critical deficiencies in the state’s infrastructure, including a significant backlog of maintenance on existing infrastructure.

Competing spending priorities and the need to maintain the state’s long-term fiscal stability means the General Fund cannot afford to shoulder the costs of all potential infrastructure investments. Instead, the state must focus its limited infrastructure dollars on core responsibilities and priorities.

Similar to the 2014 Plan, the vast majority of the funding proposed in this Plan is dedicated to the state’s transportation system—over 92 percent. This reflects the sheer size of the state’s transportation system and the state’s commitment to the high-speed rail system. There are also investments proposed for addressing health and safety issues at various state institutions, including prisons, state hospitals, and the state special schools for the blind and deaf. The Plan includes various projects to provide additional and improved space at prisons and state hospitals to address concerns of the federal government and the federal courts. The Plan also includes the first expenditures from the recently approved Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (Proposition 1) and the Water Action Plan. Additionally, the Plan proposes to invest monies into trial court facilities, the state park system, facilities that support the California Highway Patrol and Department of Motor Vehicles, and other departments.

Budget challenges over the past decade have also resulted in a greater reliance on debt financing, rather than pay-as-you-go spending. From 1974 to 1999, California voters authorized \$38.4 billion of general obligation bonds. Since 2000, voters expanded the types of programs funded by bonds and authorized more than \$103.2 billion of general obligation bonds. Of all previously approved infrastructure bonds, \$86.7 billion (\$75.9 billion of general obligation bonds and \$10.8 billion of lease revenue bonds) in debt remains outstanding. Additionally, there are \$35.4 billion of general obligation and lease revenue bonds that are authorized but not yet issued. The bonds will be issued when projects are approved and ready for construction.

The increasing reliance on borrowing to pay for infrastructure has meant that roughly one out of every two dollars spent on infrastructure investments goes to pay interest costs, rather than for construction costs such as the purchase of concrete, steel, or other building materials. The amount of funds required to service the debt has steadily increased over the past decade. Annual expenditures on debt service have grown by 155 percent, from \$2.9 billion in 2000-01 to \$7.4 billion in 2014-15.

Over the past several years, the state has weighed decisions about infrastructure investments against other expenditure priorities. In 2013 and 2014, for example, legislation was enacted to shift the cost of existing debt service for the University of California and California State University facilities into their respective budgets. Going forward, both systems will manage their infrastructure needs within their overall available resources. Also, over the past few years, transportation funds have been earmarked for the payment of general obligation debt service on bonds issued for various transportation projects. Thus, all transportation priorities can be weighed against one another—whether for operations or capital. This year the Administration is proposing an overhaul in the approach to funding school facilities.

This Plan proposes \$57 billion in spending over the next five years. Of this amount, \$482 million is from the General Fund, \$8.8 billion is from various special funds, \$1.6 billion is from lease revenue bond funds, \$5.5 billion is from General Obligation bond funds, \$15.2 billion is from federal funds, \$4.2 billion is from reimbursements and other governmental cost funds, and \$21 billion is from High Speed Rail funds. See Figure INO-01 for a summary of the proposed funding by program area. A detailed listing of the specific projects proposed to be funded can be found in Appendix 1. Appendix 1 also identifies the cost of the projects, the phase of the project to be funded, and whether the project is a new or continuing project.

Figure INO-01  
**Proposed Spending Under Infrastructure Plan**  
 (Dollars in Millions)

Program Area	2015-16 Capital Funding	2015-16 Deferred Maintenance Funding
Judicial Branch	\$1,224	\$0
Transportation / High Speed Rail Authority	\$52,803	\$0
Natural Resources	\$1,398	\$22
California Environmental Protection Agency	\$366	\$0
Health and Human Services	\$180	\$14
Corrections and Rehabilitation	\$126	\$15
Education	\$234	\$406
General Government	\$243	\$21
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$56,574</b>	<b>\$478</b>

## MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE

Historically, California’s Five-Year Infrastructure Plans have given little consideration to either the cost of maintaining the state’s capital investments or the deferred maintenance on previous capital projects. For example, while billions of dollars in bonds have been approved by the voters over the past decade to purchase land, less attention has been paid to the availability of permanent funds to maintain and operate these lands. The 2014 Plan was the first plan to include a discussion on the maintenance of existing infrastructure.

Properly maintaining state facilities ensures the longest useful life of the facilities and reduces the need to build new facilities. Actions like repainting, re-roofing, repairing wiring and plumbing, dredging of river or stream beds to restore original flow capacity, replacing old equipment items, and repairing roads can all extend the useful life of infrastructure.

As a result of many years of across-the-board budget reductions, departments’ annual operating budgets provide very limited funding for facility maintenance. This has made it difficult for departments to absorb large maintenance projects such as re-roofing or replacing heating and cooling systems. Consequently, departments undertake only the most critical activities to keep facilities operational, and other maintenance items are deferred in hopes that funding will be available in the future. Deferring routine maintenance can lead to facility deterioration—and ultimately failure—and sometimes

the need to replace the facility sooner than otherwise would have been required if properly maintained. Deferred maintenance can be costly and a threat to public safety if facilities become unsafe.

Deferred maintenance is defined as maintenance activities that have not been accomplished to keep state-owned facilities in an acceptable and operable condition, and that are intended to extend the useful life of a facility. In contrast, capital outlay is defined as the cost of planning and constructing new buildings, additions to and modifications of existing buildings, and includes projects that generally expand the capacity or change the function of state-owned properties.

At present, the reported statewide deferred maintenance need totals over \$66 billion, as shown in Figure INO-02. Transportation represents by far the highest level of deferred maintenance. Much of the state highway system was built between the 1950s

---

Figure INO-02  
**Identified Statewide Deferred Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Millions)

Department of Transportation	\$59,000
Judicial Branch	\$1,930
Department of Parks and Recreation	\$1,420
California Community Colleges	\$1,034
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation	\$996
California State University	\$692
Department of Developmental Services	\$387
Department of General Services	\$138
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection	\$126
California Military Department	\$109
University of California	\$100
Network of California Fairs	\$57
Department of State Hospitals	\$54
State Special Schools	\$25
Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$21
Department of Veterans Affairs	\$21
California Highway Patrol	\$17
California Science Center	\$6
Department of Motor Vehicles	\$5
Office of Emergency Services	\$4
Department of Food and Agriculture	\$3
California Conservation Corps	\$0.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$66,145</b>

## INTRODUCTION

and early 1970s to serve a growing economy and population. The state's population has continued to grow significantly in recent decades, resulting in a corresponding increase in vehicle miles traveled and placing additional pressure on an aging state highway system. Similarly, increased international trade, coupled with the country's dependence on the state's port system, has led to a substantial increase in trucking. As cars have become more fuel efficient, revenues from excise taxes have not kept pace with the state's increasing need for highway maintenance and repairs. Of the \$1.5 billion that Caltrans' budgets annually for maintenance priorities, approximately \$412 million is used for highway maintenance work such as patching, thin overlays, joint and bearing repairs on bridges, and minor repairs to drainage systems—well under the estimated \$1.043 billion in annual pavement and structure maintenance needs. Similarly, the average annual funding of \$2 billion available for repair and preservation work in the State Highway Operation and Protection Program is insufficient to address the estimated \$8 billion in annual needs.

The 2014 Budget Act provided \$687 million of deferred maintenance funding: \$351 million for the Department of Transportation, \$148 million for the California Community Colleges, and \$188 million for the K-12 School Facilities Emergency Repair Program. A provision of the 2014 Budget Act would have provided an additional \$200 million in deferred maintenance for the University of California, California State University, Department of Parks and Recreation, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, and other specified state agencies. However, property tax revenues failed to reach a specific target to fund these projects.

The 2015 Plan places the same priority on addressing maintenance needs. The Plan proposes allocating one-time resources of \$125 million General Fund toward the backlog of deferred maintenance (see Figure INO-03). In addition, the Plan allocates \$353 million for the California Community Colleges to address critical deferred maintenance needs. The Plan's continued commitment to address this backlog will keep the state's assets functioning longer and reduce the need to build costlier new infrastructure.

Figure INO-03

**Proposed General Fund Deferred Maintenance  
Funding, 2015-16**

(Dollars in Millions)

California State University	\$25
University of California	\$25
Department of Parks and Recreation	\$20
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation	\$15
Department of State Hospitals	\$7
Network of California Fairs	\$7
Department of Developmental Services	\$7
Department of General Services	\$5
State Special Schools	\$3
Office of Emergency Services	\$3
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection	\$2
California Military Department	\$2
Department of Veterans Affairs	\$2
Department of Food and Agriculture	\$2
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$125</b>

## AFFORDABILITY — DEBT MANAGEMENT

The state has long used debt financing as a tool for infrastructure investment, similar to the private sector. However, since 2000, the state has greatly increased its reliance on debt financing—as opposed to pay-as-you-go—for infrastructure investments. In recent years, debt service has been one of the fastest growing segments of the budget.

As shown in Figure INO-04, debt service on infrastructure bonds is expected to increase to \$8.7 billion in 2018-19, assuming no new general obligation bonds are approved by the voters and only limited new lease revenue bonds are authorized. (For more information on the state's debt history, see Appendices 2 and 3.)

Figure INO-04

**Debt Service on General Obligation and Lease Revenue Bonds**

(Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year	All Funds			General Fund	
	General Fund Revenues	Debt Service	Debt Service Ratio <sup>1/</sup>	Debt Service	Debt Service Ratio <sup>1/</sup>
2013-14	\$102,675	\$6,955	6.77%	\$5,321	5.18%
2014-15	\$108,042	\$7,422	6.87%	\$5,696	5.27%
2015-16	\$113,380	\$7,896	6.96%	\$6,035	5.32%
2016-17	\$117,861	\$7,914	6.71%	\$5,929	5.03%
2017-18	\$123,460	\$8,197	6.64%	\$5,967	4.83%
2018-19	\$125,192	\$8,711	6.96%	\$6,404	5.12%

<sup>1/</sup> The debt service ratio expresses the state's debt service costs as a percentage of its General Fund revenues.

## INTRODUCTION

What constitutes a prudent debt position is relatively subjective, and both the bond market and the bond rating agencies consider a number of factors when reaching a conclusion about the reasonableness of a state’s debt position. Two measures commonly used to determine a state’s debt position are debt as a percent of state personal income and debt per capita.

- The ratio of a state’s debt to personal income is a reflection of the state’s debt compared to the state’s wealth (Figure INO-05). According to the 2014 State Debt Medians Report, by Moody’s, California’s total outstanding debt as a percentage of personal income is 5.3 percent. This is well above the national average of 3.2 percent. Only two of the ten most populous states—New York and Illinois—have more debt as a percentage of personal income.
- Debt per capita measures each state resident’s share of the total debt outstanding. California’s per capita debt was estimated to be \$2,465 in 2014 and since 2009 has increased over 36 percent—indicating that debt levels have grown faster than the population. California is well above the national average of \$1,436 as reported by Moody’s. California’s was ninth among the states in 2014 in terms of overall debt per capita, and only two of the ten most populous states—New York and Illinois—had higher debt per capita.

Figure INO-05

### Comparison of State's Debt to Other States <sup>a/</sup>

State	Percent of Personal Income					Debt Per Capita				
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
National Average	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.2	\$1,297	\$1,404	\$1,408	\$1,416	\$1,436
California	5.6	6.0	6.0	5.8	5.3	\$2,362	\$2,542	\$2,559	\$2,565	\$2,465
(50 state rank)	(7th)	(9th)	(8th)	(9th)	(10th)	(7th)	(8th)	(9th)	(7th)	(9th)
Texas	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	\$520	\$612	\$588	\$580	\$614
Michigan	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.1	\$748	\$762	\$785	\$800	\$785
Pennsylvania	2.4	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.6	\$938	\$1,075	\$1,134	\$1,208	\$1,172
Georgia	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.0	2.9	\$1,120	\$1,103	\$1,099	\$1,061	\$1,064
Ohio	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.7	\$933	\$1,007	\$1,012	\$1,047	\$1,087
Illinois	4.4	5.7	6.0	5.7	5.6	\$1,856	\$2,383	\$2,564	\$2,526	\$2,580
Florida	2.9	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.5	\$1,123	\$1,150	\$1,167	\$1,087	\$1,008
North Carolina	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.1	\$765	\$782	\$815	\$853	\$806
New York	6.5	6.8	6.6	6.3	6.0	\$3,135	\$3,149	\$3,208	\$3,174	\$3,204

Source: Moody's 2014 State Debt Medians Report.

<sup>a/</sup> Debt includes all state tax-supported debts, but adjusted to remove the Economic Recovery Bonds for California.

The debt service ratio is another measure of relative indebtedness. It expresses the state's debt service level as a percentage of its General Fund revenues. While the debt ratio is projected to be relatively constant through 2018-19 at near 7 percent, the ratio was closer to 4 percent as recently as 2007-08—indicating the increased reliance on debt to fund infrastructure projects.

This page intentionally blank to facilitate double-sided printing.

# INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

The 2015 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan includes information from departments with capital outlay projects. The projects proposed to be funded are summarized by department and fund source in Figure IFP-01. Appendix 1 provides a detailed list of the specific project proposals to be funded.

---

## JUDICIAL BRANCH

Trial courts are the initial point of contact between California's population and the judicial system. These courts determine the facts of a particular case and initially decide the applicable law. Courts of Appeal review trial court interpretation and application of the law. The Supreme Court, the highest California court, has jurisdiction in proceedings for extraordinary relief, reviews certain cases previously decided by the Courts of Appeal, and reviews those cases in which a trial court has imposed a death sentence.

The Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 transferred responsibility for funding trial court operations from the counties to the state. The enactment of the Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 specified that counties and the state pursue a process that ultimately resulted in full state assumption of the financial responsibility and equity ownership of all court facilities. To address maintenance costs in existing court facilities and the renovation or construction of new court facilities, the facilities act specified that counties contribute to the ongoing operation and maintenance of court facilities based upon historical expenditures for facilities transferred to the state and also established a dedicated revenue stream to the State Court Facilities Construction Fund for the design,

Figure IFP-01  
**Statewide Funding by Department and Fund Source**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<b>Program Area</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Judicial Branch</b>						
Judicial Branch	\$174,675	\$745,747	\$227,513	\$23,088	\$52,593	\$1,223,616
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$174,675</b>	<b>\$745,747</b>	<b>\$227,513</b>	<b>\$23,088</b>	<b>\$52,593</b>	<b>\$1,223,616</b>
<b>Transportation/High Speed Rail Authority</b>						
Department of Transportation	\$5,294,000	\$5,340,000	\$5,300,000	\$5,308,000	\$5,308,000	\$26,550,000
High Speed Rail Authority	\$250,000	\$25,174,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,424,000
California Highway Patrol	\$136,178	\$39,000	\$179,000	\$179,000	\$179,000	\$712,178
Department of Motor Vehicles	\$4,676	\$20,382	\$17,512	\$40,171	\$33,794	\$116,535
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$5,684,854</b>	<b>\$30,573,382</b>	<b>\$5,496,512</b>	<b>\$5,527,171</b>	<b>\$5,520,794</b>	<b>\$52,802,713</b>
<b>Natural Resources</b>						
California Conservation Corps	\$5,165	\$19,666	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24,831
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection	\$38,735	\$6,400	\$6,761	\$31,828	\$23,384	\$107,108
Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$1,806	\$862	\$1,400	\$800	\$755	\$5,623
Department of Parks and Recreation	\$15,046	\$29,482	\$16,647	\$660	\$0	\$61,835
State Conservancies and the Wildlife Conservation Board	\$96,745	\$95,742	\$86,969	\$85,791	\$85,591	\$450,838
Department of Water Resources	\$748,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$748,000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$905,497</b>	<b>\$152,152</b>	<b>\$111,777</b>	<b>\$119,079</b>	<b>\$109,730</b>	<b>\$1,398,235</b>
<b>California Environmental Protection Agency</b>						
Air Resources Board	\$5,893	\$0	\$360,000	\$0	\$0	\$365,893
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$5,893</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$360,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$365,893</b>
<b>Health and Human Services</b>						
Department of Public Health	\$4,333	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,333
Department of Developmental Services	\$802	\$7,152	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,954
Department of State Hospitals	\$24,452	\$11,498	\$48,596	\$54,166	\$28,675	\$167,387
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$29,587</b>	<b>\$18,650</b>	<b>\$48,596</b>	<b>\$54,166</b>	<b>\$28,675</b>	<b>\$179,674</b>
<b>Corrections and Rehabilitation</b>						
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation	\$20,360	\$26,593	\$6,991	\$43,209	\$28,687	\$125,840
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$20,360</b>	<b>\$26,593</b>	<b>\$6,991</b>	<b>\$43,209</b>	<b>\$28,687</b>	<b>\$125,840</b>
<b>Education</b>						
State Special Schools	\$1,749	\$3,548	\$27,387	\$20,447	\$37,413	\$90,544
Hastings College of the Law	\$36,846	\$0	\$6,712	\$0	\$0	\$43,558
California Community Colleges	\$99,590	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$99,590
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$138,185</b>	<b>\$3,548</b>	<b>\$34,099</b>	<b>\$20,447</b>	<b>\$37,413</b>	<b>\$233,692</b>
<b>General Government</b>						
Office of Emergency Services	\$2,789	\$20,741	\$22,275	\$0	\$0	\$45,805
Employment Development Department	\$1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1
Department of Technology	\$206	\$5,425	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,631
Department of Food & Agriculture	\$0	\$1,958	\$1,750	\$35,230	\$0	\$38,938
Military Department	\$9,091	\$11,678	\$114,447	\$5,924	\$5,960	\$147,100
Department of Veterans Affairs	\$525	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$525
Infrastructure Planning	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$5,000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$13,612</b>	<b>\$40,802</b>	<b>\$139,472</b>	<b>\$42,154</b>	<b>\$6,960</b>	<b>\$243,000</b>
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>\$6,972,663</b>	<b>\$31,560,874</b>	<b>\$6,424,960</b>	<b>\$5,829,314</b>	<b>\$5,784,852</b>	<b>\$56,572,663</b>
<b>Proposed, By Fund</b>						
General Fund	\$90,610	\$94,524	\$109,162	\$107,227	\$80,412	\$481,935
Special Fund	\$1,945,310	\$1,541,533	\$1,998,865	\$1,655,174	\$1,645,549	\$8,786,431
Lease Revenue Bond Funds	\$179,731	\$768,776	\$363,790	\$122,660	\$115,480	\$1,550,437
General Obligation Bond Funds	\$953,322	\$4,323,777	\$76,495	\$62,291	\$61,431	\$5,477,316
Federal Funds	\$2,937,130	\$3,024,257	\$3,066,648	\$3,071,962	\$3,071,980	\$15,171,977
Reimbursements/Other Gov't Cost Funds	\$866,560	\$874,007	\$810,000	\$810,000	\$810,000	\$4,170,567
High Speed Rail Funds	\$0	\$20,934,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,934,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,972,663</b>	<b>\$31,560,874</b>	<b>\$6,424,960</b>	<b>\$5,829,314</b>	<b>\$5,784,852</b>	<b>\$56,572,663</b>

construction, or renovation of court facilities transferred. Recognizing the growing need to replace California's aging courthouses, additional legislation was enacted. Chapter 311, Statutes of 2008 (SB 1407), authorizes various fees, penalties, and assessments, to be deposited in the Immediate and Critical Needs Account to support the construction, renovation, and operation of court facilities, including the payment of rental costs associated with completed capital outlay projects funded with lease revenue bonds.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

The facilities of the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and trial courts encompass not only the public courtroom spaces, but also the chambers and workspace where the judicial officers and courtroom staff prepare for the proceedings; secure areas, including holding cells; and building support functions.

The trial courts are located in each of the 58 counties, in over 500 buildings and 2,100 courtrooms, covering approximately 13 million court exclusive square feet (sf).

The Courts of Appeal are organized into six districts, which operate in nine different locations in approximately 508,000 sf. The Fresno and Riverside appellate courts are housed in stand-alone, state-owned facilities with the balance being co-located in other leased or state-owned space.

The Supreme Court is located in the Civic Center Plaza in San Francisco (98,000 sf) and in the Ronald Regan State Building in Los Angeles (7,600 sf).

Administrative facilities are located in San Francisco (Headquarters), Burbank, and Sacramento, occupying approximately 255,000 sf. The Judicial Council also occupies several small facility management field offices.

The Judicial Council completed facility master plans for each of the 58 courts in December 2003. Those plans were consolidated into a statewide plan, approved by the Judicial Council in February 2004 as the Trial Court Five-Year Capital-Outlay Plan, which ranked 201 projects for future development. Changes to this initial statewide plan have been approved incrementally since 2004 through the Judicial Council's annual five-year plan submittal process.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

The primary drivers of court facility needs include: providing a safe and secure facility, improving poor functional conditions, and addressing inadequate physical conditions,

including seismically deficient facilities. Another driver of need is to provide space to accommodate workload growth required to serve the public.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes \$1.2 billion for the Judicial Council, comprised of \$94.7 million from the Immediate and Critical Needs Account (ICNA) and \$1.1 billion lease revenue bond funds to fund the final phases of 14 projects on the Judicial Council's Immediate and Critical Needs list. The plan includes \$174.7 million in 2015-16, \$77 million from ICNA for the acquisition, preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction phases of 10 projects and \$97.7 million lease revenue bond funds for the construction phase of 2 projects.

Appendix 1 of the Plan includes a detailed list of the specific projects proposed to be funded.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

The Introduction section of this report describes the statewide planning priorities established in Chapter 106, Statutes of 2002 (AB 857). The Judicial Council's projects are generally consistent with these planning priorities, as many projects include the renovation of existing facilities or are constructed on urban-infill sites, served by existing utilities, public transportation, and are in close proximity to the populations served. As the Judicial Council plans for future capital-outlay needs, the AB 857 planning priorities will be taken into consideration.

---

## **TRANSPORTATION AGENCY**

The Transportation Agency is responsible for improving the mobility, safety, and sustainability of California's transportation system. Key priorities include developing and integrating the high-speed rail project into California's existing transportation system, and supporting regional agencies in achieving the greenhouse gas reductions and environmental sustainability objectives required by state law. The Transportation Agency is comprised of nine departments. Infrastructure projects for the following four departments are included in the Plan: the Department of Transportation, the High-Speed Rail Authority, the California Highway Patrol, and the Department of Motor Vehicles.

---

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) designs and oversees the repair and construction of the state highway system, funds three intercity passenger rail routes, and provides a range of funding for local transportation projects. Caltrans is also responsible for long-range transportation planning for the state and is currently developing the following:

- California Transportation Plan 2040—This plan will define the policies and strategies to achieve a fully integrated, multimodal, and sustainable transportation system.
- California Freight Mobility Plan—In consultation with the Air Resources Board, Caltrans completed this plan to better prioritize funding for projects on key freight corridors to eliminate bottlenecks and better facilitate goods movement.
- Asset Management System—Caltrans is developing a risk-based asset management system to better target its resources, preserve the condition of assets, and improve the performance of the state highway system. This plan will include a listing of pavement and bridge assets with both a description of the condition of those assets and an associated risk analysis and estimated lifecycle maintenance costs. It will also include both a financial plan for funding future maintenance and a list of investment strategies to plan for the future of those assets.
- Caltrans will soon begin work on the 2016 State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP), which will identify a broad range of transportation projects such as safety, repairs, and major maintenance to the state’s transportation infrastructure, such as pavement, culverts, and bridges. The asset management plan will be phased into the 2016 SHOPP.

**EXISTING FACILITIES**

Caltrans maintains and operates more than 50,000 miles of highway and freeway lanes in California. The state highway system functions as California’s transportation backbone for commuters and commerce, providing connectivity to other modes of transportation such as rail, transit, airports, and ports. While the state highway system serves as a gateway to interstate and international transportation, a number of routes remain a part of the state highway system that no longer serve an interregional purpose and instead serve a primarily regional or local purpose.

The intercity rail system includes three state-funded Amtrak routes – the Pacific Surfliner between San Luis Obispo and San Diego, the San Joaquin between Oakland/Sacramento

and Bakersfield, and the Capitol Corridor between San Jose and Auburn. These routes, and associated feeder buses, serve over five million passengers annually and 130 destinations, and in future years will deliver passengers to the high-speed rail train.

Caltrans also operates approximately four million square feet of transportation-related facilities, including maintenance stations, equipment shops, materials laboratories that test the sustainability of construction signage and safety, and Transportation Management Centers that co-locate with the California Highway Patrol. There are 13 main and satellite Transportation Management Centers that use transportation management technology, including computer-aided dispatch, changeable warning message signs, and live TV and radio updates to provide real-time traffic information to help manage highway traffic and congestion.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

The state's transportation infrastructure has a range of needs that are split between highways and public transportation, state and local responsibility, movement of passengers and freight, and the maintenance, repair, and expansion of the existing system. Both ongoing revenues, such as sales tax, fuel excise taxes, and Cap and Trade funding, and one-time funding, such as those from bonds and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act have been provided to many of these priorities in recent decades. Altogether, approximately half of all transportation revenue collected by the state goes to fund local projects. However, recent SHOPP assessments estimate deferred maintenance needs for the state's core highway infrastructure of \$8 billion annually, compared to only \$2 billion in funding that is available each year to fund these repairs.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan has generally prioritized maintenance and preservation of the existing highway system over construction of new capacity. The most recent five-year State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate, along with local investments in state transportation systems, allocates \$26.6 billion for maintenance, preservation and safety, and STIP capacity projects, which include expansion of capacity on both highways and rail, both of which are vital to moving both passengers and freight. However, only about \$10 billion of this will go to highway preservation and repairs. The challenge will be both to find new funding and to make existing funding go further. While continuing to refine the state's highest priority deferred maintenance projects, the Administration plans to explore other revenue alternatives as well, such as a road user charge, tolls, or other mechanisms to generate revenues proportionate to usage of the highways.

While alternative funding sources are being explored, Caltrans will continue to pursue the goal of an environmentally sustainable transportation system, with steps such as funding advanced mitigation projects, improving drought management measures, and the greening of its fleet. Caltrans will also pursue efficiencies, such as the use of technology to better manage existing highway capacity and the streamlining of the process of relinquishing roads serving a primarily local function to local jurisdictions. Similarly, Caltrans will use effective project planning measures, such as pavement and infrastructure management to better focus resources and refine the assessment of maintenance needs, while developing a queue of projects to be completed if additional resources become available. This combination of measures will help both existing and future transportation revenues go further and be used on the state’s highest priorities.

**CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

Caltrans supports a multi-modal transportation system with funding for active transportation, complete streets, transit improvements and other investments that support infill development and efficient land use. All highway expansion projects include environmental review and mitigation measures, including resource protection or restoration. Furthermore, the Budget includes Cap and Trade proceeds for infrastructure investments that will modify the state’s transportation system over the long term to be less reliant on single-passenger vehicle travel. These Cap and Trade investments include the following:

- 25 percent for the high-speed rail project.
- 5 percent to local transit agencies for operational improvements.
- 10 percent in competitive grants for state or local transit improvement projects.
- 20 percent for affordable housing and other infill development that supports transit ridership.

Additionally, Caltrans has located several large district offices near major transit stations and will continue to follow the guidelines identified in AB 857, as it identifies future office space needs.

---

**HIGH SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY**

The High Speed Rail Authority (Authority) is responsible for the development and construction of a high-speed passenger train service between San Francisco and

Los Angeles/Anaheim (Phase I), with extensions to San Diego and Sacramento and points in-between (Phase II). In addition to 800 miles of rail line, the system will include up to 24 stations, 150 miles of bridges, viaducts, and elevated structures, 35 miles of tunnels, 610 grade separations, and 510,000 square yards of retaining walls. When fully completed, the high-speed train system will be easily accessible to more than 90 percent of the state's residents. The Authority's 2014 Business Plan describes how and when the system will be completed, and serves as the basis for the Authority's proposal.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

In November 2008, the passage of Proposition 1A, the Safe, Reliable, High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, provided the Authority with \$9 billion for the development of a high-speed train system. In addition, the federal government awarded the authority \$3.5 billion, targeted mostly for the development of the Central Valley section of the rail project. From these sources, the 2012 Budget Act provided \$5.8 billion for the acquisition of approximately 1,100 parcels and construction of a 130-mile section of the high-speed train system that would extend from Madera to the northern outskirts of Bakersfield. The Authority is in the process of acquiring the real property and right-of-way access needed for this section. Development of the full system will include acquisition, environmental impact mitigation efforts, rail and utility relocation, development of signals and communications infrastructure, earthwork, grade separations, track construction, systems and controls, electrification, support buildings, stations, and rolling stock.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

California is home to some of the most congested and polluted areas in the nation. In addition, California's population is expected to grow to 50 million people by 2050, exacerbating the state's congestion if left unaddressed. The Authority's project will facilitate connections for people, services, and goods across California. The development of this clean transportation option will efficiently and safely transport tens of millions of riders annually, and will reduce the number of intercity trips made each day by airplane and automobile, thereby alleviating congestion, creating faster connections between the economic centers of the state, and improving air quality.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan, which is based on the Authority's 2014 Business Plan, assumes the \$25.4 billion will be available from various funds including federal funds, Cap and Trade

funds, Prop 1A bond funds, and other sources to help accomplish the Authority’s goals over the next five years.

**CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

The high-speed train system will provide effective links to urban centers, encourage the development of infill projects, and improve access to central city employment centers. It will also reduce California’s dependence on fossil fuels and foreign oil, and be an alternative to driving or intrastate flying, which will help California meet greenhouse gas reduction goals.

---

**CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL**

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) promotes the safe, convenient, and efficient transportation of people and goods across the state highway system and provides safety and security to the facilities and employees of the State of California. CHP utilizes several types of office space which include area and division offices, headquarters space, and air operations facilities. CHP also co-locates with Caltrans in Transportation Management Centers. Along with traffic enforcement, CHP is responsible for operating special programs such as commercial vehicle inspection, vehicle theft investigations, multidisciplinary accident investigation teams, salvage vehicle inspection (which helps verify that salvaged vehicles do not contain stolen parts), canine narcotics enforcement, and homeland security.

**EXISTING FACILITIES**

Currently, CHP occupies 1.4 million sf of state-owned and 589,000 sf of leased facility space for a total of 2 million sf statewide, which includes the following:

- Headquarters Facilities—The headquarters facility is located in Sacramento and houses the executive staff and general administrative support staff such as accounting, budgeting, and business services that support division and area offices and communication centers.
- CHP Academy—The Academy is located in West Sacramento and provides training for cadets and officers. It consists of multiple classroom and training facilities in a campus configuration, a road track for learning emergency driving skills, and other outdoor training structures.
- Division Offices—The eight division offices throughout the state are responsible for overseeing the area offices. Many of the special programs are handled at

the division level, such as commercial vehicle enforcement and vehicle theft deterrence programs.

- Area Offices—CHP has 103 area offices. These offices are primarily responsible for traffic management. Some area offices are co-located with the Department of Motor Vehicles and some contain dispatch/communication centers.
- Dispatch/Communication Centers—The 26 communication centers are primarily responsible for dispatching officers engaged in road patrol activities. Many of these are co-located in area offices in rural areas and some are located in the Transportation Management Centers.
- Other Facilities—CHP has 34 resident posts, 8 air operations facilities, 16 commercial vehicle enforcement facilities, 38 scale sites, and 271 telecommunications sites.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

The infrastructure plan for CHP is mainly driven by the need to modernize and expand existing facilities to account for personnel growth and to provide adequate space for required functions. The Essential Services Building Seismic Safety Act of 1986 requires fire stations, police stations, emergency operations centers, CHP offices, sheriff's offices, and emergency communication dispatch centers to be designed to minimize fire hazards and to resist, as much as practical, the forces of wind and earthquakes. In recent seismic reviews of ten area offices and one division office built between 1960 and 1988, all were found to have seismic safety deficiencies.

Most of the facilities with seismic issues are also undersized due to population growth and policy changes. New field offices are typically three to four times larger than the existing offices, and existing sites generally do not have the capacity to expand to meet these needs. As a result, a majority of the older offices will need either a new location or the acquisition of adjacent parcels. Some drivers of the updated space needs are as follows:

- Personnel Growth—CHP staff has increased from 8,525 positions in 1992 to over 11,000 positions currently, a 30 percent increase. Most area offices have had to reconfigure existing space to accommodate additional staff.
- Evidence Retention—The responsibility for evidence retention was transferred from the courts to law enforcement agencies in the early 1980s. Evidence retention timeframes were changed from 90 days to up to four years after all legal actions

are complete. Evidence rooms in many older area offices were not originally designed for evidence storage, are inadequately sized, and often lack proper ventilation to allow for toxic substance handling.

- Records Retention—A court order requires CHP to keep records for ten years on all its traffic stops. Retention of such records increases the demand for storage space in current facilities.
- Officer Locker Rooms—Since 1974, when CHP began hiring female officers, CHP has had to retrofit area offices to provide additional locker room space to accommodate male and female officers. In some locations, the size or configuration of area offices makes it difficult or impossible to achieve this retrofitting.

**PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes \$712.2 million from the Motor Vehicle Account (MVA) for a statewide area office replacement program, of which \$135.2 million is proposed in 2015-16 for the replacement of five area offices with seismic safety needs and other infrastructure deficiencies. Total funding over the five years also proposes funding to develop budget packages and to select sites for up to 25 area office projects. CHP has a unique set of challenges in locating suitable parcels for replacement area offices, as the sites must have easy access to freeways and may not be within close proximity to at-grade railroad crossings. The ability to fund these replacement area office projects is a function of resources available in the MVA, which also funds highway-related expenditures in other departments, including the Department of Motor Vehicles.

**CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

The CHP takes into consideration the state planning priorities when constructing or leasing new area offices, as programmatic needs allow.

---

**DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES**

The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) promotes driver safety by licensing drivers, and protects consumers and ownership security by issuing vehicle titles and regulating vehicle sales. DMV employees have significant contact with the public at customer service field offices and other smaller customer service spaces located in high-traffic public areas around the state.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

DMV has eight categories of facilities—headquarters, field offices, call centers, investigation offices, occupational licensing offices, industry business centers, commercial driver license centers, and driver safety offices. DMV’s total statewide office inventory of 2.8 million sf is comprised of 247 sites (112 state-owned facilities and 135 leased facilities).

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

Population growth, population movement, and seismic deficiencies have been the primary measurable drivers of infrastructure needs for DMV. Population changes across the state have driven demand for DMV services in areas where the buildings were not originally designed to accommodate such growth. This increase results in more driver safety hearings, criminal investigations, occupational licensing inspections, and increased wait times in field offices in certain areas of the state.

In addition, new mandates place additional demands on DMV facilities, as they often require DMV to quickly address customer service needs within existing facilities. DMV continuously develops new service delivery methods to best meet the needs of the state’s motorists within its existing infrastructure. Alternative service methods available to minimize the need to physically visit an office include the use of the Internet, private business partners, self-service terminals, and mail services. These efforts contributed to a 16 percent decline in the annual number of field office transactions from 2008 through 2013.

Despite the various alternative service methods available, many DMV customers will still require face-to-face services in a field office environment to complete specific transactions and skills tests. For these customers, DMV plans to continue to work on realigning the various transactions by location and type in order to streamline the use of field office sites and mitigate the need for more space.

Many DMV offices date from the 1960s to 1970s. Several of these older offices have identified seismic and structural deficiencies. In some cases, the deficiencies exceed what can be managed through special repairs, or are in addition to population-driven space shortfalls, thereby creating demand for replacement field offices.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes \$116.5 million to address critical infrastructure and workload space deficiencies at 6 existing field office facilities and at DMV’s 62-year old Headquarters

West building in Sacramento. The Plan also proposes funding to provide a new Commercial Driver License (CDL) facility in the Bay Area. In 2015-16, the Plan proposes \$4.7 million to begin the replacement of deficient field offices in Delano, Santa Maria, and Inglewood.

**CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

DMV takes into consideration the state planning priorities when constructing or leasing new facilities, as programmatic needs allow.

---

**NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY**

The Natural Resources Agency is responsible for the conservation, enhancement, and management of California’s diverse natural resources, including land, water, wildlife, parks, minerals, and historic sites. The Natural Resources Agency is comprised of 26 various departments, boards, conservancies, and commissions. Infrastructure projects, land acquisition, and other conservation projects for 15 entities are included in the Plan.

**CALIFORNIA WATER ACTION PLAN**

In January 2014, the California Water Action Plan was released. It is a comprehensive, five year water infrastructure and management strategy to secure California’s long-term water supply reliability, restore damaged ecosystems, and improve the state’s resilience in times of drought. The Action Plan identifies three goals—restoration, reliability, and resilience—and ten specific actions and multiple sub-actions to guide the state towards the achievement of these goals. Many of the actions involve significant infrastructure investments, such as the investment in projects that expand water storage capacity and improvements in flood protection for California’s urban and rural communities, industries, and agricultural lands.

In November 2014, the voters approved the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014 (Proposition 1), which provides \$7.5 billion in general obligation bonds for water storage, water quality, flood protection, and watershed protection and restoration projects (see Figure IFP-02).

Proposition 1 includes funding specifically intended to achieve the three over-arching goals described in the Water Action Plan: restoration, resilience, and reliability.

- Restoration—Economic growth in California’s early years drove large-scale land use changes. Further urban and rural development drove local, regional,

Figure IFP-02  
**2014 Water Bond**  
 (Dollars in millions)

Bond Category	Bond Allocation
Water Storage	\$2,700
Watershed Protection and Restoration	\$1,495
Groundwater Sustainability	\$900
Regional Water Reliability	\$810
Water Recycling	\$725
Safe Drinking Water	\$520
Flood Management	\$395
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,545</b>

and system-wide water management projects unaided by the current understanding of ecological process. Consequently, California’s native fisheries and watersheds have been negatively affected for decades. Proposition 1 funds will support projects that restore California’s ecosystems for the benefit of fish, wildlife, communities, and water management systems.

- Resilience—Ongoing and future changes to the climate will drive rising sea levels, salinity encroachment, altered precipitation patterns, reduced Sierra snowpack, and numerous other changes to California’s hydrology. Every aspect of the water management system will be affected. Increased severity of Central Valley flood events, for example, requires the state to increase the capacity of its flood system (most notably within the flood bypass facilities) to better protect urban and rural communities. Proposition 1 funds will be used to increase the state’s resilience to anticipated and currently unknown impacts of a changing global climate.
- Reliability—A significant portion of the state’s economy depends on a strong agricultural sector that in turn depends on water supplies from various sources. Other sectors of the economy also depend on precious water supplies. Strengthening the reliability of water supplies, with an emphasis on efficient use and integrated management strategies, is the key to providing affordable and safe drinking water, continuing agricultural supplies, and growing the state’s economy. Proposition 1 funds will be used for projects such as water storage, groundwater sustainability, safe drinking water, and regional water management projects.

In addition to the significant investment Proposition 1 will make for statewide water infrastructure, state and federal agencies are working on a comprehensive conservation strategy aimed at protecting dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta, while

permitting the reliable operation of California’s two biggest water delivery projects —the State Water Project and the Central Valley Project. The Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) will help secure California’s water supply by building new water delivery infrastructure and operating the system to improve the ecological health of the Delta. BDCP includes conservation measures to restore or protect approximately 145,000 acres of habitat; provide more reliable water operations, secure water supplies for 25 million Californians, and an agricultural industry that feeds millions; and promote a thriving economy.

A portion of Proposition 1 programs support grants to local agencies and will not be implemented as state capital outlay projects (and therefore are not included in this Plan). Furthermore, some of these investments, such as the water delivery infrastructure in the BDCP, will be made by the water users of the State Water Project and are not eligible for funding from Proposition 1. These expenditures are not displayed in either the Plan or the Budget. However, Department of Water Resources’ expenditures for water storage and flood management projects in the Central Valley are included in this Plan.

---

**STATE CONSERVANCIES AND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD**

The state conservancies and the Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) acquire and preserve land for the protection, enhancement, preservation, and restoration of sensitive landscapes, wildlife and habitat areas, and public recreation areas. WCB acts as a purchasing agent for the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) and grants funds to other local governmental agencies and nonprofit organizations for the same purposes.

**EXISTING FACILITIES**

To date, approximately 23,000 acres of land have been acquired and protected via fee title acquisition by state conservancies. (The WCB’s acquisitions made on behalf of DFW are accounted for in DFW’s section of the Plan.) From 2000 to present, an additional 1.6 million acres have been protected via funding provided to local governments and non-profit organizations that have either acquired fee title or conservation easements. Protected lands provide multiple environmental benefits, making the long-term stewardship and management of these state-owned lands an important priority.

**DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

The WCB’s, as well as the state conservancies’ capital requirements, are driven by public policy efforts to strike a balance between economic development, population expansion, wildland ecosystem preservation, open-space protection, and public

recreational opportunities. Statewide entities, such as the State Coastal Conservancy and WCB, have broader goals to acquire lands and easements that can provide more expansive access to and protection of wildlands or coastal regions. Regional conservancies focus on acquisition and restoration of lands and habitat within their statutorily established regions.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan for the state conservancies and WCB includes approximately \$450.8 million for infrastructure and land acquisition investments. The funding will come from various bond funds, reimbursements, federal funds, and available special funds.

Proposition 1 provides \$628 million for state conservancies for water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration projects, including \$200 million for WCB projects that enhance stream flows. Proposition 1 bond expenditures for state conservancies will differ from previous bond funds in two significant ways. First, projects supported from Proposition 1 will focus on providing water quality and water supply reliability benefits by restoring native ecosystems to reduce unnecessary conflicts between water management decisions and the state's fish and wildlife. Second, the projects will be selected through competitive grant processes. The Natural Resources Agency will be coordinating the development of grant guidelines, to provide consistency among the state conservancies.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

The state conservancies' proposals will protect, restore, and enhance wetlands, watersheds, and coastal areas, as well as wildlife habitats and wild land areas. The plans identify opportunities to open and improve recreational lands and trails, and develop access for the public to use and experience the state's natural environment.

---

### **CALIFORNIA SCIENCE CENTER**

The California Science Center is an educational, scientific, and technological center governed by a nine-member board of directors. It is located in Exposition Park, on 160 acres of state-owned land in Los Angeles. Hands-on educational exhibits and programs focus on science, math, technology, and conservation which explore: (1) biological processes of humans, animals, and plants, (2) the Earth's ecosystems, habitats, and geophysical processes, and (3) engineering, communications, and transportation, on land and in space. The Science Center averages over two million guests annually.

**EXISTING FACILITIES**

The Science Center consists of two main areas, referred to as Phase I and Phase II. The 245,000 sf Phase I California Science Center museum features hands-on exhibits and other science learning programs for families, students, and educators that center around two themes: the World of Life and the Creative World. The Phase II Ecosystems portion of the museum is a 167,000 sf facility connected to Phase I. The balance of the facility is comprised of a museum store, cafeteria, IMAX Theater, conference center, special exhibit galleries, and warehouse and office space for Science Center staff.

Also located at the Science Center is the Science Center School (K-5 Los Angeles Unified School District Charter School) and the Center for Science Learning.

**DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

The Science Center’s Master Plan envisions the Science Center as a regional and statewide center for participatory science experiences. The Master Plan calls for the Science Center to be built-out in three phases, and covers four major content areas: the World of Life, Creative World, Ecosystems, and the Air and Space Center, with each content area having its own facility.

In the fall of 2011, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) informed the Science Center Foundation (Foundation) that it had been selected to display the Space Shuttle Endeavor. As a condition of receiving the shuttle, the Foundation agreed to construct a facility for display.

Since 2012, Space Shuttle Endeavour has been on display in a temporary home, while design and construction of the Science Center’s Phase III is completed. Phase III will be approximately 188,000 sf and will physically connect with Phase I.

**PROPOSAL**

The Plan does not propose any new state funding for the Science Center’s Phase III. However, the Plan recognizes the Foundation’s plan to construct the expansion of the Phase II Ecosystems facility and the new Phase III Air and Space Center facilities. The construction projects will not require any state funds and the amount and timing of the receipt of donations will control the schedule of each project’s initiation and completion. Once each facility is operational, additional state resources will be needed for operations, maintenance, security, and other services in the new facility. The Science Center estimates \$4 million per year and 24 new positions will be needed for the Phase III Air and Space Center once it is completed. The Phase II expansion will

begin sometime after the Air and Space Museum is complete. As both projects get closer to completion, the numbers and appropriate funding sources for operating costs will be reviewed.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

The projects are consistent with infill development, as the projects will be situated on existing state land within Exposition Park.

---

### **CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS**

The California Conservation Corps (CCC) engages young men and women in meaningful work, public service, and educational activities to assist them in becoming more responsible citizens. CCC also provides state agencies and other partners, such as school districts and local government agencies, with valuable labor for a variety of tasks.

Corpsmembers are primarily engaged in projects that are beneficial to California's environment and communities. This work includes a wide variety of activities such as park development, reforestation, trail construction, firefighting, historic structure renovation, oil spill cleanup, habitat improvement, erosion control, flood prevention, energy conservation, and recycling. In addition, Corpsmembers and staff also provide statewide emergency response assistance when disasters such as earthquakes, fires, or floods occur. Since 1976, more than 109,500 young men and women have worked over 67.6 million hours on environmental and community enhancement, as well as an additional 10.3 million hours of disaster response efforts.

CCC currently serves approximately 1,622 corpsmembers, with up to 550 of CCC's corpsmembers housed in residential facilities and the remaining corpsmembers using non-residential facilities and living in separate housing. An additional 200 local corpsmembers also participate in CCC's projects.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

CCC operates 25 facilities in urban and rural areas statewide, including seven residential facilities. The typical residential facility includes the following types of space: (1) residential including dormitory, educational, dining and kitchen, administration, recreational, and warehouse space, and (2) non-residential facilities that are generally educational and administrative space.

**DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

The number of corpsmembers drives the need for new residential, non-residential, and administrative facilities. The Plan assumes that the number of corpsmembers will not change significantly over the next five years. Capital outlay needs are also driven by the age and relative deficiency of the existing infrastructure.

**PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes \$24.8 million to address critical infrastructure and workload space deficiencies at two existing CCC facilities over the course of the next five years. The projects include constructing and/or renovating new dorms and a kitchen and mess hall at the Placer Center in Auburn, as well as the acquisition and renovation of an equipment storage facility near the Tahoe Base Center in South Lake Tahoe.

**CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

CCC’s proposal is consistent with the state’s planning priorities. Specifically, CCC proposes to renovate existing infrastructure and/or develop facilities in areas currently served by existing infrastructure. CCC also promotes efficient development, to the extent possible, by ensuring that new projects use existing infrastructure, such as roads, sewers, and utilities.

---

**DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION**

The Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) provides wildland fire protection and resource management for over 31 million acres of private and state-owned wildlands. The land protected by CAL FIRE, referred to as State Responsibility Areas (SRA), is generally outside city boundaries and must meet at least one of three qualifying characteristics:

- Produce or be capable of producing forest products.
- Contain vegetation that protects watershed.
- Be used primarily for grazing.

Each year, CAL FIRE responds to an average of 5,600 wildland fires and answers approximately 350,000 other emergency calls, including structural fires, medical emergencies, and natural disasters. In addition, CAL FIRE regulates timber harvesting on over eight million acres of non-federal forestland to protect watershed and wildlife

habitat, as set forth in the Forest Practices Act of 1973. CAL FIRE also operates eight demonstration forests to develop and promote improved forest resource management techniques and two state-owned nurseries that grow and supply seedling trees for the state's many different climate zones, which are commonly used for the reforestation of land devastated by fire.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

CAL FIRE operates over 500 facilities statewide, consisting of:

- 235 forest fire stations
- 112 telecommunications sites
- 39 fire/conservation camps
- 21 ranger unit headquarters
- 13 air attack bases
- 9 helitack bases
- 8 state forests
- 16 administrative headquarters
- Over 100 other miscellaneous facilities

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

The main driver of capital outlay is the need to replace aging facilities with structural and space deficiencies. For example, 162 of the 235 forest fire stations (69 percent) are more than 50 years old. Similarly, 26 of the 39 fire/conservation camps (67 percent) are more than 40 years old.

Because of changes in technology, equipment, and emergency response techniques, a majority of the older facilities no longer provide adequate space. In addition, years of constant use have degraded the quality of some of the older structures. Therefore, CAL FIRE uses the age of its facilities as a broad indicator of future needs. As a general rule, facilities operating in excess of 50 years, which is the amount of time these facilities were designed to last, are the most likely to require replacement.

In addition to aging facilities, urban encroachment on rural areas also drives capital outlay needs. More specifically, as rural areas become more populated and incorporated

by cities, the land surrounding or nearby some fire stations is no longer SRA. Furthermore, urban encroachment brings traffic congestion, which can increase response times, making it necessary to move stations closer to SRA because initial response times are critical in preventing major fire events.

Site lease expirations also drive the need for some relocation projects. A large number of CAL FIRE’s facilities were built between 1930 and 1960, when it was common for the state to acquire low-cost, long-term leases in lieu of land purchases. Many of the leases had 50-year to 60-year terms that are now expiring. Although negotiations result in some lease extensions, some owners are unwilling to extend their leases with the state or request lease terms that the state finds unacceptable. In such cases, the only option is to relocate the facility.

For the past several decades, only a relatively small number of the oldest and most deficient facilities have been replaced, largely because of funding constraints. As a result, the average age of CAL FIRE’s facilities has increased and the general condition of its facilities continues to degrade, thereby creating and adding to the current backlog of 152 facilities in need of replacement.

**PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes a total of \$107.1 million (\$70.2 million General Fund) over the next five years to make some progress toward addressing CAL FIRE’s infrastructure needs. In 2015-16, this includes the following:

- \$36.9 million lease revenue bond financing authority to replace the San Luis Obispo Unit Headquarters.
- \$1.8 million General Fund for three minor capital outlay projects, which include: (1) a statewide water system improvement project at seven forest fire stations and three conservation camps, (2) fire and life safety improvement projects at Columbia Air Attack Base, and (3) fire and life safety improvements at Rohnerville Air Attack Base.

Although the Plan acknowledges the need to reduce CAL FIRE’s backlog of replacement projects, it also recognizes the funding constraints of both the General Fund and General Fund supported bond financing. CAL FIRE currently has approximately \$760 million of authorized lease revenue bond financed projects in various stages of design and construction. Therefore, the Plan proposes to prioritize and focus on funding a limited number of the most critical and highest-priority projects over the next five years and completion of the existing authorized projects.

The Budget provides \$2 million to CAL FIRE to address critical deferred maintenance infrastructure needs.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

CAL FIRE's proposal is consistent with state planning priorities. CAL FIRE promotes infill development when possible by replacing existing infrastructure on the same site and developing facilities in areas served by existing roads, sewer, and utilities. The majority of this proposal consists of the replacement of existing facilities. However, because of the nature of CAL FIRE's mission, it is sometimes necessary to relocate facilities to lands that have environmental and agricultural value. While the relocation of these facilities can result in the loss of some environmental or agricultural lands (usually five acres or less), the strategic relocation of these facilities enables CAL FIRE to respond more effectively to wildland fires and provide superior fire protection to nearby forests, watersheds, agricultural land, and other valuable natural resources.

---

### **DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE**

The Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) is responsible for managing California's fish, wildlife, plant resources, and the habitat on which they depend, for their ecological value and public enjoyment. Under general direction from the California Fish and Game Commission, DFW administers numerous programs and enforces regulations and limits set forth in the Fish and Game Code. Its major programs are: (1) ecosystem conservation and restoration, (2) public use (including hunting and fishing), (3) management of DFW lands, (4) law enforcement, and (5) spill prevention and response.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

DFW manages 730 properties statewide, comprising more than one million acres (673,887 acres owned and 471,533 acres owned by other entities, but managed by DFW). Since several state agencies purchase land for the purpose of habitat or wildlife protection, and management responsibilities for these properties are often transferred to DFW, the acreage of land continues to increase. The properties managed by DFW include the following: 111 wildlife areas, 136 ecological reserves, 139 public access areas, and 20 fish hatcheries.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

The three main drivers of capital outlay needs for DFW are: (1) the improvement or replacement of aging buildings and structures, (2) the improvement of newly acquired lands, and (3) mandates for increased hatchery production levels and increased production and protection of California heritage and wild trout species, as required by state law. Many DFW-managed properties require expenditures to upgrade old

structures, improve existing facilities, or provide new infrastructure on properties that are realizing increased wildlife-related public use. Some important examples include additional comfort stations, public interpretive facilities, parking lot and road upgrades, water structure improvements to maintain or reestablish wetlands, and levee improvements.

Of the more than one million acres of lands managed by DFW, over 930,000 acres are dedicated wildlife areas and ecological reserves throughout the state. By law, DFW is required to protect, manage, and maintain the wildlife resources and habitats on land it owns or administers. New properties are likely to be added to DFW's stewardship in the years to come.

DFW currently operates 20 hatcheries statewide, including 10 trout hatcheries, 8 salmon and steelhead hatcheries, and 2 fish planting bases, which range from 30 to 100 years old. As these facilities continue to age, the state will need to make investments to renovate or replace these facilities to maintain existing productions levels, at a minimum. Eight of the hatcheries are currently operated to mitigate the loss of natural spawning habitat for salmon and steelhead trout. The production levels for salmon are regulated by the National Marine Fisheries Service.

The enactment of Chapter 689, Statutes of 2005 (AB 7), set production requirements for trout hatcheries tied to the number of licenses sold in 2008. In 2012, the hatchery program produced 3.9 million pounds of catchable trout equating to 89.4 percent of the AB 7 goal of 2.5 pounds of catchable trout per license sold in 2008 (4.4 million pounds). On January 1, 2013, pursuant to Chapter 565, Statutes of 2012 (SB 1148), the mandated fish production levels of 2.75 pounds per license were changed to goals of 2.75 pounds per license. Additional efforts will be needed to meet the statewide trout production goals in future years, including infrastructure improvements, operational changes, and technological improvements for rearing fish.

**PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes \$5.6 million for various minor capital outlay projects over the next five years. In 2015-16, this includes:

- \$1.8 million for three wetland improvement projects in the Gray Lodge, Upper Butte Basin, and Yolo Bypass Wildlife Areas to provide more efficient water management and restore natural ecosystem function and four projects to provide critical infrastructure improvements at Black Rock, Fillmore, and Mount Shasta Fish Hatcheries and at the Fish Health Laboratory.

Because of declining revenues in the Fish and Game Preservation Fund, the Hatcheries and Inland Fisheries Fund, and Proposition 99, the Plan focuses limited resources on only the most critical projects.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

The Plan includes funding for projects that promote infill development by rehabilitating existing infrastructure and also safeguard environmental and agricultural resources by protecting and preserving the state's most valuable natural resources.

---

### **DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

The Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks) creates opportunities for high-quality outdoor recreation, helps to preserve the state's extraordinary biological diversity, and protect its most valued natural, historical, and cultural resources. Parks offers a variety of educational programs at many of the state's parks, which include lectures, audio-visual displays, exhibits, video conferencing with students, and guided tours. Parks also conserves California's natural and cultural history through the maintenance and preservation of natural habitats and historical sites. In addition, Parks provides opportunities for off-highway vehicle recreation and is active in boater safety and aquatic health programs.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

The system consists of 279 parks, beaches, trails, wildlife areas, open spaces, off-highway vehicle areas, and historic sites. Parks is responsible for approximately 1.6 million acres of land, including over 339 miles of coastline, 974 miles of lake, reservoir and river frontage, approximately 15,000 campsites and alternative camping facilities, and 4,456 miles of non-motorized trails.

Over the past five years, Parks has expended approximately \$122 million to develop and expand the state park system. Parks has accepted gifts and other donations of property and historic structures at no cost to the state when those donations make programmatic sense.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

In June 2013, the Parks Forward Commission began an assessment of the financial, operational, and cultural challenges facing the state park system. The final report is expected to be released in January 2015. In the meantime, the Administration has established a "Transformation Team" to develop and lead Parks in executing structural

and sustainable reforms over a two-year period to strengthen the state park system, improve visitors' experiences, and make the services provided by the state park system more relevant to a broader and more diverse group of people.

Generally, Parks' projects have either been a renovation and improvement of existing facilities or the acquisition of properties and development of new facilities. The drivers of need include: (1) aging infrastructure; (2) changing recreational demands and cultural needs; (3) the encroachment of development on sensitive habitat, open spaces, and other culturally significant resources; and (4) the impact of federal, state, and local laws.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes a total of \$61.8 million for Parks for 19 projects over the next five years to address Parks' highest priority needs, comprised of:

- \$31.8 million in bond funds.
- \$21.6 million in reimbursement funds.
- \$6.4 million in off-highway vehicle funds.
- \$1.5 million in harbors and watercraft revolving funds.
- \$500,000 in federal funds.

The plan also includes \$15 million in 2015-16 from these fund sources for the preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction phases of 15 projects to address critical health and safety issues at various existing state parks, facilitate the efforts to preserve and restore the state's cultural and historic resources, and enhance public day-use facilities. The detailed list of the projects can be found in Appendix 1.

The Administration's review of Parks will refine the long-term vision for Parks and inform the infrastructure needs to support that vision. Reported infrastructure needs will be updated in future plans as the review of Parks and the park system is completed.

The Budget provides \$20 million to Parks to address critical deferred maintenance infrastructure needs.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

Parks promotes infill development when possible by renovating existing infrastructure; protects environmental and agricultural resources by acquiring sensitive habitat and other

open spaces; and promotes efficient development, to the extent possible, so that new projects use existing infrastructure, such as roads, sewers, and utilities.

---

### **DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) is responsible for supplying water for personal use, human health and safety, agricultural irrigation, industry, recreation, power generation, and fish and wildlife. DWR is also responsible for flood management and the safety of dams. DWR's major infrastructure programs include the State Water Project (SWP), flood control, statewide water planning, and water management.

Catastrophic flooding in California has been documented since the mid-1800s. Over the years, local, state, and federal entities have constructed a large network of levees, pumping plants, bypasses, gate structures, and other flood management structures to help control and direct damaging flood waters. DWR provides funding for flood control projects through both local assistance and state capital outlay. Projects located in the Central Valley are funded as state infrastructure. DWR, through the Central Valley Flood Protection Board, participates with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and local entities in the development and construction of these projects. The federal government pays between 50 and 75 percent of the total costs of any flood control project authorized by the U.S. Congress and the Legislature, with the non-federal costs typically shared by state (70 percent) and local entities (30 percent). Available bond funding has exceeded federal funding availability and in many cases state and local agencies will proceed to repair and improve flood control infrastructure without federal cost sharing. Cost sharing for nonfederal projects varies from evenly split between the state and locals to 100 percent state, averaging around 70 percent state. Under federal crediting rules, some state and local entities will receive credits that may be used in lieu of state cash contributions required on future projects that are federally approved and funded.

In areas outside the Central Valley, local agencies sponsor federal flood control projects. Although the state provides significant financial assistance for these projects, they are not included in the five-year plan because they are owned and operated by local agencies.

In addition to flood control projects, DWR is responsible for the operation of the SWP that provides adequate water supplies to 25 million Californians, 750,000 acres of irrigated farmland, and critical habitat. DWR also coordinates with the federal government on the operation of the Central Valley Project. These two large water projects are the backbone of California's water delivery system.

**EXISTING FACILITIES**

To create an effective system of flood control in the Central Valley, the Sacramento River Flood Control Project was developed in the early 1900s to provide a regional flood management system consisting of multiple interrelated levees, weirs, and bypasses. The existing flood control infrastructure in the Central Valley consists of 1,595 miles of levees, 348,000 acres of channels and floodways, over 800,000 linear feet of bank protection, over 60 mitigation and environmental restoration sites, and 55 various flood control structures, including dams, weirs, pumping plants, diversion structures, gate structures, and drop structures.

The SWP consists of 34 storage facilities, reservoirs, and lakes, 20 pumping plants, four pumping-generating plants, five hydroelectric power plants, and over 700 miles of channels, canals, and pipelines. The SWP is self-supporting and is entirely funded by the 29 urban and agricultural water suppliers that receive the project's water. Because of its self-supporting financial structure, funding for the SWP is not included in the five-year plan except for projects funded by both the SWP contractors and general obligation bonds.

**DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

The primary driver of the needs of the Central Valley levee system is the Central Valley Flood Protection Act of 2008, adopted in June 2012. The Central Valley Flood Protection Project describes a system-wide approach considering the interaction of all flood system components. In particular, the approach looks beyond the traditional project-by-project approach and justification, and incorporates actions on both flood system improvement and proactive floodplain management. Integrated flood management is an approach to flood risk reduction that recognizes the interconnection of flood management actions with water resources management and land use planning, including the value of coordinating across geographic and agency boundaries, integrating environmental stewardship, and promoting sustainability. Much of the Central Valley levee system is aged and many levees have deteriorated and no longer meet current standards. Most levees were not engineered to perform to modern standards and need repairs and improvements.

The primary drivers of water supply infrastructure needs are population growth and the need to restore and maintain the health of the state's natural water ecosystems. In addition to agricultural and urban water demands, substantial water supplies are necessary to comply with the Endangered Species Act, to reverse the decline of fish and

wildlife populations, and to improve the health of the Bay-Delta ecosystem. To protect the listed species, operational restrictions have been imposed on both the SWP and the Central Valley Project to limit pumping under certain conditions. By 2050, annual statewide water demand to meet combined urban, agricultural, and environmental uses and to eliminate groundwater overdraft is expected to be 83.7 to 86.9 million acre-feet per year, 3.6 to 6.8 million acre-feet per year higher than the total current average annual demand of 80.1 million acre-feet.

Lastly, infrastructure needs are driven in part by global climate changes, particularly since global warming is predicted to reduce snowpack and increase winter runoff, which increases the need for both flood control and water storage infrastructure.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes over \$748 million during the next five years to implement the following specific actions identified in the Water Action Plan:

- **Expand Water Storage Capacity**—California’s volatile hydrology challenges the ability of local agencies to provide water for the state’s growing population, the agricultural economy, and other industries. The 2014 Water Bond (Proposition 1) will allocate funding to assist in the development of expanded local water storage across the state both above and below ground that is designed to also produce benefits to the broader public, such as ecosystem flows and water quality improvements. Proposition 1 provides \$2.7 billion in funds for a broad spectrum of water storage projects that provide both localized and statewide public benefits. These funds—overseen by the California Water Commission and restricted to the public benefit portion of projects—will contribute up to 50 percent of a project’s cost. The California Water Commission will develop and adopt procedures and guidelines for the expenditure of these funds, and grant-making is expected to begin in 2016-17. This new program is not included in the Plan because, at this time, it is unknown if the funds will be allocated to state or local projects.
- **Increase Flood Protection**—The Plan proposes \$738 million to improve flood protection in the Central Valley, funded primarily by Proposition 1E bond funds. Pursuant to the requirements of Proposition 1E, bond proceeds cannot be appropriated after July 1, 2016. Therefore, the appropriation of all remaining Proposition 1E funds is being proposed in the 2015-16 fiscal year. Expenditures of these remaining bond funds will be allocated in a manner that is consistent with the recommendations of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan for prioritizing

flood management projects. The Plan funds investments for urban flood protection projects, rural/small community projects, and system-wide improvements.

- **Achieve Co-Equal Delta Goals**—One of the priorities identified in the Water Action Plan is to take actions necessary to achieve the goals of water supply reliability and the protection and restoration of the Delta ecosystem. The Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP), scheduled to be implemented within the next five years, proposes a new water conveyance infrastructure system to achieve these goals. State and federal water contractor’s estimate costs of up to \$16.8 billion to complete the water conveyance and approximately \$7.7 billion state and federal funds to support restoration and conservation efforts for a total project cost of \$24.5 billion. Funding for BDCP is not included in the Plan because the majority of costs would be outside the Plan since they would be borne by the water contractors. State funds will be included after final approvals for the project are obtained.
- **Energy Efficiency at SWP Facilities**—The Plan includes \$10 million of Cap and Trade funds to support water and energy efficiency upgrades at SWP facilities, which will result in more efficient generation of clean power and improved system reliability.

**CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

DWR’s proposal is consistent with the state’s planning guidelines. Specifically, improvements to the state’s flood protection system meet the environmental and agricultural resource protection and efficient land use priorities. Additionally, the emphasis on achieving 200-year flood protection in urban areas, combined with proposed floodplain mapping activities, will encourage development to remain in already-developed areas, thereby promoting the infill objective.

---

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

The California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) oversees departments, boards, and offices that provide a wide range of services to restore, protect, and enhance the state’s environment for public health, environmental quality, and economic vitality. The CalEPA is comprised of six departments and nine Regional Boards. Infrastructure plans for the Air Resources Board are included in the Plan.

---

### **AIR RESOURCES BOARD**

The Air Resources Board (ARB) has primary responsibility for protecting air quality in California. This responsibility includes establishing ambient air quality standards for specific pollutants, maintaining a statewide ambient air-monitoring network in conjunction with local air districts, administering air pollution research studies, evaluating standards that the United States Environmental Protection Agency has adopted, and developing and implementing plans to attain and maintain these standards. These plans include emission limitations that the ARB and the local air districts have adopted for vehicular and other mobile sources and industrial sources.

ARB also has the responsibility, in coordination with the Secretary for Environmental Protection, to implement the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (the Act). The Act established a limit on greenhouse gas emissions by requiring emission reductions in California to be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

ARB has a major motor vehicle and engine research and testing facility in El Monte, known as the Haagen-Smit Laboratory. ARB also leases office and storage space in five buildings adjacent to the Haagen-Smit Laboratory. Approximately 30 percent of ARB's workforce is located in El Monte. ARB also conducts heavy-duty motor vehicle engine testing at a location owned by the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority.

In addition, ARB leases laboratory space in Sacramento to do stationary testing on composite wood and consumer products, as well as test samples from 43 statewide air quality monitoring stations.

### **DRIVERS OF NEED**

The two main drivers of need are office space to house employees and emissions testing and laboratory space for the state's air pollution control and climate change programs. Since the construction of the Haagen-Smit Laboratory in 1971, the limitations of building design, size, and age render the facility deficient in meeting existing and future testing requirements, including the ability to adapt to the expansion of program responsibilities. The lack of adequate space has required ARB to lease space in multiple facilities, resulting in operational inefficiencies and increases in ARB facility costs.

**PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes \$366 million to build a replacement laboratory to address critical infrastructure and workload space deficiencies at the Haagen-Smit Laboratory. In 2015-16, the Plan includes acquisition and performance criteria funding for the project.

**CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

ARB’s proposal is consistent with statutory requirements. The proposal helps protect and preserve the state’s natural resources and requires infrastructure that supports the efficient use of land and the agency’s projected growth for the next 35 years.

---

**HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY**

The Health and Human Services Agency oversees departments, boards, and other offices that provide a wide range of healthcare services, social services, public health services, income assistance, and services to people with disabilities. Infrastructure projects for the following departments are included in the Plan: the Department of Public Health, the Department of Developmental Services, and the Department of State Hospitals.

---

**DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH**

The Department of Public Health (DPH) is dedicated to optimizing the health and well-being of the people of California by promoting healthy lifestyles, reducing the occurrence of preventable diseases, disabilities and premature deaths, protecting the public from unsafe environments, and enhancing public health emergency preparedness.

**EXISTING FACILITIES**

The Richmond Campus is a public health laboratory and office complex situated on 29 acres located in Richmond, California. The 697,000 sf secured campus consists of laboratories, offices, a warehouse, library, auditorium, animal care facility, and a central plant facility. Examples of laboratory services include analyzing paint and soil samples for the presence of lead, screening blood drawn from pregnant women and newborn babies for genetic diseases and birth defects, identifying infectious diseases, and evaluating and accrediting private laboratories. DPH maintains its own laboratory facilities to serve these programs.

The Southern California laboratory is located in Los Angeles. The two story 31,325 sf building provides laboratory and office space. DPH no longer uses the Southern California

lab, which is currently occupied by the Department of Toxics and Substance Control (DTSC). DTSC has leased new space and plans to vacate the facility in early 2015. When the lab is fully vacated, it will be decommissioned and disposed of through the surplus property process.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEED**

The two main drivers of need are office space to house employees and laboratory space for the state's public health programs. DPH is also periodically required to update laboratory facilities to meet new federal guidelines on handling and analyzing hazardous toxins.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes a total of \$4.3 million for DPH in 2015-16 to upgrade a lab at the Richmond facility to meet new federal guidelines on the handling of highly pathogenic agents such as the Avian/Bird flu viruses.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

The Plan is consistent with the AB 857 planning guidelines, as the project will improve infrastructure at the existing laboratory and promote the health and safety of employees.

---

### **DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES**

The Department of Developmental Services (DDS) provides services and support to children and adults with developmental disabilities, including intellectual disability, cerebral palsy, autism, epilepsy, and disabling conditions closely related to intellectual disability or requiring similar treatment. DDS contracts with 21 nonprofit regional centers located throughout the state to provide services and support at the local level. A small number of individuals live in three state-operated developmental centers (DCs) and one smaller state-leased and state-operated community facility.

Services provided in the DCs include medical, nursing, and dental care; physical, sensory, and social development; habilitation and behavioral training; and education, vocational training, and employment programs. In an ongoing effort to fulfill its mission under the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (the Lanterman Act), DDS continually explores ways to provide DC consumers opportunities to reside in community settings and use community-based programs when their needs can be met outside the DCs.

A moratorium on new admissions to DCs was effective July 1, 2012, with limited exceptions for individuals who are committed by the criminal or juvenile justice system to restore competency, individuals involved in the criminal or juvenile justice system who are a danger to themselves or others whose competency cannot be restored, and individuals in acute crisis needing short-term stabilization. That moratorium and subsequent amendments limited DC admission to only Porterville’s Secure Treatment Program and Fairview and Sonoma’s Acute Crisis Homes.

Consumers currently in DCs generally fit the profiles below and require services in one of the following areas:

- Secure Treatment—Adults or teens who have committed or allegedly participated in criminal offenses (felonies or misdemeanors) in the community, been found incompetent to stand trial, or are committed by the courts.
- Behavioral Intervention—Individuals that have challenging behaviors that prevent them from being integrated into community programs and require a high degree of structure and supervision.
- Long-Term Medical Care—Individuals that are medically fragile and require a lifetime of support, intensive medical and nursing intervention, sophisticated medical equipment, and assistive technology to maintain their lives.

**EXISTING FACILITIES**

The state continues to maintain three state-operated DCs, which all have extensive campuses and specialized facilities, including hospital units and medical clinics, residential buildings, kitchens and dining rooms, activity centers and athletic fields, auditoriums, classrooms, swimming pools, chapels, libraries, and other consumer-centered facilities.

The three active DCs are:

- Fairview DC—Opened in 1959, it is located on 114 acres in Costa Mesa. This facility has approximately 1.1 million sf of facility space, a current population of 298 consumers (all census figures are as of November 26, 2014), and 821 licensed available beds. Fairview accepts admissions only for individuals in acute crisis. It has programs for individuals who are receiving medical care and treatment, physical development, social development, and crisis and behavioral intervention. Fairview also serves young adults who require mental health services in addition to treatment for their developmental needs.

- Porterville DC—Opened in 1953, it is located on 670 acres in Porterville. Porterville has approximately 1.2 million sf of facility space, a current population of 384 consumers, and 685 licensed available beds. Porterville admits only to the Secure Treatment Program, which serves 170 individuals. This facility also serves a long-term chronic population needing medical and nursing care and physical and social development.
- Sonoma DC—Opened in 1891, it is located on 863 acres in Eldridge. This facility has approximately 1.3 million sf of facility space, a current population of 422 consumers, and 562 licensed available beds. Sonoma provides services to individuals with visual, hearing, and other sensory impairments, individuals with challenging behaviors, and individuals who are aging and have long-term chronic medical conditions.

In addition to the three facilities noted above, the Lanterman DC, which opened in 1927 and closed in 2014, is located on 302 acres in Pomona. Lanterman has approximately 1.1 million sf of facility space.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

The primary factors in the development of the Plan are the health and safety of consumers who reside in DCs, compliance with state and federal requirements for licensure, certification, receipt of federal financial participation, and the aging buildings and infrastructure. DDS envisions that eventually many buildings will no longer be needed, thereby reducing the need attributable to the aging infrastructure. Nevertheless, with buildings between 55 and 123 years old, some problems, particularly fire and life safety issues, continue to need immediate correction as long as the buildings are occupied.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes a total of \$7.9 million for DDS, including \$802,000 in 2015-16 for upgrades to the fire alarm system at Porterville DC. DDS is also undertaking infrastructure studies that may identify future capital outlay projects.

The Plan also proposes to transfer the Lanterman DC to California State Polytechnic University, Pomona on July 1, 2015. The transfer is contingent on the university acknowledging that state funds will not be specifically appropriated for operation, maintenance, or development of this property. The transfer is also contingent on the university accommodating the needs of other state departments for land in the area.

The Budget provides \$7 million to DDS to address critical deferred maintenance infrastructure needs.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

DDS supports the state’s planning priorities as identified in AB 857, as all proposals will improve infrastructure at existing facilities.

---

### **DEPARTMENT OF STATE HOSPITALS**

The Department of State Hospitals (DSH) administers the state mental health hospital system, the Forensic Conditional Release Program, the Sex Offender Commitment Program, and the Restoration of Competency program. DSH operates and maintains five state hospitals to house and treat mentally ill patients: Atascadero, Metropolitan, Napa, Patton, and Coalinga. DSH is also responsible for mental health programs at three prisons — Salinas Valley, Stockton, and Vacaville.

There are two categories of mentally ill patients at the state hospitals—those committed under the Lanterman-Petris-Short Act (LPS patients) who are civil commitments, and those committed through the criminal justice system. About 92 percent of individuals in state hospitals are forensic patients who have been committed through the criminal justice system, including patients found not guilty by reason of insanity and mentally disordered offenders, patients transferred from state prison, sexually violent predators (SVP), and patients deemed incompetent to stand trial (IST). Over the last several decades the population at DSH has become increasingly more violent. The current state hospital infrastructure was constructed when the patients at DSH were primarily civil commitments.

There is presently a waiting list of over 400 individuals in county jails who have been deemed IST and are awaiting admission to DSH. The waitlist has increased significantly over the past few years and judges across the state are ordering DSH to admit IST patients. The Department is also exploring options to increase capacity through partnerships with local governments and the private sector. These options include the following:

- Collaborating with counties to establish contract-based treatment programs located within secure county or private facilities.
- Releasing a Request for Information to community-based mental health treatment providers/facilities in response to Chapter 734, Statutes of 2014 (AB 2190), which

allowed for IST commitments to be placed in the community for treatment before the previous 180-day prohibition.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

Each state hospital is designed to provide for the complete care and rehabilitation of patients, and includes one-, two-, or four-bed hospital-type rooms, kitchens, dining rooms, off-unit treatment centers, courtyards, auditoriums, vocational classrooms, administrative offices, and physical plants.

The facilities are as follows:

- Atascadero—Opened in 1954, it is located on 448 acres in Atascadero. It is a completely self-contained residential facility surrounded by a maximum-security perimeter fence. Atascadero has approximately 846,000 sf of facility space and a licensed capacity of 1,275 beds. Atascadero primarily houses and treats high-risk, male forensic patients.
- Metropolitan—Opened in 1916, it is located on 162 acres in Norwalk. It is in a campus setting and has approximately 1.2 million sf of facility space and a licensed capacity of 1,106 beds. Metropolitan houses and treats both male and female LPS and lower-risk forensic patients, and is the only state hospital that provides psychiatric services to children and adolescents. There are limited numbers and types of forensic patients treated at this facility.
- Napa—Opened in 1875, it is located on 1,500 acres in Napa. It is in a campus setting and has approximately 1.5 million sf of facility space and a licensed capacity of 1,418 beds. Napa primarily houses and treats both male and female LPS and lower-risk forensic patients.
- Patton—Opened in 1893, it is located on 243 acres in Highland. It is in a campus setting with approximately 1.3 million sf of facility space and licensed capacity of 1,287 beds. Patton houses and treats both male and female LPS and forensic patients.
- Coalinga—Opened in 2005, it is located on 304 acres in Coalinga. It is a completely self-contained facility surrounded by a maximum security perimeter fence. Coalinga has approximately 1.1 million sf of facility space and a licensed capacity of 1,500 beds. This facility is a maximum-security psychiatric hospital to house and treat male SVPs and other high-risk male forensic patients.

**DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

The predominant driver of DSH’s infrastructure needs is based on the growth of the forensic patient population and changes in the court-driven oversight of the state prisons. Another driver is the aging infrastructure. Four of the five state hospitals are between 60 and 130 years old and have significant renovation and modernization needs. Although most 24-hour, patient-occupied space was renovated in the late 1980s through the late 1990s, much of the core functions of these hospitals—activity space; main kitchen, serving kitchens, and dining areas; administrative buildings; and utilities—have changed little since first constructed.

Finally, the growth of the forensic population that tends to be more violent has increased the need for more secure treatment and housing facilities at the state hospitals.

**PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes a total of \$167.4 million for DSH for 11 projects over the next 5 years to replace or modernize aging infrastructure at 4 of the state hospitals, including the construction of enhanced treatment units (ETUs) approved last year to address the changing nature of patients at DSH, including IST patients.

The 2015-16 Plan includes \$24.5 million for the following projects:

- \$9.6 million for projects at Metropolitan that address fire alarms and secured bed expansion. In 2019, when construction of the increased secured beds project at Metropolitan is expected to be completed, the annual staffing costs to provide treatment for IST patients will increase by approximately \$48 million.
- \$11.5 million for the construction phase of a hospital renovation project to provide ETUs at Atascadero, Napa, Coalinga, and Patton that will provide a more controlled and safe treatment space for patients prone to violence.
- \$2 million for the construction phase of the courtyard gates and security fencing project at Napa State Hospital.
- \$731,000 for the preliminary plans phase of the fire alarm system upgrades at Patton State Hospital.
- \$442,000 for the working drawings phase of the continuing seismic project at Atascadero State Hospital.

- \$219,000 for the preliminary plans phase of the courtyard expansion project at Coalinga State Hospital.

The Budget provides \$7 million to DSH to address critical deferred maintenance infrastructure needs.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

The Plan is consistent with the state planning guidelines, as all proposals will improve infrastructure at the existing state hospitals and promote the health and safety of the patients and employees.

---

### **DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION**

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) incarcerates the most violent felons, supervises those released to parole, and provides rehabilitation programs to help them reintegrate into the community. The Department provides safe and secure detention facilities and necessary support services to inmates, including food, clothing, academic and vocational training, and health care services.

In November 2006, plaintiffs filed a motion to convene a three judge panel in the *Plata* lawsuit under the 1996 Prison Litigation Reform Act, claiming that overcrowded conditions in California's prisons resulted in unconstitutional medical care. The second lawsuit joined in the three judge panel, *Coleman*, involves mental health services for inmates. Both lawsuits claim that care for inmates violates the Eighth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, which prohibits cruel and unusual punishment of the incarcerated. In 2007, a three judge panel was convened to address claims that overcrowding in state prisons results in unconstitutional levels of medical care. In 2009, the panel ordered the state to reduce its adult institution population to 137.5 percent of design capacity within two years. The state appealed this decision, but in 2011, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the panel's finding. Based on an order issued in February 2014, the state has until February 28, 2016 to meet the court-imposed population cap of 137.5 percent of design capacity.

Since 2007, California has taken numerous actions to reduce overcrowding. The most significant ongoing actions are realigning lower level offenders and parole violators to local jurisdictions (2011 Realignment), and increasing prison health care bed and treatment capacity. These actions have been effective in reducing the prison

population while maintaining public safety, eliminating the use of all non-traditional beds, and allowing CDCR to focus on providing rehabilitation programs to reduce recidivism.

As of July 31, 2014, CDCR housed approximately 135,600 adult inmates and 690 youth wards and supervised 49,250 adult parolees. The vast majority of adult inmates and youth wards were housed in state facilities, except for approximately 15,000 inmates in in-state and out-of-state contract facilities.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

CDCR's infrastructure includes more than 42 million sf of building space on more than 24,000 acres of land (37 square miles) statewide. State correctional facilities have, on average, 1.25 million sf of building space and are sited on approximately 640 acres.

The CDCR operates 37 youth and adult correctional facilities and 43 youth and adult camps. CDCR also contracts for multiple adult parolee service centers and community correctional facilities. CDCR operates an adult prisoner/mother facility, adult parole units and sub-units, parole outpatient clinics, regional parole headquarters, and a correctional training center. CDCR, under the direction of the federal court appointed Receiver, also operates: (1) licensed correctional treatment centers, hemodialysis clinics, and outpatient housing units; (2) a licensed skilled nursing facility; and (3) a hospice program for the terminally ill. CDCR also has six regional accounting offices and leases approximately two million sf of office space.

Because correctional facilities must provide a confined population with all of the services generally provided in a small city, their infrastructure includes a variety of buildings and systems including the following: housing units; pharmacies; kitchen and dining facilities; laboratories; medical, dental, psychiatric, and substance use disorder treatment space; chapels; recreation areas; classrooms; libraries; firehouses; plant operations; vocational and industry space; and warehouse, administrative, and records space.

Because of their size and often-remote locations, many correctional facilities have their own water and wastewater treatment systems and some also produce a portion of their own power through cogeneration plants or solar energy systems.

All institutions have energy, utility, telecommunications, and electronic security systems. Since all operations must occur in a secure environment, correctional facilities also have various features and systems to provide both internal and perimeter security. This includes lethal electrified fences at 28 of 34 adult correctional facilities.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

CDCR continues to have critical infrastructure issues that need to be addressed to support its public safety mission. This is due in part to the age of most of CDCR institutions, but it is also the result of poor maintenance, excessive wear and tear caused by occupancy levels beyond design capacity, changing technology requirements, facility infrastructure modifications required by the federal courts, and modernizations necessary for the change in the type of adult inmate and youth ward populations that remain in state facilities.

Many of CDCR's adult institutions have problems as a result of aged infrastructure, including issues with building systems like roofing, electrical distribution, and mechanical systems. The oldest state prisons, San Quentin and Folsom, were built in 1852 and 1880, respectively. From 1933 to 1965, ten more adult correctional facilities were added. In the early 1980s, the state built an additional 22 adult correctional facilities. Even the "newer" adult correctional institutions are now more than 25 years old. Two institutions have been added in the last decade: Kern Valley State Prison, which was completed in 2005, and the California Health Care Facility (CHCF) in Stockton, completed in 2013, with the addition of the former DeWitt Nelson Youth Correctional Facility, which was modified and activated in 2014 as CHCF's Facility E. CDCR is constructing dormitory housing units at two prisons. These facilities are expected to be completed and occupied in late 2015 and early 2016.

The CDCR's youth correctional institutions are also quite old. Two of the three institutions currently in operation were built during the 1960s and the current available space does not match the programmatic and housing needs of the older, specialized, and longer term youth ward population the state currently serves.

State prison facility needs are driven primarily by the court-ordered population cap of 137.5 percent of design capacity. The state is pursuing a number of strategies to reduce the state prison population. There are also other infrastructure needs in the prison system and the primary drivers of these needs are as follows:

- **Inmate Housing**—After a period of declining inmate population following the implementation of 2011 Realignment, CDCR has realigned its operations to appropriately house the remaining prison population. CDCR implemented a revised inmate classification scoring system, which is resulting in an overall downward shift in the security levels assigned to inmates. This is helping to alleviate crowding in celled housing, but also driving the need for additional dormitory housing within a

secure lethal electrified perimeter fence (level II housing). In addition, the age and condition of existing level II facilities within a secure lethal electrified perimeter fence is aged. The majority of the level II dormitory housing at California Rehabilitation Center (CRC) is in need of repair, which is one of the reasons it was initially proposed for closure. However, the closure of CRC has been postponed until the state can reach its court ordered cap and bring additional capacity online. CDCR has a need for additional modern facilities to house its population.

- Health Care Medical, Mental Health, and Dental Services—Several class action lawsuits and a federal court appointed Receiver have driven significant infrastructure upgrades and facilities over the past decade. Treatment space and specialized housing continues to be an issue of concern for the federal courts. Increased services have also driven increased needs for treatment space and office space for clinical staff. CHCF was completed in 2013 and its Facility E, completed in 2014, was a major new project built to address the most critical medical and mental health programs.
- Facility/Infrastructure Modernization—Changing inmate security requirements, new or expanded program needs, and essential utility expansions to support technology investments or upgrades are all factors contributing to the need for infrastructure investments.
- Critical Infrastructure Deficiencies—The age and deteriorating condition of buildings and their associated security structures and support systems are also driving infrastructure needs. In addition to the 12 adult institutions built before 1966 and the two youth institutions built during the 1960s, several of the newer institutions are experiencing premature degradation because of the excessive wear and tear caused by adult inmates during periods when occupancy levels were substantially beyond design capacity. Many of the institutions’ utility systems, particularly the wastewater systems, are worn out and the state is facing waste discharge penalties and fines associated with noncompliance issues.
- Support and Administrative space—The significant changes and expansions to medical, mental health, and dental services in the prisons has greatly increased the number of staff at each prison and has driven the need for appropriate office space for the professional staff providing treatment. There are several projects currently underway to help address this need.
- Program Delivery Changes—Infrastructure needs are also driven by litigation, court mandates, and legislation and may relate to the provision of substance use disorder

treatment programs or other rehabilitation programs, exercise time, and work training programs.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes a total of \$126 million for CDCR for eight projects over the next five years. The Plan proposes a total of \$20.4 million General Fund in 2015-16 to address critical infrastructure and fire and life safety deficiencies as follows:

- \$18.1 million for construction of a new boiler facility at San Quentin State Prison in San Quentin.
- \$997,000 for design of two new kitchen and dining facilities at the California Correctional Center in Susanville.
- \$792,000 for the design of solid cell fronts at the Deuel Vocational Institution in Tracy.
- \$500,000 to conduct studies necessary to prepare plans and develop design information for future capital outlay projects.

As noted earlier, many of the prisons are in need of significant facility and infrastructure upgrades. In addition, a sustained replacement and modernization of the prison system is needed to respond to the state's growing population, the evolving composition of the prison population, and the aging of the institutions within the system. Accordingly, the CDCR is developing a plan to address the future capacity needs of the prison system.

The Budget provides \$15 million to CDCR to address critical deferred maintenance infrastructure needs.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

CDCR's plan is consistent with the state's planning priorities and is focused on rehabilitating and improving existing infrastructure and promoting infill development. The CDCR's individual projects are evaluated for their effect on the environment and projects are modified to minimize negative effects on a case-by-case basis.

---

## **EDUCATION**

California’s public education system serves over 8 million full-time equivalent students, including over 1,000 local school districts, over 1,000 public charter schools, the State Special Schools, California Community Colleges, the California State University, the University of California, and Hastings College of the Law. Infrastructure projects for the State Special Schools, California Community Colleges, and Hastings College of the Law are included in the Plan.

---

### **K-12 SCHOOL FACILITIES**

California’s public education system for students in K-12 includes more than 1,000 local school districts and over 1,000 public charter schools serving more than 6.2 million California students. The state, through the State Special Schools and Services Division of the Department of Education, also operates a residential school for the blind and two residential schools for the deaf, serving approximately 1,000 total students, and three diagnostic centers serving approximately 4,000 students.

Since enactment of the Smaller Classes, Safer Schools, and Financial Accountability Act (Proposition 39 in 2002), local communities have increasingly funded a greater share of school construction through passage of local bonds. Voters have approved approximately 652 local bond measures authorizing more than \$71 billion for school construction and modernization since 2002. Over the same time period, approximately \$28.7 billion of state general obligation bonds have been authorized.

### **K-12 EDUCATION STATE SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM**

Over the past two decades, the state’s share of school construction costs have been financed primarily through voter-approved general obligation bonds. The State School Facility Program, administered by the State Allocation Board, apportions state bond funding primarily in the form of per-pupil grants to eligible school districts that can be used to acquire school sites, construct new school facilities, or modernize existing school facilities. Program participants apply for either new construction or modernization grants and are generally served on a first-come-first-served basis until the funds are exhausted.

The current new construction grant program generally provides funding on a 50/50 state/local match basis. A new construction project grant is intended to provide the

state's share for all necessary project costs for design, site acquisitions, and construction of a facility.

The current modernization grant program generally provides funding on a 60/40 state/local match basis. School buildings are eligible for modernization project grants every 20 years for portable classrooms or every 25 years for permanent structures pursuant to Chapter 572, Statutes of 2003 (AB 1244). The modernization project grant can be used to fund a large variety of work, including major repairs, purchasing of new equipment, or replacement of existing facilities.

School districts that are unable to provide some (or up to the entire local match requirement) may be eligible for state financial hardship funding, which will cover up to 100 percent of project costs. To receive financial hardship assistance, a district must have made all reasonable efforts to meet specified criteria, including the requirements to attain a 60 percent level of local bonded indebtedness and an attempt to pass a local bond in the past two years.

The State School Facilities Program, as designed in current law, is: (1) overly complex, creating costs for school districts to navigate a process that can involve as many as ten different state agencies each assigned oversight responsibilities; (2) creates an incentive for districts to build new schools even if they have the capacity to absorb enrollment growth; (3) allocates funding on a first-come, first-served basis, giving districts with dedicated facility personnel a substantial advantage; and (4) does not give districts enough flexibility to design school facility plans to reflect local needs. The inherent problems with the current program along with the long-term liabilities created by the issuance of debt are no longer sustainable and should be reformed.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

Increases in enrollment at California's public school districts drive a need for increased school facility construction funding. Although many schools are experiencing declining enrollments, other areas may lack the school capacity necessary to accommodate increased enrollment. Also, many districts have facilities with unoccupied classrooms while some districts continue to have overcrowded sites requiring new construction to adequately house students.

A slight increase is projected in statewide school district enrollment over the next five years. Nevertheless, the estimated need for school facilities funding by local school districts is unknown because of varying needs across local school districts. It is uncertain

where future enrollment growth will occur in the state and whether enrollment growth will occur in districts that do not have capacity to house additional students within existing facilities.

**PROPOSAL**

Since 2012, there has been no bond authority for the core school facilities new construction and modernization programs. As a result, both the 2013-14 and 2014-15 Governor’s Budgets proposed a dialogue on the future of school facilities funding, including consideration of what role the state should play in the future of facilities funding. To facilitate this dialogue, the following guiding principles were presented:

- From a state perspective, future K-12 facilities funding needs must be considered in the context of other competing education and non-education priorities and needs.
- The school facilities construction process should be easy to understand and efficient.
- School districts and their respective localities should have appropriate control of the school facilities construction process and priorities.
- School districts should have incentives to balance their facilities costs against operational needs within the total amount of funding available from state and local sources for education.

As part of a continuing dialogue, the Department of Finance convened a series of meetings this past fall to discuss a new facilities program and obtain feedback from education stakeholders. The meetings started with a review of the problems with the current program noted above, and focused on how a future program could provide districts with the tools and resources to address their core facility gaps and avoid an unsustainable reliance on state debt issuance. Informed by these discussions, and with these key principles in mind, the Budget proposes the following recommendations for the design of a new program:

- Increase Tools for Local Control:
  - Expand Local Funding Capacity—While school districts can pass local bonds with 55-percent approval, assessed valuation caps for specific bond measures and total caps on local bonded indebtedness have not been adjusted since 2000. In order to provide greater access to local financing, these caps should be increased at minimum by the rate of inflation since 2000.

- **Restructure Developer Fees**—Current law authorizes the governing board of any school district to levy fees against construction within its boundaries to fund school facilities. There are three categories that determine the amount of fees a district can levy, which range from a fraction of project costs to 100 percent of the costs. A new program should establish one developer fee level for all districts and cap the amount of fees that can be levied for specific projects at a level between the existing Level II and Level III fees (50 to 100 percent of project costs), subject to local negotiation.
- **Expand Allowable Uses of Routine Restricted Maintenance Funding**—Current law requires schools to deposit a percentage of their general fund expenditures into a restricted account for use in maintaining their facilities. Rather than requiring that these funds be used solely for routine maintenance, districts should have the ability to pool these funds over multiple years for modernization and new construction projects. Expanding the use of these funds will provide school districts with yet another funding stream to maintain, modernize, and construct new facilities.
- **Targeted State Funding for Districts Most in Need**—State funding for a new program should be targeted in a way that: (1) limits eligibility to districts with such low per-student assessed value they cannot issue bonds at the local level in amounts that allow them to meet student needs, (2) prioritizes funding for health and safety and severe overcrowding projects, and (3) establishes a sliding scale to determine the state share of project costs based on local capacity to finance projects.
- **Augment the Charter School Facility Grant Program**—Most of California’s charter schools lease facilities for instructional purposes. To assist charter schools in paying for rent and lease expenditures, the Charter School Facility Grant Program provides funding to charter schools either serving or located in attendance areas where at least 70 percent of the students qualify for free or reduced-price meals. To further assist charter schools with their facility needs, the state should permanently lower the free or reduced-price meal requirement to 55 percent (the concentration grant threshold under the Local Control Funding Formula) and provide additional funding to support this program expansion.

Over the course of the coming months, the Administration is prepared to engage with the Legislature and education stakeholders to shape a future state program that is narrowly-focused on districts with the greatest need, while providing substantial new flexibility for local districts to raise the necessary resources for school facility needs.

## **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

Chapter 1016, Statutes of 2002 exempts K-12 educational facilities from its provisions.

---

### **STATE SPECIAL SCHOOLS**

The State Special Schools and Services Division (Division) within the Department of Education provides diverse and specialized services and resources to individuals with exceptional needs, their families, and service and care providers. The Division provides technical assistance, assessment services, educational resources, and educational programs which prepare students for the transition to adulthood and promote independence, cultural awareness, and personal growth. The Division operates diagnostic centers and residential schools for deaf and blind students which serve a population of nearly 4,000 students. The Division currently has approximately 900 staff, which represents nearly 40 percent of all Department of Education employees. The programs administered by the Division include:

- **Diagnostic Centers**—The centers provide assessments to special education students, technical assistance to school districts, and conduct training programs for educators and families across California. The centers are located in Fremont, Fresno, and Los Angeles. Referrals are made through local school districts for special education students making inadequate progress despite utilization of local resources, and for students with complex behavioral and learning profiles that cannot be assessed locally.
- **California Schools for the Deaf**—The California Schools for the Deaf in Riverside and Fremont provide instructional programs to approximately 1,000 deaf and hard of hearing students from preschool through high school. The School for the Deaf in Fremont was the first special education program in California, originally established in San Francisco in 1860. Students are enrolled as day or residential students, depending on required commute distance.
- **California School for the Blind**—The California School for the Blind (CSB) in Fremont provides comprehensive educational services, in both the regular academic year and summer programming, to approximately 100 students who are blind, visually impaired, or deaf blind, and many of whom have multiple disabilities. CSB also supports more than 3,000 blind students and their teachers in local school districts via teacher training, assessment, and technical assistance. Students range from ages 5 through 21. These students can be day or residential students, depending on commute distance. Many students are served in short-term intensive programming,

including summer programs, which aim to return students to their home districts better prepared to engage in the general education curriculum.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

The Division has six facilities comprised of the three residential schools and three diagnostic centers referenced above. The facilities provide 1,035,310 sf of program space on 166 acres. The school facilities include classrooms, gymnasiums, dining commons, multipurpose rooms, assessment rooms and dormitories for residential students. The diagnostic centers include interview and assessment rooms, observation rooms, training rooms with videoconferencing capabilities, counseling rooms, waiting areas for parents, and offices for teachers and other professional staff.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEED**

The Division needs to provide safe and adequate space to the existing population of students and to accommodate changes in program delivery methods. The Division identified numerous drivers of space need for its infrastructure program, which have been grouped into the following two categories:

- Condition of Buildings—These drivers include the age of buildings, their seismic condition, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility, ventilation requirements, and electrical systems.
- Changes to Program Delivery—These are drivers that reflect changes to program delivery developed and implemented through legislation both at the state and federal level. The federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which required a free and appropriate education for children with exceptional needs in the least restrictive environment, increased the need for additional classrooms, offices, and other facilities at the State Special Schools to support school districts in behavior interventions for students receiving special education who have difficulties conforming to acceptable behavior patterns.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes a total of \$90.5 million for the Division for nine projects over the next five years. The Plan proposes \$1.7 million General Fund in 2015-16 to build a middle school activity center at the Fremont School for the Deaf.

The Budget provides \$3 million to the Division to address critical deferred maintenance infrastructure needs.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

The Division's proposal is consistent with the state's planning guidelines, as the projects promote infill on existing campuses.

---

### **HIGHER EDUCATION**

Each year, millions of Californians pursue degrees and certificates or enroll in courses to improve their knowledge and skills at the state's higher education institutions. More are connected to the system as employees, contractors, patients, and community members. California's system of higher education consists of three public segments:

- The University of California (UC) educates approximately 249,000 undergraduate and graduate students and is the primary institution authorized to independently award doctoral degrees and professional degrees.
- The California State University (CSU) provides undergraduate and graduate instruction to approximately 448,000 students, and primarily awards baccalaureate and master's degrees.
- The California Community Colleges (CCC) are publicly supported local educational agencies that provide open-access educational and vocational programs to approximately 2.1 million students.

### **INVESTING IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

Recent budgets have significantly increased state support for higher education. The passage of Proposition 30 in November 2012 prevented a \$250 million reduction in General Fund for each system, plus the state provided an additional \$125 million to each segment to recognize that they did not increase tuition and fees in 2012-13. Proposition 30 also allowed the state to commit to a multi-year investment plan. The 2013 and 2014 Budget Acts provided a total of \$267.3 million in new General Fund resources to each system, the first two installments of a plan to provide steady and predictable state funding increases. Combined, UC and CSU each received \$642 million attributable to the passage of Proposition 30 in 2014-15, and have kept tuition flat at 2011-12 levels

Total resources available for CCC have increased \$2.5 billion (23.2 percent) to \$13.2 billion estimated in 2015-16 since the passage of Proposition 30. The increase in resources has allowed the state to expand community college enrollment, while making investments in initiatives to improve student success.

For UC and CSU, costs associated with general obligation and lease revenue bond debt service are included in the segments' main General Fund appropriations. The segments now must factor these costs into their overall fiscal outlook and decision-making process. Any new expenditure will be subject to approval to ensure the funds are used for academic facilities to address seismic and life safety needs, enrollment growth, or for modernization projects. In addition, there are limits on the amount of each segment's budget that can be spent on capital expenditures.

The Administration expects that the segments will implement new practices and policies to control costs and manage operations within the level of resources proposed in the plan and use the funds to maintain affordability, decrease the time it takes students to complete programs, increase the percentage of students who complete programs, and improve the transfer of community college students to four-year universities.

It is not expected that new general obligation bond resources will be available to the segments. Furthermore, the Administration expects UC, CSU, and CCC to evaluate their instructional models and expand the use of technology where applicable to reduce costs and reduce demands for infrastructure needs in future years.

---

### **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

The UC system is comprised of ten campuses. The Master Plan designates UC as the primary state-supported academic institution for research with exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education instruction in the professions of law, medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine. Sole authority is vested in UC to award doctoral degrees in all fields, except that the doctorate in education, physical therapy, and nursing practice may be awarded by CSU. Joint doctoral degrees may also be awarded within the CSU system.

The 2013 Budget Act provided UC with a single support appropriation sufficient to cover debt service obligations associated with bonds issued for UC. The University now has the flexibility to prioritize its funding sources for its entire operation, including infrastructure.

The Budget provides \$25 million to UC to address critical deferred maintenance infrastructure needs.

---

### **CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

CSU educates students for attainment of degrees, credentials, and certificates in the liberal arts and sciences, applied fields, and certain professions. CSU may also award

doctoral degrees in education, physical therapy, and nursing practice. CSU system has 23 campuses, comprised of 22 university campuses and the California Maritime Academy. CSU has seven off-campus centers that serve upper division and graduate students.

The 2014 Budget Act provided CSU with a single support appropriation sufficient to cover debt service obligations associated with bonds issued for CSU. The University now has the flexibility to prioritize its funding for its entire operation, including infrastructure.

The Budget provides \$25 million to CSU to address critical deferred maintenance infrastructure needs.

---

### **CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

CCC is responsible for providing statewide leadership to California's 72 locally governed community college districts. CCC forms the largest post-secondary educational system in the world, currently serving approximately 2.1 million students through both vocational and academic program offerings.

Since enactment by the voters of the Smaller Classes Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act (Proposition 39 in 2002) that lowered the vote threshold to 55 percent for school facility bonds, more local communities have been able to pass local school bonds. Since 2002, voters have approved 95 of 111 local bond measures authorizing more than \$26.7 billion for the construction and modernization of 64 community college districts.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

According to an annual system-wide space inventory submitted by the districts, CCC's infrastructure consists of 72 community college districts with 112 full service campuses, 76 off campus centers and 23 separately reported district offices. Assets include over 24,363 acres of land, 5,515 buildings, and 82.2 million sf of space. In addition, the system has innumerable off-campus outreach centers at various facilities.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

CCC estimates that enrollment will increase from 1.6 million students in 2013-14 to well over 2 million students by the year 2019-20. CCC identified enrollment as the primary driver of need for funding infrastructure projects.

In addition to enrollment growth, CCC identified three other categories of space deficiencies:

- Critical Life Safety Renovations—CCC identified need associated with the renovation of existing facilities or the need for new facilities to address critical infrastructure deficiencies. This category includes projects identified by districts that pose health, fire, life, and seismic safety concerns.
- Modernization/Renovation—64 percent of CCC’s facilities are over 25 years of age, and 48 percent are over 40 years old. Generally, these facilities are lacking in functional upgrades to keep pace with technology. As such, CCC identified a need for modernization and renovation of existing facilities by analyzing their inventory of facilities over 25 years of age.
- Replacement of Temporary Buildings—One goal of CCC is to replace temporary buildings, many of which are beyond their useful lives, with permanent facilities. CCC evaluated the space needed to replace temporary buildings in excess of ten years of age.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes a total of \$99.6 million from existing general obligation bonds in 2015-16 for CCC for seven projects to address critical infrastructure deficiencies and campus needs over the next five years. This includes:

- \$33.1 million for College of the Redwoods Utility Infrastructure Replacement.
- \$20.1 million for Rio Hondo College L Tower Seismic and Code Upgrades.
- \$18.8 million for Santa Barbara City College Campus Center Seismic and Code Upgrades.
- \$13.4 million for El Camino College Compton Center Instructional Building Replacement.
- \$8.4 million Los Rios Community College District Davis Center Phase 2.
- \$4 million for Mt. San Jacinto College to replace a fire alarm system.
- \$1.7 million for Citrus College to renovate Hayden Hall.

Future projects are made up of those that are currently in the design phase or funded through construction. Funding to support future community college projects will

be determined within the context of any decisions made by the Legislature and the Administration to create and provide dedicated funding for a new K-12 school facilities program. Any future funding for community college facilities will be allocated through a process developed in consultation with the Chancellor’s Office.

The Budget provides an additional \$353.3 million Proposition 98 General Fund to continue paying down outstanding mandate claims by community colleges. These payments will further reduce outstanding mandate debt, while providing community colleges with one-time resources to address deferred maintenance at facilities, instructional equipment needs, and other one-time costs.

---

**HASTINGS COLLEGE OF THE LAW**

The Hastings College of the Law (Hastings) is the oldest and one of the largest public law schools in the Western United States, providing instruction to 960 full-time equivalent students.

**EXISTING FACILITIES**

Hastings is located in San Francisco. The physical plant consists of three buildings of approximately 639,000 sf and a 395-stall parking garage. The age of the facilities ranges from 34 years to over 85 years old. Previous state-funded capital projects at Hastings have focused on modernizing existing academic facilities for purposes of seismic strengthening and code-compliance upgrades. For its student housing facility (an auxiliary enterprise) Hastings completed a code-compliance upgrade (with only a limited seismic element) in 2004 and completed construction of a parking garage in 2009; these projects were funded with campus funds.

**DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

Hastings has two primary drivers of infrastructure needs; educational functions (such as instructional space), and auxiliary enterprises (such as student and faculty housing). These drivers are also affected by the age and poor functional utility of existing facilities.

Need exists for additional instructional space. While Hastings has sufficient building capacity to meet its enrollment and academic needs over the next five-years, additional teaching space is needed. Hastings has prepared a Space Utilization Analysis to document its need and has incorporated the report’s findings into its most recent five-year plan.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes \$43.6 million over the next five years to address infrastructure deficiencies on the Hastings campus. Of that amount, \$36.8 million is proposed in 2015-16 to construct a new academic building to replace the portion of the 198 McAllister building that was constructed in 1953. The project will develop a new academic facility of approximately 57,000 gross sf on a vacant site owned by Hastings at 333 Golden Gate Avenue. The new academic facility would replace Hastings' existing primary academic facility which encompasses approximately 76,000 sf. The new facility will address serious life safety and seismic deficiencies in the existing structure.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

The Plan complies with the AB 857 planning priorities by promoting infill development on land currently owned by Hastings.

---

## **GENERAL GOVERNMENT**

General Government is comprised of various departments, commissions, and offices responsible for oversight of distinct policy areas, such as ensuring peace officer competence, reasonable public utility rates, food and agricultural issues, and services to veterans. Infrastructure projects for the following departments are included in the Plan: the Office of Emergency Services, the Department of Technology, the Department of General Services, the Department of Food and Agriculture, the Military Department, and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

---

### **OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES**

The mission of the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (OES) is to reduce vulnerability to hazards and crimes through emergency management, homeland security, and criminal justice programs. OES responds to and coordinates emergency activities to save lives and reduce property loss during disasters and facilitates and coordinates recovery from the effects of disasters. On a day-to-day basis, OES provides leadership, assistance, training, and support to state and local agencies and coordinates with federal agencies in responding, planning, and preparing for the most effective use of federal, state, local, and private sector resources in state emergency situations. During an emergency, OES functions as the Governor's immediate staff to provide guidance and coordinate the state's responsibilities under the Emergency Services Act and applicable federal statutes. It also acts as the conduit for federal assistance through natural

disaster grants and federal agency support. Additionally, OES is responsible for the development and coordination of a comprehensive state strategy related to all hazards, including terrorism.

OES is also responsible for ensuring quality and reliable public safety communications services are provided to all state agencies in the most cost-effective, efficient, and timely manner possible. This includes maximizing the use of state resources, and the consolidation and joint use of telecommunications systems and services where operationally, technically, and economically feasible.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

OES' infrastructure includes a headquarters facility and Inland Region Coordination Center located in Sacramento County, which provides the central point of control during an emergency response. In addition, OES operates a statewide administrative office building near its headquarters facility, a Coastal Region coordination center in Walnut Creek, a Southern Region coordination center at Los Alamitos Air Field, the California Specialized Training Institute at Camp San Luis Obispo, and various small field offices throughout the state.

OES also has a main leased complex in Sacramento and 45 field locations throughout the state that support public safety communications services. These locations include 8 Area Offices and 37 Area Shops, positioned geographically to facilitate maintenance and installation services to remote communications sites and customers throughout the state. In addition, OES operates 10 communications vaults/towers and maintains and operates a total of more than 3,500 radio frequency points of presence.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

The infrastructure plan for OES is driven by the need to maintain and modernize the state's emergency response infrastructure and public safety communications services. The Essential Services Building Seismic Safety Act of 1986 requires that all buildings designed to be used as California Highway Patrol offices, emergency communication dispatch centers, emergency operation centers, fire stations, police stations, and sheriff's offices be designed and constructed to minimize fire hazards and resist insofar as practical, the forces generated by earthquakes, gravity, and winds.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes \$45.8 million for OES over the next five years to address critical infrastructure, workload space deficiencies, and telecommunications upgrades as follows:

- \$17.3 million to relocate critical public safety communications equipment and operations currently housed at Red Mountain to three new communications sites to improve public safety communication services in Northern California.
- \$24.2 million to design and construct a new emergency operation center in Southern California.
- \$4.3 million to design and construct a new network operation center at the OES headquarters building.

The Budget provides \$3 million to OES to address critical deferred maintenance infrastructure needs.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

OES takes into consideration the state's planning priorities when planning infrastructure investments, as programmatic needs allow.

---

### **DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY**

The Department of Technology (CalTech) is the central information technology (IT) organization for the State of California. CalTech is responsible for the approval and oversight of statewide IT projects, statewide IT professional development, and provides centralized IT services to state and local governments as well as non-governmental entities. CalTech publicizes statewide IT security policies and procedures, and has responsibility over telecommunication and IT procurements. The infrastructure that supports these programs consists of office buildings, warehouse and data center space, and telecommunication sites throughout the state.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

CalTech has six facilities statewide consisting of one headquarter office, two data centers, two leased office buildings, and one multi-functional storage location totaling approximately 298,000 sf.

**DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

CalTech's data center needs are driven by state information technology projects. The size and scope of data requirements drive adjustments needed for adequate storage, consistent power, and sufficient cooling.

**PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes \$5.6 million for CalTech over the next five years to address critical infrastructure deficiencies at one of CalTech's data centers. The projects include installation of an additional cooling tower and chiller, as well as an additional generator, to increase power and cooling capacity at the Gold Camp Data Center in Rancho Cordova.

**CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

This proposal is consistent with the state's planning guidelines, as it promotes infill development by addressing infrastructure deficiencies in an existing facility and encourages efficient development, to the extent possible, by consolidating state information technology capabilities in a principal location.

---

**DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES**

The Department of General Services (DGS) provides centralized services to state agencies in the areas of: management of state-owned and leased real estate; approval of architectural designs for local schools and other state-owned buildings; printing services; procurement of commodities, services, and equipment for state agencies; and management of the state's vehicle fleet. In addition to comprehensive real estate services, other support services provided by DGS include legal, risk and insurance management, records management, fiscal services, and administrative hearings.

**EXISTING FACILITIES**

DGS is responsible for approximately 39 million sf of space that supports a variety of state programs and functions (19.4 million sf state-owned and 19.6 million sf DGS-managed leases). DGS manages building maintenance for over 58 state office buildings totaling 16.6 million sf, including the State Capitol. DGS also maintains 22 other buildings totaling 2.8 million sf that includes warehouses, storage, the Central Heating and Cooling Plant, the State Printing Plant, three parking structures in Sacramento, and the State Records Warehouse. DGS also has jurisdiction over retail and residential properties in downtown Sacramento that are directly managed by the Capitol Area Development Authority (CADA).

In the Sacramento region, DGS operates and manages 34 state-owned office buildings totaling over 8,000,000 sf. At least 4,000,000 sf located in 21 buildings is over 40 years old. Many of these buildings have antiquated systems and will eventually experience failure for which replacement parts will not exist in the future. The state has been repairing and replacing critical building systems when necessary, but for some older buildings, this approach to handling aging building deficiencies is not sustainable.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

DGS' drivers of infrastructure needs are primarily the type and quantity of space required by client agencies to efficiently execute their programmatic responsibilities. In determining the space needs of the various state agencies, considerations include changes in the number of employees in an agency, benefits of consolidating fragmented agencies, and location requirements necessary to best meet program delivery needs. Aging infrastructure and infrastructure modernization needs impact the type and quantity of space required by state agencies for their programmatic responsibilities.

The state's strategy for accommodating office space in state-owned and leased property is guided by policy, statutes, and planning goals. Regional facilities plans are developed for a defined geographic area and document the facts, analyses, and actions most appropriate for locating state office operations in that area. These regional facilities plans identify current and future office space requirements of state departments, evaluate the feasibility of office consolidation alternatives, and serve as a framework for future state office development and leasing activities. Decisions leading to specific recommendations for office space are affected by agency programmatic needs, availability of funding, standard state building rental rates versus private lease costs in the local market, and the age and condition of the current DGS-controlled state office building inventory.

### **PROPOSAL**

As a part of the 2014 Budget Act, \$2.5 million was appropriated to DGS to analyze the condition of buildings in the Sacramento region and determine the best course of action to address the state's infrastructure deficiencies and needs within the region. A proposed plan of action for meeting the state's office facility needs will be completed by July 2015. Initial funding to conduct site selection, real estate due diligence, environmental documentation, and conceptual design based on the initial results of the study may be proposed during the spring of 2015.

The Budget provides \$5 million to DGS to address critical deferred maintenance infrastructure needs.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

Although the Plan does not propose funding for any specific projects, DGS will ensure the state's planning priorities are considered as part of its planning process.

---

### **DEPARTMENT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE**

The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) protects and promotes California's \$42.6 billion agriculture industry. CDFA serves the citizens of California by promoting and protecting a safe, healthy food supply, and enhancing local and global agricultural trade, through efficient management, innovation, and sound science, with a commitment to environmental stewardship.

CDFA oversees the network of California fairs and the state owned facilities they occupy. California has a network of 78 fairs including county fairs, citrus fruit fairs and District Agricultural Associations. State oversight of these local fairs includes periodic financial reviews and audits.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

The facility inventory includes approximately 977,000 sf for 16 Border Protection Stations, 9 employee residences, 11 laboratories, 7 greenhouses, 4 warehouses, as well as office space. CDFA also rents or owns 242,000 sf of laboratory space, 37,000 sf of warehouse space, 29,000 sf of greenhouse space, and 669,000 sf of office space.

Included in the inventory above are two out-of-state facilities. In Waimanalo, Hawaii, CDFA operates a laboratory to rear sterile fruit flies for eventual release over designated areas of California to help eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly. In Phoenix, Arizona, sterile moths are produced at CDFA and the United States Department of Agriculture Pink Bollworm Rearing Facilities. During the months of April through October, these moths are sent to California and released by aircraft on selected crops.

The state also owns 42 facilities across the state where the state fair and other local fairs are hosted. Each fairground contains numerous buildings and specialized facilities.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

The primary driver of infrastructure need is the replacement of aging facilities that have outlived their useful life and cannot accommodate the increased volumes of testing or inspections.

A strong veterinary diagnostic and response system is necessary to protect animal health, public health and the food system. The California Animal Health and Food Safety Laboratory network of four veterinary laboratories are strategically located throughout California and provide a framework for an effective early warning and response system. Three of CDFA's four veterinary labs were constructed more than 40 years ago and were not designed to meet current capacities, standards, conditions, or equipment needs. The Turlock laboratory faces severe space and bio-containment limitations, aged equipment, deficient electrical and airflow systems and urban encroachment, and is unable to keep pace with current and future needs in food safety, bioterrorism surveillance, molecular diagnostics, virology, and environmental monitoring.

Fourteen of the 16 Border Protection Stations located on major highways throughout the state were built between 40 and 70 years ago, and were not designed to handle the increased current traffic volumes. The Border Protection Stations are California's first line of defense in protecting against invasive pests and are worn and outdated because of their age and the extreme weather conditions that have intensified their deterioration. Additionally, because of deficiencies in current traffic lane capacity and usable office space at existing stations, it is becoming increasingly difficult to perform vehicle inspections on many routes.

Infrastructure needs for the network of California fairs is primarily driven by the age of the facilities. The majority of the state's fair facilities date back to the 1940's, and were constructed through the Federal Works Projects Administration and the California Conservation Corps. Due to the limited availability of funding in recent years, the network of California fairs is now faced with a backlog of deferred maintenance needs in many of its 3,000 buildings. CDFA notes that the most common deferred maintenance issues include the need for sewer and water line replacement, electrical repairs, asphalt repairs, roofing replacement and retrofits for ADA compliance.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes \$38.9 million for CDFA over the next five years to replace the animal health and food safety laboratory in Turlock. CDFA will also conduct studies to assess the infrastructure needs at various Border Protection Stations and laboratory facilities.

The Budget provides \$2 million to CDFA and \$7 million for the network of California fairs to address critical deferred maintenance infrastructure needs.

**CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

CDFA promotes infill development when possible by renovating existing infrastructure and developing facilities in areas currently served by existing infrastructure; protects environmental and agricultural resources by developing infrastructure in appropriate locations; and promotes efficient development, to the extent possible, by ensuring that new projects use existing infrastructure, such as roads, sewers, and utilities.

---

**MILITARY DEPARTMENT**

The Military Department is responsible for the command, leadership, and management of the Office of the Adjutant General/Joint Forces Headquarters, California Army and Air National Guard, State Military Reserve, California State Defense Forces, California Youth and Community Programs Task Force, and California Cadet Corps. The Department provides military support to federal and state governments, as well as personnel and equipment in response to natural and civil emergencies. In addition, the Department conducts youth programs throughout the state that bring structure, discipline, and effective leadership training methods to the educational setting. Furthermore, through the Defense Support to Civil Authorities mission, it also functions as a supporting service to civilian programs such as Homeland Security, fire and rescue, law enforcement, care and shelter, construction and engineering, hazardous material disposal, and logistical support.

Between 2001 and 2013, the Department received federal design and construction funds for 28 projects. However, additional federal support for the next five years is projected to be minimal. This is partially driven by a decreasing federal budget that allocates fewer funds for National Guard new construction. At this time, none of the major new construction projects in the Department's plan are currently scheduled to receive federal support. Each year, the Department receives a share of federal funds to be used at its discretion for the design of projects for which federal funds have been scheduled, but not yet awarded.

**EXISTING FACILITIES**

The Department operates 99 active armories, four aviation centers, 24 field maintenance shops, two repair parts storage and distribution centers, an Equipment Demobilization Site, two combined support maintenance shops, and two maneuver area training equipment sites. It also operates three major training properties consisting of troop lodging, administration, warehouse, maintenance, and range facilities. In total, these facilities encompass a combined area of 7.8 million sf.

The armories provide assembly areas for troop deployments for civil and natural disasters. In addition, the armories are available to serve local community needs such as youth club activities, local emergency operation centers, and voter polling sites. Finally, the armories are used for emergency shelters and have provided a base of operations for CAL FIRE during wildfires. The various maintenance shops provide support services to the Department for the upkeep and repair of ground equipment and aircraft.

In addition, the Department leases approximately 110,000 sf in Rancho Cordova to house its Headquarters facility. The facility does not comply with anti-terrorism and federal force protection safety requirements for military buildings. The facility is also undersized and does not have adequate space to accommodate current operational requirements.

### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

Much of the infrastructure requirements are driven by the need to house and train the California Army National Guard and to maintain the various ground/air vehicles and equipment located at these armories. The Department identifies infrastructure needs in four general categories:

- **Aging Facilities**—Over 77 percent of the state's armories and maintenance shops are at least 50 years old. Electrical, sewage, and telephone systems were sized for smaller facilities and cannot meet the demands of modern technology. In addition, many facilities require hazardous substance abatement and have ineffective heating and cooling systems.
- **Changing Requirements**—The Department indicates that the design of most armories is now inadequate to meet modern requirements. For example, when first constructed, units were only staffed at 50 percent capacity. Now all units are authorized to be staffed at 100 percent capacity, resulting in increased use. Facilities that once were designed for male-only units now support mixed gender units, requiring the changing of shower and locker facilities. The maintenance shops that were originally designed to support jeeps and other small vehicles now support larger vehicles that do not fit through the bay doors. Finally, the amount of equipment supported by these facilities has sharply increased, infringing on parking, and overwhelming the vehicle maintenance capabilities at local armories, training centers, and maintenance facilities.
- **Revised Federal Standards**—Force protection standards were expanded in 2003 by the Department of Defense to incorporate National Guard facilities. In order to receive federal participation for new construction, the state must comply with the

standards that include a 148-foot setback distance for buildings that regularly contain more than 50 National Guard personnel. As a result, the amount of land needed for armories and headquarters facilities has increased significantly.

- **Shifting Demographics**—The Department indicates that many of the armories are not located near the state’s current population centers because of the state’s migration patterns over the past 50 years. As a result, several regions of the state are underserved. Alternatively, in other areas, armories originally situated in rural or suburban areas are now boxed in by development and unable to expand or meet force protection requirements.

**PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes \$147.1 million for the Department. In 2015-16, the Plan includes \$9.1 million as follows:

- \$8.8 million for the acquisition phase of a new Consolidated Headquarters Complex. The Complex will consolidate approximately 900 state-funded staff from several leased facilities throughout the state into a new state-owned facility containing approximately 238,000 sf. The new facility will allow the Department to meet federal force protection standards and will significantly increase operational efficiencies and readiness capabilities.
- \$260,000 in architect-engineering funds for advanced plans and studies. The architect-engineering funds will allow for the development of conceptual designs and validated cost estimates for future projects to address critical infrastructure needs.

The Plan also includes funding for two projects that would be funded in part by federal funds: (1) the San Diego Readiness Center Renovation, and (2) the California National Guard Sustainable Armory Renovations.

The Budget provides \$2 million to the Department to address critical deferred maintenance infrastructure needs.

**CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

Proposals for consolidated armories, maintenance shops, and headquarters promote infill development through their location in urban areas. Other proposals make efficient use of facilities through the rehabilitation and expansion of existing facilities. Additionally, every new site undergoes a state and federal environmental review.

---

### **DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS**

The California Department of Veterans Affairs (CalVet) administers the following benefits for veterans and their dependents: (1) assistance in presenting claims for veterans' benefits under federal laws, (2) beneficial opportunities through direct, low-cost loans to acquire farms and homes, (3) rehabilitative, residential, and medical care services in a home-like environment at the Veterans Homes of California (VHC), and (4) the operation of State Veterans Cemeteries.

To be admitted to a VHC, a person must be aged or disabled and have served active duty in the armed forces of the United States. In addition, the veteran must have been discharged or released under honorable conditions, be eligible for hospitalization or domiciliary care according to the laws of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs (USDVA), and be a current resident of California. Honorably discharged veterans, their spouses, and their minor children are eligible for interment in national and state cemeteries.

### **EXISTING FACILITIES**

CalVet operates eight homes in Barstow, Chula Vista, Fresno, Lancaster, Redding, Ventura, West Los Angeles, and Yountville. The two newest, Fresno and Redding, began admitting residents in October 2013. Depending on location, the homes offer continuum of care consisting of residential domiciliary, assisted living, intermediate nursing, and skilled nursing. The total physical bed capacity is 2,950 at all the State Veterans Homes.

These veterans homes include the following:

- VHC-Barstow—Opened in 1996 with 6 buildings comprising 208,000 sf; the home has a physical capacity of 400 beds on 22 acres.
- VHC-Chula Vista—Opened in 2000 with 6 buildings comprising 208,000 sf; the home has a physical capacity of 400 beds on 30 acres.
- VHC-Fresno—Opened in October 2013 with 7 buildings comprising 292,000 sf; the home has a physical capacity of 300 beds on 26 acres.
- VHC-Lancaster (Pete Knight Veterans Home)—Opened in 2009, the 47,000 sf home has a physical capacity of 60 beds plus space to serve 49 veterans in a community-based adult services center. The home is located on 22 acres.

- VHC-Redding—Opened in October 2013, the 163,000 sf home has a physical capacity of 150 beds on 26 acres.
- VHC-Ventura—Opened in 2009, the 47,000 sf home has a physical capacity of 60 beds plus space to serve 49 veterans in a community-based adult services center. The home is located on 20 acres.
- VHC-West Los Angeles—located on 14 acres adjacent to the USDVA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System campus. Completed in April 2010, the 373,000 sf home has a physical capacity of 396 beds. There is presently a project to construct a main kitchen, which will allow the home to be self-sufficient in food service, a requirement for admitting skilled nursing residents.
- VHC-Yountville—located on 500 acres in Yountville, Napa County. Established by veterans of the Mexican and Civil Wars and opened in 1884, it was entrusted to the state in 1900. With 120 buildings comprising 1.1 million sf of space, the home has a physical capacity of 1,229 beds. Currently, there are capital outlay projects underway at VHC-Yountville to replace essential systems.

Finally, CalVet operates a state veterans cemetery in Igo, Shasta County. The 63-acre cemetery, 20 acres of which are developed, provides 9,923 burial sites and has approximately 9,000 sf of buildings. A second state cemetery is in development and will be located on 79 acres of land at the former Fort Ord in Monterey County, and will contain 5,000 gravesites. A third state cemetery in Southern California is currently in the conceptual design phase and will be located on 125 acres of land at the former Marine Corps Air Station El Toro, in the City of Irvine.

#### **DRIVERS OF INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

Aging infrastructure is the key driver of CalVet’s capital outlay needs. In order to more clearly understand the Department’s need for usable space, and overall use of property at that facility, the Department partnered with an Architectural and Engineering Services consulting firm to develop a comprehensive Facilities Master Plan. The Master Plan was completed on January 30, 2013 and provides an evaluation of the facilities infrastructure inadequacies and a prioritized roadmap in which to address those inadequacies. The Master Plan will be used for future capital outlay requests for VHC-Yountville.

### **PROPOSAL**

The Plan proposes \$525,000 for CalVet for the construction of a water pressure/fire sprinkler system upgrade at the Veterans Memorial Building on the grounds of the Northern California Veterans Cemetery in Igo, California.

The Budget provides \$2 million to CalVet to address critical deferred maintenance infrastructure needs.

### **CONSISTENCY WITH AB 857 PLANNING GUIDELINES**

The Plan is consistent with the state's planning priorities, as all proposals either promote the rehabilitation of facilities at the existing veterans homes or redevelopment at a former military base.

APPENDIX 1 | PROPOSED 2015 FIVE-YEAR INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

Appendix 1  
**Proposed 2015 Infrastructure Capital Funding Plan**  
 (Dollars in Thousands)

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Total
<b>Judicial Branch</b>						
0250 Judicial Branch						
El Dorado County: New Placerville Courthouse	\$4,780 AP**	\$4,918 W	\$68,260 C	\$0	\$0	\$77,958
Inyo County: New Inyo County Courthouse	\$1,930 AP	\$0	\$1,636 W	\$19,885 C	\$0	\$23,451
Lake County: New Lakeport Courthouse	\$40,803 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,803
Los Angeles County: New Eastlake Courthouse	\$13,772 A	\$0	\$2,358 P	\$3,203 W	\$52,593 C	\$71,924
Mendocino County: New Ukiah Courthouse	\$6,068 W	\$79,087 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$85,155
Riverside County: New Mid County Civil Courthouse	\$4,673 AP	\$5,666 W	\$77,027 C	\$0	\$0	\$87,366
Santa Barbara County: New Santa Barbara Courthouse	\$6,294 WC	\$0	\$78,234 C	\$0	\$0	\$84,528
Shasta County: New Redding Courthouse	\$8,849 WC	\$139,815 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$148,664
Siskiyou County: New Yreka Courthouse	\$56,936 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$56,936
Sonoma County: New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse	\$11,252 W	\$149,809 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$161,061
Stanislaus County: New Modesto Courthouse	\$15,252 W	\$225,822 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$241,074
Tuolumne: New Sonoma Courthouse	\$4,066 W	\$56,693 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$60,759
Imperial County: New El Centro Courthouse	\$0	\$40,693 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,693
Riverside County: New Indio Juvenile & Family	\$0	\$43,244 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$43,244
<b>Judicial Branch Total</b>	<b>\$174,675</b>	<b>\$745,747</b>	<b>\$227,513</b>	<b>\$23,088</b>	<b>\$52,593</b>	<b>\$1,223,616</b>
<b>Transportation Agency</b>						
2660 Department of Transportation						
State Highway System Maintenance and Improvement	\$2,505,000 V	\$2,641,000 V	\$2,704,000 V	\$2,728,000 V	\$2,728,000 V	\$13,306,000
Local Investment (Reimbursement)	\$850,000 V	\$850,000 V	\$800,000 V	\$800,000 V	\$800,000 V	\$4,100,000
State Rail and Transit	\$88,000 V	\$52,000 V	\$6,000 V	\$0	\$0	\$146,000
Local Transportation Funding	\$1,777,000 V	\$1,765,000 V	\$1,758,000 V	\$1,748,000 V	\$1,748,000 V	\$8,796,000
<b>Proposition 1B</b>						
Local Seismic Retrofits <sup>1/</sup>	\$12,000 V	\$11,000 V	\$11,000 V	\$11,000 V	\$11,000 V	\$56,000
Trade Corridors Improvement Fund <sup>1/</sup>	\$50,000 V	\$9,000 V	\$9,000 V	\$9,000 V	\$9,000 V	\$86,000
Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) - Local Transit <sup>2/</sup>	\$1,000 V	\$1,000 V	\$1,000 V	\$1,000 V	\$1,000 V	\$5,000
Highway-Railroad Crossing Safety Account <sup>2/</sup>	\$4,000 V	\$4,000 V	\$4,000 V	\$4,000 V	\$4,000 V	\$20,000
Highway Safety, Rehabilitation, Preservation Fund <sup>2/</sup>	\$3,000 V	\$3,000 V	\$3,000 V	\$3,000 V	\$3,000 V	\$15,000
State Route 99 Account <sup>2/</sup>	\$4,000 V	\$4,000 V	\$4,000 V	\$4,000 V	\$4,000 V	\$20,000
<b>Department of Transportation Total</b>	<b>\$5,294,000</b>	<b>\$5,340,000</b>	<b>\$5,300,000</b>	<b>\$5,308,000</b>	<b>\$5,308,000</b>	<b>\$26,560,000</b>
2665 High-Speed Rail Authority	\$250,000 V	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$250,000
Initial Operating Segment: Section 1	\$0	\$25,174,000 AB	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,174,000
Initial Operating Segment: Section 2	\$250,000	\$25,174,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,424,000
<b>High-Speed Rail Authority Total</b>						
2720 California Highway Patrol						
Statewide Area Office Replacement Program	\$1,000 S	\$39,000 V	\$179,000 V	\$179,000 V	\$179,000 V	\$577,000
Truckee Area Office Replacement	\$29,448 B	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$29,448
Crescent City Area Office Replacement	\$21,305 B	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,305
San Diego Area Office Replacement	\$32,855 B	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$32,855
Quincy Area Office Replacement	\$27,254 B	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27,254
Santa Barbara Area Office Replacement	\$24,316 B	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24,316
<b>California Highway Patrol Total</b>	<b>\$136,178</b>	<b>\$39,000</b>	<b>\$179,000</b>	<b>\$179,000</b>	<b>\$179,000</b>	<b>\$712,178</b>
2740 Department of Motor Vehicles						
Delano Field Office Replacement	\$1,022 A	\$673 P	\$742 W	\$9,059 C	\$0	\$11,496
Santa Maria Field Office Replacement	\$2,637 A	\$866 P	\$859 W	\$11,164 C	\$0	\$15,526
Inglewood Field Office Replacement	\$1,017 P	\$1,007 W	\$12,895 C	\$0	\$0	\$14,919
Headquarters West Renovation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,194 P	\$5,621 W	\$11,815
Bay Area Commercial Driver's License Facility	\$0	\$6,529 A	\$735 P	\$771 W	\$8,970 C	\$17,005
Daly City Field Office Renovation	\$0	\$650 P	\$600 W	\$7,410 C	\$0	\$8,660
Fontana Business Service Center Renovation	\$0	\$376 P	\$405 W	\$4,200 C	\$0	\$4,981
San Diego Field Office Replacement	\$0	\$10,281 A	\$1,276 P	\$1,373 W	\$19,203 C	\$32,133
<b>Department of Motor Vehicles Total</b>	<b>\$4,676</b>	<b>\$20,382</b>	<b>\$17,512</b>	<b>\$40,171</b>	<b>\$33,794</b>	<b>\$116,535</b>
<b>Transportation Agency Total</b>	<b>\$5,684,854</b>	<b>\$30,573,382</b>	<b>\$5,496,512</b>	<b>\$5,627,171</b>	<b>\$5,520,794</b>	<b>\$52,802,713</b>

<sup>1/</sup> Proposed capital needs for 2015-16 Governor's Budget.  
<sup>2/</sup> The amounts remaining for these programs are a result of project bid savings. The appropriations for these funds can be administratively adjusted on an as needed basis per provisional language and Department of Finance approval. The California Transportation Commission is responsible for allocating these funds.

APPENDIX 1 | PROPOSED 2015 FIVE-YEAR INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Total
<b>Natural Resources Agency</b>						
3340 California Conservation Corps						
Placer Center Renovation of Dormitories and Kitchen/Dining Halls	\$2,655 PW	\$19,666 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,321
Tahoe Base Center Equipment Storage Relocation	\$2,510 AWC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,510
<b>California Conservation Corps Total</b>	<b>\$5,165</b>	<b>\$19,666</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$24,831</b>
3540 Department of Forestry & Fire Protection						
San Luis Obispo Unit Headquarters Replacement	\$36,912 PWC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,912
Statewide - Replace Communications Facilities, Phase 5	\$0	\$1,060 P	\$1,961 W	\$18,257 C	\$0	\$21,278
Statewide - Replace Communications Facilities, Phase 6	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,000 PW	\$3,000
Statewide - Replace Communications Facilities, Phase 7	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,000 PW	\$3,000
Statewide - Helitack Base Improvements	\$0	\$3,340 AP	\$2,800 W	\$10,450 PC	\$2,100 W	\$18,690
Statewide - Forest Fire Station Improvements	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,250 P	\$10,250
Hollister Air Attack Base Relocation, San Benito County	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,121 P	\$1,121 W	\$2,242
Ukiah Air Attack Base Relocation, Mendocino County	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,913 PWC	\$1,913
Minor Capital Outlay	\$1,823 PWC	\$2,000 PWC	\$2,000 PWC	\$2,000 PWC	\$9,823	\$9,823
<b>Department of Forestry &amp; Fire Protection Total</b>	<b>\$38,735</b>	<b>\$6,400</b>	<b>\$6,761</b>	<b>\$31,828</b>	<b>\$23,384</b>	<b>\$107,108</b>
3600 Department of Fish & Wildlife						
Minor Capital Outlay	\$1,806 C	\$862 C	\$1,400 C	\$800 C	\$755 C	\$5,623
<b>Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife Total</b>	<b>\$1,806</b>	<b>\$862</b>	<b>\$1,400</b>	<b>\$800</b>	<b>\$755</b>	<b>\$5,623</b>
3790 Department of Parks & Recreation						
Heber Dunes State Vehicular Recreational Area (SVRA): Water System Upgrade	\$180 PW	\$1,006 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,186
Angel Island State Park (SP): Immigration Station Hospital Rehabilitation Phase 4	\$2,952 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,952
Carnegie SVRA: Road Reconstruction	\$1,196 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,196
Gaviota SP: Main Water Supply Upgrades	\$215 P	\$142 W	\$1,520 C	\$0	\$0	\$1,877
Malibu Creek SP: New Stokes Creek Bridge	\$232 P	\$233 W	\$1,616 C	\$0	\$0	\$2,081
Torrey Pines State Nature Reserve: Utility Modernization	\$287 PW	\$231 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,478
Leo Carrillo SP: Steelhead Trout Barrier Removal	\$2,867 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,867
Mendocino Headlands SP: Big River Watershed Restoration	\$1,741 PWC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,741
Old Sacramento State Historic Park (SHP): Boiler and Erecting Shops Renovation	\$726 P	\$423 W	\$10,550 C	\$0	\$0	\$11,699
McArthur-Burney Falls Memorial SP: Ramp and Boarding Float Replacement	\$53 W	\$482 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$535
Angel Island SP: East Garrison Mooring Field	\$38 W	\$427 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$465
Mackerricher SP: Replace Water Treatment Plant	\$2,474 WC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,474
Ocean Dunes SVRA: Construct New Lifeguard Headquarters	\$619 W	\$8,456 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,075
Bidwell-Sacramento River SP: Irvine Finch Ramp Repair	\$532 C	\$532 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$627
California Indian Heritage Center: Phase I Development	\$53 W	\$393 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$446
South Yuba River SP: Historic Bridgeport Covered Bridge	\$0	\$750 W	\$660 C	\$0	\$0	\$1,410
Ocotillo Wells SVRA: Holly Road Solar Well	\$136 PW	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,318
Ocotillo Wells SVRA: Holmes Camp Water System Upgrades	\$0	\$183 PW	\$1,052 CE	\$0	\$0	\$1,188
Hungry Valley SVRA: Shade and Solar Power Project	\$0	\$121 PW	\$817 C	\$0	\$0	\$1,275
Pigeon Point Light Station SHP: Rehabilitate Lighthouse	\$0	\$14,007 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$14,007
<b>Department of Parks &amp; Recreation Total</b>	<b>\$15,046</b>	<b>\$29,482</b>	<b>\$16,647</b>	<b>\$660</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$61,835</b>
3125 State Conservancies and the Wildlife Conservation Board						
Implementation of the Environmental Improvement Program	\$96,745 V	\$95,742 V	\$86,969 V	\$95,791 V	\$85,591 V	\$450,838
<b>State Conservancies and the Wildlife Conservation Board Total</b>	<b>\$96,745</b>	<b>\$95,742</b>	<b>\$86,969</b>	<b>\$95,791</b>	<b>\$85,591</b>	<b>\$450,838</b>
3860 Department of Water Resources						
Flood Control	\$738,000 V	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$738,000
Water-Energy Efficiency Projects	\$10,000 V	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
<b>Department of Water Resources Total</b>	<b>\$748,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$748,000</b>
<b>Natural Resources Agency Total</b>	<b>\$905,497</b>	<b>\$152,152</b>	<b>\$111,777</b>	<b>\$119,079</b>	<b>\$109,730</b>	<b>\$1,399,235</b>
<b>California Environmental Protection Agency</b>						
3900 Air Resources Board						
New Southern California Laboratory	\$5,893 AD	\$0	\$360,000 B	\$0	\$0	\$365,893
<b>Air Resources Board Total</b>	<b>\$5,893</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$360,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$365,893</b>
<b>California Environmental Protection Agency Total</b>	<b>\$5,893</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$360,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$365,893</b>

APPENDIX 1 | PROPOSED 2015 FIVE-YEAR INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Total
<b>Health and Human Services Agency</b>						
4265 Department of Public Health						
Richmond Viral and Rickettsial Enhanced Lab Upgrade	\$4,333 WC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,333
<b>Department of Public Health Total</b>	<b>\$4,333</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$4,333</b>
4300 Department of Developmental Services						
Porterville Upgrade Fire Alarm System	\$802 PW	\$7,152 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,954
<b>Department of Developmental Services Total</b>	<b>\$802</b>	<b>\$7,152</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$7,954</b>
4440 Department of State Hospitals						
Atascadero: Renovate Existing Kitchen and Existing Dining Areas	\$0	\$1,971 P	\$2,670 W	\$35,242 C	\$0	\$39,883
Atascadero: East West Corridor Seismic	\$442 W	\$5,428 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,870
Coalinga: Courtyard Expansion Project	\$219 P	\$260 W	\$3,166 C	\$0	\$0	\$3,645
Statewide: Enhanced Treatment Units	\$11,467 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,467
Metro: Fire Alarm System Upgrade	\$7,634 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,634
Metro: Increased Secured Bed Capacity	\$1,930 P	\$1,707 W	\$31,893 C	\$0	\$0	\$35,530
Metro: Vocational Rehabilitation Seismic Upgrade	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$471 P	\$471
Metro: Relocate Hospital Police Department	\$0	\$1,306 P	\$1,471 W	\$17,164 C	\$0	\$19,941
Napa: Remodel S Units in Building 194	\$0	\$0	\$1,128 P	\$1,760 W	\$28,204 C	\$31,092
Napa: Courtyard Gates and Security Fencing	\$2,029 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,029
Patton: Fire Alarm System Upgrade	\$731 P	\$826 W	\$6,268 C	\$0	\$0	\$9,825
<b>Department of State Hospitals Total</b>	<b>\$24,452</b>	<b>\$48,596</b>	<b>\$48,596</b>	<b>\$54,166</b>	<b>\$28,675</b>	<b>\$167,387</b>
<b>Health and Human Services Agency Total</b>	<b>\$29,587</b>	<b>\$118,650</b>	<b>\$48,596</b>	<b>\$54,166</b>	<b>\$28,675</b>	<b>\$179,674</b>
<b>Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation</b>						
5225 Corrections and Rehabilitation						
Deuel Vocational Institution: Solid Cell Fronts	\$792 W	\$7,942 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,734
California Correctional Center: Arnold Unit and Antelope Camp						
Kitchen/Dining Replacements	\$997 W	\$14,189 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,186
Minor Capital Outlay	\$0	\$2,000 PWC	\$2,000 PWC	\$3,000 PWC	\$3,000 PWC	\$10,000
Budget Packages and Advance Planning	\$500 S	\$600 S	\$750 S	\$750 S	\$750 S	\$3,350
San Quentin State Prison: New Boiler Facility	\$18,071 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,071
California Institution for Men: Air Cooling Facilities A, B, C, and D	\$0	\$443 P	\$536 W	\$8,373 C	\$0	\$9,352
California Men's Colony: Fire Alarm and Suppression Upgrade	\$0	\$1,419 P	\$1,754 W	\$29,235 C	\$0	\$32,408
San Quentin State Prison: New Warehouse	\$0	\$0	\$1,951 P	\$1,851 W	\$24,937 C	\$28,739
<b>Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Total</b>	<b>\$20,360</b>	<b>\$26,593</b>	<b>\$6,991</b>	<b>\$43,209</b>	<b>\$28,687</b>	<b>\$125,840</b>
<b>Education</b>						
6100 State Special Schools						
Fremont Modular Middle School Activity Center	\$1,749 WC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,749
Fremont Football Field/Track Renovation - School for the Deaf	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,520 PW	\$1,520
Fremont Career Technical Education Project	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,226 PW	\$31,417 C	\$35,643
Fremont Perimeter Fencing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$97 PW	\$1,210 C	\$1,307
Riverside Athletic Complex	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,547 PW	\$1,547
Riverside High School Activity Center	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,971 PWC	\$6,971	\$6,971
Riverside Auditorium/Theater	\$0	\$0	\$1,523 PW	\$9,153 C	\$0	\$10,676
Riverside Transportation Facilities and Warehouse Complex	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,719 PW	\$1,719
Riverside Centralized Services Complex	\$0	\$3,548 PW	\$25,864 C	\$0	\$0	\$29,412
<b>Department of Education Total</b>	<b>\$1,749</b>	<b>\$3,548</b>	<b>\$27,387</b>	<b>\$20,447</b>	<b>\$37,413</b>	<b>\$90,544</b>
6600 UC Hastings College of The Law						
Academic Building Replacement	\$36,846 PWC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,846
198 McAllister Annex Renovation	\$0	\$0	\$6,712 PWC	\$0	\$0	\$6,712
<b>UC Hastings College of The Law Total</b>	<b>\$36,846</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$6,712</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$43,558</b>
6870 California Community Colleges						
Citrus Community College District (CCD), Citrus College, Hayden Hall #12 Renovation	\$1,738 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,738
El Camino CCD, El Camino College Compton Center, Instructional Building 1 Replacement	\$13,438 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,438
Los Rios CCD, Davis Center, Davis Center Phase 2	\$8,387 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,387
Mount San Jacinto CCD, Mount San Jacinto College, Replace Fire Alarm	\$3,986 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,986
Redwoods CCD, College of the Redwoods, Utility Infrastructure Replacement	\$33,146 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$33,146
Santa Barbara CCD, Santa Barbara City College, Campus Center	\$18,805 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,805
Seismic Upgrades	\$20,090 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,090
Rio Hondo CCD, Rio Hondo College, L Tower Seismic and Code Upgrades	\$99,590	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$99,590
<b>Board of Governors of Community Colleges Total</b>	<b>\$138,185</b>	<b>\$3,548</b>	<b>\$34,099</b>	<b>\$20,447</b>	<b>\$37,413</b>	<b>\$233,692</b>

APPENDIX 1 | PROPOSED 2015 FIVE-YEAR INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

		2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Total
<b>General Government</b>							
0690	Office of Emergency Services						
	Red Mountain: Relocate Public Safety Communications Facilities	C	\$16,038 C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17,299
	Southern Region Emergency Operation Center	N	\$1,908 PW	\$22,275 C	\$0	\$0	\$24,183
	Public Safety Communications Network Operations Center	N	\$1,528 P	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,323
	<b>Office of Emergency Services Total</b>		<b>\$2,789</b>	<b>\$22,275</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$45,805</b>
7100	Employment Development Department						
	Facility Purchase Option: Crenshaw Office	N	\$1 A	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1
	<b>Employment Development Department Total</b>		<b>\$1</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1</b>
7502	Department of Technology						
	Generator and Cooling Equipment for Gold Camp Data Center	N	\$206 P	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,394
	Generator for Gold Camp Data Center	N	\$0	\$3,237 PWCE	\$0	\$0	\$3,237
	<b>Department of Technology Total</b>		<b>\$206</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$5,631</b>
8570	Department of Food & Agriculture						
	Turlock Laboratory Replacement	N	\$0	\$1,750 W	\$35,230 C	\$0	\$38,938
	<b>Department of Food &amp; Agriculture Total</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,750</b>	<b>\$35,230</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$38,938</b>
8940	Military Department						
	Advance Plans and Studies	N	\$260 S	\$260 S	\$0	\$260 S	\$780
	Consolidated Headquarters Complex Phase I	N	\$8,831 A	\$99,151 B	\$0	\$0	\$113,146
	San Diego Readiness Center Renovation	N	\$0	\$814 PW	\$224 E	\$0	\$10,374
	California National Guard Sustainable Armory Renovations	N	\$0	\$5,700 PWC	\$5,700 PWC	\$5,700 PWC	\$22,800
	<b>Military Department Total</b>		<b>\$9,091</b>	<b>\$114,447</b>	<b>\$5,924</b>	<b>\$5,960</b>	<b>\$147,100</b>
8955	Department of Veterans Affairs						
	Igo Cemetery Water System Upgrade	N	\$525 PWC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$525
	<b>Department of Veterans Affairs Total</b>		<b>\$525</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$525</b>
9860	Infrastructure Planning						
	Infrastructure Planning	C	\$1,000 S	\$1,000 S	\$1,000 S	\$1,000 S	\$5,000
	<b>Infrastructure Planning Total</b>		<b>\$1,000</b>	<b>\$1,000</b>	<b>\$1,000</b>	<b>\$1,000</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>
	<b>General Government Total</b>		<b>\$40,802</b>	<b>\$139,472</b>	<b>\$42,154</b>	<b>\$6,960</b>	<b>\$243,000</b>
	<b>2015 Five-Year Infrastructure Plan Total</b>		<b>\$31,560,874</b>	<b>\$6,424,960</b>	<b>\$5,829,314</b>	<b>\$5,784,852</b>	<b>\$56,572,663</b>

\* Values in this column reflect project status:  
 N: New Project  
 C: Continuing Project  
 \*\* Values in these columns reflect project phase:  
 S: Study  
 A: Acquisition  
 P: Preliminary Plans  
 W: Working Drawings  
 C: Construction  
 E: Equipment  
 D: Performance Criteria  
 B: Design-Build  
 V: Various

## APPENDIX 2 | HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA BONDS BY PROGRAM AREA

### Appendix 2

#### History of California General Obligation Bonds Since 1972

##### By Program Area

(Dollars in Millions)

Program	Date	Proposed General Obligation Amount	Proposed Self- Liquidating Amount	Total Approved	Vote (%) For Against	
<b>Public Safety</b>						
New Prison Construction	June 1982	\$495		\$495	56.1	43.9
County Jail Capital	November 1982	280		280	54.3	45.7
County Jails	June 1984	250		250	58.7	41.3
Prisons	June 1984	300		300	57.8	42.2
County Jails	June 1986	495		495	67.2	32.8
Prison Construction	November 1986	500		500	65.3	34.7
County Correctional Facility & Youth Facility	November 1988	500		500	54.7	45.3
New Prison Construction	November 1988	817		817	61.1	38.9
New Prison Construction	June 1990	450		450	56.0	44.0
New Prison Construction	November 1990	450			40.4	59.6
County Correctional Facility and Juvenile Facility	November 1990	225			37.3	62.7
Youthful and Adult Offender Local Facilities	November 1996	700			40.6	59.4
Crime Laboratories	March 2000	220			46.3	53.7
		\$5,682		\$4,087		
<b>Seismic</b>						
Earthquake Reconstruction & Replacement	June 1972	\$350		\$350	53.8	46.2
Earthquake Safety/Housing Rehabilitation	June 1988	150		150	56.2	43.8
Earthquake Safety & Public Rehabilitation	June 1990	300		300	55.0	45.0
Earthquake Relief and Seismic Retrofit	June 1994	2,000			45.7	54.3
Seismic Retrofit	March 1996	2,000		2,000	59.9	40.1
		\$4,800		\$2,800		
<b>K-12 Education</b>						
State School Building Aid and Earthquake Reconstruction	November 1974	\$150		\$150	60.1	39.9
State School Building Lease Purchase	June 1976	200			47.3	52.7
State School Building Aid	June 1978	350			35.0	64.0
State School Building Lease Purchase	November 1982	500		500	50.5	49.5
State School Building Lease Purchase	November 1984	450		450	60.7	39.3
State School Building Lease Purchase	November 1986	800		800	60.7	39.3
State School Facilities	June 1988	800		800	65.0	35.0
School Facilities	November 1988	800		800	61.2	38.8
New School Facilities	June 1990	800		800	57.5	42.5
School Facilities	November 1990	800		800	51.9	48.1
School Facilities	June 1992	1,900		1,900	52.9	47.1
School Facilities	November 1992	900		900	51.8	48.2
Safe Schools Act of 1994	June 1994	1,000			49.6	50.4
Public Education Facilities	March 1996	3,000		3,000	61.9	38.1
Public Education	November 1998	6,700		6,700	62.4	37.6
Public Education	November 2002	11,400		11,400	59.1	40.9
Public Education	March 2004	10,000		10,000	50.9	49.1
Public Education Facilities	November 2006	7,329		7,329	56.9	43.1
		\$47,879		\$46,329		

APPENDIX 2 | HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA BONDS BY PROGRAM AREA

Program	Date	Proposed General Obligation	Proposed Self- Liquidating	Total Approved	Vote (%) For	Vote (%) Against
<b>Higher Education</b>						
Community College Facilities	November 1972	\$160		\$160	56.9	43.1
Community College Facilities	June 1976	150			43.9	56.1
Higher Education Facilities	November 1986	400		400	59.7	40.3
Higher Education Facilities	November 1988	600		600	57.7	42.3
Higher Education Facilities	June 1990	450		450	55.0	45.0
Higher Education Facilities	November 1990	450			48.8	51.2
Higher Education Facilities	June 1992	900		900	50.8	49.2
Higher Education Facilities	June 1994	900			47.4	52.6
Higher Education Facilities	November 1998	2,500		2,500	62.4	37.6
Higher Education Facilities	November 2002	1,650		1,650	59.1	40.9
Higher Education Facilities	March 2004	2,300		2,300	50.9	49.1
Higher Education Facilities	November 2006	3,087		3,087	56.9	43.1
		\$13,547		\$12,047		
<b>Environmental Quality &amp; Resources</b>						
Recreational Lands	June 1974	\$250		\$250	59.9	40.1
Clean Water	June 1974	250		250	70.5	29.5
Safe Drinking Water	June 1976	175		175	62.6	37.4
State, Urban & Coastal Parks	November 1976	280		280	52.0	48.0
Clean Water and Water Conservation	June 1978	375		375	53.5	46.5
Parklands and Renewable Resource Investment	June 1980	495			47.0	53.0
Parklands Acquisition and Development	November 1980	285		285	51.7	48.3
Lake Tahoe Acquisition	November 1980	85			48.8	51.2
Lake Tahoe Acquisition	November 1982	85		85	52.9	47.1
Parks and Recreation	June 1984	370		370	63.2	36.8
Fish and Wildlife	June 1984	85		85	64.0	36.0
Clean Water (Sewer)	November 1984	325		325	75.9	27.1
Hazardous Substance Clean-up	November 1984	100		100	72.0	28.0
Safe Drinking Water	November 1984	75		75	73.5	26.5
Community Parklands	June 1986	100		100	67.3	32.7
Water Conservation/Quality	June 1986	150		150	74.1	25.9
Safe Drinking Water	November 1986	100		100	78.7	21.3
Wildlife, Coastal and Park Land Conservation	June 1988	776		776	65.2	34.8
Safe Drinking Water	November 1988	75		75	71.7	28.3
Clean Water and Water Reclamation	November 1988	65		65	64.4	35.6
Water Conservation	November 1988	60		60	62.4	37.6
Water Resources	November 1990	380			43.9	56.1
Park, Recreation, and Wildlife Enhancement	November 1990	437			47.3	52.7
Environment, Public Health	November 1990	300			36.1	63.9
Forest Acquisition, Timber Harvesting	November 1990	742			47.2	52.8
Parklands, Historic Sites, Wildlife and Forest Conservation	June 1994	2,000			43.3	56.7
Safe, Clean, Reliable Water	November 1996	995		995	62.9	37.1
Safe Neighborhood Parks, Clean Water, Clean Air, Coastal Protection	March 2000	2,100		2,100	63.2	36.8
Safe Drinking Water, Clean Water, Watershed Protection	March 2000	1,970		1,970	64.8	35.2
Water, Air, Parks, Coast Protection	March 2002	2,600		2,600	57.0	43.0
Water Quality, Supply, Safe Drinking Water, Coastal Wetlands Purchase and Protection	November 2002	3,440		3,440	55.4	44.6
Water Quality, Safety, Supply, Flood Control, Resource Protection, Parks	November 2006	5,388		5,388	53.8	46.2
Disaster Preparedness, Flood Prevention	November 2006	4,090		4,090	64.2	35.8
Water Quality, Supply, Treatment, and Storage Projects	November 2014	7,545		7,545	67.1	32.9
		\$36,548		\$32,109		

## APPENDIX 2 | HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA BONDS BY PROGRAM AREA

Program	Date	Proposed General Obligation Amount	Proposed Self- Liquidating Amount	Total Approved	Vote (%) For	Against
<b>Veterans Home Loans</b>						
Veterans Home Loan	June 1972		\$250	\$250	65.5	34.5
Veterans Home Loan	June 1972		350	350	72.3	27.7
Veterans Home Loan	June 1976		500	500	62.5	37.5
Veterans Home Loan	November 1978		500	500	62.3	37.7
Veterans Home Loan	June 1980		750	750	65.5	34.5
Veterans Home Loan	November 1982		450	450	67.1	32.9
Veterans Home Loan	November 1984		650	650	66.3	33.7
Veterans Home Loan	June 1986		850	850	75.6	24.4
Veterans Home Loan	June 1988		510	510	67.6	32.4
Veterans Home Loan	November 1990		400	400	59.0	41.0
Veterans Home Loan	November 1996		400	400	53.6	46.4
Veterans Home Loan	March 2000	50		50	62.3	37.7
Veterans Home Loan	November 2000		500	500	57.0	43.0
Veterans Home Loan	November 2008		300	300	63.6	36.4
			\$50	\$6,410	\$6,460	
<b>Housing</b>						
First-Time Home Buyers	November 1976	\$500			43.0	57.0
Housing and Homeless	November 1982	200		200	53.8	46.2
Housing and Homeless	November 1988	300		300	58.2	41.8
Housing	June 1990	150		150	52.5	47.5
Housing	November 1990	125			44.5	55.5
California Housing and Jobs Investment	November 1993	185			42.2	57.8
Housing and Emergency Shelter	November 2002	2,100		2,100	57.5	42.5
Housing and Emergency Shelter	November 2006	2,850		2,850	57.8	42.2
+ Veterans Housing and Homeless Prevention	June 2014	600		600		
			\$7,010	\$6,200		
<b>Transportation</b>						
Transportation	June 1988	\$1,000		-	49.9	50.1
Rail Transportation	June 1990	1,990		\$1,990	53.3	46.7
Passenger Rail and Clean Air	November 1992	1,000		-	48.1	51.9
Passenger Rail and Clean Air	June 1990	1,000		1,000	56.3	43.7
Passenger Rail and Clean Air	November 1994	1,000		-	34.9	65.1
Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, Port Security	November 2006	19,925		19,925	61.4	38.6
Safe Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century	November 2008	9,950		9,950	52.7	47.3
			\$35,865	\$32,865		
<b>Health Facilities</b>						
Health Science Facilities	November 1972	\$156		\$156	60.0	40.0
Children's Hospital Projects	November 2004	750		750	58.1	41.9
Children's Hospital Projects	November 2008	980		980	55.3	44.7
			\$1,886	\$1,886		
<b>Senior Centers</b>						
Senior Citizens' Centers	November 1984	\$50		\$50	66.7	33.3
			\$50	\$50		
<b>Libraries</b>						
Library Construction and Renovation	November 1988	\$75		\$75	52.7	47.3
California Reading and Literacy Improvement and Public Library	March 2000	350		350	59.0	41.0
Reading Improvement, Library Renovation	June 2006	600			47.3	52.7
			\$1,025	\$425		
<b>County Courthouses</b>						
County Courthouse Facility Capital Expenditure	November 1990	\$200			26.5	73.5
			\$200	\$0		
<b>Child Care Centers</b>						
Child Care Facilities Financing	November 1990	\$30			47.6	52.4
			\$30	\$0		

APPENDIX 2 | HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA BONDS BY PROGRAM AREA

Program	Date	Proposed General Obligation Amount	Proposed Self- Liquidating Amount	Total Approved	Vote (%) For	Against
<b>Drug Enforcement</b>						
Drug Enforcement	November 1990	\$740			28.3	71.7
		<u>\$740</u>		<u>\$0</u>		
<b>Energy Conservation</b>						
Residential Energy Conservation	November 1976	\$25			41.0	59.0
Alternative Fuel Vehicles and Renewable Energy	November 2008	\$5,000			40.5	59.5
		<u>\$5,025</u>		<u>\$0</u>		
<b>Voter Modernization</b>						
Voter Modernization	March 2002	\$200		\$200	51.6	48.4
		<u>\$200</u>		<u>\$200</u>		
<b>Medical Research</b>						
California Stem Cell Research and Cures	November 2004	\$3,000		\$3,000	59.1	40.9
		<u>\$3,000</u>		<u>\$3,000</u>		
<b>Economic Recovery Bonds</b>						
Economic Recovery Bonds	March 2004	\$0	\$15,000	\$15,000	63.4	36.6
		<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>		

+ Chapter 727, Statutes of 2013 (AB 639), reduced the voter authorized amount from \$900 million to \$300 million.

**APPENDIX 3 | HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA BONDS BY PROGRAM AREA**

Appendix 3

**History of California General Obligation Bonds Since 1972  
By Date of Authorization**

(Dollars in Millions)

<b>Date</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Proposed General Obligation Amount</b>	<b>Proposed Self- Liquidating Amount</b>	<b>Total Approved</b>
June 1972	Veterans Home Loan		\$250	\$250
	Earthquake Reconstruction & Replacement	\$350		350
		<u>\$350</u>	<u>\$250</u>	<u>\$600</u>
November 1972	Community College Facilities	\$160		\$160
	Health Science Facilities	156		156
		<u>\$316</u>		<u>\$316</u>
June 1974	Recreational Lands	\$250		\$250
	Clean Water	250		250
	Home Loans		\$350	350
		<u>\$500</u>	<u>\$350</u>	<u>\$850</u>
November 1974	State School Building Aid and Earthquake Reconstruction	\$150		\$150
		<u>\$150</u>		<u>\$150</u>
June 1976	Home Loans		\$500	\$500
	Safe Drinking Water	\$175		175
		<u>\$175</u>	<u>\$500</u>	<u>\$675</u>
November 1976	State, Urban & Coastal Parks	\$280		\$280
		<u>\$280</u>		<u>\$280</u>
June 1978	Clean Water and Water Conservation	375		375
		<u>\$375</u>		<u>\$375</u>
November 1978	Veterans Home Loan		\$500	\$500
			<u>\$500</u>	<u>\$500</u>
June 1980	Veterans Home Loan		\$750	\$750
			<u>\$750</u>	<u>\$750</u>
November 1980	Parklands Acquisition and Development	\$285		\$285
		<u>\$285</u>		<u>\$285</u>
June 1982	New Prison Construction	\$495		\$495
		<u>\$495</u>		<u>\$495</u>
November 1982	State School Building Lease Purchase	\$500		\$500
	County Jail	280		280
	Veterans Home Loan		450	450
	Lake Tahoe Acquisition	85		85
	First-Time Home Buyers	200		200
		<u>\$1,065</u>	<u>\$450</u>	<u>\$1,515</u>
June 1984	County Jails	\$250		\$250
	Prisons	300		300
	Parks and Recreation	370		370

**APPENDIX 3 | HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA BONDS BY DATE OF AUTHORIZATION**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Proposed General Obligation Amount</b>	<b>Proposed Self- Liquidating Amount</b>	<b>Total Approved</b>
	Fish and Wildlife	85		85
		<u>\$1,005</u>		<u>\$1,005</u>
November 1984	Clean Water	\$325		\$325
	State School Building Lease Purchase	450		450
	Hazardous Substance Clean-up	100		100
	Safe Drinking Water	75		75
	Veterans Home Loan		650	650
	Senior Citizens' Centers	50		50
		<u>\$1,000</u>	<u>\$650</u>	<u>\$1,650</u>
June 1986	Veterans Home Loan		\$850	\$850
	Community Parklands	100		100
	Water Conservation/Quality	150		150
	County Jails	495		495
		<u>\$745</u>	<u>\$850</u>	<u>\$1,595</u>
November 1986	State School Building Lease Purchase	\$800		\$800
	Prison Construction	500		500
	Safe Drinking Water	100		100
	Higher Education Facilities	400		400
		<u>\$1,800</u>		<u>\$1,800</u>
June 1988	Earthquake Safety/Housing Rehabilitation	\$150		\$150
	State School Facilities	800		800
	Wildlife, Coastal and Park Land Conservation	776		776
	Veterans Home Loan		510	510
		<u>\$1,726</u>	<u>\$510</u>	<u>\$2,236</u>
November 1988	Library Construction and Renovation	\$75		\$75
	Safe Drinking Water	75		75
	Clean Water and Water Reclamation	65		65
	County Correctional Facility Capital Expenditure and Youth	500		500
	Higher Education Facilities	600		600
	New Prison Construction	817		817
	School Facilities	800		800
	Water Conservation	60		60
	Housing and Homeless	300		300
		<u>\$3,292</u>		<u>\$3,292</u>
June 1990	Housing and Homeless	\$150		\$150
	Passenger Rail/Clean Air	1,000		1,000
	Rail Transportation	1,990		1,990
	New Prison Construction	450		450
	Higher Education Facilities	450		450
	Earthquake Safety & Public Rehabilitation	300		300
	New School Facilities	800		800
		<u>\$5,140</u>		<u>\$5,140</u>
November 1990	Veteran's Home Loan		\$400	\$400
	School Facilities	800		800
		<u>\$800</u>	<u>\$400</u>	<u>\$1,200</u>

## APPENDIX 3 | HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA BONDS BY PROGRAM AREA

Date	Subject	Proposed General Obligation Amount	Proposed Self- Liquidating Amount	Total Approved
June 1992	School Facilities	\$1,900		\$1,900
	Higher Education Facilities	900		900
		\$2,800		\$2,800
November 1992	Schools Facilities	\$900		\$900
		\$900		\$900
March 1996	Seismic Retrofit	\$2,000		\$2,000
	Public Education Facilities	3,000		3,000
		\$5,000		\$5,000
November 1996	Safe, Clean, Reliable Water Supply	\$995		\$995
	Veterans Home Loan		\$400	400
		\$995	\$400	\$1,395
November 1998	K-12, Higher Education Facilities	\$9,200		\$9,200
		\$9,200		\$9,200
March 2000	Safe Neighborhood Parks, Clean Water, Clean Air, Coastal Protection	\$2,100		\$2,100
	Safe Drinking Water, Clean Water, Watershed Protection	1,970		1,970
	California Reading and Literacy Improvement and Public Library	350		350
	Veterans Homes	50		50
		\$4,470		\$4,470
November 2000	Veterans Home Loan		\$500	\$500
			\$500	\$500
March 2002	Water, Air, Parks, Coast Protection	\$2,600		\$2,600
	Voting Modernization	200		200
		\$2,800		\$2,800
November 2002	Housing and Emergency Shelter	\$2,100		\$2,100
	K-12, Higher Education Facilities	13,050		13,050
	Coastal Wetland Purchase and Protection	3,440		3,440
		\$18,590		\$18,590
March 2004	K-12, Higher Education Facilities	\$12,300		\$12,300
	Economic Recovery Bonds		\$15,000	15,000
		\$12,300	\$15,000	\$27,300
November 2004	Children's Hospital Projects	\$750		\$750
	California Stem Cell Research and Cures	3,000		3,000
		\$3,750		\$3,750
November 2006	Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, Port Security	\$19,925		\$19,925
	Housing and Emergency Shelter	2,850		2,850
	Education Facilities - Kindergarten University Public Education Facilities	10,416		10,416

**APPENDIX 3 | HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA BONDS BY DATE OF AUTHORIZATION**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Proposed General Obligation Amount</b>	<b>Proposed Self- Liquidating Amount</b>	<b>Total Approved</b>
	Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention	4,090		4,090
	Water Quality, Safety and Supply, Flood Control, Natural Resource Protection, Park Improvements	5,388		5,388
		<u>\$42,669</u>		<u>\$42,669</u>
November 2008	Safe Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train	\$9,950		\$9,950
	Children's Hospital	980		980
	+ Veterans		300	300
		<u>\$11,530</u>	<u>\$300</u>	<u>\$11,830</u>
June 2014	Veterans	\$600		\$600
		<u>\$600</u>		<u>\$600</u>
November 2014	Water Quality, Supply, Treatment, and Storage Projects	\$7,545		\$7,545
		<u>\$7,545</u>		<u>\$7,545</u>

\* Chapter 727, Statutes of 2013 (AB 639), reduced the voter authorized amount from \$900 million to \$300 million.

Appendix 4  
**AUTHORIZED AND OUTSTANDING GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS**  
**As of December 1, 2014**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Voter		Long Term	Commercial	Unissued
	Authorization Date	Authorization Amount	Bonds Outstanding	Paper Outstanding (a)	
<b>GENERAL FUND BONDS (Non-Self Liquidating)</b>					
+ 1988 School Facilities Bond Act	11/08/88	797,745	42,125	0	0
+ 1990 School Facilities Bond Act	06/05/90	797,875	90,705	0	0
+ 1992 School Facilities Bond Act	11/03/92	898,211	261,385	0	0
California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Act of 2002	03/05/02	2,600,000	2,153,960	0	259,240
+ California Library Construction and Renovation Bond Act of 1988	11/08/88	72,405	12,965	0	0
*+ California Park and Recreational Facilities Act of 1984	06/05/84	368,900	12,725	0	0
* California Parklands Act of 1980	11/04/80	285,000	2,650	0	0
California Reading and Literacy Improvement and Public Library Construction and Renovation Bond Act of 2000	03/07/00	350,000	264,200	0	5,040
*+ California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1976	06/08/76	172,500	3,070	0	0
* California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1984	11/06/84	75,000	1,905	0	0
* California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1986	11/04/86	100,000	23,415	0	0
California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1988	11/08/88	75,000	28,270	0	0
*+ California Wildlife, Coastal, and Park Land Conservation Act	06/07/88	768,670	119,530	0	0
Children's Hospital Bond Act of 2004	11/02/04	750,000	658,330	0	47,445
Children's Hospital Bond Act of 2008	11/04/08	980,000	569,995	22,690	377,080
Class Size Reduction Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 1998 (Hi-Ed)	11/03/98	2,500,000	1,748,050	0	0
Class Size Reduction Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 1998 (K-12)	11/03/98	6,700,000	4,139,005	0	11,400
Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Bond Act of 1990	06/05/90	1,990,000	813,845	0	4,985
* Clean Water Bond Law of 1984	11/06/84	325,000	11,080	0	0
* Clean Water and Water Conservation Bond Law of 1978	06/06/78	375,000	4,570	0	0
Clean Water and Water Reclamation Bond Law of 1988	11/08/88	65,000	20,440	0	0
* Community Parklands Act of 1986	06/03/86	100,000	2,795	0	0
* County Correctional Facility Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1986	06/03/86	495,000	15,565	0	0
County Correctional Facility Capital Expenditure and Youth Facility Bond Act of 1988	11/08/88	500,000	74,295	0	0
Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Act of 2006	11/07/06	3,990,000	2,231,645	0	1,718,652
Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990	06/05/90	300,000	79,800	1,815	7,490
* Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement Act of 1984	06/05/84	85,000	5,110	0	0
Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1988	11/08/88	600,000	24,745	0	0
Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990	06/05/90	450,000	48,865	0	540
Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1992	06/02/92	900,000	321,025	0	0
Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006	11/07/06	19,925,000	14,743,250	422,720	4,162,650
Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2002	11/05/02	2,100,000	821,890	25,000	82,080
Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006	11/07/06	2,850,000	1,663,435	0	1,094,135
Housing and Homeless Bond Act of 1990	06/05/90	150,000	1,470	0	0
Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2002 (Hi-Ed)	11/05/02	1,650,000	1,400,795	0	0
Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2002 (K-12)	11/05/02	11,400,000	9,303,215	0	57,810

APPENDIX 4 | AUTHORIZED AND OUTSTANDING GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS

	Voter Authorization Date	Authorization Amount	Long Term Bonds Outstanding	Commercial Paper Outstanding (a)	Unissued
Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2004 (Hi-Ed)	03/02/04	2,300,000	2,051,470	4,045	58,824
Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2004 (K-12)	03/02/04	10,000,000	8,861,990	7,900	143,700
Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2006 (Hi-Ed)	11/07/06	3,087,000	2,997,465	5,085	38,775
Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2006 (K-12)	11/07/06	7,329,000	6,546,520	5	651,710
* Lake Tahoe Acquisitions Bond Act	08/02/82	85,000	150	0	0
* New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1986	11/04/86	500,000	2,510	0	0
New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1988	11/08/88	817,000	13,300	0	2,165
New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990	06/05/90	450,000	17,835	0	605
Passenger Rail and Clean Air Bond Act of 1990	06/05/90	1,000,000	49,800	0	0
Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 1996 (Higher Education)	03/26/96	975,000	525,785	4,485	4,650
++ Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 1996 (K-12)	03/26/96	2,012,035	949,110	0	0
Safe Drinking Water, Clean Water, Watershed Protection, and Flood Protection Act	03/07/00	1,884,000	1,419,720	0	43,346
Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006	11/07/06	5,283,000	2,420,845	20,335	2,805,625
Safe Neighborhood Parks, Clean Water, Clean Air, and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2000	03/07/00	2,100,000	1,529,890	0	73,820
Safe, Clean, Reliable Water Supply Act	11/05/96	969,500	557,345	0	62,915
Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century	11/04/08	9,950,000	815,760	0	9,003,520
* School Building and Earthquake Bond Act of 1974	11/05/74	40,000	15,970	0	0
School Facilities Bond Act of 1990	11/06/90	800,000	142,200	0	0
School Facilities Bond Act of 1992	06/02/92	1,900,000	536,985	0	10,280
Seismic Retrofit Bond Act of 1996	03/26/96	2,000,000	1,186,230	0	0
* State, Urban, and Coastal Park Bond Act of 1976	11/02/76	280,000	4,055	0	0
Stem Cell Research and Cures Bond Act of 2004	11/02/04	3,000,000	1,464,395	52,045	1,287,650
Veterans Homes Bond Act of 2000	03/07/00	50,000	35,205	0	975
Veterans Housing and Homeless Prevention Bond Act of 2014	06/03/14	600,000	0	600	599,400
Voting Modernization Bond Act of 2002	03/05/02	200,000	36,305	0	64,495
Water Conservation Bond Law of 1988	11/08/88	60,000	22,990	0	5,235
*++++ Water Conservation and Water Quality Bond Law of 1986	06/03/86	136,500	32,270	0	230
++++ Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002	11/05/02	3,345,000	2,734,920	1,810	309,574
Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014	11/04/14	7,545,000	0	0	7,545,000
<b>Total General Fund Bonds</b>		<b>135,239,341</b>	<b>76,691,140</b>	<b>568,535</b>	<b>30,541,041</b>
<b>ENTERPRISE FUND BONDS (Self Liquidating)</b>					
* California Water Resources Development Bond Act	11/08/60	1,750,000	208,550	0	167,600
Veterans Bond Act of 1986	06/03/86	850,000	31,730	0	0
Veterans Bond Act of 1988	06/07/88	510,000	34,690	0	0
Veterans Bond Act of 1990	11/06/90	400,000	50,475	0	0
Veterans Bond Act of 1996	11/05/96	400,000	142,485	0	0
Veterans Bond Act of 2000	11/07/00	500,000	243,150	0	128,610
Veterans Bond Act of 2008	11/04/08	300,000	0	0	300,000
<b>Total Enterprise Fund Bonds</b>		<b>4,710,000</b>	<b>711,080</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>596,210</b>
<b>SPECIAL REVENUE FUND BONDS (Self Liquidating)</b>					
* Economic Recovery Bond Act	04/10/04	15,000,000	1,578,725	0	0
<b>Total Special Revenue Fund Bonds</b>		<b>15,000,000</b>	<b>1,578,725</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS</b>		<b>154,949,341</b>	<b>78,980,945</b>	<b>568,535</b>	<b>31,137,251</b>

(a) A total of not more than \$2.225 billion of commercial paper principal plus accrued interest may be owing at one time. Bond acts marked with an asterisk (\*) are not legally permitted to utilize commercial paper.

- + Chapter 39, Statutes of 2012 (SB 1018), reduced the voter authorized amount
- ++ Chapter 28, Statutes of 2013 (SB 71), reduced the voter authorized amount
- +++ Chapter 727, Statutes of 2013 (AB 639), reduced the voter authorized amount
- ++++ Chapter 188, Statutes of 2014 (AB 1471), reallocated the voter authorized amount

SOURCE: State of California, Office of the Treasurer.

Appendix 5

**STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD AND  
OTHER LEASE REVENUE FINANCING  
OUTSTANDING ISSUES  
As of December 1, 2014**  
(Whole Dollars)

<u>Name of Issue</u>	<u>Outstanding</u>
<b><u>GENERAL FUND SUPPORTED ISSUES</u></b>	
<b>State Public Works Board</b>	
California Community Colleges	\$ 284,520,000
California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitations	4,237,205,000
Trustees of the California State University	1,052,340,000
+ Various State Facilities	<u>5,553,120,000</u>
<b>Total State Public Works Board Issues</b>	<b>\$ 11,127,185,000</b>
<b><u>SPECIAL FUND SUPPORTED ISSUES</u></b>	
East Bay State Building Authority	\$ 20,480,000
San Bernardino Joint Powers Financing Authority	<u>24,550,000</u>
<b>Total Special Fund Supported Issues</b>	<b>\$ 45,030,000</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b><u><u>\$ 11,172,215,000</u></u></b>

+ This includes projects that are supported by multiple funding sources and \$88,005,000 Sacramento City Financing Authority Lease Revenue Refunding Bonds State of California - Cal/EPA Building, 2013 Series A, which are supported by lease rentals from the California Environmental Protection Agency; these rental payments are subject to annual appropriation by the State Legislature.

SOURCE: State of California, Office of the Treasurer.

This page intentionally blank to facilitate double-sided printing.

**APPENDIX 6 | AUTHORIZED BUT UNISSUED LEASE REVENUE BONDS**

Appendix 6  
**AUTHORIZED BUT UNISSUED LEASE REVENUE BONDS**  
**As of December 1, 2014**  
 (Whole Dollars)

<b>Judicial Council</b>	
Glenn County: Renovation and Addition to Willows Courthouse	\$33,182,000
Merced County: New Los Banos Courthouse	21,889,000
<b>Total Judicial Council</b>	<b>\$55,071,000</b>
<b>Natural Resources Agency</b>	
CA Conservation Corps - Delta Service District Center	\$27,583,762
CA Conservation Corps - Tahoe Base Center, Relocate Phase 2	256,441
Department of Forestry & Fire Protection - 36 Various Forestry Projects	729,092,612
<b>Total Natural Resources Agency</b>	<b>\$756,932,815</b>
<b>Health and Human Services Agency</b>	
Hospitals - Central Kitchens at Napa and Patton	\$33,829,000
<b>Total Hospitals and Homes</b>	<b>\$33,829,000</b>
<b>Corrections and Rehabilitation</b>	
Remaining Assembly Bill (AB) 900 Health Care Facilities Financing	\$393,866,753
Remaining AB 900, Phase 1 Jail Facilities Financing	111,576,000
Remaining AB 900, Phase 2 Jail Facilities Financing	854,229,000
Remaining Senate Bill (SB) 81 Local Youthful Offender Rehabilitative Facilities Financing	269,341,000
Three Level II Dorm Facilities	79,727,000
Ironwood State Prison, Blythe: HVAC	145,029,000
California Men's Colony, SLO: Central Kitchen	22,926,000
<b>Total Corrections and Rehabilitation</b>	<b>\$1,876,694,753</b>
<b>Board of State and Community Corrections</b>	
SB 1022 Adult Local Criminal Justice Facilities Financing	\$500,000,000
SB 863 Adult Local Criminal Justice Facilities Financing	500,000,000
<b>Total State and Community Corrections</b>	<b>\$1,000,000,000</b>
<b>School for the Deaf</b>	
School for Deaf, Riverside - New Gymnasium and Pool Center	\$13,898,431
<b>Total School for the Deaf</b>	<b>\$13,898,431</b>
<b>California State University</b>	
Fresno: Faculty Office/Lab Building	\$9,882,000
Pomona - Administration Replacement Facility	76,546,000
<b>Total California State University</b>	<b>\$86,428,000</b>
<b>General Government</b>	
Department of Food & Agriculture - Yermo Agriculture Inspection Station	\$40,387,219
Department of Veterans Affairs - Yountville Steam and Water Distribution Systems	5,623,000
<b>Total General Government</b>	<b>\$46,010,219</b>
<b>TOTAL LEASE REVENUE BONDS</b>	<b>\$3,868,864,218</b>

This page intentionally blank to facilitate double-sided printing.