

15	Potential impact of the 2006 STIP Fund Estimate on 2006 FSTIP	11:50	Rachel Falsetti
16	CFPG Charter	11:55	Rachel Falsetti
17	Follow-up Items	11:50	Abhijit Bagde
18	Open Forum & Next meeting date and location: Date January 10, 11 2006 Place February 21, 2006 Workshop, SACOG April 4, 2006 FHWA, Sacramento SACOG, Sacramento	11:55	All

**CALIFORNIA FEDERAL PROGRAMMING GROUP (CFPG)
MEETING MINUTES –December 13, 2005**

The CFPG meeting was held at the SACOG Office, 1415 L Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, from 10:00 a.m. to 11:45 a.m.

1. Topics/Agenda/Introduction:

The meeting started with the self-introduction of attendees.

2. Ground Rules:

Abhijit Bagde, Caltrans, Federal Programming, gave a brief overview of ground rules for the meeting. Here are the full ground rules:

- Since there are phone participants, everyone who speaks should state his/her name and agency.
- Keep comments as brief as possible.
- Stick to the current agenda item. Additional items not in the agenda will be added to the end and will be discussed if time permits.
- Turn off cell phones and limit interruptions.
- This is a forum to hear everyone's concerns, comments and suggestions. Please make sure your voice is heard.
- Facilitator to ask before moving on to the next item if anyone on the phone has any additional comments on the item, then pause for a few seconds.
- Respond to follow-up items and meeting notices by the deadlines.
- Except for follow-up items, the minutes will include discussions that take place during the meeting only. If you do not want what you say during the meeting included in the minutes, state "off the record."
- When not speaking, phone participants to keep their phones on mute if possible.

3. Approval of 11/01/05 CFPG meeting minutes:

The meeting minutes for November 1, 2005, were approved with no changes.

4. Announcements and updates:

John Barna is the new California Transportation Commission Executive Director.

5. Follow-Up Items from last meeting:

The updated federal discretionary program contact list will be distributed by the next CFPG meeting.

6. 2006 FTIP/FSTIP Workshop

Attendance at the January 10-11, 2006 workshop will be initially limited to one person for each of the 18 MPOs and 1 representative from each of the 12 Caltrans districts. Due to limited space, additional requests will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

7. SAFETEA-LU – Four Year FTIP Cycle

Rachel Falsetti provided an update on the four-year FTIP cycle. The 2006 FTIP will be prepared using the current two-year cycle (two year program with three years of projects). The Department is proposing a four-year program with five years of projects for the 2008 FTIP. This proposal has been discussed with FHWA, but no decision has been made. Additional guidance from FHWA is expected by the summer of 2006. Questions were raised regarding proposed changes to state statute. Once final guidance is received from FHWA, necessary changes to state statute will be pursued. Additional discussion was conducted related to proposed amendments to the 2006 FTIP – will those amendments be required to meet the SAFETEA-LU planning requirements, especially if the amendments occur after July 1, 2007. Steve Luxenberg, FHWA, stated that any planning document that is being changed after July 1, 2007 must meet the SAFETEA-LU planning requirements. This issue will be discussed in greater detail at the January 10-11 FTIP Workshop.

AFTER THE MEETING UPDATE NOTE: FHWA posted “Information/Guidance: Transition and Implementation of SAFETEA-LU Planning Provisions” on December 13, 2005. This document provides additional “clarifying information/guidance” on the transition and implementation of the SAFETEA-LU planning provisions for the time period of August 10, 2005 through July 1, 2007. The document states that metropolitan and statewide transportation plans, federal transportation improvement programs (FTIPs), and statewide federal transportation improvement programs (FSTIPs) may be completed under TEA-21 requirements prior to July 1, 2007. However, FHWA action (i.e., conformity determinations and FTIP approvals) must be completed no later than June 30, 2007. If applicable actions are not taken before July 1, 2007, all SAFETEA-LU provisions will apply, regardless of when the transportation plan and/or program were developed.

State and MPO adoption actions on transportation plans, FTIPs, and FSTIPs (i.e., amendments, revisions, or updates) on or after July 1, 2007, must completely reflect all SAFETEA-LU planning provisions prior to the FHWA/FTA action. Projects contained in FTIPs and FSTIPs approved after July 1, 2007 must be consistent with transportation plans based on SAFETEA-LU requirements. This document can be found at <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/hep/planningtransition.htm> and contains additional FAQs.

8. CMAQ:

Cathy Gomes is continuing work on the CMAQ annual report. Most agencies have submitted project information. Reconciliation of funds by MPO and review of specific data is underway. It is anticipated that the report will be submitted to FHWA by mid January 2006.

The CMAQ Task Force had its first meeting November 17, 2005. The Task Force was convened to develop a uniform process for determining CMAQ project eligibility. This meeting concentrated on information sharing, brainstorming, and review of various stewardship and contract agreements between FHWA and Caltrans, and between Caltrans and local agencies. The next meeting will be held sometime in late January or early February.

Caltrans is still waiting for the 2006 supplementary apportionment tables to be released from FHWA. When that information becomes available, revised apportionments for 2005-06 and estimates for 2006-07 and 2007-08 will be distributed. Caltrans is requesting a legal opinion regarding distributing apportionments for the 2005 FFY.

As discussed at the November 1, 2005 meeting, the Reauthorization Consensus Group prepared an issue paper regarding options for distributing CMAQ funds to counties that currently are not included in the distribution formula, such as AMBAG. A task force has been convened to address the phase out of CMAQ funds for those agencies. Regional agencies have the lead to pursue legislation to implement task force recommendations.

9. Implementation of Projects Within Triennial FTIP Period:

Ahbijit Bagde and Rachel Falsetti reiterated that projects can be obligated anywhere within the three-year triennial period for implementation without processing an Administrative FTIP Amendment if the MPO has an approved Expedited Project Selection Process (EPSP) is in place and there are no changes in scope or cost. These project changes will not be reflected in CTIPS at that time. However, when the next FTIP is prepared, projects will be shown under the correct year in which they were obligated. Concerns were expressed that projects could not be obligated unless an amendment was prepared showing the project in the correct year. Rachel stated that Local Assistance and FHWA have been included in discussions regarding this issue and both have concurred with this process. Rachel will provide written clarification on this process.

Questions were raised regarding programming of funds freed up (de-obligated) from inactive projects. These funds will need to be added to the program level as additional revenue. Currently, there is no way to determine how much revenue will be freed up and when by this process – it would be impractical to complete amendments to increase revenue each time a project is de-obligated. This issue will require additional discussions with FHWA and Local Assistance. This item will be added to the January 10-11 FTIP Workshop agenda.

10. Status of FTIP Amendment Guidance:

FHWA/FTA is preparing a letter regarding Amendment Guidance. It will be discussed at the FTIP Workshop. Also, the status of AC procedures was requested. This item will also be discussed at the FTIP Workshop.

11. ITS Projects:

Frank Cechini, FHWA gave a presentation on ITS Project Development and Local Assistance Procedures. His power point presentation was distributed to the CFPG group on December 14, 2005. In addition, Frank is requesting that all ITS projects be included in the TIP. Non-federally funded projects would be for informational purposes only.

12. Timeline for the Air Quality Conformity Determinations (Handout):

Penny Gray distributed a simple timeline showing the major milestone dates for TIPs, 8-hour ozone, PM 2.5, and Air Quality Conformity Determinations. This chart was prepared to show that even though SAFETEA-LU has changed the program cycles for RTPs, TIPs, and Air Quality Conformity Determinations to four years so all programs are on an equivalent

cycle, the interaction of these programs and requirements for updates or redeterminations are such that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to maintain identical cycles. Caltrans is requesting a legal opinion regarding distributing apportionments for the 2005 FFY

PM 2.5 Hot Spot Analysis

Mike Brady gave an update on the requirements for conformity for projects with PM 2.5 conformity impacts which only affect the South Coast Air Basin and the San Joaquin Valley. However, it will also apply to about 20-30 SHOPP projects. FHWA advises that if you have a project ready for construction, try to advance that project prior to April 2005 in order to obtain authorization prior to the PM 2.5 hot spot analysis requirement. EPA is required to have the regulations completed by March 31, 2005 – the draft is currently in the review process. Until the regulations are released, we will not know the total impact nor the methods that are specified. However, it is anticipated that the methods will be similar to what was used for PM 10.

13. Indian Reservation Roads (IRR) Projects

A handout listing IRR projects was e-mailed to the CFPG group. These projects must be programmed in the TIP. The list includes projects with funding programmed for FYs 2004/05, 05/06, and 06/07. MPOs to carry over projects with phase(s) programmed in FY 06/07 funding into 2006 FTIP. There were some questions regarding agency IDs. Additional questions should be submitted to Abhijit.

14. Public Involvement Process for Lump Sum Projects

The federal regulations do not require public comment on FTIP amendments involving minor projects that may be grouped under 23 CFR 450.321(i). The MPOs established public involvement processes in compliance with 23 CFR 415.316©. In the public involvement process, the MPO can specify which type of FTIP amendments will not be subject to public involvement procedures.

15. Potential Impact of the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program Fund Estimate (FE) on 2006 FSTIP

Rachel distributed a December 9, 2005 letter to all MPOs discussing the potential impact of specific revenue assumptions in the FE on 2006 FTIPs. If specific revenues are not realized in the FE, the FTIP (if using the same revenue assumptions) may go into an immediate financial constraint lockdown. MPOs are encouraged to be vigilant in programming 2006 FTIPs in order to minimize the need for FTIP amendments once FHWA/FTA approves 2006 FSTIP.

16. CFPG Charter

Rachel will develop a charter for the group. The CFPG Group was formed as an information exchange forum rather than a decision-making body.

17. Follow-up Items

- At the November meeting, the group identified several actions that would improve the CFPG meetings. One suggestion was for an MPO to present a process to the

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING
1120 N STREET
P. O. BOX 942874, MS 82
SACRAMENTO, CA 94274-0001
PHONE (916) 654-5266
FAX (916) 654-5013
TTY (916) 654-2738



*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

December 9, 2005

Metropolitan Planning Organizations

Dear Executive Directors:

The purpose of this letter is to alert you of a potential impact of the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program Fund Estimate (FE) on your 2006 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and California's 2006/07-2008/09 Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP). The FE includes revenue assumptions and State funding levels that will be used in the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) as prescribed by law. The FE includes the assumption that the 2006 STIP will receive Proposition 42 for each year of the FE period, various loan repayments as prescribed by law, and will also receive Tribal Gaming funds. If assumed revenues in the FE and 2006 STIP do not materialize, the FTIP and FSTIP may be impacted.

Recent history has shown that what is prescribed by law cannot always be relied upon. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have accepted the FE as the initial basis for the revenue assumptions to be used for development of the 2006 FTIP/FSTIP. However, once the FTIP/FSTIP is approved, FHWA and FTA will look to see whether the assumed revenues have been realized beginning with the 2006/07 State Budget. If the revenues are not realized, the FTIP/FSTIP may go into an immediate financial constraint lockdown. FHWA/FTA will then look at each region to determine if financial constraint has been met based on the new revenue information.

The likelihood of all these funding sources coming forward is uncertain at this point. Depending on the MPO FTIP revenue assumptions and the realization of the assumed revenues your FTIP may be at risk for a potential financial constraint lockdown. This will mean that no FTIP amendments would be processed until the Metropolitan Planning Organization is able to re-demonstrate financial constraint of its FTIP. This could cause project delays, and may require new emission analysis and conformity determinations.

In anticipation of the possible lockdown, I encourage you to be vigilant in programming your 2006 FTIP in order to minimize the need for FTIP amendments once FHWA and FTA approve 2006 FSTIP.

If you have any questions please call Rachel Falsetti of my staff at 916-654-2983.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ross A. Chittenden", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

ROSS A. CHITTENDEN

Chief

Division of Transportation Programming

c: CMcKim
TAbbott
NOrtega
RFalsetti
GFong - FHWA
SKiser - FHWA
LRogers - FTA
RSukys - FTA
DDD's PM and Planning

DRAFT

The following is a draft series of questions for the WebFMS system to prompt project sponsors about ITS projects.

1a. Is your project an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) project or does it include ITS components? If you answer YES please also answer 1b and 1c.

Y N Help/ info 



 **ITS** is the application of advanced computing and communications technology to the surface transportation system. ITS includes transit technologies, smart corridors, 511 and many other technologies. Federally funded ITS projects are subject to specific project development requirements, one of which is to identify the projects that include ITS components in the TIP.

For more information about what constitutes ITS, try this site: http://www.its.dot.gov/its_overview.htm

1b. Does your project have the potential to be a '*major*' ITS project?

Y N Help/ info 



 '**Major**' ITS projects are defined in terms of significant risks or costs. They involve actual system implementation. 'Major' projects include:

- a. Multi-jurisdictional or multi-modal system implementations – These projects require connecting systems from different agencies, which are often developed and maintained by different contractors/vendors. Examples include a traveler information system that collects data from multiple agencies or modes, or a Bus Signal Priority system that crosses multiple jurisdictions. Because of the external interfaces, these projects generally include substantial software development.
- b. The first stage of an "umbrella" system implementation – A traffic-related example would be the overall regional Information Exchange Network (IEN) design plus the first implementation in a city. A transit example would be the Universal Fare System design and initial implementation on Metro buses. During this first stage, the full system engineering process would be used to develop the overall framework plus the first implementation of that framework. Subsequent stages that replicate the initial implementation would fit the definition of a '*minor*' project for expansion of existing systems with similar capabilities and interfaces. The initial stage of these projects often requires heavy software development.

If your project does not meet these criteria, it is likely '*minor*' in nature.

For FHWA-funded projects, the '*minor*' or '*major*' designation has important consequences including the completion of additional documents when requesting an obligation of funds (such as the System Engineering Review Form (SERF) and the System Engineering Management Plan (SEMP)) and potentially a two-step process for obligating Preliminary Engineering funds. A '*major*' designation could affect the project budget, schedule and contracting needs.

The project sponsor is responsible for making the '*minor*' or '*major*' ITS project designation. If a project sponsor is not certain how to classify a project, FHWA recommends either 1) asking early in the project development process for FHWA assistance in making the designation or 2) erring on the side of caution by designating the project as '*major*' since this decision affects project cost, schedule and contracting needs. FHWA plans to assess how correctly project designations are made through programmatic reviews or if asked to look at a particular project.

For FTA-funded projects, these designations do not result in any federal funding consequences at this time.

DRAFT

For more information about minor and major ITS projects, try this site:
<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/ITS/12.6ITS04-05-04.pdf>

1c. Is your project included the Bay Area Regional ITS Architecture?

Y **N** Help/ info 



 **The Bay Area Regional ITS Architecture** is a plan for how ITS projects, systems, and components can potentially work together over time to capitalize on investments through integrating systems for data sharing, standardizing some functions for interoperability and overall to increase the benefits of these systems to the transportation network.

Click here to determine whether your project is in the Bay Area Regional ITS Architecture <hyperlink to the web page that answers this question>

Federally funded projects that include ITS components must be in compliance with the Regional Architecture, meaning that the functionality is addressed in the Regional Architecture, that integration issues have been considered, and that adopted ITS communication standards are being utilized.

If your project is federally funded and is not currently in the architecture, then you should provide information to have the project added. [Click here](#) to go directly to the form to fill out and submit or [click here](#) for more information about the process of updating the Bay Area ITS Architecture on a periodic basis to include new projects.

To directly access the Regional Architecture for the Bay Area, try this site:
<http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/ITS/>



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
CALIFORNIA DIVISION
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 4-100
Sacramento, CA. 95814
November 28, 2005

McKim.
For
PACIFIC

IN REPLY REFER TO
HDA-CA
Document #: S48323

Mr. Will Kempton, Director
California Department of Transportation
1120 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RECEIVED

NOV 30 2005

Attention: Federal Resources Office, Room 3500
For Ross A. Chittenden, Division of Transportation Programming

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE

Dear Mr. Kempton:

SUBJECT: INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have approved the fiscal year 2005-2007 Indian Reservation Roads (IRR) Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) for the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Pacific and Western Regional Office projects that are located in California.

The projects included in these IRR TIPs provide for a range of transportation activities, including: IRR system planning, preliminary project engineering, pavement overlays and surface treatments, and highway construction and reconstruction. These projects are eligible for 100 percent federal funding with IRR program funds reserved by the Federal Highway Administration. By copy of this letter we are providing copies of these updated IRR TIPs to those California Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) with Federal TIP programming responsibility for the listed strategies and improvements. In accordance with the requirements of 23 USC Section 204(a)(5), and metropolitan and statewide planning requirements listed in 23 CFR 450, these projects are to be included in the MPO's TIP and FSTIP without modification.

If you have questions concerning the statewide and metropolitan programming requirements applicable to these projects, please contact Wade Hobbs in the FHWA, California Division Office at (916) 498-5027. Questions concerning the specific projects included the BIA Pacific Region IRR TIP should be directed to Mr. Kanu Patel in the Bureau of Indian Affairs Pacific Region Roads Office at (916) 978-6033. Questions regarding specific project included in the BIA Western Region IRR TIP should be directed to Mr. Vernon Palmer in the Bureau of Indian Affairs Western Region Roads Office at (602) 379-6782.

Sincerely,

Gene K. Fong

For
Gene K. Fong
Division Administrator

Received on

DEC 6 2005

Enclosures

Cindy McKim's Office





INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
 FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY PROGRAM, 23 USC 204
 Direct Service Tribes

Report run on: August 29, 2005 2:40 PM

APPROVED

19-JUL-2005 13:00[:22]

Page 1 of 10

Region: Pacific
State: California
FFS: F31

Project Id Route No(s) Structure No	County Agency Reservation	Project Name Length Roads ml / Bridges m	Type of Work PCAS	PROJECT TOTALS				
				FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2005 -- 2007	
45700	LAKE CENTRAL CALIFORNIA	BIG VALLEY ROADS 1.5	RECONS J5145700	PE	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$25,000
				CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				\$15,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$25,000	
0165 0502 5027	BIG VALLEY RANCHERIA	DRY CREEK ROAD .9	RECONS J5145100	PE	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,000
				CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	
34200 0217	MONO CENTRAL CALIFORNIA PAIUTE-BENTON	BENTON ROAD 2.1	RECONS J5134200	PE	\$50,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$60,000
				CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				\$50,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$60,000	
35300 0167	MENDOCINO CENTRAL CALIFORNIA LAYTONVILLE RANCHERIA	LAYTONVILLE 1.1	RECONS J5135300	PE	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
				CE	\$55,000	\$0	\$0	\$55,000
				CON	\$800,000	\$0	\$0	\$800,000
				\$865,000	\$0	\$0	\$865,000	
45600 0097 0097 0226 0226	INYO CENTRAL CALIFORNIA FORT INDEPENDENCE	ROCKY ROAD 3.7	NEWCON J5145600	PE	\$70,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$90,000
				CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				\$70,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$90,000	



INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
 FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY PROGRAM, 23 USC 204
 Direct Service Tribes

Report run on: August 29, 2005 2:40 PM

APPROVED

19-JUL-2005 13:00[:22]

Page 2 of 10

Region: Pacific
 State: California
 FFS: F31

Project Id Route No(s) Structure No	County Agency Reservation	Project Name Length Roads mi / Bridges m	Type of Work PCAS	PROJECT TOTALS				
				FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2005 -- 2007	
43100 0219 0219 0223 0224 0224	INYO	BIG PINE RANCHERIA ST.	OVRLAY	PE	\$60,086	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$70,086
	CENTRAL CALIFORNIA	3.4	J5143100	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	BIG PINE			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$60,086	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$70,086
35100 0046 0046 0255 0255 0256 0256	MENDOCINO	COUNTY RD.-ROAD I	NEWCON	PE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	CENTRAL CALIFORNIA	1.1	J5135100	CE	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
	REDWOOD VALLEY RANCHERIA			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
38300 0315	EL DORADO	SHINGLE SPRINGS ROAD*	NEWCON	PE	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,000
	CENTRAL CALIFORNIA	.2	J5138300	CE	\$0	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
	SHINGLE SPRINGS RANCHERIA			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$10,000
45400 0159 0159 0160 0160	INYO	BISHOP ROADS	NEWCON	PE	\$70,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$90,000
	CENTRAL CALIFORNIA	1.4	J5145400	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	BISHOP COLONY			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$70,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$90,000

* This includes the project as described in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/
 Environmental Assesmant (EA) from CalTrans and BIA. Interchange Construction will
 not be overseen by BIA and will be accomplished with non-Federal fund.

11/22/2005 12:50 FAX 2023667495

FEDERAL LANDS

002



INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
 FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY PROGRAM, 23 USC 204
 Direct Service Tribes

Report run on: August 29, 2005 2:40 PM

APPROVED

19-JUL-2005 13:00[:22]

Page 3 of 10

Region: Pacific
 State: California
 FFS: F31

Project Id Route No(s) Structure No	County Agency Reservation	Project Name Length Roads mi / Bridges m	Type of Work PCAS	PROJECT TOTALS				
				FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2005 -- 2007	
42900	TULARE	WATER TANK & CASINO ROAD 3.6	RECONS J5142900	PE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	CENTRAL CALIFORNIA			CE	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
	TULE RIVER			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	
45500	INYO	LONE PINE ROADS 1.7	RECONS J5145500	PE	\$60,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$80,000
	CENTRAL CALIFORNIA			CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	LONE PINE			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				\$60,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$80,000	
45200	LAKE	SULPHUR BANK ROAD 1.5	RECONS J5145200	PE	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
	CENTRAL CALIFORNIA			CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	SULPHUR BANK RANCHERIA			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000	
45800	TUOLUMNE	TUOLUMNE RANCHERIA RDS. 4.4	NEWCON J5145800	PE	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$20,000
	CENTRAL CALIFORNIA			CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	TUOLUMNE RANCHERIA			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$20,000	



INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
 FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY PROGRAM, 23 USC 204
 Direct Service Tribes

Report run on: August 29, 2005 2:40 PM

APPROVED

19-JUL-2005 13:00[:22]

Page 6 of 10

Region: Pacific
 State: California
 FFS: F31

Project Id Route No(s) Structure No	County Agency Reservation	Project Name Length Roads mi / Bridges m	Type of Work PCAS	PROJECT TOTALS					
				FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2005 -- 2007		
0038 0038									
45700 0012	HUMBOLDT NORTHERN CALIFORNIA HOOPA VALLEY	LOOP ROAD .6	NEWCON J5245700	PE CE CON	FY2005 \$0 \$0 \$10,000	FY2006 \$0 \$0 \$0	FY2007 \$0 \$0 \$0	FY2005 -- 2007 \$0 \$0 \$10,000	
					\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	
45900 0016	HUMBOLDT NORTHERN CALIFORNIA HOOPA VALLEY	TRANSLATOR ROAD .7	NEWCON J5245900	PE CE CON	FY2005 \$0 \$10,000 \$0	FY2006 \$0 \$0 \$0	FY2007 \$0 \$0 \$0	FY2005 -- 2007 \$0 \$10,000 \$0	
					\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	
46000 0018	HUMBOLDT NORTHERN CALIFORNIA HOOPA VALLEY	DOWD ROAD 6.8	NEWCON J5246000	PE CE CON	FY2005 \$10,000 \$0 \$0	FY2006 \$10,000 \$0 \$0	FY2007 \$0 \$0 \$0	FY2005 -- 2007 \$20,000 \$0 \$0	
					\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$20,000	
46100 0011	HUMBOLDT NORTHERN CALIFORNIA HOOPA VALLEY	BALD HILL ROAD 2.8	RECONS J5246100	PE CE CON	FY2005 \$0 \$5,000 \$70,000	FY2006 \$0 \$0 \$25,000	FY2007 \$0 \$30,000 \$700,000	FY2005 -- 2007 \$0 \$35,000 \$795,000	
					\$75,000	\$25,000	\$730,000	\$830,000	



**INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY PROGRAM, 23 USC 204
Direct Service Tribes**

Report run on: August 29, 2005 2:40 PM

APPROVED

19-JUL-2005 13:00[:22]

Page 7 of 10

Region: Pacific
State: California
FFS: F31

Project Id Route No(s) Structure No	County Agency Reservation	Project Name Length Roads mi / Bridges m	Type of Work PCAS	PROJECT TOTALS				
				FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2005 -- 2007	
46200	HUMBOLDT	REDWOOD GROVE	NEWCON	PE	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,000
0019	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	2	J5246200	CE	\$0	\$40,000	\$5,000	\$45,000
	HOOPA VALLEY			CON	\$0	\$550,000	\$5,000	\$555,000
					\$5,000	\$590,000	\$10,000	\$605,000
46300	HUMBOLDT	MILL CREEK ROAD	NEWCON	PE	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$15,000
0004	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	.9	J5246300	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	HOOPA VALLEY			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$15,000
46400	HUMBOLDT	BIG HILL ROAD	NEWCON	PE	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
0102	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	1.6	J5246400	CE	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000
	HOOPA VALLEY			CON	\$0	\$0	\$800,000	\$800,000
					\$10,000	\$10,000	\$860,000	\$880,000
46500	HUMBOLDT	CAMPBELL FIELD ROAD	NEWCON	PE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
0014	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	1.1	J5246500	CE	\$44,000	\$0	\$0	\$44,000
	HOOPA VALLEY			CON	\$460,000	\$0	\$0	\$460,000
					\$504,000	\$0	\$0	\$504,000
46600	HUMBOLDT	BIA CAMPUS ROAD	RECONS	PE	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
0110	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	.9	J5246600	CE	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$25,000
	HOOPA VALLEY			CON	\$75,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$100,000
					\$110,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$135,000



**INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY PROGRAM, 23 USC 204
Direct Service Tribes**

Report run on: August 29, 2005 2:40 PM

APPROVED

19-JUL-2005 13:00[:22]

Page 8 of 10

Region: Pacific
State: California
FFS: F31

Project Id Route No(s) Structure No	County Agency Reservation	Project Name Length Roads mi / Bridges m	Type of Work PCAS	PROJECT TOTALS				
				FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2005 -- 2007	
41100	HUMBOLDT	BAY VIEW DRIVE	RECONS	PE	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
4231	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	.8	J5241100	CE	\$0	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$15,000
4231	TABLE BLUFF RANCHERIA			CON	\$0	\$150,000	\$5,000	\$155,000
4231					\$10,000	\$160,000	\$10,000	\$180,000
4232								
4232								
35100	HUMBOLDT	TRINIDAD SCENIC ROAD	RECONS	PE	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
3001	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	.5	J5235100	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	TRINIDAD RANCHERIA			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
34500	MODOC	CEDERVILLE ROAD	NEWCON	PE	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	.2	J5234500	CE	\$0	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$25,000
0001	CEDARVILLE RANCHERIA			CON	\$0	\$400,000	\$15,000	\$415,000
0001					\$10,000	\$415,000	\$25,000	\$450,000
0044								
0044								
42100	SAN DIEGO	CAMPO ROAD	NEWCON	PE	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$45,000
0016	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	1.1	J5442100	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	CAMPO			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$5,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$45,000
45800	SAN DIEGO	WILD CAT CANYON	RECONS	PE	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
0001	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	6.8	J5445800	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	BARONA			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000



**INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY PROGRAM, 23 USC 204
Direct Service Tribes**

Report run on: August 29, 2005 2:40 PM

APPROVED

19-JUL-2005 13:00[:22]

Page 9 of 10

Region: Pacific
State: California
FFS: F31

Project Id Route No(s) Structure No	County Agency Reservation	Project Name Length Roads mi / Bridges m	Type of Work PCAS	PROJECT TOTALS				
				FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2005 -- 2007	
45400 0042 0042 0043 0043	SAN DIEGO	EAGLE VIEW POINT	NEWCON	PE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	16.8	J5445400	CE	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$0	\$160,000
	LOS COYOTES			CON	\$1,460,000	\$1,450,000	\$0	\$2,910,000
					\$1,540,000	\$1,530,000	\$0	\$3,070,000
45700 0005 0005 0006 0006 0051 0051	SAN DIEGO	BLACK CANYON ROAD	NEWCON	PE	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	8.8	J5445700	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	MESA GRANDE			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
41400 0002	SAN DIEGO	LILAC ROAD	RECONS	PE	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$35,000
	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	3.2	J5441400	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	PALA			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				\$15,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$35,000	
45500 0036	SAN DIEGO	WATER TANK - PAUMA	NEWCON	PE	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	\$40,000
	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	.3	J5445500	CE	\$0	\$25,000	\$10,000	\$35,000
	PAUMA/YUIMA			CON	\$0	\$350,000	\$25,000	\$375,000
				\$20,000	\$395,000	\$35,000	\$450,000	
45600 0340	SAN DIEGO	RINCON RESERVATION RD.	NEWCON	PE	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	2.7	J5445600	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	RINCON			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
				\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000	



INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
 FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY PROGRAM, 23 USC 204
 Direct Service Tribes

Report run on: August 29, 2005 2:40 PM

APPROVED

19-JUL-2005 13:00[:22]

Page 10 of 10

Region: Pacific
 State: California
 FFS: F31

Project Id Route No(s) Structure No	County Agency Reservation	Project Name Length Roads mi / Bridges m	Type of Work PCAS	PROJECT TOTALS				
				FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2005 -- 2007	
31200 0023	RIVERSIDE	SANTA ROSA ROAD	NEWCON	PE	\$10,000	\$95,000	\$0	\$105,000
	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	2.1	J5431200	CE	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000
	SANTA ROSA			CON	\$0	\$75,000	\$1,350,000	\$1,425,000
					\$10,000	\$170,000	\$1,450,000	\$1,630,000
42200 0009 0009 0053 0053	SAN DIEGO	SANTA YSABEL	NEWCON	PE	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$45,000
	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	2.2	J5442200	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	SANTA YSABEL			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$5,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$45,000
31300 0001	RIVERSIDE	MONROE STREET	NEWCON	PE	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	.8	J5431300	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	TORRES MARTINEZ			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
41500 0003	SAN DIEGO	HOG LAKE ROAD	NEWCON	PE	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	1.6	J5441500	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	RAMONA			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
State Totals:					\$3,814,086	\$4,120,000	\$4,095,000	\$12,029,086



INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
 FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY PROGRAM, 23 USC 204

2005

Report run on: August 29, 2005 2:37 PM

APPROVED

16-AUG-2005 13:03[01]

Page 1 of 1

Region: Western
 State: California
 FFS: 931

Project Id Route No(s) Structure No	County Agency Reservation	Project Name Length Roads mi / Bridges m	Type of Work PCAS	PROJECT TOTALS				
				FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2005 -- 2007	
89600	SAN BERNADINO COLORADO RIVER CHEMEHUEVI	CHIR INVEN2	PLANING	PE	\$30,127	\$0	\$0	\$30,127
			H5189600	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	
			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
					\$30,127	\$0	\$0	\$30,127
85200	ALPINE WESTERN NEVADA WASHOE-WOODFORDS COMM	WAIR INVENTORY UPDATE 2	PLANING	PE	\$41,304	\$0	\$0	\$41,304
			H6185200	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	
			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
					\$41,304	\$0	\$0	\$41,304
81100	IMPERIAL FORT YUMA FORT YUMA	FYIR TRANSPORTATION PLAN	PLANING	PE	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
			H6381100	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	
			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
					\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
85200	IMPERIAL FORT YUMA FORT YUMA	FYIR INVENTORY UPDATE 2	PLANING	PE	\$45,120	\$0	\$0	\$45,120
			H6385200	CE	\$0	\$0	\$0	
			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
					\$45,120	\$0	\$0	\$45,120
State Totals:					\$126,551	\$0	\$0	\$126,551



INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY PROGRAM, 23 USC 204
Direct Service Tribes

Report run on: August 29, 2005 2:34 PM

APPROVED

16-AUG-2005 13:01[:58]

Page 1 of 1

Region: Western
State: California
FFS: F31

Project Id Route No(s) Structure No	County Agency Reservation	Project Name Length Roads m / Bridges m	Type of Work PCAS	PROJECT TOTALS				
				FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2005 -- 2007	
49100 0018	SAN BERNADINO	CRIR 18(8)A	REHAB	PE	\$389	\$0	\$0	\$389
	COLORADO RIVER	2.5	H5149100	CE	\$2,604	\$0	\$0	\$2,604
	COLORADO RIVER			CON	\$42,000	\$0	\$0	\$42,000
					\$44,993	\$0	\$0	\$44,993
63300 0201	SAN BERNADINO	MOIR201(2)	SEALING	PE	\$330	\$0	\$0	\$330
	COLORADO RIVER	.8	H5163300	CE	\$347	\$1,389	\$0	\$1,736
	FORT MOJAVE			CON	\$129,612	\$0	\$0	\$129,612
					\$130,289	\$1,389	\$0	\$131,678
64100 0001 0003	SAN BERNADINO	CHIR CHIP SEAL 3	OVRLAY	PE	\$2,200	\$2,037	\$0	\$4,237
	COLORADO RIVER	5.8	H5164100	CE	\$6,820	\$6,820	\$0	\$13,640
	CHEMEHUEVI			CON	\$460,000	\$0	\$0	\$460,000
					\$469,020	\$8,857	\$0	\$477,877
39300 0101	ALPINE	WFIC 101 (2) Woodfords Sts	OVRLAY	PE	\$1,400	\$0	\$2,593	\$3,993
	WESTERN NEVADA	1	H6139300	CE	\$8,680	\$8,680	\$0	\$17,360
	WASHOE-WOODFORDS COMM			CON	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
					\$10,080	\$8,680	\$2,593	\$21,353
48200 0102	IMPERIAL	FYIR 102(1)	NEWCON	PE	\$5,832	\$3,278	\$0	\$9,110
	FORT YUMA	.4	H6348200	CE	\$10,974	\$10,974	\$0	\$21,948
	FORT YUMA			CON	\$2,200	\$0	\$0	\$2,200
					\$19,006	\$14,252	\$0	\$33,258
State Totals:					\$673,388	\$33,178	\$2,593	\$709,159