

**FFY 2011 - 2012  
Local Assistance Delivery**

**Formula OA Funds as of May 31, 2012 (Revised July 6, 2012 - see footnote<sup>11</sup> and August 3, 2012 - see footnote<sup>12</sup>)**

Region	Projected Base FFY 2012 OA <sup>1</sup>	Adjustment to FFY 2012 OA for FFY 2011 Over - Under Delivery <sup>2</sup>	Contribution for LS&Rs Needs Assessment FFY 2011/12 <sup>9</sup>	LS&Rs Needs Assessment Funding Offset	Projected FFY 2012 Target OA <sup>3</sup>	FFY 2012 Obligations as of 5/31/12	Percent Target OA Delivered	Balance FFY 2012 Target OA <sup>4</sup>
Butte	5,017,397	(296,263)	(1,500)		4,719,634	2,449,957	51.9%	2,269,677
Fresno	22,221,447	1,259,117			23,480,564	163,180	0.7%	23,317,384
Kern	17,256,937	2,126,453			19,383,391	3,800,220	19.6%	15,583,171
Kings	3,297,987	(1,286,385)	(956)		2,010,646	2,006,383	99.8%	4,264
Los Angeles	262,711,496	5,108,786	(70,260)	198,774	267,948,796	134,203,593	50.1%	133,745,204
Madera	3,203,212	(622,111)			2,581,101	1,562,288	60.5%	1,018,813
Merced	5,396,367	29,704	(1,554)		5,424,517	3,021,711	55.7%	2,402,805
Monterey	5,101,015	(1,094,929)	(2,965)		4,003,121	5,191,751	129.7%	(1,188,629)
Orange	79,442,677	3,676,721			83,119,398	72,791,501	87.6%	10,327,897
Riverside <sup>5</sup>	49,833,395	(20,389,754)	(11,406)		37,432,234 <sup>5, 12</sup>	(10,293,493)	0.0%	47,725,727
Sacramento (SACOG)	50,257,330	(12,641,986)	(11,302)		37,604,042	17,271,821	45.9%	20,332,222
San Benito	675,891	(141,638)	(393)		533,860	691,328	129.5%	(157,468)
San Bernardino <sup>5</sup>	50,691,343	(12,747,830)			29,943,512 <sup>5, 12</sup>	1,226,245	4.1%	28,717,267
San Diego	68,930,083	(45,673,117)	(21,000)		23,235,967	23,701,505	102.0%	(465,538)
S.F. Bay Area (MTC)	164,997,599	(34,538,662)	(52,000)		130,406,937	105,462,567	80.9%	24,944,371
San Joaquin	16,082,967	(12,116,161)	(4,160)		3,962,645	14,658,284	369.9%	(10,695,639)
San Luis Obispo	3,132,013	145,355	(1,821)		3,275,548	3,402,394	103.9%	(126,846)
Santa Barbara	5,070,353	2,639,739	(2,948)		7,707,144	5,314,586	69.0%	2,392,559
Santa Cruz	3,245,279	(15,271)	(1,887)		3,228,121	3,401,600	105.4%	(173,479)
Stanislaus	12,455,746	(6,013,152)			6,442,594	2,007,557	31.2%	4,435,037
Tahoe	1,232,781	1,503,081	(341)		2,735,521	609,089 <sup>11</sup>	22.3%	2,126,432
Tulare	9,388,948	2,038,340	(2,716)		11,424,573	4,459,708	39.0%	6,964,865
Ventura	18,389,266	6,231,396	(5,559)		24,615,103	669,755	2.7%	23,945,348
Amador <sup>6, 7</sup>	798,206	335,656	(259)		1,000,382 <sup>7, 12</sup>	405,268	40.5%	595,114
Calaveras <sup>6, 7</sup>	946,791	1,399,647	(299)		2,611,461 <sup>7, 12</sup>	546,279	20.9%	2,065,182
Imperial <sup>6</sup>	3,470,511	(809,111)			2,661,400	(37,894)	0.0%	2,699,294
Mariposa <sup>6</sup>	383,232	465,129			848,361	226,651	26.7%	621,710
Nevada <sup>6</sup>	2,063,937	631,387			2,695,324	1,214,851	45.1%	1,480,473
Tuolumne <sup>6, 7</sup>	1,205,017	655,332	(402)		1,727,846 <sup>7, 12</sup>	1,157,867	67.0%	569,979
Rural Counties <sup>6</sup>	12,136,465	660,663	(5,046) <sup>10</sup>	-	12,792,082	12,753,381 <sup>11</sup>	99.7%	38,701
<b>TOTAL LOCAL AGENCIES</b>	<b>879,035,689</b>	<b>(119,479,861)</b>	<b>(198,774)</b>	<b>198,774</b>	<b>759,555,828</b>	<b>414,039,933</b>	<b>54.5%</b>	<b>345,515,895</b>
HBP	289,434,245	(97,005,165)			192,429,081	187,278,207	97.3%	5,150,873
Safety	71,342,659	162,472,018			233,814,678	27,609,134	11.8%	206,205,544
SRTS	20,583,523	50,319,375			70,902,897	11,338,988	16.0%	59,563,910
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,260,396,116<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>(3,693,633)<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>(198,774)</b>	<b>198,774</b>	<b>1,256,702,483</b>	<b>640,266,262</b>	<b>50.9%</b>	<b>616,436,222</b>
FFY 2011 Formula OA Obligations YTD (5/31/11) (Total)		<i>Prior year data here for informational purposes</i>			1,167,895,917	528,733,449	45.3%	639,162,469

**FFY 2011 - 2012  
Local Assistance Delivery**

**Formula OA Funds as of May 31, 2012 (Revised July 6, 2012 - see footnote<sup>11</sup> and August 3, 2012 - see footnote<sup>12</sup>)**

**Information:**

- < This May 31, 2012 report is based on the Department's Federal Aid Data System (FADS) transactions.
- < Obligations include obligations, deobligations, exchanges, and Federal Transit Administration transfers (FTAs).

**Footnotes:**

- <sup>1</sup> The Regions' Projected Base federal fiscal year (FFY) 2011-12 OA is based on the amount provided by the Department's Federal Resources Office (FRO) in November 2011 per FHWA's 49-day Continuing Resolution (Oct. 1 through Nov. 18). The Local share of the 49-days of OA is \$169,203,862.18, which was then annualized to come up with the projected base OA of \$1,260,396,116.
- <sup>2</sup> Balance of FFY 2011 OA (last FFY's OA balance) -- This is the amount a Region must pay back if it over delivered or the amount a Region will receive to "make whole" if under delivered based on the DLA OA Management Policy. Amounts shown in parenthesis are amounts owed and positive (non-parenthesis numbers) amounts are to be repaid to Regions/Programs.
- <sup>3</sup> This is the FFY 2012 projected base OA, which includes adjustments for FFY 2011 OA Over or Under Delivery, and Local Streets and Roads (LS&R) Statewide Needs Assessment contributions and offsets.
- <sup>4</sup> Balance of FFY 2012 Target OA per date of report -- This is the running balance of FFY 2012 Target (later Actual) OA that remains to be obligated prior to the close of the current FFY. At the end of the FFY, this is the amount a Region must pay back if over delivered or the amount a Region will receive to "make whole" if under delivered based on the DLA OA Management Policy. Amounts shown in parenthesis require repayment and positive (non-parenthesis numbers) figures are amounts owed to those Regions/Programs. If OA is lost to the state as a whole due to DLA under delivery, then under delivered OA may not be available to repay Regions and/or Programs.
- <sup>5</sup> Per the August 1, 2006 MOU between Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) and the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), the FFY 2006 OA for these two regions was adjusted in September 2006 to reflect an OA loan of \$16,000,000. The loan decreased RCTC's FFY 2006 OA and increased SANBAG's FFY 2006 OA by \$16,000,000. The August 1, 2006 memo states that the repayment of the OA to RCTC from SANBAG is anticipated in FFY 2009 or FFY 2010. Upon direction from these Regions, repayment will now be applied in FFY 2012 (50% - applied October 2011) and FFY 2013 (50% - next FFY in October 2012).
- <sup>6</sup> The Rural Counties' subtotal above excludes those rural counties receiving CMAQ beginning in FFY 2006.
- <sup>7</sup> MOU (June 2008) between Amador County Transportation Commission (ACTC), Calaveras Council of Governments (CCOG), and Tuolumne County Transportation Council (TCTC) -- \$133,221 of OA from ACTC to CCOG for FFY 2011-12; and \$132,101 of OA from TCTC to CCOG for FFY 2011-12. This FFY (2012) is the last year of this MOU agreement/repayment.
- <sup>8</sup> Based on the September 30, 2011 (FFY 2011) year-end reconciliation (please see September 30, 2011, OA delivery report for details on this amount). This results in an adjustment to Regional OA for this FFY (FFY 2012). This amount will be reduced from the Region's OA balance.
- <sup>9</sup> Received agreements from Regions for the LS&R Statewide Needs Assessment Funding Concurrence.
- <sup>10</sup> Received agreements from the following Rural Regions for the LS&R Statewide Needs Assessment Funding Concurrence: Del Norte (\$203); El Dorado (\$903); Glenn (\$195); Humboldt (\$934); Lake (\$430); Mendocino (\$637); and Placer (\$1,744).
- <sup>11</sup> Original May 31, 2012, OA Delivery Report dated June 25, 2012, has been revised to correct a misposting related to the RSTP exchange for Tahoe, Placer, and El Dorado.
- <sup>12</sup> The original June 30, 2012, OA Delivery Report dated July 16, 2012 (and the revised May 31, 2012, report dated July 6th), were revised to correct inadvertent errors to these reports. On prior OA delivery reports adjustments were made for footnote <sup>5</sup> in October 2011 and for footnote <sup>7</sup> in April 2012. However, when the LS&Rs Needs Assessment adjustments were added with the May 2012 OA delivery report, the prior adjustments for footnotes <sup>5</sup> and <sup>7</sup> were inadvertently removed. This is being corrected with this revised report.