

# Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: June 25-26, 2003

Reference No.: 2.8d.  
Action Item

From: ROBERT L. GARCIA  
Chief Financial Officer

Prepared by: Terry Abbott  
Division Chief  
Local Assistance

Ref: **REQUEST TO EXTEND THE PERIOD OF PROJECT REIMBURSEMENT PER  
RESOLUTION G-01-21, FOR LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS PROJECTS  
WAIVER-03-18**

## **ISSUE:**

The California Transportation Commission (Commission) allocated funds totaling \$1,555,000 in Fiscal Year 2000-2001 for the 13 projects shown on the attached list. The implementing agencies have been unable to expend the funds and do not anticipate expending all the funds by the June 30, 2003 deadline. The attachment shows the details of each project and the delays that have resulted in the extension requests. The project sponsors request extensions, and the planning agencies concur.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Department of Transportation's recommendations are shown on the attachment.

## **BACKGROUND:**

Resolution G-01-21, STIP Guidelines, adopted by the Commission on July 12, 2001, stipulates that funds programmed for project development and right of way components of local grant projects are available for expenditure only until the end of the second fiscal year after allocation. The guidelines further stipulate that the Commission may approve waivers to the timely use of funds deadline one time only for up to 20 months in accordance with Section 14529.8 of the Government Code.

Attachment

Time Extension/Waiver – Reimbursement Deadline  
Item 2.8d.– Local Streets and Roads Projects  
Program Year 2002/2003

Project #	Applicant County	Extension Amount By Component (\$ in thousands)			Number of Months Requested  Extended Deadline
		E&P	PS&E	R/W	
PPNO Project Description		R/W	CON	TOTAL	
Reason for Project Delay:					
1	City of Dunsmuir	\$0			6 months
	Siskiyou	\$0			
		\$110			12/31/2003
	PPNO: 2082	\$0			
	Rehabilitation Project on Sacramento Avenue	\$110			Support – meets STIP guidelines
<p>The City is obtaining an easement from Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and acquiring a house that sits on land owned by the City and UPRR. The closing date for the UPRR easement was changed from December 31, 2002 to July 31, 2003 or sooner. UPRR has promised to do everything possible to facilitate the transaction. The owner of the house has indicated that he wants to live there, and the City has offered to move the house. A document has been prepared for the owner's signature, but there are indications that he may decide not to sign. If so, the City will need to use eminent domain or condemnation to procure the right-of-way. This could take an additional 6 months. Therefore, the City is requesting a 6-month extension of the deadline for right-of-way expenditures. This should also cover the UPRR transaction should it not occur as promised.</p>					
2	County of Plumas	\$50			6 months
	Plumas	\$0			
		\$0			12/31/2003
	PPNO: 2232	\$0			
	Big Creek Road Retaining Wall/RSP	\$50			Support – meets STIP guidelines
<p>This project was allocated for E&amp;P only on January 25, 2001. The project scope is streambank repair along a steep 50 feet high slope along Big Creek in the Plumas National Forest. The site is at elevation 4,750 and is generally covered with snow until late May or early June each year. Big Creek Road is closed for winter by November 1 in most years. Since the allocation was made, the project site has been accessible only 10 months out of the last 27.</p> <p>The County has completed the preliminary geotechnical design, alternatives analysis and field surveys. The consultant determined the final alternative for design in December 2002. The County has completed the preliminary design for the purposes of obtaining all permits (Stream Alteration, Corps of Engineers and RWQCB). However, the Plumas National Forest, in cooperation with UC Davis, is currently conducting surveys for red-legged and yellow-legged frog habitat. The County needs an extension in order to coordinate additional field studies to verify the presence or non-presence of this frog habitat at the project site. The original research indicated that the habitat was present within 4 miles. The County wishes to ensure that the presence of the endangered species does not become evident after the County has completed the E&amp;P phase. Therefore, the County is requesting a 6-month extension of the deadline for E&amp;P expenditures.</p>					
3	County of Sierra	\$9			20 months
	Sierra	\$0			
		\$0			2/28/2005
	PPNO: 1L39	\$0			
	Salmon Lake Lodge Road Bridge	\$9			Support – meets STIP guidelines
<p>The proposals received for completion of the E&amp;P for this project all came in over the amount budgeted and programmed. Sierra County anticipated requesting a supplemental allocation, but current policy to not approve supplemental allocations makes it necessary to reduce the scope of the E&amp;P phase. The revised scope is to require completion of only the bridge type selection report and environmental documentation. Based upon time required to obtain environmental clearance for other HBRRP projects, the County is requesting a 20-month extension of the deadline for E&amp;P expenditures.</p> <p>The County intends to re-program the PS&amp;E, R/W and Construction phases for this project in the 2004 STIP.</p>					

Time Extension/Waiver – Reimbursement Deadline  
Item 2.8d.– Local Streets and Roads Projects  
Program Year 2002/2003

Project #	Applicant County	Extension Amount By Component (\$ in thousands)	Number of Months Requested
	PPNO Project Description	E&P PS&E R/W CON TOTAL	Extended Deadline CT Recommendation
	Reason for Project Delay:		
4	County of Sierra Sierra	\$10 \$0 \$0 \$0 <b>\$10</b>	20 months  02/28/2005  Support – meets STIP guidelines
	<p>The proposals received for completion of the E&amp;P for this project all came in over the amount budgeted and programmed. Sierra County anticipated requesting a supplemental allocation, but current policy to not approve supplemental allocations makes it necessary to reduce the scope of the E&amp;P phase. The revised scope is to require completion of only the bridge type selection report and environmental documentation. Based upon time required to obtain environmental clearance for other HBRRP projects, the County is requesting a 20-month extension of the deadline for E&amp;P expenditures.</p> <p>The County intends to re-program the PS&amp;E, R/W and Construction phases for this project in the 2004 STIP.</p>		
5	County of Sierra Sierra	\$9 \$0 \$0 \$0 <b>\$9</b>	20 months  02/28/2005  Support – meets STIP guidelines
	<p>The proposals received for completion of the E&amp;P for this project all came in over the amount budgeted and programmed. Sierra County anticipated requesting a supplemental allocation, but current policy to not approve supplemental allocations makes it necessary to reduce the scope of the E&amp;P phase. The revised scope is to require completion of only the bridge type selection report and environmental documentation. Based upon time required to obtain environmental clearance for other HBRRP projects, the County is requesting a 20-month extension of the deadline for E&amp;P expenditures.</p> <p>The County intends to re-program the PS&amp;E, R/W and Construction phases for this project in the 2004 STIP.</p>		
6	County of Sierra Sierra	\$10 \$0 \$0 \$0 <b>\$10</b>	20 months  02/28/2005  Support – meets STIP guidelines
	<p>This project is the County match for a \$3 million direct Federal Forest Highway project programmed for construction in 2004-2005. The project was initially programmed with state-only funding, but during the field review it was determined that the project qualified for HBRRP funds. This process caused delays and in order for the project to continue concurrent with the Federal Forest Highway project, additional time is needed. Based upon the time needed to complete environmental clearance for HBRRP projects in Sierra County, the County is requesting a 20-month extension of the deadline for E&amp;P expenditures.</p>		
7	County of Sierra Sierra	\$110 \$0 \$0 \$0 <b>\$110</b>	20 months  02/28/2005  Support – meets STIP guidelines
	<p>The proposals received for completion of the E&amp;P for this project all came in over the amount budgeted and programmed. Sierra County anticipated requesting a supplemental allocation, but current policy to not approve supplemental allocations makes it necessary to reduce the scope of the E&amp;P phase. The revised scope is to require completion of only the bridge type selection report and environmental documentation. Based upon time required to obtain environmental clearance for other HBRRP projects, the County is requesting a 20-month extension of the deadline for E&amp;P expenditures.</p> <p>The County originally budgeted and programmed only the E&amp;P phase of this project. The County intends to program the PS&amp;E, R/W and Construction phases for this project in the 2004 STIP.</p>		

Time Extension/Waiver – Reimbursement Deadline  
Item 2.8d.– Local Streets and Roads Projects  
Program Year 2002/2003

Project #	Applicant County	Extension Amount By Component (\$ in thousands)	Number of Months Requested
	PPNO Project Description	E&P PS&E R/W CON TOTAL	CT Recommendation
Reason for Project Delay:			
8	City of Santa Clarita Los Angeles	\$112 \$185 \$0 \$0 <b>\$297</b>	18 months  12/31/2004  Support – meets STIP guidelines
<p>The project scope has been expanded to include the extensive environmental review of an “abandoned” railroad trestle bridge over the Santa Clara River. In an effort to utilize an existing railroad bridge within the proposed bike alignment along a portion of abandoned railroad right-of-way, the amount of analysis and environmental review has significantly increased. The additional analysis needed to use this unique structure requires substantial additional time. Therefore, the City is requesting an 18-month extension of the deadline for E&amp;P and PS&amp;E expenditures.</p>			
9	Town of Mammoth Lakes Mono	\$0 \$239 \$3 \$0 <b>\$242</b>	6 months  12/31/2003  Support – meets STIP guidelines
<p>The Town is requesting an extension based on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The USDA – Inyo National Forest (INF) is the co-lead with the Town of Mammoth Lakes in completing the NEPA document. The INF has completed a “Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact” (FONSI) in their final environmental assessment. The State Historic Preservation Officer has reviewed the FONSI and the FHWA approved the FONSI on March 27, 2003. The Town can now proceed with PS&amp;E and R/W acquisition. However, these activities will extend beyond the expenditure deadline by approximately 6 months.</li> <li>• Mammoth Lakes has a short construction season, generally from late May through mid-October. This affects all processes of the project including base topographic collection, field design and construction.</li> </ul> <p>Due to these delays, the Town is requesting a 6-month extension of the deadline for PS&amp;E and R/W expenditures.</p>			
10	City of Bishop Inyo	\$10 \$0 \$0 \$0 <b>\$10</b>	20 months  2/28/2005  Support – meets STIP guidelines
<p>Environmental documents have been completed and the small amount remaining in the E&amp;P phase is to be transferred to PS&amp;E in order to complete that phase. Due to the State budget problems, PS&amp;E has yet to be allocated, and the transfer cannot occur until that allocation takes place. Therefore, the City is requesting a 20-month extension of the deadline for E&amp;P expenditures.</p>			
11	City of Bishop Inyo	\$10 \$0 \$0 \$0 <b>\$10</b>	20 months  2/28/2005  Support – meets STIP guidelines
<p>Environmental documents have been completed and the small amount remaining in the E&amp;P phase is to be transferred to PS&amp;E in order to complete that phase. Due to the State budget problems, PS&amp;E has yet to be allocated, and the transfer cannot occur until that allocation takes place. Therefore, the City is requesting a 20-month extension of the deadline for E&amp;P expenditures.</p>			

Time Extension/Waiver – Reimbursement Deadline  
 Item 2.8d.– Local Streets and Roads Projects  
 Program Year 2002/2003

Project #	Applicant County	Extension Amount By Component (\$ in thousands)	Number of Months Requested
	PPNO Project Description	E&P PS&E R/W CON TOTAL	Extended Deadline CT Recommendation
	Reason for Project Delay:		
12	City of Bishop Inyo	\$0 \$66 \$0 \$0 \$66	20 months 2/28/2005 Support – meets STIP guidelines
	PPNO: 0004 Local Road Rehabilitation		
	<p>PS&amp;E has been completed and the amount remaining in the PS&amp;E phase is to be transferred to construction in order to complete that phase. Construction needs to be increased due to higher construction costs and delayed construction schedules. Due to the State budget problems, Construction has yet to be allocated, and the transfer cannot occur until that allocation takes place. Therefore, the City is requesting a 20-month extension of the deadline for PS&amp;E expenditures.</p>		
13	City of Irvine Orange	\$0 \$622 \$0 \$0 \$622	18 months 12/31/2004 Support – meets STIP guidelines
	PPNO: 9651 Grade Separation and Street Widening		
	<p>Unforeseen delays in processing and approving the environmental documentation, allowing the City to obtain NEPA environmental clearance, prevented issuance of a contract for final design. All of the environmental studies, with the exception of the Historical Property Study, have been completed and approved by Caltrans District 12. There were several issues concerning some historical homes that were through to be resolved in July 2002. It took several weeks for the issues to be reconciled. The Historical Study was to be forwarded to Caltrans Headquarters in August 2002, with comments in two to three weeks. Responses were received from Caltrans January 23, 2002, and the document was revised and resubmitted March 3, 2003. In the June/July 2002 period, based on the general approval of the environmental studies, a consultant for development of the PS&amp;E phase was selected and a contract negotiated. Unfortunately, to date the Historical Study has not been approved. Further, the District approved documents must be assembled as a single document for submittal to FHWA. This will take additional time. The delay in the Historical Document is approaching 18 months. The City does not believe the delay is its fault. The final environmental documentation must be approved by FHWA before the City can finalize PS&amp;E. Therefore, the City is requesting an 18-month extension of the deadline for PS&amp;E expenditures.</p>		

