

Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: June 10-11, 2009

Reference No.: 2.8d.(1)
Action Item

From: CINDY McKIM
Chief Financial Officer

Prepared by: Denix D. Anbiah
Division Chief
Local Assistance

Subject: **REQUEST TO EXTEND THE PERIOD OF PROJECT DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE FOR LOCALLY-ADMINISTERED STIP PROJECTS, PER STIP GUIDELINES WAIVER-09-24**

RECOMMENDATION:

The Department of Transportation (Department) recommends the California Transportation Commission (Commission) extend the period of project development expenditure for the time periods identified for each project on the attached document.

ISSUE:

The attached list identifies eight locally-administered State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects totaling \$2,222,000. The Commission allocated the funds in Fiscal Year 2006-07 for project development phases, as shown on the attachment. The local agencies will not be able to expend the funds by the June 30, 2008 deadline. The attachment shows the details of the projects and the explanation for the delays. The project sponsors are requesting extensions, and the regional planning agencies concur.

BACKGROUND:

Current STIP Guidelines stipulate that funds allocated for local project development or right of way costs must be expended by the end of the second fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the funds were allocated. The Commission may approve a waiver 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 – Project Development Expenditure Deadline
Local Streets and Roads Projects**

Project #	Applicant County PPNO Project Description Reason for Project Delay	Extension Amount (\$ in thousands) E&P (Environmental & Permits) PS&E (Plans, Specifications & Estimates) R/W (Right of Way) CON (Construction) TOTAL	Allocation Date Allocation Resolution Number Number of Months Requested Extended Deadline CT Recommendation
1	City of Eureka Humboldt County PPNO: 01-0302D Waterfront Drive Connection, TE	\$0 \$30 \$0 \$0 \$30	06/07/07 FP-06-104 20 Months 02/28/2011 Support
<p>The City of Eureka (City) is requesting a 20-month extension to the period of project development expenditure for PS&E for the Waterfront Drive Connection TE project. The City experienced unforeseen delays during the E&P phase of the project. The CEQA process was completed; however, the NEPA certification has been delayed pending resolution of an abatement action by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB). The NCRWQCB determined that contaminated soils exist within the project area and need to be addressed. The City has drafted all the necessary reports for NEPA certification, but is waiting for the outcome of the abatement action. Due to the unknown outcome of the abatement action and the uncertainty of the time needed to address the contaminated soils, the City requests the maximum time extension of 20 months to February 28, 2011.</p>			
2	County of Tehama Tehama County PPNO: 02-2148 Bowman Road Bridge	\$0 \$79 \$0 \$0 \$79	04/26/07 FP-06-89 12 Months 06/30/2010 Support
<p>The County of Tehama (County) is requesting a 12-month extension to the period of project development expenditure for PS&E for the Bowman Road Bridge project. The County discovered an archaeological cultural site within the project alignment. The alignment could not be modified to leave the site undisturbed. The site will need to be excavated and the archaeological findings will be relocated. The property owner created additional delays by restricting access to the site and then disputing the ownership of the archaeological findings. The County estimates an overall delay of 12 months to excavate the area, relocate the archaeological findings, and complete the PS&E. The County requests a 12-month time extension to June 30, 2010.</p>			
3	County of Tehama Tehama County PPNO: 02-2331 McCoy Road Low Water Crossing	\$0 \$67 \$11 \$0 \$78	04/26/07 FP-06-89 12 Months 06/30/2010 Support
<p>The County of Tehama (County) is requesting a 12-month extension to the period of project development expenditure for PS&E and R/W for the McCoy Road Low Water Crossing project. The property owner denied access to the project area. This resulted in the need for modifications to the design alignment. The Area of Potential Effect (APE) maps needed to be revised due to the modifications made to the alignment. The County could not move forward to final PS&E until the new APE maps were approved. The APE maps were submitted in January 2008 and approved in September 2008. The County experienced an overall delay of 12 months to modify the alignment and request approval of the new APE maps. The County requests a 12-month time extension to June 30, 2010.</p>			
4	County of Tehama Tehama County PPNO: 02-2333 Kirkwood Road Bridge Rehabilitation	\$37 \$0 \$0 \$37 \$37	07/20/06 FP-06-05 18 Months 12/31/2010 Support
<p>The County of Tehama (County) is requesting an 18-month extension to the period of project development expenditure for E&P for the Kirkwood Road Bridge Rehabilitation project. After evaluating the stream that flows under the bridge, the County determined that it was a possible habitat for the red legged frog. This has caused an unforeseen delay to the environmental phase of the project. Extensive environmental studies are required to make a final determination. Pending approval of this time extension request, the County plans to hire a consultant to complete the environmental component of the project within 18 months. The County requests an 18-month time extension to December 31, 2010.</p>			

**Time Extension/Waiver – Project Development Expenditure Deadline
Local Streets and Roads Projects**

Project #	Applicant County PPNO Project Description Reason for Project Delay	Extension Amount (\$ in thousands) E&P (Environmental & Permits) PS&E (Plans, Specifications & Estimates) R/W (Right of Way) CON (Construction) TOTAL	Allocation Date Allocation Resolution Number Number of Months Requested Extended Deadline CT Recommendation
5	County of Tehama Tehama County PPNO: 02-2334 Columbia Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation	\$17 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$17	07/20/06 FP-06-05 18 Months 12/31/2010 Support
<p>The County of Tehama (County) is requesting an 18-month extension to the period of project development expenditure for E&P for the Columbia Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation project. This project is in the same vicinity as the Kirkwood Road Bridge Rehabilitation project and crosses the same stream. The County is requesting a concurrent extension for the Columbia Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation project with the same reason for delay. After evaluating the stream that flows under the bridge, the County determined that it was a possible habitat for the red legged frog. This has caused an unforeseen delay to the environmental phase of the project. Extensive environmental studies are required to make a final determination. Pending approval of this time extension request, the County plans to hire a consultant to complete the environmental component of the project within 18 months. The County requests an 18-month time extension to December 31, 2010.</p>			
6	County of Tehama Tehama County PPNO: 02-2428 Lake California Drive Bikeway, TE	\$0 \$10 \$0 \$0 \$10	07/20/06 FP-06-07 12 Months 06/30/2010 Support
<p>The County of Tehama (County) is requesting a 12-month extension to the period of project development expenditure for PS&E for the Lake California Drive Bikeway TE project. The County had difficulty locating the "As Built Plans" for the Lake California Bridge. Part of the Lake California Drive Bikeway TE project includes the bridge crossing. This delayed the design of the bikeway because the final contours of the land in the "As Built Plans" determine the design surface for the bikeway. In addition, the County cannot proceed to final design until NEPA certification is completed. The County is in the process of revising the Area of Potential Effect maps for NEPA certification due to issues raised about the footprint and depth of excavation for the Lake California Drive Bikeway and the underlying culverts. The County anticipates that NEPA certification will be completed by February 2010, and final design will be completed by May or June 2010. The County requests a 12-month time extension to June 30, 2010.</p>			
7	County of Riverside Riverside County PPNO: 08-9803 FY 2006-07 Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM)	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$1,947 \$1,947	07/20/06 FP-06-08 20 Months 02/28/2011 Recommend 12 months
<p>The County of Riverside (County) is requesting a 20-month extension to the period of project development expenditure for Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM). The Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) secured federal funds for projects that were initially expected to be funded with FY 2006-07 PPM. RCTC plans to use FY 2006-07 PPM funds as matching funds for these projects and to fund the staff time associated with these projects. Due to the large allocation of FY 2006-07 PPM funds, the County requests a 20-month time extension to February 28, 2011.</p> <p>The County has not expended any of their FY 2007-08 PPM allocation and is concurrently requesting additional PPM funds for FY 2008-09. The Department recommends a 12-month time extension to June 30, 2010.</p>			

**Time Extension/Waiver – Project Development Expenditure Deadline
Local Streets and Roads Projects**

Project #	Applicant County PPNO Project Description Reason for Project Delay	Extension Amount (\$ in thousands) E&P (Environmental & Permits) PS&E (Plans, Specifications & Estimates) R/W (Right of Way) CON (Construction) TOTAL	Allocation Date Allocation Resolution Number Number of Months Requested Extended Deadline CT Recommendation
8	County of San Joaquin San Joaquin County PPNO: 10-K657 Airport Way Beautification, TE	\$0 \$24 \$0 \$0 \$24	06/07/07 FP-06-104 9 Months 03/31/2010 Support
<p>The County of San Joaquin (County) is requesting a nine-month extension to the period of project development expenditure for PS&E for the Airport Way Beautification TE project. The County has submitted a request to extend the period of project allocation for the construction component of this project. The County experienced a high level of staff turn over last year due to workers seeking better employment opportunities. The design component was delayed due to a reduction in staff, which caused a discontinuity in the active projects that the prior staff was working on, including this project. The staffing transition has caused approximately 12 months of delay to the project.</p> <p>Pending the outcome of this extension request, the County plans to select a consultant to perform design services for the project and to prepare the subsequent design and construction funding requests. Environmental clearance on the project has already been completed. The County anticipates that the design will be completed by March 2010 to support a request for construction funding by June 2010. The County requests a nine-month time extension to March 31, 2010.</p>			