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Introduction
The U.S. Constitution and treaties recognize Native American communities as separate and independent sovereign nations within the territorial boundaries of the United States. In the San Diego region, there are 17 federally recognized tribal governments with jurisdiction over 18 reservations\(^1\)—the most in any county in the United States.

Figure I.1: Tribal Lands in the San Diego Region

\(^1\) Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians acquired some trust land in San Diego as a result of the Bureau of Land Management transferring a conservation easement to the tribe. However, for planning purposes, the tribe engages with the Southern California Association of Governments region.
Federal legislation requires that federally recognized tribal governments be consulted in the development of regional transportation plans and programs (23 CFR 450.316). In particular, the current federal transportation authorization, the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), emphasizes the importance of tribal government participation. It directs public agencies to incorporate tribal consultation into their plans and programs in a timely and meaningful manner.

At the state level, the recent administrations have elevated the critical importance of tribal-state relations through the creation of the Office of the Tribal Advisor (Executive Order B-10-11) in 2010. The Tribal Advisor’s charge is to serve as a direct link between the tribes in California and the Governor, facilitate communication and consultations between tribes and state agencies, and review and provide recommendations on state legislation and regulations affecting California tribal communities. This work has intensified under the leadership of Governor Newsom, who, through Executive Order N-15-19, acknowledged and apologized on behalf of the state for the “violence, exploitation, dispossession, and the attempted destruction of tribal communities” that dislocated California Native Americans from their ancestral land and sacred practices. This Executive Order also established the California Truth and Healing Council. The state continues to work with California tribes on a government-to-government basis to address issues concerning Native American tribal self-government and tribal trust resources.

At the regional level, the manner of consultation is left to the metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) and the tribal governments. For almost 20 years, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), as the MPO for the San Diego region, has forged a strong working relationship with the tribal nations in the region based on a diplomatic framework of communication, coordination, and collaboration in the regional transportation planning process. Each regional planning cycle integrates collaborative strategies and actions pursuing advancement in issues of mutual concern.

This appendix documents the collaborative effort undertaken to consult with tribes on regional transportation planning issues, including the development of San Diego Forward: The 2021 Regional Plan (2021 Regional Plan), and highlights policy issues of tribal concern and early actions for 2021 Regional Plan implementation.

**San Diego Forward: The 2021 Regional Plan**

As the San Diego region’s MPO, SANDAG is responsible for developing a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy every four years. On February 22, 2019, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved an action plan to develop a bigger and bolder vision for the 2021 Regional Plan that will transform the way people and goods move throughout the San Diego region by offering true alternatives to driving, protecting the environment, creating healthy communities, and stimulating economic growth to benefit all San Diegans. This new vision for the region’s future will guide the development of an innovative transportation network for the 2021 Regional Plan, anticipated to be adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in late 2021.
As sovereign nations within the boundaries of the San Diego region, it is critical that the region’s tribes have a voice in shaping the 2021 Regional Plan. The objectives for the 2021 Regional Plan regarding tribal nations and regional transportation planning are:

- To engage federally recognized tribal governments in the regional planning process in a timely, meaningful, and effective manner through the established framework for government-to-government engagement
- To pursue a set of mutually agreed-upon prioritized strategies based on government-to-government dialogue and negotiation to improve regional tribal transportation across four areas: roadways, transit, funding, and information sharing/technical assistance
- To pursue mechanisms for collaboration in regional policy areas of mutual concern, such as energy, habitat conservation, cultural resources, economic development, and emergency preparedness

During fall 2017, SANDAG and the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA) developed a Tribal Consultation Plan for the 2019 Regional Plan, which was then amended for the 2021 Regional Plan. The Tribal Consultation Plan was approved by the SCTCA Board of Directors in June 2017 and by the SANDAG Board of Directors in July 2017.

The Tribal Consultation Plan included:

- **An informational workshop**: An informational workshop was convened for tribal leaders regarding the role of SANDAG in regional and transportation planning (spring 2017).
- **Leadership meetings between the SCTCA and SANDAG**: SANDAG met with tribal leaders in a smaller setting to enable the leadership members to get to know each other prior to the San Diego Regional Tribal Summit in April 2018. These meetings facilitated opportunities for meaningful dialogue to inform regional transportation planning as well as other regional issues such as transportation funding strategies (June and October 2017; October 2018; February/June/October 2019; September/November 2020; and April 2021).
- **Policy listening sessions**: Sessions were organized with issue-area experts supported by SANDAG and SCTCA staff. These sessions focused on the other regional policy issues identified during previous cycles of the RTP to elicit ideas for potential collaborative strategies (February and March 2018).
- **Input from the Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues (Working Group)**: The Working Group provided input for the development of transportation aspects of the RTP and informs the SCTCA (ongoing; quarterly meetings).
- **A Policy Discussion Paper**: Based on the input provided, SCTCA and SANDAG staff prepared a Policy Discussion Paper to serve as a basis for informed dialogue between the tribal nations and SANDAG (April 2018).
• **The 2018 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit (2018 Tribal Summit):** The 2018 Tribal Summit was convened between the SANDAG and SCTCA boards of directors on April 13, 2018, to facilitate timely and meaningful input in the process of developing the RTP. Key policy issues were discussed for consideration in the RTP and a collaborative agenda was developed.

• **2019/2020 Tribal Symposia:** In light of the major shift in the development of the vision in 5 Big Moves, several workshops and symposia were conducted to incorporate tribal issues into the new vision. Symposia convened between the SANDAG Borders Committee and the leadership of the SCTCA.

• **A memorandum of understanding (MOU) on collaborative strategies:** In July 2020, the SCTCA and SANDAG signed a MOU to pursue a set of collaborative strategies in various policy areas agreed upon at the 2018 Tribal Summit.

• **Incorporation of tribal issues into the 2021 Regional Plan:** SANDAG and the Working Group collaborated on drafting the Tribal Consultation Appendix and other tribal elements in the 2021 Regional Plan. Recommendations from the Intraregional Tribal Transportation Strategy and other strategic actions identified at the 2018 Tribal Summit were incorporated into the 2021 Regional Plan.

**Setting the Stage**

Historically, the relationship between local governments and federally recognized tribal governments has been contentious. While the federal-tribal government relationship is well established, the local-tribal government relationship has not been as clearly defined. Past efforts by tribal governments to reach out to local governments often were not well received; however, this dynamic has evolved substantially over the years. According to various tribal leaders, local perceptions changed with the advent of gaming. As a condition of the development of more recent gaming compacts, some tribes are required to negotiate mitigation agreements with the adjacent local land use authorities. Still, what has not been clearly delineated by either the state or federal government is an effective mechanism for the inclusion of tribal input into the regional transportation planning process. The federal government requires “consultation” with tribal governments; however, the definition of meaningful consultation, or more in-depth coordination and cooperation, is handled differently in various parts of the country with varying degrees of effectiveness. San Diego has led the country in establishing mechanisms of meaningful cooperation and collaboration with area tribal nations. As the San Diego region continues to pursue a sustainable future, it is incumbent on us to coordinate our tribal and regional planning efforts to make the best use of resources while protecting and enhancing the quality of life for all our region’s residents.
Tribal Nations in San Diego
Of the 109 federally recognized Indian tribes in California, 17 are located in San Diego County. In addition, there are two California tribes that are not yet recognized by the federal government but that are registered by the Native American Heritage Commission. Historically, the tribal members of today’s bands represent four Indian cultural/linguistic groups who have populated this region for more than 10,000 years, taking advantage of its abundant natural resources and diverse ecological system for their livelihoods. The four nations are the Luiseño, who traditionally inhabited the land along the San Luis Rey River in north and northwestern San Diego County; the Cahuilla, who live in the mountains in the northeastern part of the county and into the Coachella and Imperial Valleys; the Cupeño, who live in the Warner Springs area; and the Kumeyaay (Northern Ipai/Southern Tipai), who live in the southern part of the county from the coast to the desert and all the way to what today is Baja California.

Figure I.2: Kumeyaay Map

---

There are 566 federally recognized tribes in the United States. The next-highest concentration in a county after San Diego is Riverside County, with 16 federally recognized tribes.
In the years immediately preceding California’s statehood, the federal government developed treaties with native nations in the region to reduce tribal and settler violence at the end of the U.S.–Mexican War and the onset of the Gold Rush. However, these treaties were never ratified—they were thwarted on the U.S. Senate floor by pressure from the new California senators—and the tribal nations that had signed the treaties were never informed that the treaties had not been fully executed. In 1875, President Ulysses S. Grant signed an executive order based on several of the “lost treaties,” creating tribal reservations for Santa Ysabel, Pala, Sycuan, La Jolla, Rincon, and Capitan Grande. Most of the current tribal reservations were established by the end of the 19th century; however, several other reservations were established well into the 20th century. Today, these four ethnic groups are distributed across 18 reservations and are represented by 17 federally recognized tribal governments, as shown in Table I.1.

As domestic sovereign nations, tribes are subject to federal regulations but are not subject to local or state regulations absent congressional delegation. From a governance perspective, tribal governments are considered a separate category of government from federal, state, and local governments. In addition to the standard governmental functions of regulating, taxing, and delivering services, tribal governments act to preserve and protect the tribal culture and community, including determining tribal membership. Tribal governments also are responsible for the development, management, and operation of tribal economic enterprises. Most of the land within the boundaries of reservations is owned by tribes and held in trust by the federal government.

Native American reservations currently cover more than 127,000 acres in the San Diego region—approximately 4% of the region’s land base.

---

3 On June 18, 2019, Governor Gavin Newsom issued Executive Order N-15-19, which acknowledges and apologizes on behalf of the state for the historical “violence, exploitation, dispossession, and the attempted destruction of tribal communities” that dislocated California Native Americans from their ancestral land and sacred practices and establishes the California Truth and Healing Council. The destructive impacts of this forceful separation persist today, and meaningful, reparative action from the State of California can begin to address these wrongs to heal its relationship with California Native Americans.

4 The Capitan Grande Reservation included the bands that would later become the Barona Band of Mission Indians that relocated to the Barona Valley Ranch (1932) and subsequently the Barona Indian Reservation, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians that relocated to Baron Long Ranch (1934) and subsequently the Viejas Indian Reservation.

5 The Jamul Indian Village did not receive federal recognition as a reservation until 1975; other landless California tribes, such as the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians and the Mount Laguna Band of Luiseño Indians, continue to seek federal recognition.


7 The original inhabitants of the still federally recognized Capitan Grande reservation established in the 1890s were moved to two different ranches in 1932, when the City of San Diego, by act of the U.S. Congress, acquired more than 7,000 acres of land inside that reservation territory to build the El Capitan Reservoir. Capitan Grande is currently uninhabited and is jointly managed by the Barona and Viejas tribal governments.

8 As defined in the U.S. Constitution.

9 For many tribal governments, land ownership is complex, as the reservations often have non-Indian-owned in-holdings and/or allotments or individual land parcels owned by tribal members. This complicates land and resource management for tribal governments.
Table I.1: American Indian Reservations and Federally Recognized Tribal Governments in the San Diego Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reservation Name</th>
<th>Tribal Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barona*</td>
<td>Barona Band of Mission Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campo*</td>
<td>Campo Band of Mission Indians of the Kumeyaay Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitan Grande</td>
<td>Joint Power Authority between Barona and Viejas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewiiaapaayp</td>
<td>Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaja and Cosmit</td>
<td>Inaja Cosmit Band of Diegueño Mission Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamul Indian Village*</td>
<td>Jamul Indian Village of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla*</td>
<td>La Jolla Band of Luiseño Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Posta**</td>
<td>La Posta Band of the Kumeyaay Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Coyotes</td>
<td>Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla/Cupeño Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>Manzanita Band of Diegueño Mission Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Grande</td>
<td>Mesa Grande Band of Diegueño Mission Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pala*</td>
<td>Pala Band of Mission Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauma and Yuima*</td>
<td>Pauma Band of Luiseño Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon*</td>
<td>Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pasqual*</td>
<td>San Pasqual Band of Diegueño Mission Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ysabel**</td>
<td>Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycuan*</td>
<td>Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viejas*</td>
<td>Viejas Band of the Kumeyaay Indians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG; Bureau of Indian Affairs
*tribe with a gaming facility
**tribe with a closed gaming facility

<sup>10</sup> Several official sources alternately refer to the Ewiiaapaayp tribe by the Spanish spelling “Cuyapaipe.”
**Current Conditions**
Several planning issues are relevant to these reservations, all of which are located in remote areas outside of incorporated areas. Reservation locations range from those that are outside the urban transportation system but near major highways, such as Viejas, to those that are not even fully connected to county roads, such as Los Coyotes. Inadequate access to and from reservations frequently results in a lack of economic opportunities as well as insufficient health, social, and cultural services.

**Tribal Economic Development**
Gaming is a traditional social activity among many tribal nations, and commercial tribal gaming enterprises expanded exponentially nationwide in the early 1990s as a result of the passage of the federal Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA). The IGRA was the result of a legal battle between the Cabazon Band of Mission Indians and the State of California over the issue of the definition of sovereignty. The state claimed that Cabazon was violating state anti-gambling laws, while the tribe asserted its sovereign right to advance its economic interests. In 1987, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of Cabazon, prompting Congress to pass federal gaming legislation clarifying how gaming should be conducted nationwide and what role states should have in that activity. Several tribes in the San Diego region had bingo facilities prior to IGRA, but by the 1990s, most of the tribes had developed or had agreements to develop gaming facilities as a means of economic development. San Diego County now has ten tribal gaming facilities, which is the greatest number of Indian gaming facilities in any county in the United States (Table I.1).

Gaming-related and other types of development have led to rapid economic growth for a number of tribes while also providing jobs and stimulating the regional economy. In the San Diego region, statistics show that the Indian gaming industry as a whole has created more than 10,000 jobs in the region, resulting in a $1 billion industry with approximately $263 million in goods and services purchased annually and $500 million in payroll. Despite the scale of gaming-related economic activity, tribal poverty levels remain above the national average, and some gaming tribes have enjoyed far greater success than others.

---

14 Two smaller gaming facilities—La Posta and Santa Ysabel—closed their operations. Viejas and Sycuan added hotels to their facilities, while Pala and Rincon expanded their existing hotels/parking facilities. La Jolla opened a gaming facility in 2019.
15 For additional discussion on the impact of tribal gaming in California, see California Nations Indian Gaming Association California Tribal Government Gaming Impact Study 2016.
Gaming industry growth has been accompanied by increases in traffic, jobs-housing accessibility issues, and the need for additional resources such as water and energy.\textsuperscript{16} The tribes that do not have gaming facilities continue to struggle with unmet economic development, transportation, and infrastructure needs.

Since the mid-1990s, tribal governments in San Diego have been in the process of developing gaming compacts with the State of California that have allowed them to plan and develop gaming facilities on their reservations. As part of the gaming compact process, tribal governments are required to submit to the state a Tribal Environmental Impact Report, the findings of which are subject to negotiation between the tribal government and the local land use authority adjacent to it. However, there are currently no protocols or requirements in place for exchanging information regarding long-term land use and transportation plans on tribal lands for purposes of regional planning, making effective coordination a continuing challenge.

**Tribal Transportation**

In 2003, the County of San Diego, in its capacity as the land use authority adjacent to most tribal developments in the San Diego region, conducted traffic impact assessments related to tribal developments, the scale of which intensified after the enactment of IGRA. The county’s subsequent report on the roadway impacts of tribal development requested that SANDAG consider the impacts of tribal development on the regional transportation system.

Based on its study, the county negotiated cooperative agreements with several tribes for “fair share” funding of traffic impact mitigation. Notwithstanding these agreements, the county estimated that levels of service on several road segments in the SR 76, SR 67, and SR 94 corridors would deteriorate due to increased traffic volume associated with the gaming facilities. Both Caltrans and the County of San Diego called for additional corridor studies in the unincorporated area associated with gaming facilities to better understand the situation.

Currently, the main input required to accurately incorporate tribal land use into transportation forecast modeling for the 2021 Regional Plan is the square footage of gaming area, which produces the estimate of average daily trips. Ten tribal gaming facilities are currently in operation. More accurate protocols could be developed for assessing traffic impacts through further government-to-government discussions with tribal governments.

\textsuperscript{16} For a comprehensive overview, see the San Diego County study, Update on Impacts of Tribal Economic Development Projects in San Diego County, April 2003. Contact the Department of Land Use and Planning for a copy of this document.
In addition to concerns about the impacts of gaming industry growth on the regional transportation system, there are also concerns about the lack of tribal access to that same system. Located in the unincorporated portion of the county, tribal lands are largely isolated from the regional transportation system. All non-gaming tribes in San Diego County receive funding from gaming tribes through the Revenue Sharing Trust Fund (RSTF) to support the administration of their nations. However, their physical isolation—both in terms of infrastructure and transit services—is a significant limiting factor in their ability to:

(1) improve the health and well-being of tribal members who reside on the reservation, and

(2) explore alternative sources for economic development. As more tribal members return to their homelands to live, this will continue to be a challenge regardless of the success of tribal enterprises. Federal regulations for transportation require that regional transportation systems address the needs of federally recognized tribal reservations.

Federally recognized tribes face a dilemma when it comes to transportation planning and funding. Most of their transportation funding comes through the federal Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) through a national competitive process among all tribal nations in the country. The funding formula is based on population, road inventory, and average tribal shares. Small land-based tribes with small populations and few on-reservation roads do not compete well against larger tribes with extensive road inventories, such as the Navajo Nation, which spans over three states. From 2005 to 2009, under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, the Indian Reservation Roads (IRR) program funding formula was revised to allow tribes to include off-reservation transportation facilities critical to reservation ingress and egress as part of their tribal transportation system. This allowed tribes in the San Diego region to compete successfully for funds. With the 2012 passage of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, the provision was removed, and the 2015 FAST Act retained that change. As a result, many of the San Diego region’s tribes lack the resources needed to plan for their mobility needs and to address the problem areas that most hinder their regional connectivity.

In addition to limited resources, the process to plan for and implement transportation projects is complicated and involves many agencies and jurisdictions. At a federal level, tribes work with the BIA, the Tribal Transportation Program (TTP) of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and, in more recent years, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). In most cases, tribes in the region have worked on an individual basis, not as a group. This is the case even though many of the issues that impact tribal mobility and access to the regional transportation system are common to several tribes along transportation corridors. The federal government has no mechanism for examining the regional needs of tribes. Each tribe submits a tribal Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and updates its

---

17 The 1999 Compact defines a “non-gaming” tribe as a tribe that has no gaming or operates less than 350 gaming devices. Gaming devices are defined to be Class III devices. Class II devices, or bingo gaming devices, are not included in this count.

18 The State Controller’s Office began distributing checks to tribal governments in August 2001. “Eighty-five of the 109 federally recognized tribes in California (those that have either small or no gaming operations) will receive checks that will provide these Tribes with funds to help meet the critical needs of their communities. Tribes will manage the RSTF distributions in a variety of ways, including providing per capita distributions of direct cash benefits.” Source: cgcc.ca.gov.
own road inventory, but there is no forum for assessing their collective concerns. At the state level, the tribes work with Caltrans through the Native American Liaison Branch, which has been highly successful in analyzing the needs of tribes on state transportation facilities. The state receives the Tribal Transportation Improvement Programs for inclusion in the State Transportation Improvement Program, but again, there is no mechanism for evaluating their collective needs in a regional context.

**Tribal Environmental Context**

Tribes face a variety of environmental and topographical challenges. Several reservations, like Barona, are in valleys surrounded by mountainous terrain, while others, like Los Coyotes, are situated on steep slopes. Historically, Indian reservations were established by the federal government in remote, rocky, steep, and desolate areas of the region in which agriculture and other subsistence activities were limited.

Today, there are a number of environmental issues that tribal communities share with non-tribal communities, such as air and water quality, threats from hazardous and solid waste, and illegal dumping. The 2003 and 2007 regional fires decimated several reservations. The Poomacha fire in 2007 destroyed 99% of the La Jolla Band of Luiseño Reservation, including homes and open space.

Other environmental challenges are unique to tribal lands because of their sovereign status. For example, many reservations in the region are in watersheds with groundwater. The rules and regulations governing surface water and groundwater are different for tribes than for the communities that surround them. This has led to confusion and at times has created tensions between the tribes and their neighbors. Another challenge is habitat conservation. Although habitat conservation is an important concern for tribal nations, tribal lands are only a fraction of the acreage originally agreed to in the treaty negotiations in the 1800s and are often fully surrounded by land controlled by federal, state, or private parties. Nonetheless, habitat conservation efforts often lead to pressure for tribal lands to be considered open space or protected habitat for endangered species. As sovereign land-use authorities, however, tribal governments have the right to define their own land use and are not properly subject to external land use designations. Conversely, since reservations represent only a fraction of traditional native territories, there are many important natural areas with cultural significance that are located off-reservation in areas where there is limited tribal influence or control. This highlights the importance of diplomatic discussions to identify ways in which tribes, as land-use authorities, can engage in the regional dialogue on habitat conservation and habitat planning.
A Regional Government-to-Government Framework

As development on tribal reservations continues and interregional planning issues become more relevant for surrounding jurisdictions, the need for establishing a government-to-government framework at a regional level has become increasingly apparent. Tribes operate under independent constitutions, have their own systems of governance, and establish and administer their own laws. This sovereign status of tribal governments dictates that the United States and all agencies operating within it are expected to engage in government-to-government relationships with Native American tribes. Government-to-government interaction with Native American tribes should follow the principles of coordination, cooperation, and consultation.

For almost 20 years, SANDAG and the SCTCA have developed a government-to-government framework to engage in planning dialogue and action at the regional level. The success of this model has demonstrated that working collaboratively, public agencies and tribal governments can create a mechanism for timely, meaningful, and effective involvement of tribal governments in the regional and transportation planning process.

Regional Partners

The core of the framework is an ongoing dialogue among key stakeholders at the regional level. Today, three main public agencies in the region have tribal liaisons: SANDAG, Caltrans, and the County of San Diego. The SCTCA is an intertribal council of governments in the San Diego region and is a tribal counterpart to SANDAG.

- **SANDAG**: SANDAG pursues government-to-government relations with tribal governments in the San Diego region through the Borders Committee. The Borders Committee discusses policy issues related to borders-related planning from three perspectives: interregional, binational, and tribal. In 2005, the SCTCA joined the Borders Committee as an intertribal council of governments to engage on tribal planning issues with other neighboring councils of government, including Imperial Valley, Riverside, and Orange counties and the Republic of Mexico (as represented by the Consul General in San Diego). The SANDAG Tribal Liaison is a member of the Regional Planning Department, which provides technical support to the Borders Committee as well as the SANDAG Board of Directors and other Policy Advisory Committees.

- **SCTCA**: The SCTCA is a multiservice nonprofit corporation established in 1972 by a consortium of 24 federally recognized Indian tribes in Southern California. The primary mission of the SCTCA is to serve the health, welfare, safety, education, cultural, economic, and employment needs of its tribal members and descendants in the San Diego County urban areas. A board of directors composed of tribal chairpersons from each of its member tribes governs the SCTCA. As an intertribal council, the SCTCA serves as a forum for a wide variety of issues for its member tribes. The SCTCA provides a liaison to SANDAG to coordinate their collaborative activities.

---

19 The SCTCA provides support services to Native American residents throughout Southern California. The SCTCA Board of Directors is predominately composed of tribal governments in San Diego County but also includes several tribal governments from Riverside County.
Caltrans District 11: Caltrans was the first state agency in California to enact an agencywide policy on tribal consultation. The Native American Liaison Branch was established in 2002 to work with the 19 tribes in its jurisdiction (San Diego and Imperial counties). Its objectives are to establish close coordination and early project involvement with tribal governments to streamline funding, environmental, and project delivery processes in areas on or near reservations; ensure that Caltrans programs do not adversely affect important California Native American sites, traditions, or practices; encourage cooperation between other agencies and local tribal governments; assist with training and information dissemination; and consider Tribal Employment Rights Ordinance (TERO) from individual tribes for employment and contracting opportunities for Native Americans on Caltrans projects on or near reservations.

County of San Diego: The county’s Tribal Liaison was established in 2001. Liaison responsibilities include participating in tribal-related regional land use and transportation planning; economic and services forecasting, funding, and development activities; assisting tribes with permitting and other issues; identifying and resolving issues related to impacts of tribal economic development projects on infrastructure and other county services in unincorporated areas; and providing support and tracking legislation and policy matters related to tribes for the county Board of Supervisors and the Chief Administrative Officer.

Policy Level
The regional government-to-government framework for working with tribal nations in the San Diego region has been strengthened during the last decade. Institutional trust has been built over time through a combination of policy dialogue and technical action, forming the foundation for communication, cooperation, and collaboration.

Periodic Summits
An overarching element of the government-to-government framework is having periodic summits between the boards of directors of the two principal intergovernmental agencies—SCTCA and SANDAG. Bringing together these two government agencies offers an opportunity for tribal and local elected officials from the region to engage in diplomatic conversations, identify issues of mutual concern, and develop priority actions that can be carried out through the partnership framework.
SCTCA Representation at SANDAG

One of the key issues raised by the tribal leaders at the inaugural 2006 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit (2006 Tribal Summit) was tribal representation on the SANDAG Board of Directors. The SANDAG Board of Directors and the tribal governments recognized the benefits to be gained by taking a cooperative approach to planning for an improved quality of life for the San Diego region. The leadership of SANDAG and the SCTCA had discussions over several months following the 2006 Tribal Summit regarding the development of a formula for tribal representation that would respect tribal sovereignty and involve tribal governments in policy decisions at SANDAG. It was agreed that the tribal leaders should be involved in SANDAG at a policy level, representing the intertribal council in the same way that other associations of governments are represented. The SCTCA and SANDAG signed a memorandum of understanding on January 26, 2007, memorializing the agreement to have representatives of the SCTCA join the SANDAG Board of Directors and Policy Advisory Committees, including the Transportation Committee, Regional Planning Committee, Borders Committee, and Public Safety Committee, as advisory members. Tribal leaders have been part of the regional decision-making process at a policy level, offering a tribal perspective to complex regional issues.

Mutual Exchange of Policy-Level Information

At the policy level, the representatives of the SCTCA sit on the SANDAG Board of Directors and various Policy Advisory Committees. However, the SCTCA also wanted to ensure that information on major SANDAG initiatives was shared with the entire tribal leadership. Liaison staff from the SCTCA and SANDAG work together to ensure that briefings on major agencywide initiatives are brought to the entire SCTCA Board of Directors to inform the tribal leadership and obtain feedback. Similarly, staff supports SCTCA representatives who bring tribal issues to the SANDAG Board of Directors and their respective Policy Advisory Committees. This creates a systematic, ongoing feedback loop to ensure that all tribal nations are involved in the process and have an opportunity to raise issues and provide feedback.

Technical Level

The other element of the government-to-government framework is a technical mechanism for pursuing collaborative action. Another key outcome of the 2006 Tribal Summit was the strategic creation of an ongoing forum for discussion on tribal transportation issues between the tribal nations and public agencies that influence tribal transportation.

Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues

The SCTCA and SANDAG boards of directors approved the charter (Attachment 1) for the Working Group in the summer of 2006. The Working Group reports to the Borders Committee, and all tribes in the San Diego region can be members (Attachment 2). At the request of the tribal nations, the Working Group has two co-
chairs, a tribal leader, and a SANDAG executive staff member. The Working Group is
staffed by SANDAG and meets quarterly, and tribal nations alternate hosting the
meetings at different reservations. Over the years, Barona, Campo, Jamul, Pala, Pauma,
Rincon, San Pasqual, Sycuan, and Viejas all have hosted the quarterly Working Group
meetings.

The purpose of the Working Group is to serve as a forum for tribal governments in the
San Diego region to discuss and coordinate transportation issues of mutual concern with
the relevant public planning agencies, including SANDAG, Caltrans, the County of
San Diego, and the transit operators. In partnership with the SCTCA, the Working Group
monitors and provides input on the implementation of the strategies and planning
activities related to transportation that were identified at the 2018 Tribal Summit.

Working Group responsibilities include reviewing current activities and plans being
implemented by SANDAG and the tribal governments in an effort to coordinate
programs, address issues of concern, and ensure that the needs and issues of tribal
governments are being incorporated into the regional transportation planning process.
The Working Group provides feedback and comments on current and planned activities
and technical advice on the implementation of these activities. The Working Group also
assists with the associated outreach to the tribal community on transportation issues of
regional significance.

Collaboration with Federal and State Agencies
The Working Group is an important forum for engaging federal and state agencies in
tribal transportation issues and ensuring effective information exchange, outreach for
funding opportunities, and technical support. The Caltrans Native American Liaison
Branch coordinates efforts with the Working Group, as does the National Indian Justice
Center. Recently, the FHWA engaged in a collaborative long-range transportation plan to
integrate the transportation needs of federal lands into the statewide and metropolitan
transportation planning process in California.

Collaborative Policy Area: Tribal Transportation
For the past decade, the principal focus of regional consultation and collaboration with
tribal nations has been tribal transportation. Since 2007, each update of the RTP has
considered, analyzed, and reprioritized issues and actions of mutual concern. Four
primary transportation-related policy areas were considered in the 2021 Regional Plan as
a result of the consultation process with tribal governments: roadway infrastructure,
funding, transit, and information sharing/data gathering. These policy areas are proposed
to continue as promising areas for future collaboration.
Progress in Tribal Transportation Planning

Through the Tribal Liaison Program, SANDAG dedicates significant resources to ensuring that tribal issues are considered in SANDAG plans, programs, and projects. Since 2006, effort has been made in all of the strategic areas identified at the 2006 Tribal Summit. Attachment 3 provides a summary table of those transportation strategic accomplishments.

Tribal transportation issues have been increasingly integrated into the development of the RTP. During the 2050 RTP (adopted in 2011), a tribal component was added to both the Project Evaluation Criteria and the Performance Measures. In addition, several tribes have submitted their own LRTPs as an appendix to the RTP. For the 2050 RTP, 8 tribes submitted their LRTPs, while for the 2015 Regional Plan, 12 tribes submitted their LRTPs. For the 2015 Regional Plan, tribes were also asked to highlight projects with regional significance, which were then mapped in the tribal consultation appendix of the 2015 Regional Plan to illustrate the connectivity issues.

Public transit has been another area of focus in the past. SANDAG was awarded a technical assistance grant from Caltrans in 2007, which was used to fund the Working Group’s first project: the Tribal Transit Feasibility Study. The project analyzed the connections between two transit districts and the tribal reservations and identified potential corridors and types of service. The study results served as the basis for an intertribal transportation agency—the Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA)—application for federal tribal transit set-aside FTA Section 5311c funding. One of the study recommendations was to operate an enhanced route in North County Transit District (NCTD), Route 388/389, running an express segment from Escondido on I-15 to SR 76. The RTA successfully competed for more than $2 million of these funds over several years, subsidizing NCTD operation of this enhanced route. In addition, the RTA received a $1.2 million capital improvement grant in FY 2009 under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 to construct a bus stop at the Park & Ride at I-15 and SR 76, as well as make enhancements to bus stops along NCTD bus routes (Routes 864, 888, 891, 892, and 894).

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is another strategic area that has been collaboratively pursued. For tribal nations with rural reservations, TDM offers a significant solution to mobility needs. There have been a number of collaborative projects over the years encouraging tribal enterprises to adopt TDM policies.

Although tribal gaming facilities are now major employers in the region, their involvement in the region’s commuter services program (iCommute) remains limited. Barona, Campo, Sycuan, and Viejas in the I-8 corridor have approximately 6,000 total employees. In the SR 76 corridor, Pala, Pauma, Rincon, and San Pasqual have almost

---

20 In 2005, Caltrans and SANDAG conducted an initial Tribal Transportation Needs Assessment to determine the overall status of tribal transportation planning and needs. For more information on this assessment, visit sandag.org/TribalTransportationAssessment.
21 Tribal Transit Feasibility Study: sandag.org/TribalTransitStudy.
22 For more information on the Reservation Transportation Authority Transportation Demand Management Study, visit sandag.org/RTATDMStudy.
5,000 combined employees. It is estimated that each gaming facility attracts a daily count of anywhere from 6,000 to 12,000 guests. The tribal governments invest extensively in the San Diego region. Statistics show that the Indian gaming industry purchases approximately $263 million in goods and services annually. Although many tribal members now live on the reservations, non-tribal employees travel from all over the region and other counties, including Riverside, Imperial, and Orange counties to gaming industry jobs on the reservations. These commutes would be considered “reverse” commutes as urban residents are traveling to rural employment opportunities.

Several years ago, SANDAG, the RTA, and the SCTCA collaborated on an assessment of the needs of tribal employers and developed a strategy to meet their needs. SANDAG then assisted the RTA in developing a business/marketing plan for establishing a tribal Transportation Management Association (TMA) that would collaborate with the SANDAG iCommut e program. The tribal TMA, a private, nonprofit, member-controlled organization, provided the institutional framework for the recommended TDM programs and services that were developed as a result of the study. Six tribal enterprises participated in the study and completed commute surveys in their facilities: Pala, Pauma, Rincon, Viejas, Sycuan, and Santa Ysabel. This transportation focus holds tremendous potential for future collaboration.

Lastly, the regular functioning of the Working Group has offered consistent benefits to tribal nations and other regional, state, and federal agencies. The Working Group has served as a forum for information sharing and technical assistance both regionally and at the state and federal levels. As an example, when the State of California began its listening sessions for its 2040 Statewide Plan, it used the regular meetings of the Working Group to engage tribal governments in the San Diego region in the process.

**Intraregional Tribal Transportation Strategy**

The 2015 Regional Plan focused primarily on transportation investments in the most urbanized areas, where there is existing and planned transportation infrastructure. At the same time, the transportation system must support the needs of federally recognized tribal nations whose reservations are in the sparsely populated eastern rural areas of the region. To identify and serve the transportation needs of the tribal communities most effectively, the 17 tribal nations in the region sought an opportunity to evaluate their mobility issues collectively in a regional context and determine collective priorities for further analysis.

A near-term action from the 2015 Regional Plan was developing an Intraregional Tribal Transportation Strategy (ITTS)\(^\text{23}\) by the tribal nations and other agencies that influence tribal transportation in the San Diego region. In 2015, SANDAG and the SCTCA successfully competed for a Caltrans Strategic Partnership Planning Grant to support this effort. The funding allowed SANDAG and the SCTCA to work together with the County of San Diego, NCTD, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), Caltrans, and the BIA to identify key

---

\(^\text{23}\) For more information on the Intraregional Tribal Transportation Strategy, visit sandag.org/ITTS or see Appendix EE.
multimodal transportation projects for improving tribal mobility while meeting regional, state, and federal goals. The recently completed ITTS included projects, criteria, cost estimates, potential partners, and funding opportunities.

Development of the ITTS was initiated in January 2016. The Working Group served as the Project Advisory Group. Key development milestones were shared with the SCTCA Board of Directors and the SANDAG Transportation Committee and Borders Committee. A Project Development Team composed of staff from SANDAG, the SCTCA, the County of San Diego, and Caltrans, and a representative from the Working Group led the project with consultant assistance. All 17 tribal nations in the San Diego region participated actively in the project. Please see Appendix EE: Intraregional Transportation Strategy for more details and the final publication.

**Tribal Corridors**
The 2015 Regional Plan developed a multimodal plan of improvements for the San Diego County region. Roadways included in the plan are shown below.

Many of the roadways highlighted in the 2015 Regional Plan were in urbanized areas due to the congestion concerns and population density of these areas. Tribal reservations are located in rural areas of the county, however, and transportation needs revolve primarily around issues such as safety, road maintenance, expansion of multimodal facilities, and design issues rather than capacity expansions. In an effort to address long-range tribal transportation issues, the key transportation corridors providing transportation into and out of the reservations were identified as follows:

- SR 76, which generally runs east-west in the northern area of the county
- SR 79, which generally runs north-south in the eastern half of the county
- I-8, which runs east-west in the southern area of the county and is subdivided into the I-8 east and I-8 west corridors; it should be noted that SR 67 projects have been included as part of the I-8 west corridor
- SR 94, which generally runs east-west in the southern area of the county

The ITTS describes these corridors and tribal transportation issues in these areas in greater detail. Please see Attachments 4a and 4b for maps of the corridors.

**Tribal Transportation Issues**
Tribal nations have unique transportation concerns. Many tribes are located in rural areas with small populations and lack funding resources to maintain existing roads and address needed improvements. In some cases, tribal roads are not built to the same standards as surrounding jurisdictions, causing transportation safety issues.

Tribal communities need road, bridge, and highway improvements to adequately connect their communities to other communities and to advance opportunities for economic, social, cultural, and community development. They also need better transit to and from
their communities to take advantage of job and education opportunities in surrounding communities. As new economic and community development ventures expand in tribal communities, transportation is becoming a major planning component for land use, mobility, and accessibility.

As detailed in the Caltrans Transportation Guide for Native Americans (March 2017), the current level of annual funding to California tribes from the TTP, the successor to the IRR program, is distributed to tribes via a complex TTP funding formula. This formula considers factors such as land base, road inventory, and population. But because California tribes are smaller in enrolled population and land base than many other tribes across the United States, California tribes have not received a proportion of TTP funds commensurate with their number of tribal governments, resulting in a lack of funding and consequent deterioration of critical tribal infrastructure.

In developing the ITTS, tribal representatives discussed possible goals/issues in transportation and their relative importance. The top goal was improving safety, followed closely by improving roadway conditions, enhancing economic vitality, and improving regional connectivity. Important considerations for transportation improvements, as indicated by tribal representatives in the San Diego region, are shown in Figure I.3.

Figure I.3: Relative Importance of Goal Areas for Transportation Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway condition</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic vitality</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional connectivity</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit mobility</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian mobility</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tribal Mobility Needs Assessment Survey 2017

Tribal Mobility Needs Assessment Survey
A key component of the ITTS was developing and administering the Tribal Mobility Needs Assessment Survey. One-on-one meetings were conducted with tribal representatives over several months to discuss the survey questions and responses. The survey was tailored to each tribal nation by including a list and maps of transportation projects that had previously received consideration. Through their survey responses, tribes provided essential project details, feedback on the transportation modes and priorities most important to their governments, and information regarding cultural resource awareness considerations.

This survey was conducted to determine the specific transportation needs for each tribal community to identify opportunities for partnerships and further coordination on funding opportunities. Approximately 126 transportation improvement projects were identified.
through the survey process. These projects include improvements to roadways and intersections, safety, and travel demand management (transit, bicycle, and pedestrian).

To identify opportunities for potential coordination, projects were summarized by region, corridor, tribal nation, and project type. The project inventory then was mapped and entered into a database with information such as the project description and planning-level cost estimate. See the ITTS for the project lists and the database for additional information.

**Figure I.4: Project Screening Tool**

An interactive project screening tool was developed to facilitate the clustering of projects with potential regional partners and funding opportunities. The tool allows for easy sorting of the 126 identified projects across approximately 45 data fields, including cost estimates, potential funding sources, and project readiness. With the tool, a user can easily enter a query to find projects that may align with potential funding opportunities, partnerships, or cost goals.

The ability to cluster and rapidly sort through projects will facilitate implementing the ITTS. New funding opportunities and potential partnerships often emerge rapidly. With governments becoming increasingly budget-conscious, competition for external dollars is increasingly tough. The project screening tool allows users to quickly identify projects that could be eligible for these emerging opportunities and focus more time on the application process and less time on the project identification. The tool will continue to be updated and used by the Working Group.

**Strategies and Actions**

The ITTS brought together the region’s tribal nations to work collectively with key agencies—including Caltrans, the County of San Diego, SANDAG, and the transit agencies—to develop this ITTS, which will serve as a guide for addressing the transportation needs of tribal communities. The ITTS identified four key strategic objectives to guide future tribal transportation solutions:
• Support partnerships/collaboration
• Coordinate collaborative planning
• Share data supporting tribal transportation
• Create opportunities to fund priority tribal transportation projects and programs

These strategic objectives provide a flexible structure for continued collaboration on tribal multimodal access to the transportation system and create an effective framework for near-term and future efforts. The ITTS provides short-term and ongoing actions for the Working Group to consider as it moves forward in the transportation planning process.

The recommendations of the ITTS informed the development of the 2021 Regional Plan. Projects identified by the tribes in the ITTS project inventory were analyzed for potential inclusion in the network. The projects of regional significance identified in the ITTS project inventory were matched with the network improvements in the Rural Corridor in the 2021 Regional Plan.

**Collaborative Emerging Regional Policy Areas**

The 2021 Regional Plan is comprehensive and involves policy issues beyond transportation. Consequently, it presents an opportunity for tribal nations and SANDAG to identify non-transportation areas of mutual concern and develop collaborative strategies for addressing these issues.

The tribal nations have identified four such policy areas in which the interests of the tribes and SANDAG intersect: cultural resources, habitat conservation, economic development, and energy. A fifth topic, emergency preparedness and management, was raised at several previous San Diego Regional Tribal Summits, after which the county and tribal nations developed and implemented a range of agreed-upon recommendations. In the course of discussions preceding the 2018 Tribal Summit, the related topic of public safety was introduced. The legislative context, background, tribal initiatives, and ideas for potential collaboration were presented for each policy area and are summarized below.

**Cultural Resources**

Because many California tribes were moved off of their traditional lands or had their land base significantly reduced in size, it is often the case that lands of cultural significance to the tribes exist outside the boundaries of the reservation. This is a frequent source of conflict between tribes and developers and land-use authorities that propose development on land that the tribe does not control, but that nonetheless retains cultural or religious significance. These conflicts can be compounded when coastal communities lack an understanding of the coastal history of many of the tribes.

Modern-day reservation lands represent a small fraction of the traditional lands under the direct authority of the tribal nations. Indirectly, through federal and state law, tribal nations continue to play an extensive role in assessing the impacts of development on cultural and biological resources, and the protection or disposition of human remains and religious
items. For local governments and businesses, however, not understanding these roles and authorities can result in significant conflict and, at times, added costs to proposed developments. For tribal nations, the lack of early involvement in the process often makes it very difficult to define a course of action that minimizes impacts to all parties.

**Legislative Context**

California and federal legislation address tribal cultural resources to some extent through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). California also provides specific protections through the Native American Historic Resource Protection Act (Public Resources Code, Div. 5, Ch. 1.76). The repatriation of human remains is primarily governed through the federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.).

- **NEPA:** NEPA requires federal agencies to consider the environmental impacts of their proposed actions and analyze reasonable alternatives to those actions. Tribal interests are addressed in conjunction with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, which requires that tribes be a part of the consultation process when development may affect their cultural or sacred sites.

- **NAGPRA:** Agencies and institutions that receive federal funding are required to comply with the NAGPRA. This relates to the disposition of Native American cultural items and human remains under the control of federal agencies and institutions that receive federal funding (i.e., museums) as well as the ownership or control of cultural items and human remains discovered on federal or tribal lands after November 16, 1990.

- **CEQA:** CEQA requires state and local agencies in California to identify the significant environmental impacts of their actions, including impacts to cultural resources, and avoid or mitigate those impacts if feasible.

- **Native American Historic Resource Protection Act:** This state act makes it a crime to unlawfully and maliciously excavate upon, remove, destroy, injure, or deface a Native American historic, cultural, or sacred site that is listed or may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.

- **California Senate Bill 18 (Burton, 2004) (SB 18) (Tribal Consultation):** This state law went into effect in March 2005 and requires cities and counties in California to conduct consultations with tribal nations in their region when updating any element of a general plan. These consultations are for preserving or mitigating impacts to Native American historic, cultural, or sacred sites, features, and objects located within the city or county.
• **California Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, 2016) (AB 52):** To preserve culturally significant and sacred lands, tribes worked with Assembly Member Mike Gatto to pass an amendment to CEQA that establishes a new category, “tribal cultural resources,” and requires consideration of tribal cultural value in addition to scientific and archeological value. A tribe must request, in writing, to be notified by lead agencies through formal notification of proposed projects in the geographic area with which the tribe is traditionally and culturally affiliated. AB 52 recognizes California Native Americans as potential experts with regard to tribal histories and practices.

• **Co-management of natural lands (2020):** On September 25, 2020, the governor released a Statement of Administration Policy on Native American Ancestral Lands to encourage state entities to seek opportunities to support California tribes’ co-management of and access to natural lands that are within a California tribe’s ancestral land and under the ownership or control of the State of California. The statement also encourages state entities to work cooperatively with California tribes that are interested in acquiring natural lands in excess of state needs.

**Background**

Although NEPA and CEQA have consultation requirements, tribal nations have reported that the consultation on specific projects often comes too late in the process, when decisions have already been made or development is underway. In addition, tribes have reported that consultation does not necessarily result in the avoidance of impacts to culturally significant or sacred land. On the other hand, agencies carrying out projects have followed procedures outlined in SB 18 and have sometimes found tribes nonresponsive. There have been occasions when tribes contact the agency much later in the process even though they were contacted earlier within the specified timeframe. These problems will continue to grow absent cooperative efforts at increasing the response capacity of the tribal nations.

**Tribal Initiatives**

• **Tribal Historic Preservation Offices:** Several reservations have developed or are developing Tribal Historic Preservation Offices to address the protection of cultural resources both on reservation and within their traditional cultural region. These offices provide local control and expertise in ensuring that tribal concerns are addressed and reduce reliance on the State Historic Preservation Office.

• **Intertribal organizations:** There are also local intertribal organizations such as the Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee, the Kumeyaay Historic Preservation Council, and the Luiseño Cultural Preservation Group. All of these organizations get involved in land use/development issues in the region. Often they advocate on behalf of member tribes to agencies involved in projects that may have impacts on cultural resources.
• **Conservation easements:** One method of conserving cultural resources is the use of private property conservation easements under state law. One organization, the Kumeyaay Diegueño Land Conservancy, was created as a 501(c)(3) under California law specifically for that purpose. State law conservation easements avoid the lengthy and sometimes expensive process of protecting lands through the federal fee-to-trust process.

• **Tribal museums/storage facilities:** A persistent problem with tribal acquisitions is the lack of adequate storage facilities for items that can be fragile or susceptible to deterioration. To address this problem, storage facilities on reservations are being created, usually in conjunction with tribal museums or cultural departments. These facilities are supplemented by working arrangements with existing archive facilities to allow access to items for educational or cultural purposes. However, tribal storage capacity remains inadequate, and most do not meet the national repository standards.

• **Tribal cultural resource monitors:** Under both federal and California actions, monitors are often hired to oversee construction and ensure that identified cultural resources are protected by alerting the project developer to resources discovered in the construction process. The high variability in the skill levels of monitors has been an issue of concern for many in the tribal community. Many tribal communities are endeavoring to define a baseline monitoring skill set and thereby aid in providing a reliable pool of monitors for off-reservation projects.

**Habitat Conservation**

The area of habitat conservation provides a number of opportunities for collaboration, including creating frameworks for addressing environmental concerns such as stormwater runoff management, air quality monitoring, and solid waste management. There are also opportunities for collaborating on the regional Multiple Species Conservation Program and other habitat conservation programs. Traditional land-management techniques are still relevant and are adaptable to many present-day ecosystems. Tribal harvest techniques, fire management, water management, and plant utilization are all topics studied and, at times, implemented in many areas of the state.

**Legislative Context**

Habitat conservation is important to both tribes and local jurisdictions in the San Diego region. However, a lack of information sharing and coordination has created some challenges. Lack of tribal consultation in the planning process can exacerbate situations where programs and legislation fail to include or protect tribal interests. Some examples of these legislative gaps are as follows.
• **The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act** was implemented in 2016 to provide a framework for local and regional agencies to provide sustainable groundwater management for a groundwater basin or sub-basin. Several tribes have participated in ongoing outreach efforts by the state as they move forward with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. Many concerns regarding the methodologies of defining basins and the potential of impacts to long-term planning on reservation lands have been brought forward in early discussions.

• **The Multiple Species Conservation Plan** and **the Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan** were created to preserve the region’s distinct native habitats and wildlife for future generations. These regional conservation efforts are intended to work across political boundaries, protect watersheds and water quality, and ensure compliance with federal and state endangered species acts. Tribal nations have expressed several concerns, including the lack of inclusion of tribal boundaries, the failure to actively involve tribal land managers in watershed protection, and agency failures to incorporate tribal nations' lists of important species and habitats of cultural significance into either the Multiple Species Conservation Plan or the Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan.

• **The TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP):** The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, approved by the voters in November 2004, includes the EMP, which provides funding to mitigate habitat impacts from regional and local transportation projects and provides funding for regional land management and biological monitoring. The EMP is a unique component of the TransNet Extension Ordinance in that it goes beyond traditional mitigation for transportation projects by including a funding allocation for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities to help implement the regional habitat conservation plans. This funding allocation is tied to mitigation requirements and the environmental clearance approval process for projects outlined in the RTP. Each year, the SANDAG Board of Directors allocates $4 million toward the implementation of regional land management and biological monitoring pursuant to a memorandum of agreement with state and federal agencies on the implementation of the EMP. Tribal governments are eligible to apply for land-management and monitoring funds, although few have. It should be noted, though, that some grants to other organizations have benefitted the tribes. An example is a grant to California Wildlife Services to control a feral pig population that was affecting unincorporated areas, including several tribal reservations.

• **Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)** is an initiative aimed at developing long-term water supply reliability, improving water quality, and protecting natural resources. The statewide IRWM program is supported by bond funding provided by the California Department of Water Resources to fund competitive grants for projects that improve water resources management. The IRWM program began in 2005 as an interdisciplinary effort by water retailers, wastewater agencies, stormwater and flood managers, watershed groups, the business community, tribes, agriculture, and nonprofit stakeholders to improve water resources planning in the San Diego IRWM region.
Background
Tribes are invested in environmental and habitat conservation, but they are often not included in planning efforts. Tribal concerns, values, and impacts are not broadly known. While most conservation planning is done from a species and biological perspective, tribal conservation planning comes from a cultural perspective. Certain plants and animals have great cultural significance to local tribes but do not necessarily fit the definition of an endangered species.

Positive efforts toward the inclusion of tribal conservation values have resulted from SB 18, which requires local jurisdictions to consult with tribes when amending their general plans. The challenge for tribes is that consultation is an unfunded mandate. Small, non-gaming tribes often cannot afford to spend limited resources and staff time on a consultation process.

Tribal Initiatives
Each tribe has its own habitat-conservation concerns based on where its land is located and what kind of development plans the tribe has in place. Some tribal lands come into contact with larger municipalities more than others do, in which case the considerations become more complex. Some examples of projects with the tribes include creek realignment, wetlands restoration projects, habitat restoration along San Luis Rey and Trujillo Creek, and oak tree monitoring partnerships with the California Native Plant Society.

- **Tribal Environmental Protection Agency offices:** Most of the tribal nations of the San Diego region have an environmental office or department in place. They provide a broad range of programs, including environmental education, drinking water oversight, surface water pollution control, solid waste management, air quality monitoring, and more. Many tribes have incorporated water conservation into their economic development. These tribes have included the use of reclaimed water in facilities and for landscape, enhanced recharge through wetlands development, native plant nurseries, and landscaping.

- **Intertribal efforts:** Along with individual tribal projects, there also are intertribal efforts such as the Kumeyaay Diegueño Land Conservancy (KDLC). The KDLC is a collaborative effort among ten of the Kumeyaay nations. Its mission is to protect and preserve former use areas and sacred sites and work collaboratively with entities with similar goals and ambitions. The KDLC currently owns or directly manages over 600 acres and has ongoing relationships to support conservation and management with California State Parks, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. KDLC also is working with other land trust organizations to co-manage thousands of additional acres.

- **The Native American Environmental Protection Coalition (NAEPC)** is a tribally led organization that provides technical assistance, environmental education, professional training, information networking, and intertribal coordination. Established in 1997 and designated a 501(c)(3) nonprofit in 2006, the NAEPC currently counts 23 Southern California tribes as members.
Economic Development
Tribal economic development has a complicated history rooted in many layers of past government policies of assimilation and political and cultural termination. In addition, tribal leaders note there are often misperceptions of tribal business enterprises as “taking” from the off-reservation economy.

Legislative Context
Tribal economic development is complex because laws apply differently to tribal governments than they do to states, counties, and cities. The laws regarding taxation create the greatest level of confusion. Tribal nations do not have the authority to displace taxing of reservation property and commerce by the state and county, effectively depriving tribes of the ability to take advantage of the tax incentives that federal, state, and local governments use to support local investment.

Background
A common misconception is that all tribes have gaming facilities and that all tribal members are directly benefitting as a result of gaming. In fact, less than 50% of tribes have gaming facilities, and of those tribes, only a small percentage are making enough money to provide regular income for tribal members. Some tribes are successful and are able to support the tribal members financially, some barely break even, and some fail altogether, leaving tribes in debt. In the San Diego region, nine tribes have gaming facilities. While gaming has helped many San Diego tribes, it comes with no guarantees and some substantial risks. As a result, most local tribes are working to diversify their economic development opportunities.

Economic development beyond gaming is subject to many constraints. The issues of remote locations and lack of access to capital and infrastructure are compounded by the tribes’ limited ability to fully use the tax base of reservation lands. Property, sales, possessory interest, and income taxes from businesses on reservation lands are diverted from the reservation economy with little or no consideration for government services provided by the tribal nation, which places tribal economies at a competitive disadvantage when pursuing economic development outside of the gaming industry.

An added burden can sometimes be the clash between tribes and local governments with respect to differing views on long-term planning, as well as mistrust over tribal regulations and enforcement. This can result in lengthy and costly legal fights.

In 2012, the U.S. government enacted the Helping Expedite and Advance Responsible Tribal Homeownership (HEARTH) Act amendments to the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act. The HEARTH Act helps promote economic growth and job creation on tribal lands by significantly restructuring the lease approval process. Ewiiaapaayp and Rincon are the first two tribes in San Diego County to receive approval of their regulations under the HEARTH Act.

Tribal Initiatives
Each local tribe has its own plan for economic development and diversification. Many markets are being explored, such as renewable energy, ecotourism, waste management,
recreational facilities, and more for essentially state-run enterprises. Some tribes choose to run their own businesses, while others select contractors to operate their enterprises. Some tribal business ventures have been off reservation, such as purchases of small businesses, historic buildings, golf courses, and land. There are also instances where tribes support local jurisdictions through a contracting process, such as fire protection.

There also are tribal businesses on tribal land. The businesses tribes choose to develop often are dependent on the location of the reservation and availability of space. Some examples of businesses that local tribes run, aside from gaming facilities, include motocross racetracks, campgrounds, wind/energy projects, gas stations, restaurants, shopping centers, and ballparks. Tribes bring outside businesses onto their land under varied business agreements. Private-sector investment in tribal communities is limited due to the present tax structure, which can make some types of tax-based private-sector investment so problematic as to be infeasible.

Since the 2010 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit, the issue of tribal employment has been increasingly discussed. Transportation projects with federal funding must do their due diligence and make every effort to hire tribal members from reservations within the area of influence of the project. Many tribes have a TERO. There has been an extensive effort by the U.S. Department of Labor to educate contractors doing business with the federal government on this requirement. In 2012, the SCTCA sponsored the development of Nativehire, a program to address the need for matching qualified tribal members with employment opportunities. Nativehire is a nonprofit organization owned and operated by the SCTCA. Nativehire.org is a job search engine developed to meet the unique employment needs of Native Americans.

Energy

Southern California tribes continue to explore the potential for energy development on their lands. Tribes have been working at the state and federal levels to promote renewable energy opportunities for reservations. The federal government has sought to streamline the review process for energy development through Tribal Energy Resource Agreements (TERAs) under the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005 (Energy Act 2005), which was in turn augmented by the HEARTH Act of 2012. With the passage of the Energy Act 2005, tribal nations can develop energy plans without waiting for the approval of the secretary of the interior. During the past few years, SANDAG has updated the Regional Energy Strategy and prepared a Climate Action Strategy for the San Diego region. An open topic for discussion is how tribal nations and SANDAG could work together to address energy reliability and independence and the development of clean, alternative, and reliable energy resources.

There are also issues with tribes not having the same standing as local governments under the state regulations for the purposes of maximizing the benefits of renewable energy. For example, a county can “net meter” from a renewable energy source that is on another county property far from the meter. Tribal governments cannot do that.
Legislative Context
Tribal governments across the country have been developing energy projects with varying difficulties and degrees of success. With the federal Energy Act 2005 came the ability to establish TERAs, under which a tribe may enter into leases and business agreements for the purpose of energy resource development on tribal land. Leases and business agreements may encompass exploration, extraction, or other development activities related to energy mineral resources located on tribal land. These activities may include marketing or distribution; construction or operation of an electric generation, transmission, or distribution facility located on tribal land; and construction or operation of a processing or refining facility for energy resources developed on tribal land. Under an approved TERA, a tribe may grant rights-of-way for purposes of:

- energy resource development on tribal land;
- construction or operation of a pipeline;
- an electrical transmission or distribution line serving an electric generation, transmission, or distribution facility located on tribal land; or
- a facility located on tribal land that processes or refines energy resources developed on tribal land.

Background
Some Southern California tribes have expressed interest in energy development, particularly in alternative or green energy development. Some tribes have already established wind and solar energy projects as commercial enterprises or net-meter projects. Tribal governments have identified several obstacles to developing tribal energy projects, including funding, land availability, area, and location. One challenge is that the funding resources available to assist tribes are usually for feasibility studies rather than the implementation of operations. Another challenge is that smaller projects often are too small and costly to be effective. Wind farms, solar farms, and other large projects often are difficult to achieve because of the large amount of land required. Many reservations are in remote locations and are not close enough to be part of the local municipal electric grid. As such, these tribal areas often are run entirely on propane- or diesel-powered generators. These reservations tend to rely on well water, which requires the use of electric pumps.

Tribal meetings identified several challenges to energy implementation, including:

- Difficulties in establishing partnerships across jurisdictional boundaries, and in particular, the limited ability of tribes to work directly as suppliers to federal jurisdictions.
- Lack of consideration for the unique aspects of reservation jurisdictions in using community renewables and governmental use in net metering.
- Difficulties in using renewable energy incentive programs that are tax credit based.
- Impacts to tribal communities from the depowering of the rural electric transmission lines during high winds.
Tribal Initiatives
Tribes in the San Diego region are at various stages of energy development. Campo and Rincon were two of the first tribes to pursue large-scale energy projects. Many other tribes have incorporated renewable energy into the local tribal portfolio. Many casinos have begun to provide power stations for electric vehicles, although this effort has been primarily offered as a service to casino patrons. In sum, the opportunity to expand and incorporate the reservations in the regional planning for power stations has not been fully realized.

Emergency Preparedness and Climate Resilience
As with previous meetings, the 2018 Tribal Summit identified the need to coordinate on emergency preparedness. Interagency coordination, community resilience, training, planning, and resource management are all key issue areas in which tribal nations and the local jurisdictions can and have collaborated. Some of these issue areas could be extended to regional initiatives.

Legislative Context
At the federal level, the passage of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000) (Public Law 106-390) provides the legal basis for Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mitigation planning requirements for state, local, and tribal governments as a condition of mitigation grant assistance. The DMA 2000 repealed prior mitigation planning statutes and replaced them with a new set of requirements that emphasizes the need for state, local, and tribal governments to closely coordinate mitigation planning and implementation efforts. As an incentive to strengthen coordination activities, the DMA 2000 made up to 7% of Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funds available to a state for the development of collaborative mitigation plans. FEMA further updated its implementation rules to streamline the process for mitigation planning in 2016. Most tribes have hazard mitigation plans in place and maintain a current emergency response plan. Many of the tribes have entered into agreements with the Hazardous Materials Response Team to respond to hazardous materials incidents on reservations. This program has worked well in providing tribes with access to the expertise of the local Hazardous Materials Response Team at a reasonable rate.

At the state level, California Assembly Bill 307 (Nestande, 2011) went into effect on January 1, 2012, and created a state and local mechanism for federally recognized tribes to be considered public agencies for purposes of entering into Joint Power Agreements (JPAs). On October 11, 2012, the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians entered into a JPA with the Heartland Fire Authority (HFA), thereby becoming one of the first tribal governments to enter into a JPA in the state. The JPA grants the Viejas tribe full member status to the HFA and provides access to its training facility and full voting rights over operational and budgetary issues involving the existing and new facilities.

At the regional level, the Unified Disaster Council (UDC) is the governing body of the Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization. The UDC is comprised of the San Diego County Board of Supervisors—which serves as chair of the UDC—and
representatives from the 18 incorporated cities. The County of San Diego Office of Emergency Services (OES) serves as staff to the UDC. In this capacity, the OES is a liaison between the incorporated cities, the California Emergency Management Agency, and FEMA, as well as nongovernmental agencies such as the American Red Cross.

**Background**
Disasters know no boundaries, and the regional risks of catastrophic wildfire, earthquakes, and severe weather are shared. Mutual aid agreements have been a part of the reservation fire departments since their inception. The ability to cross political boundaries to attack a fire early has been key to the preservation of life and property for many years. These early agreements have been built on in recent years to include JPAs. Tribes and tribal emergency service personnel have been very active in managing intertribal efforts and coordinating with local, state, federal, and private-sector partners.

Collectively, the 11 tribal fire departments represent a tremendous resource to the region. For many of the departments, the bulk of calls are off reservation. Reservations are the training grounds for many of the first responders who go on to work in the urban fire departments after gaining experience with the tribes. This is all done without the traditional tax-based generated revenues enjoyed by most jurisdictions. In fact, some private inholdings are assessed a fire protection fee that goes to the off-reservation jurisdiction even though the property relies almost exclusively on the reservation for fire protection.

**Tribal Initiatives**
The Inter Tribal Long Term Recovery Foundation (ITLTRF) was formed in the aftermath of San Diego County's catastrophic wildfires in 2007. Seven tribal nations came together to ensure that the unmet needs of the American Indian community would be addressed during the long-term recovery. The recovery workgroup formed a 501(c)(3) with a mission to help people and tribal nations affected by wildfires and other disasters recover and become more resilient. Since its inception, ITLTRF membership has more than doubled. With 15 tribal nations serving on its Executive Board of Directors, the ITLTRF is a regional and national model for intertribal cooperation, philanthropy, community preparedness, and recovery. The ITLTRF recently revised its charter to expand its membership statewide and is in the process of expanding nationally. Through corporate and government grants obtained by the ITLTRF, the ITLTRF has helped its member tribes and partners secure more than $1 million in equipment, staffing, and community resources. The executive officers are the heart of the organization, and their passion to serve their communities is anchored in their individual and collective memories of their tribal communities’ experience surviving wildfires and floods. The vision of the ITLTRF is to gather and share resources for the American Indian people to create resilient communities.

**Public Safety**
Public safety is a primary concern on all reservations. As the reservations begin developing their economies, increasing resident populations, as well as visitors, bring corresponding increases in crimes against people and property. Prior to the 1950s, law
enforcement was primarily under the authority of the federal government. In many tribal communities, local public safety was enforced through tribal leaders under tribal traditions. With the passage of Public Law 83-280 (PL 280) in 1953, a tremendous shift occurred in the legal authority between tribal, federal, and some state governments, including California.

**Legislative Context**

**PL 280:** In 1953, PL 280 was passed by the federal government as a part of a policy of termination of Indian tribes in the 1950s and early 1960s. Even though terminations were ended and ultimately reversed for many tribes in California, PL 280 continues to be applied. This has resulted in California tribes lagging further and further behind tribes in other states, where tribes have been able to improve and expand their capabilities. PL 280 on affected reservations did the following: a) transferred most federal Indian country criminal jurisdiction to the state; b) authorized state criminal jurisdiction under a broader scope than previously applied under federal jurisdiction; c) opened state civil courts to suits against Indians; d) after 1968, authorized retrocession upon the Department of the Interior’s acceptance of a state’s request; and e) pursuant to the Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA), authorized tribes to request that federal authorities reassume concurrent federal jurisdiction.24

**Criminal Justice (CJ) Clearinghouse/Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS):** At the regional level, the SANDAG Applied Research Division, in conjunction with ARJIS, created the CJ Clearinghouse, which provides timely, accurate, and objective information so that policymakers can make informed decisions about resource allocation to prevent, reduce, and control crime. ARJIS is an essential source of regional information on public safety, health, substance abuse, crime and arrest, and crime-prevention strategies. The CJ Clearinghouse was initiated as a pilot program in 1977 with state funds. After the pilot program ended in the mid-1990s, the SANDAG Board of Directors saw the value of continuing to fund the CJ Clearinghouse through an annual member assessment from all of the region’s cities and the county. Over time, the primary functions of the CJ research at SANDAG have evolved to include: (1) compiling crime and arrest trends; (2) serving as a resource for information about crime and justice for member agencies and provider agencies (justice and social services); (3) conducting independent and objective assessments of specific programs geared to address crime and social issues through additional dedicated funding; and (4) providing staff support to the Public Safety Committee. In recent years, Sycuan joined ARJIS as the first tribal government to become a member.

**Background**

PL 280 authorizes state criminal jurisdiction and opened state civil courts to suits against Indians. It has often been misconstrued, and it is important to note what it did not do. It did not terminate tribes nor release the trust status of tribal land. It did not make state regulations applicable to American Indians, nor did it give the states taxing authority over tribes. PL 280 did not make county or city laws applicable to tribes. Neither did PL 280

---

24 Tribal Court Clearinghouse – A project of the Tribal Law and Policy Institute. For more information, visit tribal-institute.org/lists/pl280.htm.
abrogate the tribes’ federally protected hunting and fishing rights, nor eliminate the tribes’ civil and criminal jurisdictions.

Further, there are provisions for tribes to retrocede from the TLOA upon a state request accepted by the Department of the Interior. There is also a provision under the TLOA for tribes to request that federal authorities reassume concurrent federal jurisdiction.

With the withdrawal of federal support for local law enforcement, tribal nations have, in many cases, become dependent on the local county law enforcement for services. Efforts to increase the local role in law enforcement have met resistance as tribes have pushed for co-licensing or improved response. There is little support on the state level for tribes to retrocede from the TLOA. According to tribal leaders, county law enforcement has generally been reluctant to enforce tribal laws.

**Tribal Initiatives**

**Intertribal Court of Southern California:** The Intertribal Court of Southern California originated in 2002 when the SCTCA received a U.S. Department of Justice grant. The court began operations in August 2006. Each tribe determines which kinds of cases it will authorize the court to hear. Currently, the court hears a wide variety of cases, including peace and security code violations, environmental issues, conservator issues, contracts, tort claims, family law (including Indian Child Welfare Act cases), evictions, enrollment, exclusions, and more. The court hears all evictions for the All Mission Indian Housing Authority and handles cases for several tribes not formally part of the tribal court consortium on a case-by-case basis.

**Federal licensing:** Several tribes in San Diego County have successfully pursued a federal licensing program for their tribal police allowing the right to investigate and enforce numerous federal laws on tribal lands.

**2018 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit**

The 2021 Regional Plan serves as the long-term planning framework for the San Diego region. It provides a broad context in which local and regional decisions can be made that move the region toward a sustainable future—a future with more choices and opportunities for all residents of the region. In addition to SANDAG, many agencies in the region are responsible for helping to implement the 2021 Regional Plan. As domestic sovereign nations and neighbors within the region, tribes are part of this landscape and are critical partners in developing this future vision.

The 2018 Tribal Summit was held on April 13, 2018, and was hosted by the Pala Band of Mission Indians. The 2018 Tribal Summit was the result of collaboration between SANDAG and the SCTCA. The purpose was to bring together elected leaders from the 19 local governments who make up the SANDAG Board of Directors and the 17 federally recognized tribal governments in the San Diego region to discuss policy issues of mutual
interest related to transportation and regional planning. The goal was to identify priority actions that could be addressed through continued collaboration and coordination and integrate them into the 2021 Regional Plan. For a complete description of the event, see the 2018 Tribal Summit Proceedings.
The one-day forum was opened by then SANDAG Board of Directors Chair Terry Sinnott of Del Mar and SCTCA Board of Directors Chair Robert Smith of the Pala Band of Mission Indians and was attended by more than 80 participants, including the boards of directors of SANDAG and the SCTCA, as well as SANDAG advisory members such as Caltrans, MTS, NCTD, and the San Diego County Water Authority. In addition, representatives from other agencies participated, including the California State Assembly, the governor’s office, the office of Senator Dianne Feinstein, the San Diego County Sheriff’s Department, and the Southern California Association of Governments.

In his keynote speech, then California Assembly Member Todd Gloria brought a unique perspective to the importance of tribal engagement in transportation and regional planning. As an active member of an Alaskan tribe, Assembly Member Gloria spoke to the blessings and challenges tribes have in developing their nations, diversifying their economies, and defending their sovereignty, while also noting that many of these tribal challenges are shared by local jurisdictions in planning for the future regarding transportation. He added that although he has tremendous respect for sovereignty and will staunchly defend it, tribes are not isolated entities, and all jurisdictions are interdependent. Assembly Member Gloria challenged the group to think of the 2021 Regional Plan as reflecting the needs, wants, and desires of the entire region, not just certain jurisdictions. In his closing remarks, he stated his hope is that local elected officials can develop an authentic, durable relationship with tribal counterparts that will benefit everyone.

SANDAG staff presented an overview of the outcomes and collaborative actions taken at the San Diego Regional Tribal Summits conducted by the SCTCA and SANDAG in 2002, 2006, 2010, and 2014. Facilitator Adam Geisler, a member of the La Jolla Band of Luiseño Indians, briefed the assembly on several topic areas to set the context for dialogue. The areas identified were transportation, habitat conservation, energy, cultural resources, public safety and emergency preparedness, and economic development. SCTCA and SANDAG board members and other participants were seated at round tables to review and prioritize possible collaborative actions and exchange thoughts on the identified policy areas.
Based on the dialogue at the 2018 Tribal Summit and follow-up discussions with the SANDAG and SCTCA boards of directors, the following strategies and actions were developed and approved for implementation in the 2021 Regional Plan. Table I.2 provides a framework for collaborative planning in both transportation and regional planning issues.
Table I.2: 2021 Regional Plan – Tribal Collaborative Strategic Objectives by Policy Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Area</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government-to-Government</td>
<td>• Share legislative agendas and explore opportunities to collaborate on the legislation of mutual interest that benefits the region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transportation                        | • Coordinate the incorporation of existing tribal LRTPs in the 2021 Regional Plan  
                                         • Implement the ITTS through the Working Group |
| Cultural Resources                    | • Collaborate on a way to provide information regarding the location of culturally significant resources without compromising the preservation of the resource  
                                         • Explore ways to collaborate in communicating information to local jurisdictions regarding legal requirements of tribal consultation such as SB 18 and AB 52 |
| Habitat Conservation                  | • Support the protection of habitat from cultural and environmental perspectives  
                                         • Explore opportunities to engage tribal nations in regional habitat conservation efforts  
                                         • Use SANDAG working groups as regional forums to bring tribes, local jurisdictions, resource agencies, and environmental stakeholders together for better collaboration and coordination |
| Energy                                | • Explore opportunities to engage tribal nations in regional energy planning coordination |
| Public Safety/Emergency Preparedness  | • Provide educational opportunities for local and state elected officials and emergency responders on PL 280  
                                         • Continue exploring opportunities for coordination and collaboration between the ITLTRF and other established emergency management organizations, based upon mutually agreed priorities  
                                         • Identify ways to craft policy and agreements concerning mutual aid opportunities in accordance with tribal public safety laws  
                                         • Expand efforts to plan, evaluate, and test joint exercises for emergency preparedness |
| Economic Development                  | • Seek funding and partnerships to develop economic impact analysis of tribal enterprises for the regional economy |
Consultation for the 2021 Regional Plan

SANDAG is developing a bold new vision for transportation in the San Diego region—one that will lead to a world-class transportation system and a more sustainable future. New investments in the regional transportation network will provide people with more travel choices while protecting the environment, creating healthy communities, and stimulating economic growth. In February 2019, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved an action plan that extended the development of a new vision for the 2021 Regional Plan to late 2021.

While work progressed to develop this new vision, SANDAG prepared a 2019 Federal Regional Transportation Plan (2019 Federal RTP) that complied with federal requirements for the development of regional transportation plans, retained air quality conformity approval from the U.S. Department of Transportation, and preserved funding for the region’s transportation investments. The tribal nations in the region through the SCTCA supported this action (Attachment 5).

The vision for the future of transportation in the San Diego region reimagines how people and goods move in the 21st century. SANDAG is applying key strategies, known as the 5 Big Moves, to envision a balanced transportation network that gets people where they need to go more quickly and easily, increases access to opportunity, and meets state greenhouse gas emissions mandates. The result is a comprehensive vision that leverages technology to create a safe, adaptable, and socially equitable transportation ecosystem that responds to the unique needs of the wonderfully diverse communities throughout our region. This vision provides a framework for the 2021 Regional Plan.

Essential to this vision was the incorporation of tribal transportation priorities in the design of the transportation network. A workshop was held in October 2019 with the tribal nations to discuss their issues and concerns to integrate the findings from the ITTS into the network. The focus of the workshop was to align the goals and objectives of the ITTS with the 5 Big Moves.

SANDAG is planning for a regional network of Complete Corridors on major roads and highways. The proposed network intertwines with the adopted regional bike network to create seamless connections within communities and across jurisdictions. Complete Corridors create a backbone for Flexible Fleets and Transit Leap services by combining infrastructure and technology solutions. Next OS will unify Complete Corridor management systems and complement the proposed infrastructure improvements to let
people choose the travel option that works best for them. The regional arterials network includes smart infrastructure and intersection improvements. The adopted regional bike network includes both on- and off-street improvements to create a safe and comfortable space for micromobility options such as walking, biking, and riding.

SANDAG staff analyzed the projects identified in the ITTS to ensure that any project with regional significance would be considered in the network. Rural corridor projects include infrastructure and technology improvements for enhanced safety and evacuation. The proposed rural corridors of the 2021 Regional Plan incorporate key projects identified by the tribes consistent with the vision in 5 Big Moves.

On July 1, 2020, the SCTCA and SANDAG signed an MOU to establish a coordinated effort to implement strategies born out of government-to-government dialogues and regional planning efforts. In particular, the resources provided through the MOU will allow the SCTCA to advance the ITTS, building capacity to prioritize and pursue transportation projects of interest to tribal nations as well as pursue the other policy areas of concern including cultural resource management, environmental preservation, energy, and economic development. In addition, as a diplomatic courtesy, several tribes have submitted their own tribal LRTP summaries for inclusion in the 2021 Regional Plan (Attachment 6) to highlight the connections between their own transportation plans and the region.

**Key Meetings and Workshops**

**February 19, 2019:** The new SANDAG Executive Director, Hasan Ikhrata, addressed the SCTCA and described the action to be discussed by the SANDAG Board of Directors on February 22, 2019.

**April 17, 2019:** The Working Group convened at the Pala Reservation to discuss both the 2021 Regional Plan and the 2019 Federal RTP.

**June 28, 2019:** The 2019 Tribal Symposium, a joint meeting between the SCTCA and the SANDAG Borders Committee, was held at SANDAG to discuss collaborative strategies for inclusion in both efforts.

**July 24, 2019:** The Working Group convened at the Viejas Reservation to review the draft network for the 2019 Federal RTP and discuss the next steps for the ITTS.

**August 20, 2019:** Executive Director Hasan Ikhrata presented the 2019 Federal RTP draft network to the SCTCA Board of Directors.
October 2, 2019: SANDAG held a workshop to determine how to incorporate the recommendations of the ITTS into the 5 Big Moves framework. Barona Band of Mission Indians hosted the workshop. This also served as a public hearing on the 2019 Federal RTP.

September 14, 2020: Executive Director Hasan Ikhrata and SANDAG staff presented the vision for the 2021 Regional Plan in a special virtual session of the Working Group.

November 20, 2020: The SCTCA and SANDAG Borders Committee convened the second annual Tribal Symposium to discuss policy issues of mutual concern including the work plan for the MOU for collaborative strategic implementation of the 2021 Regional Plan.

April 21, 2021: A virtual session of the Working Group was held to discuss the 2021 Regional Plan, including the details of the plan network and financing strategy.
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Appendix I Attachment 1:
Charter – Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues
CHARTER
Interagency Technical Working Group
on Tribal Transportation Issues

PURPOSE
The purpose of the Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues (Working Group) is to serve as a forum for tribal governments in the region to discuss and coordinate transportation issues of mutual concern with the various public planning agencies in the region, including SANDAG, Caltrans, the County of San Diego, and the transit operators. In partnership with the Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA), the Working Group will monitor and provide input on the implementation of the strategies and planning activities related to transportation mutually developed through the San Diego Regional Tribal Summit. There is currently no other working group that can serve this function.

LINE OF REPORTING
The Working Group reports to the Borders Committee and the Transportation Committee, which report to the Board of Directors on tribal-related transportation activities.

RESPONSIBILITIES
The Working Group responsibilities include reviewing current activities and plans being implemented by SANDAG and the tribal governments in an effort to coordinate programs, address issues of concern, and ensure that the needs and issues of tribal governments are being incorporated into the transportation planning process at the regional level. The Working Group will provide feedback and comments on current and planned activities and provide technical advice on the implementation of these activities. The Working Group also assists with the associated outreach to the tribal community on transportation issues of regional significance.

MEMBERSHIP
The voting membership of the Working Group shall be comprised of one representative from each of the federally recognized tribal governments and California tribes in San Diego County. These voting members shall be appointed by the leadership of their respective tribes for a term of one calendar year. Caltrans, the County of San Diego, the Reservation Transportation Authority, Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District shall each be entitled to appoint one advisory member of the working group. Each entity represented in the working group, whether voting or advisory, may additionally appoint an alternate representative to serve in the primary member’s absence. Any member who misses two meetings in a row or three meetings in a calendar year shall be removed and replaced by that member’s alternate, if any. Should a vacancy occur in the position of a primary or alternate member, a represented entity shall be entitled to appoint a replacement representative.
MEETING TIME AND LOCATION

The Working Group will meet quarterly as determined by the group. The location will rotate among tribal reservations, and, when deemed appropriate, at the SANDAG offices. Whenever possible, locations will alternate between southern and northern reservations to allow everyone to attend.

SELECTION OF THE CHAIR

The Working Group shall have two “Co-Chairs” – a Tribal Leader and a SANDAG Executive Team representative. In addition, the Working Group shall have a second Tribal Co-Chair, to serve in the capacity of Tribal “Vice-Chair,” in the event that the first Tribal Co-Chair is unavailable for the meeting.

The Tribal Co-Chairs will be elected by the voting members of the group every two years, and the representative from SANDAG’s Executive Team will be appointed by its Executive Director.

DURATION OF EXISTENCE

The Working Group will continue as long as the tribal governments and participating agencies determine that it serves as an effective means of communication and coordination, subject to annual review.
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Appendix I Attachment 3:  
2021 Transportation Strategies and Accomplishments
# Regional Tribal Transportation Collaborative Strategy Accomplishments
## Summary 2006–2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Area</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government-to-Government Framework</strong></td>
<td>Develop collaborative legislative agenda that benefits the region</td>
<td>Supported tribal efforts to pass Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Identify corridors critical to tribal reservations and coordinate the funding and implementation of relevant studies</td>
<td>Developed the Intraregional Tribal Transportation Strategy (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Identify critical regional arterials serving tribal nations which should be included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)</td>
<td>Developed the Intraregional Tribal Transportation Strategy (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Coordinate the incorporation of existing Tribal Transportation Plans (TTPs) into the current RTP</td>
<td>8 tribes submitted TTPs for 2050 RTP/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 tribes submitted for the 2015 Regional Plan (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit/Mobility</strong></td>
<td>Collaborate on the issue of reverse commuting for tribal enterprise employees and pursue funding opportunities</td>
<td>Collaborated on an assessment of the needs of tribal employees and developed a business/marketing plan for establishing a Tribal TMA (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate on the pursuit of funding opportunities to implement the recommendations from the Tribal Transit Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Assisted the Reservation Transportation Authority on development of proposal for the Federal Transit Administration Tribal Transit Program based on recommendations of the Tribal Transit Feasibility Study (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received $2.1 million in operating funds (annual grants of approximately $300,000–400,000) to enhance service of North County Transit District (NCTD) Route 388/389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Received $1.2 million capital improvement grant in FY 2009 under American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Constructed a bus stop at the Park &amp; Ride at Interstate 15 (I-15) and State Route 76 (SR 76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhancements to bus stops along bus routes 864, 888, 891, 892, and 894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit/Mobility</strong></td>
<td>Collaborate on the development of a Tribal Transportation Management Association for increased tribal participation in</td>
<td>Collaborated on a Tribal Transportation Demand Management Study with funding from Caltrans Environmental Justice Planning Grant to assess the needs of tribal employees and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Area</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs regionwide</td>
<td>develop a business/marketing plan for establishing a Tribal Transportation Management Association (TTMA) (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for pooling/leveraging transportation funding for mutually important projects</td>
<td>Collaborated on the update of tribal road inventories Many tribes increased their transportation funding from the IRR program (2007) IRR Program replaced by a new program called TTP (2008) • Funds from the Highway Account Trust Fund are allocated among the Tribes using a new statutory formula Received a grant from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Communities Putting Prevention to Work, also known as a “Healthy Communities” grant (2010) • La Jolla received $70,000 to develop a walkability study • Campo received $10,000 to design a community park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate and advocate for new transportation funding in the region, including transit and TDM</td>
<td>Implementation of tribal gaming mitigation agreements: Pala Band of Mission Indians (2008) • TDM program supported by SANDAG • Park &amp; Ride facility at the I-15/SR 76 junction • Support for an NCTD bus stop Pauma Band of Luiseño Indians (2008) • Fair share contributions for operational improvements on SR 76 East • Commitment to a specific goal of having 20 percent of their employees participate in carpools, vanpools, or other rideshare programs Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation (2012) • Traffic improvements related to the Fee to Trust application¹ La Jolla Band of Luiseño Indians (2016) • Successfully competed for statewide Active Transportation grant for the reservation – $4.1 million California Highway Safety Program – Tribal set aside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The process by which a tribe petitions the Department of the Interior to absorb County land owned by the tribe to be converted to reservation land held in trust thereby expanding the reservation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Area</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify mechanisms for providing ongoing funding for new or additional</td>
<td>• Barona, San Pasqual, and Viejas received funding for projects identified in the ITTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transportation programs, including transit services and TDM</td>
<td>Developed the Intraregional Tribal Transportation Strategy (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agencies will provide ongoing training to tribal governments on funding</td>
<td>Worked closely with the Tribal Transportation Assistance Program (TTAP) managed by National Indian Justice Center (NIJC):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>processes, transportation, and regional planning</td>
<td>• NIJC invited to speak on a number of occasions at Working Group meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide information on technical support for planning and data analysis</td>
<td>Supported the UC Berkeley SafeTREC – Tribal Road Safety Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sharing/Technical</td>
<td>services to tribal governments parallel to member agencies</td>
<td>• SANDAG makes technical support available to tribal governments for planning and data analysis services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnered with Jamul Indian Village on Caltrans Sustainable Planning Grant – Multiuse Pathway Feasibility Study (2019) - $280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Served as pass through agency for statewide project led by NIJC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Created the Tribal Road Safety Audit Education Program that supports the Western Regional TTAP (2016):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Caltrans Environmental Justice Grant for $189,000 to develop an online training program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Production of a video, online course, and support materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I Attachment 4a:
Intraregional Tribal Transportation Strategy Northern Tribal Corridor Map
Appendix I Attachment 4b:
Intraregional Tribal Transportation Strategy Southern Tribal Corridor Map
Appendix I Attachment 5:
2019 Federal Regional Transportation Plan Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association Support Letter
October 22, 2019

Hon. Steve Vaus, Chairman
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego CA 92101

Dear Chairman Vaus;

The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA) would like to submit this letter of support for the adoption of San Diego Forward: The 2019 Federal Regional Transportation Plan (2019 Federal RTP) for San Diego.

As neighbors, we need to be cognizant of the impact we have on each other. At the same time, SANDAG as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) responsible for developing the regional transportation plan, has a federal obligation to ensure the needs of Federally Recognized Tribal Nations in the region are served by the system.

As SANDAG initiated the development of the 2019 Regional Plan our intertribal council and SANDAG developed a tribal consultation plan which has been implemented in good faith collaboratively throughout this process to ensure that tribal issues are considered.

We have worked closely with SANDAG to analyze our mobility needs in the region through the development of the Intraregional Tribal Transportation Strategy which is included as a technical appendix to the 2019 Federal RTP (U3). This project was a collaborative effort of the Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues.

We look forward to continuing to work together through our diplomatic framework to ensure that the collaborative strategies we have developed as neighbors will be incorporated into this and successive Regional Plans.

Sincerely,

Robert Smith
Pala Tribal Chairman
Chairman of the Board of SCTCA

Bo Mazzetti
Rincon Tribal Chairman
President of the Board of SCTCA
Appendix I Attachment 6:
2021 Tribal Long-Range Transportation Plan Summaries
**Long Range Tribal Transportation Plans**

Native American communities are recognized as separate and independent political communities within the territorial boundaries of the United States. The San Diego region is home to 17 federally recognized tribal nations with jurisdiction over 18 reservations. Transportation needs often cross borders so communication and collaboration with federally recognized tribal governments is important for an effective regional transportation planning. Documenting tribal priorities for their own transportation systems helps ensure that the Regional Plan will be comprehensive, effective, and accurate.

For the first time Tribal Transportation Plans (TTP) were included in the 2050 RTP approved in October of 2011 and again for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan adopted in October 2015. The importance of this effort was confirmed at 2018 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit on April 13. The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA) Board reiterated the importance of sharing long range Tribal Transportation Plans with the region through this document.

Working collaboratively, the SCTCA and SANDAG coordinated with tribal governments to provide an option of submitting a summary document of their Long Range Transportation Plans which follow. A basic Tribal Transportation Plan includes background information about the tribe, existing conditions on their reservation, a transportation network map, goal statements about their transportation, and a list of priority transportation projects. As a diplomatic courtesy, this document contains the respective Tribal Transportation Plans or transportation summaries from those tribes that agreed to share their Plans with SANDAG. Those tribes are:

- Barona Band of Mission Indians
- Campo Band of Mission Indians
- Jamul Indian Village of California
- Pala Band of Mission Indians
- Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians
- San Pasqual Band of Diegueño Mission Indians of California
- Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
- Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians

Collaboration on regional transportation issues is also achieved through the Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues. The Working Group serves as a forum for regional tribal governments to discuss and coordinate transportation issues of mutual concern with the various public planning agencies in the region, including SANDAG, Caltrans, the County of San Diego, and the transit operators. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the federal agency that distributes transportation funding to tribes is an active advisory member to the Working Group. The Working Group monitors and provides input on the implementation of the strategies and planning activities related to transportation mutually developed through the San Diego Regional Tribal Summit.
April 21, 2021

Hon. Catherine Blakespear, Chairwoman
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Barona Band of Mission Indians’ Tribal LRTP Summary

Dear Chair Blakespear,

For the last two cycles of the Regional Plan, the tribes in the San Diego region submitted summaries of their Long Range Transportation Plans (LRTP) as a diplomatic courtesy to share their priorities with SANDAG. The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, (SCTCA), believes that sharing this information is an important step to understanding the linkages between regional and tribal priorities. In that continued spirit of sharing, our tribe, the Barona Band of Mission Indians, submits a summary of our current Tribal Transportation Plan for inclusion in the San Diego Forward document.

The Barona Band of Mission Indians, (appearing in the U.S. Federal Register at Vol. 75, No 190, p 60810 as the Barona Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians of the Barona Reservation, California) is a self-governing federally recognized Indian Tribe exercising sovereign authority over the lands of the Barona Indian Reservation; and joint patent administration of the Capitan Grande Indian Reservation with the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians.

We are pleased to work with you to highlight the importance of tribal transportation planning in the regional process. Should you need additional information, please contact Sheilla Alvarez at 619-402-0182.

Respectfully,

Raymond Welch
Chairman, Barona Band of Mission Indians
Barona Band of Mission Indians  
Transportation Plan Summary 2021

Per 25 CFR Part 170 at subsection 170.414, this summary narrative serves as justification of that the Barona Band of Mission Indians FY2021 to 2041 LRTP (Long Range Transportation Plan) update is consistent with State and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), hence San Diego Forward: the 2021 Regional Plan.

The purpose of transportation planning is to identify broad goals to meet transportation needs of a community. Multi-modal strategies for achieving these goals can and should consider current and future community land use, economic development, environment (natural, human, and cultural), traffic demand, public safety, health, and social needs, among others.1

Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Barona Band of Mission Indians, (appearing in the U.S. Federal Register at Vol. 75, No. 190, p. 60810 as the Barona Group of the Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians of the Barona Reservation, California) is a self-governing federally recognized Indian Tribe exercising sovereign authority over the lands of the Barona Indian Reservation; and joint patent administration of the Capitan Grande Indian Reservation with the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Barona Band has lived in the vicinity since pre-historic times. The Band moved onto the current Barona Reservation, following their forced removal from Capitan Grande Reservation, when a portion was condemned by a special Act of Congress to convert it into a reservoir and a water source for the City of San Diego.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Barona Reservation consists of over 7,800 acres, and is located approximately 35 miles northeast of the City of San Diego. The Tribe has 594 members in 2021, of which 85% of the adult population lives on the Reservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reservation is bordered by San Diego Country Estates to the north, a nature conservancy to the northwest, private and City land to the west, County land to the southwest, private land to the south, BLM and Cleveland National Forest to the southeast, and BLM and private land to the east. The main access to the Reservation is via Wildcat Canyon Road, a two-lane County road (within the County Regional Arterial System) that runs through the reservation from the town of Lakeside to the town of Ramona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Barona Band is the sole owner and manager of the Barona Resort and Casino, Barona Creek Golf Club, and the Barona Gas Station and convenience store – all are located on the reservation. Since opening in 1991, the Barona Resort and Casino has become one of the leading employers in San Diego County, employing approximately 3,000 staff members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Barona Tribal Government Office houses the administrative offices for Tribal Council and Government staff. Governmental functions include Tribal Government Accounting, Tribal Member Services, Barona Tribal Water Authority, and Housing and Land Use. Also on the reservation are the Barona Fire Department, Barona Tribal Enforcement and Resident Sheriff, Barona Museum and Cultural Center, Recreation Center, the Barona Indian Charter School, Library, Tutoring Center and Preschool.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Existing Transportation Conditions

The Barona Reservation is accessed from State Highway 67 via Willow Road, or through the community of Lakeside, and onto Wildcat Canyon Road.

The major arterial road, Wildcat Canyon Road, runs northeast through the reservation connecting the Barona Band to the communities of Ramona to the north and Lakeside to the south.

Wildcat Canyon Road, also known as Barona Road within the reservation boundary, is a County maintained road that starts in the town of Lakeside and ends in the town of Ramona. At the south end of the reservation, Founders Way, which runs perpendicular to Wildcat Canyon Road, connects travelers to the Barona Resort and Casino to the west and community members to the Barona Mission Church to the east.

San Vicente Road to the north connects the Barona Reservation to other small outlet roads, through the Cleveland National Forest, to the interior of the Capitan Grande Reservation and San Diego River.

State Highway 67 is used to access Interstate 8 for travel to La Mesa, El Cajon and San Diego on the west and to the Viejas, Campo, La Posta, and Manzanita Reservations, the Southern Indian Health Clinic in Alpine, and to Arizona on the east. I-8 is also used for travel east to a network of County roads to the Jamul and Sycuan Reservations and to a network of County roads with connections to Highway 94 and international ports of entry to access the Kumeyaay Border Tribes of Baja California in northern Mexico.

Goals and Objectives

Basic transportation needs include inventory of existing roads and driveways on tribal lands for inclusion on the BIA Tribal Transportation Program (TTP) inventory; improvements to County maintained roads to meet current design standard for improved maintenance, safety, and traffic management.

1. Maximize federal revenues available through the Tribal Transportation Program, the American Rescue Plan, and other funding prioritized for Indian Reservation Roads.
   - Evaluate roads throughout the reservation community for safety improvements, including speed humps, paving, resurfacing, and signage.
   - Focus on priority projects.

2. Improve road maintenance, safety and traffic management.
   - Evaluate county roads, State Highway 67, and I-8 for compliance with current design and maintenance standards.
   - Coordinate with the County Department of Public Works and California Department of Transportation for road improvements.

3. Focus on major arterial road: Wildcat Canyon Road
   - Coordinate with the County Department of Public Works for road improvements.
   - Signalization at intersection of Wildcat Canyon Road and Willow Road.
Priority Projects

1. In coordination with the County, finalize improvements at the intersection of Willow Road/Wildcat Canyon Road that were formalized in 2015, specifically:
   - Intersection widening/turn lanes
   - Signalization at Willow Road/Wildcat Canyon Road Intersection
   - Improving curves north of the intersection to meet County public road standards and to improve sight distance on the approach to the intersection.

2. In coordination with the County, improve driving conditions for safety purposes on Wildcat Canyon Road by:
   - Widening and straightening at various sections to improve sight distance.
   - Adding passing lanes and turn out lanes at various sections.
   - Resurfacing and repaving various sections
Hon. Catherine Blakespear, Chairwoman  
San Diego Association of Governments  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, Ca 92101

RE: (Campo Band of Mission Indians ) Tribal Long Range Transportation Plan

Dear Chair Blakespear,

For the last two cycles of the Regional Plan, the tribes in the San Diego region submitted summaries of their Long Range Transportation Plans as a diplomatic courtesy to share their priorities with SANDAG. The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, (SCTCA), believes that sharing this information is an important step to understanding the linkages between regional and tribal priorities. In that continued spirit of sharing, our tribe, the Campo Band of Mission Indians, submits a summary of our current Tribal Transportation Plan for inclusion in the San Diego Forward document.

The Campo Tribe (appearing in the U.S. Federal Register at Vol. 75, No 190, p 60810 as the Campo Band of Mission Indians) is a self-governing federally recognized Indian Tribe exercising sovereign authority over the lands of the Campo Indian Reservation.

We are pleased to work with you to highlight the importance of tribal transportation planning in the regional process. Should you need additional information, please contact Gary Connolly at the Campo Tribal Office.

Respectfully,

Marcus Cuero  
Chairman of the Campo Band of Mission Indians
Tribal Transportation Needs Assessment

Campo Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Tribal Transportation Needs Assessment
Campo Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Final Report

Prepared by:
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.
516 North Tejon Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
(719) 633-2868

LSC #084880
March 26, 2009
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 OVERVIEW

The Campo Band of Mission Indians is part of the Kumeyaay Tribe of southern California. Their language belongs to the Hokan language group which is spoken from southern Oregon to southern Mexico. The Kumeyaay people are related to the Colorado River people who are believed to have been the first Native Americans in the southwest to come into contact with Europeans. The area’s heavy concentration of Spanish missionaries, with their zeal for assimilation, adversely affected the Kumeyaay Tribe’s native language and cultural retention.

Traditionally, the lands of the Kumeyaay Tribe extended from 50 to 75 miles north and south of the present Mexican border, as well as from the California coast to the Colorado River. They spoke a Hokan language of the Yuman branch which was related to the languages of people from northern California to Mexico and east to the Great Basin. The Tribe made their living in areas stretching from the southern coast east into the desert; depending on marine resources, vegetable foods such as corn, and dry farming. In the 18th century, there were 50 bands in the Kumeyaay Tribe. Today they live on the Barona, Campo, Capitan Grande, Ewiiapaayp, Inaja-Cosmit, La Posta, Manzanita, Mesa Grande, Pala, San Pasqual, Santa Ysabel, Campo, and Viejas Reservations. There are at least 3,000 Kumeyaay Tribe descendents living in California today.

The current Campo Reservation was established in 1875. The Campo Reservation consists of 17,429 acres and is located in the southeastern portion of San Diego County. Figure 1-1 presents the study area.

Roadway development on the Campo Reservation followed travel patterns from early California history. The most accessible travel in the region was by direct routes, generally by walking and/or horseback. This allowed for roadways that were traveled by carriages, buckboards, and other turn-of-the-century modes of travel. The roadways in the region had a direct connection and relationship to other parts of the state. The dirt roadways that were built on the Reservation were based on the terrain. This roadway relationship is still prevalent today.
The Campo Reservation is currently accessible from the east and west by Interstate 8 (I-8), State Route (SR) 94, and Old Highway 80. The trend as to where housing and economic development will occur depends on the distance from and direct relationship to these roadways. These roadways have become the primary access mode for all new tribal economic development (i.e., tribal casino and other commercial development). The building of roadways will continue to create major milestones for the region in the area of general transportation, as well as the development of commerce.

1.2 PLAN PURPOSE

To assess the Campo Reservation's transportation needs, LSC carried out background research on the existing transportation infrastructure and services for all transportation modes, including references to the Campo Reservation Transportation Plan (Appendix B). LSC also examined several elements of the socio-economic conditions including demographics of the Indian population in the area of the Reservation; economic activities of tribal members; and social, recreational, and cultural activities of tribal members. These conditions play a key role in the generation of transportation needs.

Background research was followed by a site visit on February 3, 2009 to meet with the Campo Band of Mission Indians representative to understand tribal
members' transportation requirements and vision for the Campo Reservation, and to receive input on how to best meet the current and future transportation needs. The lead tribal representative was Chairwoman Monique La Chappa.

This report also considers transportation needs in a wider context. With the impact of future land development on the Campo Reservation and the tribal members' focus on economic issues and concern for public health, this report notes the need for improvements to roadway safety, transit service, and the bicycling/pedestrian infrastructure. Providing improved transportation infrastructure and services will be essential in helping to meet tribal members' transportation needs now and into the future.

There are two appendices added to the report. Appendix A is the reference and glossary. Appendix B is the Campo Reservation Transportation Plan.
CHAPTER 2

Demographics

2.1 DEMOGRAPHICS

The Native American Housing Assistance and Self Determination Act (NAHASDA) database states a total enrolled population for the Tribe of 313 people. Of these 313 individuals, 265 are listed as being American Indian/Alaskan Native.

US Census data from the year 2000 reveal that there were 369 Native American individuals living in the study area that surrounds the Reservation. Figure 2-1 shows the Reservation and the surrounding land. Figure 2-2 shows the population density of Native Americans in relation to the Reservation.
Figure 2.1
Lands of the Kumeyaay Nation

San Pasqual
Santa Ysabel
Mesa Grande
Naja and Cosmit
Barona
Captain Grande
Ewilaapay
Sycuan
Jamul Village
La Posta Campo
Manzanita
San Diego
Oceanside
Demographics

2.2 ECONOMICS

The Campo Tribe currently owns and operates a casino on their Reservation lands. The casino features a mix of slots and table games, as well as an on-site restaurant. The casino provides significant employment for many tribal members and individuals living in close proximity to the casino. In addition to providing employment for the community, the casino generates a significant amount of income for the Tribe as a whole. The Tribe also owns wind turbines that are sited on their land north of I-8.

2.3 EXISTING LAND USE

The Campo Reservation occupies a large amount of land in San Diego County, which is split between two parcels. The Reservation is home to the casino in addition to a fair number of residences. The lands are also home to 25 wind-powered turbines that produce a renewable energy source. The land is also home to the Indian Health Clinic which serves the Campo Reservation and surrounding tribes. Figure 2-3 shows the Reservation land and surrounding land uses as identified by the county.
CHAPTER 3

Existing Conditions

3.1 HIGHWAY

The Campo Reservation is served primarily by Interstate Highway 8 and State Route (SR) 94, which both pass through the Reservation. These roadways are major thoroughfares that connect the Reservation to the San Diego metropolitan area. This relationship is shown in Figure 3-1 along with other major roadways that access the surrounding region.

The Reservation is located 30 miles east of metropolitan San Diego and is served by a major highway. The Reservation’s position along this roadway is advantageous because of the connections it provides. Table 3-1 presents the roadways in the region that link to the Campo Reservation. As can be seen in the table, all of the roads are paved, and listed being in “very good” condition. The fact that these roadways are in good condition is important in terms of the Reservation’s access. There are several roadways on the Reservation that are not included on the inventory that are in poor condition.

Because of the high traffic volumes that are often associated with different types of land uses, it is important to examine the performance of the roadway. Traffic planners and engineers use level of service (LOS) as a guide to aid in the selection of roads for improvement. Level of service provides a six-tiered ranking system using the letters “A-F.” A score of “A” indicates that the roadway can handle the demand very efficiently, while a score of “F” indicates that it cannot handle the current demand. In general, roads scoring in the range of “A-C” are performing well, while those scoring a “D” or below should be improved to handle current use.

The current level of service on roads in the region can be seen in Figure 3-2. The majority of roads surrounding the Reservation are at a level of service ranging from “A-C.” This means that the roads are performing well. The lone exceptions are two small segments of roadway which are rated at LOS D. These segments are near the junction of Old Highway 80 and SR 94, and are represented in blue on the map. These small sections of roadway may need to be upgraded if there is projected growth along the route to ensure that they are performing adequately.
## Table 3-1
### Campo Reservation
#### Indian Reservation Road System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Route Name</th>
<th># of Sections</th>
<th>Owner Route Number</th>
<th>BIA Route Number</th>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Surface Type</th>
<th>Wearing Condition</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Width (feet)</th>
<th>Average Daily Traffic</th>
<th>ADT Year</th>
<th>On 2006 RIFDS?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County (5)</td>
<td>Buckman Springs Rd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>SD02</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County (5)</td>
<td>Old Highway 80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>SD80</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (3)</td>
<td>Interstate 8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>I8</td>
<td>F010</td>
<td>Major Arterial</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38400</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (3)</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SR94</td>
<td>5094</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in brackets represent codes for the Indian Reservation Roads (IRR) RIFDS inventory system of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

3.2 EXISTING ROADWAY NEEDS

Based on tribal input and visual observation, condition and safety issues were identified for all Reservation roads. The major issues pertain to improving the surface conditions of major roads and improving safety conditions. These improvements will be beneficial for all modes of transportation, increasing both the safety and functionality of the roadways on the Reservation. Tribal members have noted the need for intersection improvements, more appropriate signage, and also the presence of turn lanes. Needs as identified by the Tribe are:

- Repaving of Church Road from Old Highway 80 to SR 94. This includes the addition of turn lanes to improve access to the SIHC and other important facilities.
- Turn lanes and stop lights for Old Highway 80 and Golden Acorn Way. Repaving and/or resurfacing may also be needed.
- Straightening of SR 94 from east of Church Road to north of Kumeyaay Road.
- Turn lanes eastbound on SR 94 approaching Church Road North.

3.3 TRANSIT

There are two San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (SDMTS) routes that serve the area of the larger parcel of the Reservation. The route that runs closest to the Reservation is Route 888. However, this route runs very infrequent service. Route 888 runs from the El Cajon Transfer Center to Jacumba on Monday and Friday only. Figure 3-3 presents the routes in the study area.

The smaller parcel of the Reservation, which is further west than the large parcel, is being served by transit. Route 894 operates along Buckman Springs Road. This route operates on weekdays only, making three eastbound and westbound trips daily. This route operates from Santee to Lake Morena. Route 888 also serves the smaller parcel, but once again has a more limited service than Route 894.

3.3.1 Paratransit Service

Paratransit service is available through SDMTS for the smaller parcel because the Reservation is within the coverage area and along the portion of SR 94 on which Route 888 operates. In general, SDMTS will provide paratransit service up to three-quarters of a mile to either side of an existing route. This means that the larger parcel of land is not eligible for paratransit services.
3.3.2 Human Service Transportation

The STRIDE agency was created as a referral service for special transportation needs for seniors and the disabled. Individuals may call STRIDE to obtain information on agencies and programs that provide special transportation service in their area. The following agencies participate in this referral service throughout San Diego County:

- Aging and Independence Services
- Coordinated Transportation Service Agency
- Senior Communities Centers of San Diego
- United Jewish Federation
- Out & About Vista

3.3.3 School Transportation

The Mountain Empire Unified School District provides transportation for students in the area of the Campo Tribe. There are eight schools within the district—six elementary schools, a middle school, and a high school.

3.4 EXISTING TRANSIT NEEDS

The Tribe has expressed interest in having transit so that individuals living on the Reservation can connect to the El Cajon transit center as well as access medical, educational, and employment opportunities. Although there is transit service to the smaller parcel, the Tribe has specifically asked for service on a more frequent schedule to better accommodate their needs.

3.5 BIKE/PEDESTRIAN

The Tribe has expressed interest in adding bike lanes to roads on the Reservation to increase the safety of cyclists. Widening existing roads will help to increase pedestrian safety as well. The Tribe has expressed the need for sidewalks along Golden Acorn Way near the casino.

3.6 SUMMARY OF TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

Figure 3-4 presents the summary of transportation needs for the Campo Reservation. This figure is based on the information presented in the above sections. As presented in Figure 3-4, overall needs are improved surface and operational conditions, increased safety, and the addition of bike lanes and pedestrian facilities.
3.7 INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION

The nearest major airport to the Campo Indian Reservation is San Diego International, which is approximately 62 miles away. The airport’s location is presented in Figure 3-5. San Diego International is a large airport with approximately 300 departures daily. It is ranked as the thirtieth busiest passenger airport in the nation, providing access to and from numerous international and domestic locales. It is also known as the busiest single-runway commercial airport in America.

In addition to San Diego International, Brown Field Municipal Airport is also located fairly close to the Reservation. Brown Field Municipal Airport is located approximately 67 miles from the Reservation and is just east of Imperial Beach. Imperial County Airport is also located 58 miles from the Reservation, but only provides access to a limited area.

The nearest passenger railway is the Amtrak station on Kettner Boulevard in San Diego. The station is located on the shore and close to downtown. The railway station is approximately 61 miles away from the Reservation. Amtrak provides daily service within California and throughout the United States.

Bus service is considerably closer than either air or rail travel for long-distance commutes. There is a Greyhound bus location 45 miles away from the Reservation in El Cajon. There is also a bus stop in El Centro, east of the Reservation, which is approximately 56 miles away, and another station in Calexico, which is 65 miles away. The result of these distances is that there is limited access to intermodal facilities for tribal members who do not drive.
CHAPTER 4

Future Needs

This chapter presents future needs that have been identified based on input from the Campo tribal representative and research conducted by the LSC team. Research was based on information gathered from existing planning documents and a site visit in February 2009. Roadway, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle needs on and off the Campo Reservation were examined to create a more comprehensive view of the Tribe's future transportation needs.

In addition to the site visit, the Campo tribal staff developed a list of their transportation needs and economic development plan. Figure 4-1 presents existing and potential land use developments on the Campo Reservation. Future transportation needs are presented in Figure 4-2. The Tribe currently has a casino on the Reservation. The Tribe is planning to develop a hotel, convenience store with gas station, solid waste landfill, expanded wind turbines, and recreational facilities (which include a motor-cross bike park and a hiking/biking trail). The Tribe is also looking into the expansion of their existing casino.
4.1 ROADWAY NEEDS

Future roadway improvement needs were identified based on input from the Campo tribal representative and the Campo Reservation Transportation Plan. The highway needs on and off the Reservation are:

- Church Road needs repaving from Old Highway 80 to Highway 94 with turn-out lanes and turn lanes for the Southern Indian Health Clinic, Fire Department, Education Building, Tribal Administration, and the Campo Materials Sand and Concrete Plant.

- Church Road also needs new railings, reflectors, painting, and more capacity (for heavy equipment, trucks, and trailers).

- The northern and southern portions of Old Highway 80 and Golden Acorn Way need turn lanes, stop lights, and repaving/resurfacing. There will be serious safety and capacity issues on Old Highway 80 and Golden Acorn Way with the casino expansion.

- Highway 94 needs to be straightened east of Church Road and west of Kumeyaay Road due to serious safety issues.

- Highway 94 needs eastbound turn lanes onto Church Road North.

- Highway 94 needs to be widened from Old Highway 80 to Jewel Valley to improve capacity.

- Tusil Road needs turn lanes and paving from Crestwood Road to the wind turbines in order to address future economic development and housing issues.

- BIA 10 needs turn lanes and paving from Highway 94 to the solid waste landfill in order to accommodate social/cultural gatherings.

- Interstate 8 (I-8) needs a new off-ramp onto Live Oak Springs Road to reach the motor-cross bike park.

- Campo Truck Trail needs to be paved from Highway 94 to North Campo Truck Trail for Reservation residents and the Fire Department.

- New paved streets with turn lanes are needed to accommodate the housing development projects on Highway 94, east of Kumeyaay Road, and west of Shasta.

- Signage is needed on I-8 to reflect that there is gas and food service off of Old Highway 80.
4.2 TRANSIT NEEDS

In the short and long term, transit will play an increasingly important role in providing local and regional transportation. The Campo Tribe currently has limited access to the existing transit services in San Diego County. Following are the Tribe’s transit needs:

- Add transit service along Buckman Springs Road south to Highway 94 and east to Church Road, with various stops along Highway 94 to the casino. This service should link with other transit routes at the El Cajon Transit Center, and should operate once in the morning and once in the afternoon/evening.

- Develop routes from the casino along Old Highway 80 and along Highway 94 via Boulevard Area to Buckman Springs Road.

- Develop transit service for the Campo Reservation from Kumeyaay Road to the El Cajon Transit Center at least once or twice a day.

- Develop a park-and-ride lot with a transit stop on Old Highway 80 at the junction with Golden Acorn Way.
Future Needs

4.3 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE NEEDS

By making the roadway improvements listed above, safe movement of non-motorized forms of transportation on and around the Campo Reservation will be improved. Following are the Reservation’s pedestrian and bicycle needs:

- Sidewalks on Golden Acorn Way to the casino.
- Bicycle lanes on the southern portion of Old Highway 80 and along Crestwood Road, Tierra Del Sol South, Highway 94, La Posta Road North, and Old Highway 80 East to help accommodate the reoccurring bicycle races held in the area.
Chapter 5
CHAPTER 5

Priority Projects

This chapter reviews the planned projects on and adjacent to the Campo Reservation, as well as those that can play a significant role in improving the transportation service for the Reservation. The LSC team reviewed information from the Campo Tribe, San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), San Diego County, and Caltrans to determine if there are any local, state, or federally funded transportation projects planned for the next five years for roadways on or adjacent to the Reservation. The Campo Tribe may develop roadway projects on the Campo Reservation to improve roadways that are currently on the BIA inventory. These roadways are eligible for BIA funding through the RTA.

In addition to the below information, LSC has identified that San Diego County and Caltrans have various lump sum funding programs that are used for bridge improvements, roadway resurfacing, traffic calming, and intelligent transportation systems (ITS). Such funding can be used to address some of the issues identified in this document.

5.1 INTERSTATE 8 IMPROVEMENTS

Caltrans has identified environmental and erosion mitigated projects along Interstate 8 (I-8) through the Campo Reservation. These projects will preserve and improve the condition of the land adjacent to the I-8 roadway surface.
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1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Purpose of Long-Range Transportation Plan

Through an agreement with the Federal Highway Administration (FWHA), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) provides technical assistance per Tribal request to compile Long Range Transportation Plans (LRTP). The LRTP is used for Indian reservations to receive Highway Trust Funds (HTF) for road construction and maintenance on the Indian Reservation Road System. The main objectives of the Program Agreement with Tribes are:

1. To establish a process for determining transportation needs on the Tribe’s roadway inventory, and
2. Update existing Long-Range Transportation Plans (LRTP) that define and recommend improvements to address identified needs.

This LRTP is an update to the 2017 Jamul Indian Village Long Range Transportation Plan.

1.2 Program Agreements

Through the Tribal Transportation Program Agreement with the Bureau of Indian Affairs Division of Transportation, Tribes have the capacity of the Secretary of Interior to plan and expedite transportation related projects and maintenance of existing roads. The Program Agreement is a five-year scope of work, which coincides with the 5-year required LRTP updates.

1.3 Reference Funding Agreements

To implement the Program Agreement and the prioritize road related projects within the LRTP, the Tribal Shares\(^1\) are executed by the BIA through a Reference Funding Agreement (RFA) with Tribes every year.

1.4 25 CFR Part 170 Uses

The RFA funds are applied to eligible projects\(^2\) listed within Appendix A, Subpart B, 25 CFR 170.176.

1.5 Tribal Transportation Delivery Guide - 2017

Tribes can access the link below that provides the Tribal Transportation Program Delivery Guide - 2017\(^3\) as a resource manual on technical detail information regarding transportation related topics

2 INTRODUCTION

25 CFR Part 170 states the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) should have a 20-year horizon, and strategies within the LRTP to address future land use, economic development, traffic demand, public safety, and health & social needs. The Tribal government uses its TTP long-range transportation plan to develop transportation projects as documented in a Tribal priority list or TTIP and to identify and justify


the Tribe’s update to the National Tribal Transportation Facility Inventory (NTTFI). It is suggested TTP LRTP are to be reviewed annually and updated every five years.

The main objectives of this program are:

1. To establish a process for determining transportation needs on the Tribe’s roadway inventory.
2. To assist the Tribe in updating the existing LRTP to define and recommend improvements to address identified needs.

Within this overall program, the BIA Sacramento Area Office during 1996-97 prepared transportation plans for Reservations/Rancherias throughout California that contained a public road system.

This 2019 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is an update and addendum to all existing LRTPs, which takes into consideration the integration of the 2017 to 2020 Tribal Safety Plans, the Project Review Reports, the Level of Service (LOS) data collection with engineer cost estimates that make up the statewide list, and the last 5-year Fast Act TIP list.

### 2.1 Tribal Participation: PRO BIADOT Transportation Mini-Symposiums

This LRTP update takes into consideration the BIA staff engaging with Tribes to meet the criteria regarding Tribal input to compile this LRTP. The following Tables 1, 2, and 3 show BIA staff collaborating with tribes regarding data gathering to compile this LRTP update.

**Table 1.** Transportation Mini-Symposiums - Tribal Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th># of Mtgs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Agency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Agency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Agency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.** Transportation Mini-Symposiums Safety Plans - Tribal Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th># of Mtgs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Agency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Agency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Agency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.** Level of Service Field Data Collection - Tribal Staff Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th># of Mtgs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Agency</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Agency</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Agency</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the spring of 2017, a Transportation Mini-Symposium was conducted. The BIA and tribal staff collaborated and had dialogue on the Program Agreement, the FAST Act, the 25 CFR Part 170, Financial
Reporting, PORT, and other items of importance regarding road related projects. This allowed tribal staff to familiarize themselves with an overview on the functions of the Tribal Transportation Program.

During the summer and fall of 2017, another Transportation Mini-Symposium on Safety Plans was conducted. The BIA and tribal staff worked together and had dialogue on the upcoming FY2017 and FY2018 Safety Funds competitive grant for Safety Plan projects. BIA staff and tribal staff conducted field visits to collect existing road data, and BIA provide technical assistance in terms of engineering cost estimates to Tribes, which was applied to the competitive grant.

From January to the end of summer 2018, BIA staff worked with tribes on identifying existing Deferred Maintenance of roads (DMR) and conducted the level of services (LOS) on all BIA routes.

2.2 Study Area

The Jamul Reservation comprises approximately 6 acres in the Jamul-Dulzura community in unincorporated San Diego County, California. Figure 1 shows the location of the Jamul Indian Village Reservation. The Reservation is adjacent to State Route 94 (SR-94) and is about 0.3 miles south of the intersection of Melody Road and SR-94. The terrain is hilly with fir trees and other low growing native vegetation.
2.2.1 Land Use and Development

Development on the Reservation can be characterized as rural commercial. Existing land uses on the Reservation include public administration, commercial, and special use as shown in Figure 2. There is a church with a cemetery at the western end, a Tribal hall, an administration building, and a gaming facility. Although the reservation has an official resident population of zero, it serves as a cultural center for 71 enrolled Tribal members and supports more than 1,000 jobs. The reservation is one of the largest employment centers in the area, making it a significant economic development catalyst and regional attraction for the community.
2.3 Purpose and Scope of the Plan

The scope of services for this study involves:

- Identifying the public roads that compose the BIA and Tribal Road System.
- Conduct the level of service (LOS) data on existing BIA roads to assess transportation needs on the Reservations and Rancherias.
- Performing transportation engineering and planning evaluations necessary to identify existing and future deficiencies on the existing road system.
- Developing a plan to improve the existing and future needs within the study area.
- Identifying specific improvement projects, establishing road priorities, and determine a reasonable implementation time frame.

3 TRIBAL PROFILE

3.1 Demographics

The Tribe has a total Tribal enrollment of 71 with 0 members living at the reservation, 65 members live within Jamul Indian Village, 29 members under 16 years old, 7 members 65 years and older, 35 members over 16 years of age and under 65 years of age.
4 EXISTING TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE

4.1 System Description

Figure 3 to Figure 9 display the roadway inventory for Jamul Indian Village. The roadway inventory\(^4\) includes 23 roadway segments on the following roads: SR-94/Campo Road, Skyline Truck Trail, Lyons Valley Road, Melody Road, Daisy Drive, Proctor Valley Road, Jamul Drive, Rose Lane, and Otay Lakes Road.

The roadway inventory includes SR 94 from State Route 54 (SR-54) in the north to Tecate Road in the south, about 16 miles. SR-94 provides the primary access into and out of the reservation for the tribe’s members and reservation’s employees and guests. In addition, SR-94 serves as a primary facility for the surrounding community as it provides access between Jamul Indian Village, Steele Canyon High School, commercial centers, residential homes, and open spaces.

There are two access points from SR-94 to the Reservation. These access points are two roadway segments of Daisy Drive, labeled with ID 6, 16, and 22 on Figure 9. Roadway segments ID 6 and 16 of Daisy Drive serve as the main entrance and exit to the Reservation, while roadway segment ID 22 is an emergency access and utility corridor. Daisy Drive is a paved road that wraps around the casino on the Reservation. The church and cemetery on the Reservation can be accessed with a paved road known as Rose Lane, labeled with ID 15 on Figure 9. Daisy Drive and Rose Lane are the only two roads on the Reservation, making about 0.54 miles of paved roads.

The roadway inventory also includes Proctor Valley Road, Otay Lakes Road, Jamul Drive, Skyline Trail, and Lyons Valley Road.

\(^4\) The Jamul Indian Village Reservation Roadway Inventory consists of roads identified in the Indian Reservation Road Program Inventory and the 1997 Jamul Indian Village Reservation Long Range Transportation Plan.
Figure 3. Jamul Indian Village Reservation Roadway Inventory
Figure 4. Jamul Indian Village Reservation Roadway Inventory (Part 1 of 6)
Figure 5. Jamul Indian Village Reservation Roadway Inventory (Part 2 of 6)
Figure 6. Jamul Indian Village Reservation Roadway Inventory (Part 3 of 6)
**Figure 7.** Jamul Indian Village Reservation Roadway Inventory (Part 4 of 6)
Figure 8. Jamul Indian Village Reservation Roadway Inventory (Part 5 of 6)
Figure 9. Jamul Indian Village Reservation Roadway Inventory (Part 6 of 6)
4.2 Transportation Needs

To better understand the Reservation’s traffic needs, the Reservation completed the following three efforts:

- Jamul Indian Village Gaming Project Traffic Impact Study (November 2012)
- Jamul Indian Village Strategic Transportation Safety Plan (August 2019)

Through these efforts, the Jamul Indian Village was better equipped to understand and identify the Reservation’s transportation needs both within the Reservation and on other roads in the Reservation’s roadway inventory.

The Jamul Indian Village Gaming Project Traffic Impact Study (TIS) identified several improvements to enhance traveling conditions to and from the Reservation. Improvements were identified at the following seven intersections along SR-94: Jamacha Boulevard, Jamacha Road, Steele Canyon Road, Lyons Valley Road, Melody Road, Daisy Drive, and Maxfield Road. Proposed improvements included restriping of lanes for additional turn lanes, signal installations/upgrades, and roadway widening.

From the Jamul Indian Village Strategic Transportation Safety Plan (Safety Plan), it was identified that transportation improvements along SR-94 were necessary to help reduce collisions, especially since SR-94 serves as the primary facility for members to be able to access the Reservation and surrounding community destinations such as schools, recreational areas, and shopping centers. The Safety Plan proposed several improvements along SR-94 including but not limited to multi-use pathway, improving sight distance, advance signing and wayfinding, additional turn lanes at intersections with higher turning volume movements, installing lighting, and upgrading striping, rumble strips, and roadway edges.

In accordance with 25 CFR Part 170, subsection 170.411, Figure 2 to Figure 9 address items (a) through ((h). Figure 2 shows the land uses abutting the existing roadways. The main regional arterial is SR94, which runs southeast to northwest. Daisy Drive, Rte. #SD08, is the only ingress/egress onto the Jamul land tract.

5 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

5.1 Road Inventory

Table 3 and Table 4 reflect the existing transportation system within the community, designated ‘official roads’ within the Indian Reservation Roads Program (IRR).

- Bureau of Indian Affairs – Daisy Drive (Rte. #SD08 Sec 10 to Sec 70) totals about 0.74 miles. Daisy Drive (Rte. #SD08 Sec 10 and Sec 70) is the main ingress/egress onto and into the Jamul land tract.
- Tribal Roads – Rose Lane (Rte. #0007 Sec 10), Church Parking Lot (Rte. #0007 Sec 20), and the Admin Parking Lot (Rte. #0007 Sec 30) provide access to the public admin and special uses on the Reservation.
- State – SR-94 (Rte. #S094 Sec 810, Sec 830, Sec 840, Sec 870, Sec 880, and Sec 990) is the only state route in the inventory, totaling about 23.4 miles.
- County – There are six County routes for approximately 34.2 miles.
### Table 3. Jamul Indian Village - Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (March 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location ID</th>
<th>J54575</th>
<th>J54575</th>
<th>J54575</th>
<th>J54575</th>
<th>J54575</th>
<th>J54575</th>
<th>J54575</th>
<th>J54575</th>
<th>J54575</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservation</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>S#94</td>
<td>S#94</td>
<td>S#94</td>
<td>S#94</td>
<td>S#94</td>
<td>S#94</td>
<td>S#94</td>
<td>S#94</td>
<td>S#94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-RR Route Number</td>
<td>0399</td>
<td>0954</td>
<td>0594</td>
<td>0294</td>
<td>0594</td>
<td>0594</td>
<td>0954</td>
<td>0954</td>
<td>0954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Section Number</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Route Number</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Length of Section</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Bridge Condition</td>
<td>0015</td>
<td>0013</td>
<td>0013</td>
<td>0013</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Bridge Length</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-County</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-Congressional District</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-State</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Ownership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Construction Need</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Terms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Roadbed Condition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Surface Condition Index</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Right of Way</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Surface Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Federal Aid Category</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Right of Way Status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Right of Way Width</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTM BIA Average</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>11.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Additional Incidental Percent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Shoulder Width</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Shoulder Type</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Existing ADT</td>
<td>8750</td>
<td>8750</td>
<td>8750</td>
<td>8750</td>
<td>8750</td>
<td>8750</td>
<td>8750</td>
<td>8750</td>
<td>8750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Percent Trucks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-Owner Route Number</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Width</td>
<td>37.12994</td>
<td>12994</td>
<td>12994</td>
<td>24948</td>
<td>48867</td>
<td>48867</td>
<td>48867</td>
<td>48867</td>
<td>48867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTMC Future ADT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTMC ADS Number</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTMC Future Surface Type</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-Drainage Condition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-Shoulder Condition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37/38 &amp; RR XING TYPE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-Right of Way Utility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-Right of Way Cost</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Level of Maintenance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Snow &amp; Ice Control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-End Longitude</td>
<td>116.63417550</td>
<td>32.60909100</td>
<td>32.60909100</td>
<td>32.60909100</td>
<td>32.60909100</td>
<td>32.60909100</td>
<td>32.60909100</td>
<td>32.60909100</td>
<td>32.60909100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-Begin Latitude</td>
<td>116.69855200</td>
<td>32.69855200</td>
<td>32.69855200</td>
<td>32.69855200</td>
<td>32.69855200</td>
<td>32.69855200</td>
<td>32.69855200</td>
<td>32.69855200</td>
<td>32.69855200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-Atlas Map Number [98]</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50 Grade/Slope/Curve/Stop / Safe</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-Road Category</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location ID</td>
<td>J54575</td>
<td>J54575</td>
<td>J54575</td>
<td>J54575</td>
<td>J54575</td>
<td>J54575</td>
<td>J54575</td>
<td>J54575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservation</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>Sr14/</td>
<td>Sr14/</td>
<td>Sr14/</td>
<td>Jamul Dr/</td>
<td>Jamul Dr/</td>
<td>Lyons Va</td>
<td>Molino R</td>
<td>Otay Lak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-RR Route Number</td>
<td>SD04</td>
<td>SD04</td>
<td>SD04</td>
<td>SD01</td>
<td>SD01</td>
<td>SD02</td>
<td>SD00</td>
<td>SD04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Section Number</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Length of Section</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Bridge Number</td>
<td>062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Bridge Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Bridge Length</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-County</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-Congressional District</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-State</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Ownership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Construction Need</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Terrain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Roadbed Condition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Surface Condition Index</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Surface Width</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Surface Type</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Federal Air Category</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Right of Way Status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Right of Way Width</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTM All Width</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Shoulder Width</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Shoulder Type</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Existing ADT</td>
<td>42500</td>
<td>87700</td>
<td>5900</td>
<td>5920</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Pavement Truck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-Owner Route Number</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Width</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTM Future ADT</td>
<td>63113</td>
<td>130232</td>
<td>8762</td>
<td>8762</td>
<td>9356</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>4604</td>
<td>4604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTM ADS Number</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTM Future Surface Type</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-Drainage Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-Shoulder Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37/38 RR XING TYPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-Right of Way Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-Right of Way Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Level of Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Shore &amp; Ice Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-Reserve Latitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-Reserve Longitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-Atlas Map Number [99]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50 Grade/Straight/Curve/Start/Safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-Road Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-Year of Construction Change</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td>OFFICIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location ID</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Reservoir</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>4-RR Route Number</th>
<th>5-Section Number</th>
<th>6-Subsection Number</th>
<th>7-County</th>
<th>8-State</th>
<th>9-Ownership</th>
<th>10-Class</th>
<th>11-Terrain</th>
<th>12-Roadbed Condition</th>
<th>13-Surface Condition Index</th>
<th>14-Surface Width</th>
<th>15-Surface Type</th>
<th>16-Federal Aid Category</th>
<th>17-Existing ADT</th>
<th>18-ADT Year</th>
<th>19-Percent Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J65675</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>SD06</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J65675</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>SD06</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J65675</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>SD06</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J65675</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>SD06</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J65675</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Jamul In</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>SD06</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roadway Width**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Width</th>
<th>TTAM Future ADT</th>
<th>TTAM ADS Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4010</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4010</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4010</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Information**

- **09-MAR-16**
Table 4. Jamul Indian Village Long Range Transportation Plan Master Inventory - 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Name</th>
<th>Section Number</th>
<th>Owner Route Number</th>
<th>BIA Route Number</th>
<th>Functional Class[^3]</th>
<th>Surface Type</th>
<th>General Condition</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Width (feet)</th>
<th>Average Daily Traffic (ADT)[^4]</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Drive[^1]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SD08</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>40 (avg)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Drive[^1]</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>SD08</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Drive[^1]</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>SD08</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>141 ft</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Drive[^1]</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SD08</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Drive[^1]</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>SD08</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>70 ft</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Drive[^1]</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>SD08</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Drive[^1]</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>SD08</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Drive[^1]</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>SD08</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Lane[^1]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0007</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Jamul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Parking Lot[^1]</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6,245 sf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Jamul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Parking Lot[^1]</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1,744 sf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Jamul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline Truck Trail[^2]</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>SD06</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>8,853</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons Valley Road[^2]</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>SD02</td>
<td>Minor Collector</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>8,853</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody Road[^2]</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>SD03</td>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor Valley Road[^2]</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>SD05</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamul Drive[^2]</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>SD01</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otay Lakes Road[^2]</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>SD04</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamul Drive[^2]</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>SD01</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor Valley Road[^2]</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>SD05</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Name</td>
<td>Section Number</td>
<td>Owner Route Number</td>
<td>BIA Route Number</td>
<td>Functional Class</td>
<td>Surface Type</td>
<td>General Condition</td>
<td>Length (miles)</td>
<td>Width (feet)</td>
<td>Average Daily Traffic (ADT)</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor Valley Road²</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>SD05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-94²</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>S094</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>6,590</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-94²</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>S094</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies⁵</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campo Road²</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>S094</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>22,340</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campo Road²</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>S094</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>22,340</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) Route obtained from 2017 Jamul Indian Village Long Range Transportation Plan. (2) Route obtained from Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (FY 2016). (3) Functional class obtained from Caltrans California Road System (CRS) maps accessed March 2021. (4) The source for the ADT is from the Jamul Indian Village Gaming Project Traffic Impact Study (November 2012). (5) The ADT for SR-94 Section Number 870 varies throughout. The ADT ranges from 7,830 (Otay Lakes Road to Honey Springs Road) to 20,840 (between Cougar Canyon Road to Steele Canyon Road).
5.1.1 Traffic Data

Traffic count data (2018) indicates that the average daily trips (ADT) on Campo Road (SR 94) in the vicinity of the Jamul Indian Village are approximately 7,700. Currently, Daisy Drive on the Reservation is estimated to have an ADT of approximately 8,000.

Jamul is not currently considering adding roads to the inventory list.

5.2 Public Relations Report

The Public Relations Report, Table 5, show the funds that were distributed per MAP21, FAST Act, and road maintenance funds. The Native American Housing Assistance Self-Determination Act (NAHASDA) generated population estimates are the driving factor in the amount of TTP funds Tribes are awarded.

**Table 5. Public Relations Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>FY 2014 TTP Funding</th>
<th>FY 2015 TTP Funding</th>
<th>FY 2016 TTP Funding</th>
<th>FY 2017 TTP Funding</th>
<th>FY 2018 TTP Funding</th>
<th>FY 2019 TTP Funding</th>
<th>FY 2020 TTP Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribe</td>
<td>$400,478.60</td>
<td>$331,279.60</td>
<td>$331,522.00</td>
<td>$322,220.10</td>
<td>$335,379.89</td>
<td>$371,798.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Delivery Type</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>BIA Contact</th>
<th>P.L. 93-638 Awarding Official</th>
<th>Project Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>02G</td>
<td>James Hatch</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>02G</td>
<td>James Hatch</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>02G</td>
<td>James Hatch</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$83,900.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact Information Tribal:** Vice-Chair Michael Hunter Phone: (619) 669-4785

**Contact Information BIA (TEPOC):** Leonard Gilmore Phone No. (916) 978-6018

**Notes:**

- Project Name: Planning
- Project Type: Planning
- Program Delivery Type: 02G
- BIA Contact: James Hatch
- P.L. 93-638 Awarding Official: N/A
- Project Amount: $35,000.00

**Tribal Transportation Program**

**Road Maintenance Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Program Delivery Type</th>
<th>BIA Contact (TEPOC)</th>
<th>P.L. 93-638 Awarding Official</th>
<th>Project Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.L. 93-638</td>
<td>Leonard Gidmore</td>
<td>Sandra Yeguza</td>
<td>FY-14</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.L. 93-638</td>
<td>Leonard Gidmore</td>
<td>FY-15</td>
<td>$219.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.L. 93-638</td>
<td>Leonard Gidmore</td>
<td>FY-16</td>
<td>$228.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.L. 93-638</td>
<td>Leonard Gidmore</td>
<td>FY-17</td>
<td>$222.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.L. 93-638</td>
<td>Leonard Gidmore</td>
<td>FY-18</td>
<td>$254.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.L. 93-638</td>
<td>Leonard Gidmore</td>
<td>FY-19</td>
<td>$293.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| P.L. 93-638  | Leonard Gidmore | FY-20 | $300.00 |
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5.3 5 Year TIP

The FAST Act, 2016 to 2020, is a scope of work, where Tribes can apply their expenditure to road related projects. The expenditure to road related projects for Jamul Indian Village is shown in Table 6 to Table 10.

Table 6. 2% Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Identification</th>
<th>Work Item Summary</th>
<th>Phase Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region: J - Pacific</td>
<td>FY 2016 ($)</td>
<td>2016 End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency: JSA</td>
<td>FY 2017 ($)</td>
<td>2020 End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservation: Southern California</td>
<td>FY 2018 ($)</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity: JSA475 - Jamul Indian Village</td>
<td>FY 2019 ($)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State: California</td>
<td>FY 2020 ($)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County: San Diego</td>
<td>Total ($)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF9 PCAS: JSA475</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name: 2% Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Type: Long Range Transportation Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: 2% Transportation Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remark:</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Z)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Long Range Transportation Planning (LRTP)

Table 8. Equipment Acquisition
### Table 9. Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS Entity</th>
<th>Indian Reservation Roads Program Project Detail Report (Single CSTIP version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J6475</td>
<td>FY 2016 ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6475</td>
<td>326,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Identification**
- Region: Southwestern California
- Reservation: J6475 - Jamul Indian Village
- State: California
- County: San Diego
- FFS: 6K1

**Description**
Funds will be used for road maintenance activities on all eligible routes on the inventory.

### Table 10. Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS Entity</th>
<th>Indian Reservation Roads Program Project Detail Report (Single CSTIP version)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J4575</td>
<td>FY 2016 ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4575</td>
<td>5,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Identification**
- Region: J4 - Southern California
- Reservation: J4575 - Jamul Indian Village
- State: California
- County: San Diego
- FFS: 6K1

**Description**
Funds will be used for the planning of a tribal transit program.
6 TRANSPORTATION & SAFETY PLAN INTEGRATION

6.1 Potential Need for Safety Plans

Each year under the FAST Act, 2016 to 2020, 2% of the available TTP funds are set aside to address transportation safety issues in Native America. Funds are available to federally recognized Indian tribes through a competitive, discretionary program. Awarded annually, projects are chosen whose outcomes will address the prevention and reduction of death or serious injuries in transportation related incidents, such as motor vehicle crashes. Transportation fatalities and injuries severely impact the quality of life in Indian country. Statistics are consistently higher than the rest of the nation as a whole.\(^5\)

Jamul Indian Village received funding to develop and adopt a Safety Plan. This effort was completed in August 2019. Components of the Safety Plan are outlined in the following sections.

6.2 Safety Goals and Objectives

Providing safe, sustainable, and efficient transportation for their tribe members and their neighboring community is a primary goal for Jamul and their safety partners. Through the development of the Safety Plan, the Tribe continued their collaboration with their safety partners to discuss issues within the reservation, the region, and beyond. Using collision analysis, engineering evaluations, prior documents and information, and the ideas generated from the kick-off meeting, the Jamul Indian Village Strategic Transportation Safety Plan was developed. This Safety Plan focuses on the five E's of safety: Engineering, Enforcement, Education, Emergency Response, and Everyone. The key components of the Safety Plan include emphasis areas with an evaluation and implementation plan for each. Jamul’s vision for the Safety Plan is shown below.

Provide safe, sustainable, and efficient transportation to enhance the economy and standard of living for the Tribe and its neighboring community.

6.3 Emphasis Areas

6.3.1 Emphasis Area One: Improve Driver Expectancy

Description:

There are limited visual cues on the roadways to and from Jamul, creating an environment where drivers are unable to expect the tasks they may need to perform while driving. Visual cues help drivers understand what may come ahead and be able to adjust their driving to the upcoming roadway conditions. Drivers must be given consistent and coherent information if they are to be expected to behave in a consistent and safe manner. This information comes from the road geometry, signs, and markings.

Many of the local roadways are undivided two-lane facilities that lack the necessary signs and markings to help facilitate driver’s expectancy of the upcoming roadway conditions. For instance, SR-94 is a winding road with limited signalized intersections, lighting, and occasional curves. There are limited to

no acceleration/deceleration lanes to allow drivers the opportunity to speed up or slow down, causing stop-and-go traffic and a high number of speed-related collisions. Additionally, animals native to the area may enter the road, causing an unexpected situation for drivers especially when the road is lacking animal crossing signs. Because of the lack of lighting and advance-warning signs such as signs for merging traffic, winding road, and slow traffic ahead, drivers have difficulty preparing for potential hazards upcoming on the roadway.

**DATA FINDING**

| Nearly 59% of fatal and severe collisions within the five-mile area of Jamul are attributed to hitting an object or rear end accidents. About 58% of fatal and severe collisions within the five-mile area are primarily caused by unsafe speeds and improper turning. Six of the unsafe speed related collisions involved a pedestrian or bicyclist. |

From the collision data and anecdotal information provided by Jamul stakeholders, factors contributing to accidents which are indicative of driver expectancy problems include:

- Improper turning, possibly from inadequate signage
- Unexpected or inappropriate maneuvers or actions by road users (e.g., slow down of vehicles to make a turn onto an adjacent roadway or driveway, inability of vehicles to match the flow of traffic due to the lack of acceleration lanes)
- Speeds that are inappropriate for the road conditions (e.g., high speeds on winding roadway, high speeds with upcoming curves)

**Goals:**

- Provide road users with sufficient visibility, advance signs, striping, and other traffic cues to safely reach their destination
- Area-wide signage for road identification and traffic control
- Reduce the frequency and severity of crashes at signalized and unsignalized intersections

**Strategies:**

- Improve sight distance
- Provide advance signing and wayfinding
- Provide turn lanes at intersections with higher turning volume movements
- Add safety striping and rumble strips to centerlines and roadway edges
- Provide accessible shoulders
- Install lighting

**POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENT LOCATION**

**Signage Improvements**

Increase driver awareness by installing the following advanced warning signs:

- Intersection ahead
- Merging traffic
- Set of curves
- Animal crossing
6.3.2 Emphasis Area Two: Improve Active Transportation Facilities

Description:

The reservation of Jamul is situated in rural, unincorporated San Diego County where many of the roads lack active transportation infrastructure such as sidewalks, crosswalks, bike paths, intersection control, and speed controls that help provide a safe and comfortable environment for people walking and biking.

There are many communities, especially students and the reservation’s employees that need appropriate and safe active transportation infrastructure to commute to key destinations such the Jamul Indian Village. Pedestrians frequently walk on the highway (SR 94), or on the gravel beside it, to move along the corridor. The high speeds on roads, lack of crosswalks, and absence of designated pedestrian and bike pathways create unsafe conditions, especially for students walking and biking to school and the tribe’s employees and members who walk and bike to the reservation.

DATA FINDING

Six fatal and severe collisions between 2013 and 2017 within the Jamul five-mile area involved a pedestrian or bicyclist. As there is limited active transportation infrastructure, the collisions occurred either in the road, shoulder, or crossing the street where there is no crosswalk.

Goals:

- Decrease number of pedestrians walking along the highway with high-speeding vehicles
- Improve active transportation infrastructure by adding pedestrian facilities, bike lanes, and other amenities to make it safer for Jamul’s members and employees and community members to get to key destinations such as school, commercial centers, transit center, and the reservation
- Encourage healthier lifestyles through active transportation infrastructure

Strategies:

- Install high-visibility crosswalk markings at the intersection of key destinations
- Install advance school and pedestrian signage
- Provide dedicated pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure to and from bus stops
- Install adequate street lighting
- Widen street shoulders
- Provide signage (e.g., pedestrian crossing ahead) to help drivers expect to slow down for pedestrians and bikes

POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENT LOCATION

Multiuse Pathway Along SR-94

Look into installing a mixed-use pathway along SR-94 for pedestrians and cyclists that is separated from the roadway and connects the reservation to nearby schools, bus stops, and commercial centers
6.3.3 Emphasis Area Three: Eliminate Impaired Driving

**Description:**

The second leading collision factor for fatal and severe injuries is between 2013 and 2017 in the five-mile area of Jamul is driving or biking under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs, which is three percent higher than the next highest collision factor (unsafe speeds) and about nine percent higher than the fourth highest collision factor. The percentage of fatal and severe injuries due to a driver being under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs is higher than California and is relatively the same as unincorporated areas of San Diego County and other tribal lands. By law, drivers are alcohol-impaired when they have a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of 0.08% or higher.

**DATA FINDING**

About 23% of fatal and severe injuries that occurred within the five-mile area involved impaired driving.

**Goals:**

- Reduce the number of fatal and severe injury accidents attributed to driving under the influence

**Strategies:**

- Authorize, publicize, and conduct sobriety checkpoints programs
- Implement an impaired driving education campaign
- Additional enforcement presence
- Continued partnership with Jamul Casino to intercept potentially impaired drivers on-site

**POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENT LOCATION**

- Impaired driving education campaign (e.g., community awareness events)
- Additional enforcement presence
- Continued partnership with Jamul Casino to intercept potentially impaired drivers on-site

6.3.4 Emphasis Area Four: Improve Intersection Safety

**Description:**

The risks associated with unsignalized rural highway intersections are relatively high. Motorists often travel at high speeds on rural highways, not expecting to have to suddenly yield to a slowing vehicle, a crossing pedestrian, or bicyclist. While rural intersection collisions occur less frequently than urban intersection collisions due to lower traffic volume, the severity of injury and/or fatality tends to be higher in rural collisions due to the average vehicle speed. A large portion of rural intersection fatalities occur at unsignalized intersections. Rural unsignalized intersections experience twice as many fatal crashes as urban unsignalized intersections. Many of the risks associated with unsignalized rural intersections occur along SR-94.
Locals note that the intersection of SR-94 and Otay Lakes Road tend to be extremely dangerous for those making left turns. This intersection typifies the issues associated with non-signalized intersections.

**Goals:**

- Improve intersections by incorporating safer crossings
- Reduce the number of pedestrian/vehicle conflicts by improving intersection design

**Strategies:**

- Signalize intersections with low-visibility, heavy traffic flow, or high speeds
- Create high-visibility crosswalks to improve pedestrian safety
- Add early-warning systems to alert drivers of approaching intersections

**Potential Improvement Location:**

- Signalize Intersection of I-94 and Otay Lakes to prevent blind turns and improve the intersection for all modes

6.3.5 Emphasis Area Five: Improve Roadway Geometry

**Description:**

The roadway geometry of roads in rural, unincorporated San Diego County is often substandard. Despite being a high-speed corridor, the SR-94 does not possess the necessary turn-lane infrastructure or general width of road to maintain safe travel for all users.

**Data Finding:**

The fire station directly adjacent to the Jamul Indian Village lacks the necessary acceleration lane for its firetrucks and must perform risky entrance/exit maneuvers to respond to calls.

**Goals:**

- Increase roadway safety by improving roadway geometry

**Strategies:**

- Education
  - Work with schools
  - Organize targeted education campaign on safety problems at “high risk” intersections along SR 94
- Engineering
  - Focus on lanes near the driveways of the fire station
- Enforcement
7 DEFERRED MAINTENANCE ROADS:

7.1 Purpose and Need

The purpose in conducting the Level of Service (LOS) data collection in regards to existing Deferred Maintenance Roads is to identify existing BIA roads within the boundaries of tribal lands that are in need of future maintenance. A LOS rating is applied to existing roads to determine a priority for maintenance, which in turn is given a cost estimate by engineers, thus allows the Tribes and BIA to apply existing and future TTP funds.

7.2 Level of Service

In Table 11, shows the existing BIA routes with LOS rating, and the ratings indicate the higher the number the higher the need for road maintenance and repair. This list will be updated in the near future to reflect the recent data collected regarding the LOS rating that was conducted in the summer of 2018. Some roads are now in better condition as a result of Tribal accomplishments to repair their road system.

Table 11. Jamul: Deferred Maintenance Assessment for Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Qtr</th>
<th>Surface Type Code</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Level Of Service Code</th>
<th>Maintenance Need ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4- Bitumenous &lt; 2&quot;</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1: Excellent</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: RIFDS DMR, 2013)

The LOS/DMR data collect were used by BIA Engineers to generate approximate cost estimates to rehabilitate an existing BIA road with the full depth reclamation (FDR) approach or considered a routine maintenance (ROU) activity for the tribe to consider depending on their constraint TTP funds and other funding sources. This information is listed in the next section on Suggested Implementation of LRTP: LOS & Safety Plan - Road Maintenance Projects.

7.3 Suggested Implementation of LRTP: LOS & Safety Plan - Road Maintenance Projects

The cost estimates generated by BIA staff in the tables below are based on commercial estimates. These estimates will change with time, distance, and material cost. Tribes can consider one of two possible
options to address the need to repair, restore, and preserve existing roadway surface conditions within tribal lands regarding BIA own roads.

Option One – a Tribe with an established Transportation Program, with its own equipment and labor can address their road maintenance needs with TTP funds.

Option Two – to reduce the cost for road maintenance activities (patch work, signs, stripping, etc.) to Tribes. A “host” Tribe can consider the California Indian Tribal Transportation Alliance (CITTA) approach. The CITTA was initiated in the spring of 2019, which considers the “host” Tribe to apply their TTP funds for road maintenance activities and partner with other Tribes who have access to equipment and labor, hence the “host” Tribe will go into an agreement with the partnering Tribe(s) to pay for equipment and labor cost. In this approach the Tribe could have a potential savings of approximately 40% in comparison to commercial cost depending on distance, maintenance activities, and material cost.

Option Three – a Tribe can bid out for a commercial contract.

Prioritization

Because of the mitigations and proposed project improvements outlined in the Jamul’s Traffic Impact Study, it would be important for Jamul to continue working diligently with Caltrans and San Diego County to improve intersections and roadways at the following locations:

- Jamacha Boulevard & SR-94
- Jamacha Road & SR-94
- Steele Canyon Road & SR-94
- Melody Road & SR-94
- Daisy Drive & SR-94
- Maxfield Road & SR-94

Proposed improvements include but not limited to additional lanes, re-striping, new signal installation, and roadway widening to provide dedicated turn lanes.

Implementation

Daisy Road Reconstruction & Realignment - Completed

The reconstruction of Daisy Road along with its realignment near its intersection with SR 94 has been completed. In addition, traffic and safety improvements such as striping and rumble strips have been made along Daisy Road.

SR-94 at Steele Canyon Road Realignment (Construction)

The project will enhance safety conditions and help reduce rear-end collisions and improve vehicle turning/passing through the intersection as the project will provide an additional lane in the eastbound direction for right turn movement to help minimize collisions between vehicles turning right and following vehicles, and merging taper lanes to allow slower vehicles to accelerate into the common through lane while allowing for passenger car vehicles to safety pass the slower vehicles at the intersection. The proposed through/right-turn lane will help reduce the undesirable effects and collisions currently resulting between vehicles going through and vehicle decelerating to turn right along the project limits, which experiences high-volumes (AADT of 16,946) and high-speeds (55 mph). In addition, the collision analysis performed showed that 10% of the collisions at the project location dealt with hitting an
object. The project also removes existing fixed objects (utility) within the clear recovery zone. Through the proposed improvements, the project aims to enhance safety conditions for all users – vehicle users, families dropping off their students at the nearby high school, and employees accessing their work. This project supports the identified “Improve Driver Expectancy,” “Improve Roadway Geometry,” and “Improve Intersection Safety” emphasis areas in the Tribe’s Safety Plan.

7.3.1 FY2020 to FY2025: Short Range - Road Maintenance Projects

7.3.1.1 Proposed Projects

**Intersection Improvements: SR-94 & Jamacha Boulevard**

The proposed project is at the intersection of SR-94 and Jamacha Boulevard in San Diego County.

The project proposes to restripe the northbound through shared left-turn lane to a northbound through shared right-turn lane. The project would include the required traffic signal modifications. This project will improve traffic and signal operations along the SR-94 corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Item</th>
<th>Amount (Millions$^6$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAED (10%)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E (10%)</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (5%)</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.07M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Improvements: SR-94 & Jamacha Road**

The proposed project is at the intersection of SR-94 and Jamacha Boulevard in San Diego County.

The project proposes to restripe the northbound through lane to a northbound left turn lane and northbound right-turn lane to a shared through right-turn lane. The project would include the required traffic signal modifications. The project also proposes to add a second eastbound right-turn lane. This project will improve traffic and signal operations along the SR-94 corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Item</th>
<th>Amount (Millions$^7$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAED (10%)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E (10%)</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (5%)</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.25M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^6$ Assuming 2021 dollars

$^7$ Assuming 2021 dollars
Intersection Improvements: SR-94 & Steele Canyon Rd

The proposed project is at the intersection of SR-94 and Steele Canyon Rd in San Diego County. The NTTFI Route Number is S094 and the Section Number is 870.

The proposed project proposes to reconstruct the roadway along SR-94 between Pine Lane and Rancho Miguel Road to provide additional through lanes and merging taper lanes in each direction, improve shoulder, curb, gutter, and pedestrian ramp to current standards, relocate existing fixed objects (utility) within clear recovery zone, and improve drainage. The project proposes to add second eastbound and westbound through lanes. This project will improve traffic and signal operations along the SR-94 corridor.

The project will not only improve the traffic operations along the SR 94 segment and performance of the signalized intersection, but it will also enhance the safety as the project will remove existing fixed objects (utility) within the clear recovery zone, provide an additional lane in the eastbound direction for right turn movement to help minimize collisions between vehicles turning right and following vehicles, and merging taper lanes to allow vehicles to accelerate into the common through lane while allowing for passenger car vehicles to safely pass the slower vehicles at the intersection.

The project has obtained environmental clearance and the design of the project is near complete and approved and is looking for funding to construct the design. The total construction cost for the project is $2.5M as shown in the cost estimate provided in Attachment A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Item</th>
<th>Amount (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAED (10%)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E (10%)</td>
<td>$0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (5%)</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>$0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.0M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intersection Improvements: SR-94 & Melody Road

The proposed project is at the intersection of SR-94 and Melody Rd in San Diego County.

The project proposes to install a traffic signal at this intersection. Additionally, this project proposes restriping the northbound shared left-through-right lane to a through-right lane and adding a northbound left turn lane. The project also proposes restriping the southbound shared left-through right lane to a through-right lane and adding a southbound left turn lane. This project will improve traffic and signal operations along the SR-94 corridor.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Item</th>
<th>Amount (Millions¹⁰)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAED (10%)</td>
<td>$0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E (10%)</td>
<td>$0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (5%)</td>
<td>$6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8.01M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Improvements: SR-94 & Maxfield Road**

The proposed project is at the intersection of SR-94 and Maxfield Road in San Diego County.

The project proposes to restripe the northbound and southbound approaches along SR-94 to include a two-way-left-turn acceleration lane. This project will improve traffic and signal operations along the SR-94 corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Item</th>
<th>Amount (Millions¹⁰)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAED (10%)</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E (10%)</td>
<td>$0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (5%)</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.7M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SR-94 Multi-Use Pathway**

The proposed project recommends a 7-mile multi-use path along a segment of SR 94 in the Jamul-Dulzura community of San Diego County. The project begins at the intersection of Jamacha Road and Campo Road/SR 94, and ends at the southeastern boundary of the Jamul-Dulzura community in the County of San Diego. The NTTFI Route Number is S094 and the Section Number is 870 and 880.

The multi-use path, also termed as a shared-use path or Class I facility, is a path that is physically separate from motor vehicle traffic and exclusively used by people biking, walking, and those using modes of low-speed travel.

The project is planning to complete its feasibility study in late 2021/early 2022. As part of this effort, a preliminary cost estimate for the proposed project will be drafted. Funding for the next phases of the project is being identified.

---

¹ Assuming 2021 dollars
¹⁰ Assuming 2021 dollars
7.3.2 FY2025 to FY2030: Intermediate Range - Road Maintenance Projects

**SR-94 at Otay Lakes Road Intersection Improvements**

The proposed project is at the intersection of SR-94 and Otay Lakes Road.

The proposed project is to install a signal and improve drainage at Otay Lakes Road and SR-94. Currently, the intersection has a stop sign on the west leg (Otay Lakes Road) and no stop sign on the north and south legs (SR-94).

Funding for the proposed project is being identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Item</th>
<th>Amount (Millions(^{11}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAED</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>$0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.84M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.3 FY2030 to FY2040: Long Range Road Maintenance Projects

None have been identified at this time.

8 FUNDING SOURCES/STRATEGIES

8.1 BIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian Loan Guarantee and Insurance Program (ILGP)</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Through ILGP, BIA’s Division of Capital Investment (DCI) helps tribes and individuals overcome barriers to conventional financing and secure reasonable interest rates, while also reducing the risk to lenders by providing financial backing from the federal government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 Federal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Transportation Program Safety Fund (TTPSF)</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Each year under the FAST Act, 2% of the available TTP funds are set aside to address transportation safety issues in Native America. TTPSF grants are available to federally recognized Indian tribes through a competitive, discretionary program. Awarded annually, projects are chosen whose outcomes will</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) Assuming 2021 dollars
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP)</td>
<td>FLAP, FHWA</td>
<td>Provides funds for projects on federal lands like access transportation facilities that are located on or adjacent to, or that provide access to, federal lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Lands Transportation Program (FLTP)</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>The FLTP funds projects that improve access within the federal estate (national forests, national parks, national wildlife refuges, national recreation areas, and other federal public lands) on transportation facilities in the national federal lands transportation inventory and owned and maintained by the federal government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>The HSIP is a core federal-aid program with the purpose of achieving a significant reduction in fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads, including non-state-owned public roads and roads on tribal lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>The NHPP provides support for the condition and performance of the National Highway System (NHS), for the construction of new facilities on the NHS, and to ensure that investments of federal-aid funds in highway construction are directed to support progress toward the achievement of performance targets established in a state's asset management plan for the NHS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus and Bus Facilities Program (Section 5339)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (FTA)/Caltrans Division of Rail and Mass Transportation</td>
<td>The Grants for Buses and Bus Facilities program makes federal resources available to states and direct recipients to replace, rehabilitate, and purchase buses and related equipment and to construct bus-related facilities. Eligible recipients include direct recipients that operate fixed route bus service or that allocate funding to fixed route bus operators; state or local governmental entities; and federally-recognized Indian tribes that operate fixed route bus service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Public Transportation Program (Section 5311)</td>
<td>FTA/Caltrans Division of Rail and Mass Transportation</td>
<td>This program provides capital, planning, and operating assistance to states to support public transportation in rural areas with populations less than 50,000, where many residents often rely on public transit to reach their destinations. Funds may be used for public transit services operating: within small urban and rural communities, among small urban and rural communities, or between small urban and rural communities and urbanized areas (cities of 50,000 or more).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP)</td>
<td>FTA/Cal ACT</td>
<td>The RTAP provides a source of funding to assist in the design and implementation of training and technical assistance projects and other support services tailored to meet the needs of transit operators in nonurbanized areas. Eligible recipients include states, local governments, and providers of rural transit services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant Program</td>
<td>FHWA/Caltrans</td>
<td>The STBGP provides flexible funding that may be used by states and localities for projects to preserve and improve the conditions and performance on any federal aid highway, bridge and tunnel projects on any public road, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit capital projects, including intercity bus terminals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Program Name | Agency | Description
---|---|---
Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grants | U.S. DOT | The TIGER Discretionary Grant program provides a unique opportunity for the DOT to invest in road, rail, transit, and port projects that promise to achieve national objectives.

Indian Community Development Block Grant (ICDBG) | The Office of Native American Programs (ONAP) | The purpose of the ICDBG program is the development of viable Indian and Alaska Native communities including the creation of decent housing, suitable living environments, and economic opportunities primarily for persons with low- and moderate- incomes as defined in 24 CFR 1003.4. Applicants can use these funds for a multitude of community development purposes.

### 8.3 State

| Program Name | Agency | Description |
---|---|---|
Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program | Caltrans | New grant funding through Senate Bill 1

Active Transportation Program (ATP) | Caltrans | The ATP funds capital and planning projects that encourage increased use of active modes of transportation through increasing proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking, increasing safety and mobility for non-motorized users, and advancing active transportation efforts to achieve Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction goals. Eligible projects may include, but are not limited to:
- Infrastructure Projects: Capital improvements that will further the goals of ATP.
- Non-Infrastructure (NI) Projects: Education, encouragement, and enforcement activities that further the goals of the ATP.
- Combination Projects: A project that combines Infrastructure and Non-Infrastructure components.
- Plans: The development of a community wide bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to school, or active transportation plan that is located in a disadvantaged community.

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) | FHWA/Caltrans | The HSIP is a core federal-aid program with the purpose of achieving a significant reduction in fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. Eligible projects may include, but are not limited to:
- Intersection improvements
- Construction of shoulders
- Traffic calming
- Improvements for bicyclists, pedestrians, and individuals with disabilities
- Minimum standards of retro-reflectivity of traffic signs and pavement markings
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### Program Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>The Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program include the Sustainable Communities Grants and Strategic Partnership Grants. Eligible projects may include, but are not limited to:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | • Active transportation plans  
| | | • Studies that advance a community’s effort to reduce transportation related greenhouse gases  
| | | • Complete Streets Plans  
| | | • First Mile / Last Mile project development planning  
| | | • Community to school studies or safe routes to school plans  
| | | • Traffic calming and safety enhancement plans  
| | | • Data collection/data sharing initiatives |

### 8.4 County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>The Smart Growth and Active Transportation Grant Programs fund local capital and planning projects that increase opportunities for biking, walking, and transit usage throughout the region. Eligible projects may include, but are not limited to:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | • Pedestrian street crossings  
| | | • Traffic calming features  
| | | • Pedestrian & bicycle facilities  
| | | • Comprehensive planning efforts (e.g., Community Plans)  
| | | • Smaller-scale neighborhood planning activities (e.g., Traffic calming or mobility plans) |

### 8.5 Alternative Sources

In addition to pursuing funding from public sources, the private sector is an increasingly willing partner on transportation improvement projects. Public stakeholders can engage the private sector on one or more components of project delivery including planning, design, construction, finance, operations, and maintenance. The benefits and challenges of P3s for public stakeholders include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Reduced financial risk  
| • Condensed project delivery timelines  
| • Quality assurances  
| • Lower ongoing costs  
| • Innovation  
| • Greater access to financial resources | • Complex contracting  
| | • Matching expertise with project scope  
| | • Management and oversight  
| | • Partner financial stability |
4/23/2021

Hon. Hon. Catherine Blakespear, Chairwoman
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, Ca 92101

RE: Pala Reservation Tribal Transportation Plan

Dear Chairman Blakespear,

In 2011, for the first time ever, the tribes of the San Diego Region submitted their Reservation Tribal Transportation Plans as a diplomatic courtesy to share their priorities with SANDAG. Since 2011, much progress has been made, but there is still much to do.

We have succeeded in having tribal priorities included in the Regional Transportation Plan by way of the Intraregional Tribal Transportation Strategy (ITTS), and now the next step is seeing those priorities implemented.

In the spirit of sharing, our tribe, the Pala Band of Mission Indians submits our current Tribal Transportation Plan (2014) for inclusion as a technical annex to the 2021 Regional Plan.

The Pala Band of Mission Indians, (appearing in the U.S. Federal Register at Vol. 75, No 190, p 60810 as the Pala Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Pala Reservation, California) is a self-governing federally recognized Indian Tribe exercising sovereign authority over the lands of the Pala Reservation.

Please find enclosed the Pala Reservation Summary Tribal Transportation Plan. We are pleased to work with you to highlight the importance of tribal transportation planning in the regional process. Should you need any additional information, please contact Chris Nejo at 760-891-3564.

Respectfully,

Robert Smith, Chairman
Per 25 CFR Part 170 at subsection 170.414, this summary narrative serves as justification of that Pala Band of Mission Indians’ FY2021 to 2041 LRTP (Long Range Transportation Plan) update is consistent with State and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), hence San Diego Forward: the 2021 Regional Plan.

The purpose of transportation planning is to identify broad goals to meet transportation needs of a community. Multi-modal strategies for achieving these goals can and should consider current and future community land use, economic development, environment (natural, human, and cultural), traffic demand, public safety, health, and social needs, among others.¹

Background Information

The Pala Band of Mission Indians, (appearing in the U.S. Federal Register at Vol. 75, No 190, p 60810 as the Pala Band of Luiseño Mission Indians of the Pala Reservation, California) is a self-governing federally recognized Indian Tribe exercising sovereign authority over the lands of the Pala Reservation. The Pala Reservation was established in 1875 for the Luiseño people of Pala by executive order of President Grant, and was expanded in 1902 to accommodate the arrival of the Cupeño people of Warner Springs, who were removed to the Pala Reservation from their ancestral village of Cupa in 1903.

The Pala Reservation consists of over 12,000 acres. It is located approximately 60 miles north-northeast of the City of San Diego on State Route 76, six miles east of Interstate 15. The reservation is served by three County roads (Pala Temecula Road, Lilac Road, and Pala Mission Road), SR 76, and multiple tribal/BIA roads. Public transportation needs are served by North County Transit System, which serves three stops on the Reservation. The tribe has approximately 1,000 members, more than half of whom live on the reservation. There are over 500 houses in Pala. Infrastructure and services include a public sewer system and tertiary wastewater treatment plant; utilities; Pala Solid Waste Transfer Station; Vivian Banks Charter School (Bonsall Unified School District, grades K-5); Pala Learning Center library; Pala Youth Center; Cupa Cultural Center; Pala Fire Department; Pala Tribal Law Enforcement; social service programs for families, children, and seniors; Pala Fitness Center; Jim Banks Sports Park; Wells Fargo Bank; Pala Mission Catholic Church; and two tribal cemeteries. The Pala Tribal Administration Center includes departments of finance; housing; business; environment; social services; and maintenance, as well as the offices of the Pala Executive Committee.

The Pala Band of Mission Indians is the sole owner and operator of the Pala Casino Resort and Spa, the Pala Gas Station and Mini Mart, and the Pala Raceway, a motocross park. Pala’s agricultural enterprises include orange, avocado, and grapefruit groves. Together, these businesses employ several thousand people.

Existing Transportation Conditions

The Pala Reservation is accessed via State Route 76 from Interstate 15, approximately six miles to the west. SR 76 is the main arterial road and runs for approximately four miles west to east through the reservation. I-15 is the major access point to Escondido, San Marcos, Vista, and San Diego. SR 76 provides access to Oceanside to the west. To the east, SR 76 connects to the Pauma, Rincon, La Jolla, and Mesa Grande reservations, and to Indian Health Services (located on the Rincon Reservation). The second major point of access to the Pala Reservation is via Pala Temecula Road, which travels north from SR 76/Pala Mission Road to Temecula and other points in Riverside County. Secondary access to Valley Center and Escondido to the south comes via Lilac Road, which is unpaved and largely unimproved until it leaves the Pala Reservation. Pala Mission Road connects to SR 76 on both the west and east and operates as a bypass that serves the reservation core (see map). Pala Mission Road has two NCTS bus stops; a third stop is located on SR 76 at Pala Casino. The three County roads combined total approximately 9 linear miles within Pala Reservation boundaries. While SR 76 is in good condition, all three County roads are in need of reengineering or repair. The Pala Reservation’s roads serve approximately 6,000 vehicles per day.

Goals and Objectives

1. Improve County roads
   a. Secure funding for improvements
   b. Complete improvements within a three-year period

2. Bicycle Lanes
   a. Conduct feasibility study
   b. Estimate cost of implementation
   c. Complete within a three to four-year period

3. Improve Pala Temecula Road
   a. Engineering feasibility study on straightening the road
   b. Assess areas for potential turn-outs
   c. Estimate cost

4. Improve Lilac Road
   a. Assess cost of paving
   b. Assess possible engineering design changes
   c. Complete within five years

Priority Projects

Please include a list of short- and long-term projects, including at least one project that involves the regional transportation network (transit, highway...). Please tailor the number projects to the specific needs of your tribe.
1. In coordination with Caltrans and the County, make improvements to SR 76, specifically:
   a. Conduct engineering study for possible turning lanes
   b. Estimate cost

2. In coordination with the County, make improvements to Pala Temecula Road, specifically:
   a. Evaluate potential surface designs
   b. Estimate cost

3. In coordination with the County, make improvements to Lilac Road, specifically:
   a. Assess potential engineering and design changes
   b. Determine feasibility of paving
   c. Estimate cost
April 23, 2021

Hon. Catherine Blakespear, Chairwoman
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, Ca 92101

RE: Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians Tribal Long Range Transportation Plan

Dear Chair Blakespear,

For the last two cycles of the Regional Plan, the tribes in the San Diego region submitted summaries of their Long Range Transportation Plans as a diplomatic courtesy to share their priorities with SANDAG. The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, (SCTCA), believes that sharing this information is an important step to understanding the linkages between regional and tribal priorities. In that continued spirit of sharing, our tribe, the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, submits a summary of our current Tribal Transportation Plan for inclusion in the San Diego Forward document.

The Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, (appearing in the U.S. Federal Register at Vol. 75, No 190, p 60810 as the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians) is a self-governing federally recognized Indian Tribe exercising sovereign authority over the lands of the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians.

We are pleased to work with you to highlight the importance of tribal transportation planning in the regional process. Should you need additional information, please contact Tribal Council person John Constantino at (760) 749-1051

Respectfully,

Tribal Administrator
Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians

Transportation Plan Summary

2021

Per 25 CFR Part 170 at subsection 170.414, this summary narrative serves as justification of that Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians FY2021 to 2041 LRTP (Long Range Transportation Plan) update is consistent with State and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), hence San Diego Forward: the 2021 Regional Plan.

The purpose of transportation planning is to identify broad goals to meet transportation needs of a community. Multi-modal strategies for achieving these goals can and should consider current and future community land use, economic development, environment (natural, human, and cultural), traffic demand, public safety, health, and social needs, among others.

Background Information

Established in 1875, the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians (“Rincon Tribe”) is a federally recognized Indian tribe that occupies a 4,688-acre (7.3 square mile) reservation located in north central San Diego County, California, approximately 45 miles northeast of the City of San Diego, California. The Reservation is situated within the Rodriguez Mountain and Boucher Hill U.S. Geological Survey 1:24,000 quadrangles, northeast of the unincorporated community of Valley Center and south of the intersection of State Route 76 (SR-76) and Valley Center Road (County Road S-6). The La Jolla Indian Reservation lies immediately adjacent to the Rincon Reservation to the northeast.

The Tribe consists of a General Membership of 517 members and acts by and through its Tribal Council consisting of five members elected to serve two-year terms. There are presently 409 homes on the reservation. Approximately 4,500 – 1,800 residents (based on preliminary 2020 census data) and a few small businesses are scattered throughout the reservation, as well as Harrah’s Resort Southern California, which includes 1,065 rooms spread between three hotel towers, 10 restaurants, 10 bars, 2 shopping outlets, a spa and parking for patrons.

Land Use

Current and Planned Land Use on the Rincon Reservation is illustrated in Figure 1.
Existing Road Conditions

The existing roads on the reservation are illustrated in Figure 2. The condition and ownership of the roads is illustrated in Table 1: Road Conditions.

Roads on the reservation are either paved or unpaved.
Figure 2: Roads on the Rincon Reservation
Table 1: Road Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET NAME</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SURFACE</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Calac Road</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Calac Road</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Unpaved</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus Lane</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golsh Road</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazzetti Lane</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick Lane</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendoza Lane</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales Lane</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omish</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Paradise Creek Lane</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Paved/Unpaved</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Road</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Top Lane</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Tribal Road</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arviso Road</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucher Heights</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Unpaved</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damian Lane</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolb Road</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Unpaved</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuutput Road</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luiseño Road</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningstar Road</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tank</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Paradise Creek Lane</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Paradise Creek Lane</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon Hill Top View</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tank</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Bush Lane/Abandoned Tank</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Lane</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waa’ash Road</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Center Road</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Paved</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals and Objectives

Rincon envisions a transportation system that maximizes the social and economic well-being of the Rincon Band and its community in a resilient, safe, and cost-effective manner. Overall goals include providing safe, affordable, and convenient means for all, including the young, elders, and people with disabilities, to participate in the activities of daily living and to enhance the economic wellbeing of Rincon, and ensuring that transportation infrastructure and services support:

- Current and future housing needs;
- Economic activities and further economic development;
- Emergency services and law enforcement access;
- Safety for drivers, passengers, pedestrians, and bicyclists;
- A healthy environment (reductions in air and water pollution); and
- Human health by encouraging walking and bicycling (active transportation)

Policies Guiding Short and Long-Range Strategies:

- Must address current and future transportation needs;
- Must be consistent with applicable Tribal, Federal, and State government policies where applicable;
- Must consider existing and future land uses, economic development, traffic demand, public safety, health, and social needs; and
- Must consider all modes of transportation including vehicle, transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and as appropriate, freight, rail, air, and water.

Priority Projects

1. Improve the condition of the local streets
   - Paving or re-paving more streets
   - Widening streets, where appropriate
   - Acquiring easements to allow wider rights-of-way

2. Improve traffic and pedestrian safety
   - Installing street lighting where appropriate
   - Constructing sidewalks for pedestrian use, where possible.

3. Flood Hazard Mitigation
   - Have an engineer design and construct stormwater runoff systems
   - Repair existing erosion prevention structures

4. Public Transit
   - Improve the bus shelter structures
   - Improve public transit options for handicapped and disabled individuals.
April 28, 2021

Hon. Catherine Blakespear, Chairwoman
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, Ca 92101

RE: San Pasqual Band of Diegueño Mission Indians of California Tribal Long Range Transportation Plan

Dear Chair Blakespear,

For the last two cycles of the Regional Plan, the tribes in the San Diego region submitted summaries of their Long Range Transportation Plans as a diplomatic courtesy to share their priorities with SANDAG. The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, (SCTCA), believes that sharing this information is an important step to understanding the linkages between regional and tribal priorities. In that continued spirit of sharing, our tribe, the San Pasqual Band of Diegueño Mission Indians of California, submits a summary of our current Tribal Transportation Plan for inclusion in the San Diego Forward document.

The San Pasqual Band of Diegueño Mission Indians of California, (appearing in the U.S. Federal Register at Vol. 75, No 190, p 60810 as the San Pasqual Band of Diegueño Mission Indians of California) is a self-governing federally recognized Indian Tribe exercising sovereign authority over the lands of the San Pasqual Band of Diegueño Mission Indians of California.

We are pleased to work with you to highlight the importance of tribal transportation planning in the regional process. Should you need additional information, please contact Andrew Orosco at (760) 651-5158.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Tribal Chairman
San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians Transportation Plan
Summary 2021

Per 25 CFR Part 170 at subsection 170.414, this summary narrative serves as justification of that San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians FY2021 to 2041 LRTP (Long Range Transportation Plan) update is consistent with State and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), hence San Diego Forward: the 2021 Regional Plan.

The purpose of transportation planning is to identify broad goals to meet transportation needs of a community. Multi-modal strategies for achieving these goals can and should consider current and future community land use, economic development, environment (natural, human, and cultural), traffic demand, public safety, health, and social needs, among others.1

Background Information

The San Pasqual Band of Diegueño Mission Indians of California is a federally recognized American Indian Tribe of Diegueño/Kumeyaay origin consisting of 162 federally enrolled members.

The San Pasqual Band of Diegueño Mission Indians of California originally occupied territory in the San Pasqual Valley and adjacent areas of San Diego County, where the San Diego Wild Animal Park is now situated. The present reservation, approximately ten miles east of the City of Escondido, in the Valley Center region of San Diego County, was established by the federal government July 1, 1910, acting under the Congressional Act of 1891. Currently, there are approximately 1,925 acres of trust land and approximately 1,065 acres in fee. The San Pasqual Reservation has approximately 430 residential homes, gaming facility, fuel center, Education Center, Community Center, Fire Department, Fire fighter cadet training academy, Tribal Administrative Office building (HR Department Finance Department Information Technology & Tribal Government), Housing Department, and Public Safety office building, Public Works and Planning Department office building, Environmental/Domestic/Waste Water/Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO), and a Domestic Violence office.

The San Pasqual Band of Diegueño Mission Indians of California began its first major economic development activity with the opening of Valley View Casino interim facility in April of 2001. In December 2010, the tribe completed an eight-story hotel. The casino & hotel currently provide employment for over 1,200 people. This tribal business enterprise provides a steppingstone to make San Pasqual financially independent and create a long-term, diversified, sustainable economy for generations to come.

The San Pasqual Tribal Government is continuously making every effort to improve the tribe’s infrastructure, i.e. underground utilities and roads, in order to improve the quality of life if its people, as well as provide the best quality of amenities for those who come to visit.

Existing Transportation Conditions

The San Pasqual Reservation is served by a network of seven county roads, ten Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) roads, and 10 tribal roads. Valley Center Road (see attached map)—a regional arterial road—is the primary access road to the City of Escondido. The residents of the San Pasqual Reservation use Lake Wohlford Road (a regional arterial), North Lake Wohlford Road, Paradise Mountain Road, and Woods Valley Road to reach Valley Center Road. Within the reservation, the county roads form the primary network of roads. North Lake Wohlford cuts through the center of the reservation from south to north, Woods Valley Road and Paradise Mountain Road connect to cross the reservation west to east.

The San Pasqual Band has contributed $6,000,000 plus towards the improvement of Valley Center road and Lake Wohlford Road, as well as, contributed funding for additional public infrastructure. All roads that are identified in this report need improvements and or maintenance. The tribe has identified Lake Wohlford Road as a primary access road that is in drastic need of repair; road safety is a major concern for the tribe. Safety threats exist during the rainy season and present potential risks of rockslides and dangerous mud/debris on the roadway. Safety is not limited to the rain; narrow and winding design presents safety risks to vehicles and bicyclist that utilize the road daily. The tribe feels that the public as well as the tribe would benefit from major improvements on Lake Wohlford Road.

Goals and Objectives

The San Pasqual Band of Diegueño Mission Indians seeks to create and maintain a multi-modal transportation system that supports the quality of life to its tribal citizens, residents, and guests by providing safe, reliable access to all amenities on the reservation, as well as to regional, off reservation, amenities such as hospitals, educational facilities, and jobs which cannot be accommodated on the reservation.

Objectives:
1. Add critical roadways to the BIA Tribal Transportation Program (TTP) Inventory
2. Improve intergovernmental collaboration for regional transportation planning.
3. Increase access to Public Transit and opportunities for other modes of transportation.
4. Improve critical infrastructure on the San Pasqual Reservation and the neighboring community.

Priority Projects

1. TTP Inventory Additions
   - Tribal Roads
     - All tribal roads on the BIA Maintenance list within the San Pasqual Indian Reservation must be included in the inventory. Tribal roads are accessed through three county major access roads; Lake Wohlford Road, Valley Center Road, Paradise Mountain Road, and Woods Valley Road, the first two of which are on the regional arterial system of SANDAG.
• Bear Valley Parkway and San Pasqual Valley Road
  o San Pasqual uses San Pasqual Valley Road to access their tribal cemetery in the San Pasqual Valley near the San Diego Wild Animal Park. Every 2nd of November, community members light candles for All Souls Day at the small museum at the San Pasqual Battlefield interacts with the tribe to support their activities.

2. Infrastructure Improvements
• Widen and Re-align Lake Wohlford Road
  o Currently the road is narrow and winding. During rainy season, mud and debris create road hazards. There are no passing lanes or turn outs, which create significant safety issues.
• Widen and Re-align Woods Valley Road
  o Currently the road is narrow and winding. The drainage system needs improvement to be able to divert mud and debris that accumulate during the winter rains.

3. Public Transit and Alternate Modes of Transportation
• Construct Bicycle Lanes and Pedestrian Sidewalks
  o Bicycle lanes, pedestrian sidewalks and crosswalks are greatly needed on Lake Wohlford Road and all tribal roads. Children who attend Valley Center Middle School and the San Pasqual Education Center need a safer method of walking to and from these facilities.
• Construct Public Transit and School Bus Stops on San Pasqual Reservation
  o Both employees and guests of the resort and casino would take public transit if there were stops on the reservation. Transit stops at the intersection of Lake Wohlford Road and Kumeyaay Way, and at the tribal government complex are needed along with improvements to existing school bus stops i.e. bus turnaround near the San Pasqual Education Center.
• Improve Lighting and Signage
  o Lighting is needed on Lake Wohlford Road and all tribal roads. The distance between emergency call boxes is excessive and there is inadequate lighting. Installation of road signs addressing speed, residential areas, how far to emergency call boxes, transit stops, school crossing, etc. would greatly improve tribal and public safety.

4. Regional Transportation Planning
• Planning Participation
  o Participate in the SANDAG Tribal Transportation Working Group and Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA).
• Road Additions
  o The San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians is considering adding other access roads within its interior borders including roads in Districts/Tracts “A,B, and C”.
May 4, 2021

Hon. Catherine Blakespear, Chairwoman
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, Ca 92101

RE: Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation Tribal Long Range Transportation Plan

Dear Chair Blakespear,

For the last two cycles of the Regional Plan, the tribes in the San Diego region submitted summaries of their Long Range Transportation Plans as a diplomatic courtesy to share their priorities with SANDAG. The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, (SCTCA), believes that sharing this information is an important step to understanding the linkages between regional and tribal priorities. In that continued spirit of sharing, our tribe, the Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation (Sycuan), submits a summary of our current Tribal Transportation Plan for inclusion in the San Diego Forward document.

The Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation is a self-governing federally recognized Indian Tribe exercising sovereign authority over the lands of the Sycuan Reservation.

We are pleased to work with you to highlight the importance of tribal transportation planning in the regional process. Should you need additional information, please contact me at (619) 445-4564 ext. 1060.

Respectfully,

Sid Morris,
Director of Planning & Development
Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation Transportation Plan Summary (FY2021- FY2041)

Per 25 CFR Part 170 at subsection 170.414, this summary narrative serves as justification of that Sycuan FY2021 to 2041 LRTP (Long Range Transportation Plan) update is consistent with State and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), hence San Diego Forward: the 2021 Regional Plan.

The purpose of transportation planning is to identify broad goals to meet transportation needs of a community. Multi-modal strategies for achieving these goals can and should consider current and future community land use, economic development, environment (natural, human, and cultural), traffic demand, public safety, health, and social needs, among others.1

Background Information

The Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation (Sycuan) reservation encompasses 2,250 acres in San Diego County, approximately 13 miles east of downtown San Diego near El Cajon in the Dehesa Valley/Crest area. Regional access is provided by Interstate 8 (I-8) and by California State Route 54 (SR 54).

The current land use of the Reservation is distributed as 45% open-space, 20% residential, 10% tribal government, and 25% dedicated to commercial land uses. The residential zones on the Reservation are predominantly located in the northwest corner of the Reservation as well as the northern parcels. The commercial zones located to the northern portion of the original Reservation which comprises the casino, hotel and the main parking structure.

Within the Sycuan property, the northeast portion encompasses the former Starr Ranch, largely undeveloped land that was historically used for farming and/or livestock grazing on a portion of the land. The former Smith Ranch of the Sycuan Property abuts the western boundary of the Sycuan Reservation. The Sloan Canyon area lies along the Sweetwater River downstream from Loveland Reservoir to Willow Lake, a 75-acre lake on the Sweetwater River created by a former sand mining operation within the river. To the west of Willow Lake is the existing Sycuan Golf Resort and Cultural Center. Sycuan gas station and convenient store are located near the intersection of Dehesa Rd. and Harbison Canyon Rd.

With the total of 268 enrolled tribal members, out of which 118 are under the age of 18, approximately 70 % of the tribal population live on the reservation occupying 75 housing units. Housing development remains the tribe’s highest priority to fulfill the needs of growing tribal population.

The Sycuan Band is a major employer in San Diego County, providing jobs to 2,300 employees. A recent casino expansion, the addition of a new hotel, the opening of a new gas station/convenience store and an existing golf resort, remain to be the tribe’s main source of revenue.

Existing Transportation Conditions

---

**Sycuan Road** is classified as a BIA road and is constructed as a four-lane undivided roadway between Dehesa Road and Casino Way (south). It transitions into a two-lane undivided roadway past the Casino Way intersection. Bike lanes are not provided and on-street parking is generally not permitted. The posted speed limit is 25mph. Sycuan Road provides the only ingress and egress to/from the Reservation, accumulating all traffic from the residential areas, casino & resort, and also all other government and enterprise sections. The intersection of Sycuan Road and Dehesa Road is signalized and provides additional northbound left-turn lane.

**Casino Way** is currently constructed as a four-lane, partially divided roadway between Sycuan Road (west) and Kwaaypaay Court (east). It provides main access to the casino and parking structure, and the majority of the casino and tribal departments' buildings. Bike lanes are not provided and on-street parking is generally not permitted.

**Kwaaypaay Road** connects Casino Way and Sycuan Road, creating a loop system which provides access to casino and tribal departments. It is constructed as a two-lane undivided roadway, with no designated bike lanes. There's a low water crossing in close proximity to the intersection with Sycuan Road.

**Kumeyaay Court** is a tribal residential road, constructed as a two-lane undivided roadway. It loops around connecting to the Sycuan Road.

**Sycuan Oaks Drive** is a tribal residential road, constructed as a two-lane mostly undivided roadway. Both ends of the Sycuan Oaks Drive connect to the Harbison Canyon Road. There is a bridge on the south side of the road and low water crossing on the north side.

Sloane Canyon Road is largely an unpaved backcountry county road that is part of California Riding & Hiking Trail system. It is connected to the Dehesa Road and provides access to the Sloane Canyon. Low water crossing and bridge *

**Dehesa Road** is classified as a 4.1B Major Road between Granite Hills Drive and Sycuan Road on the County of San Diego General Plan, Crest-Dehesa Mobility Element Network, and as a 2.2E Light Collector between Sycuan Road and Tavern Road on the County of San Diego General Plan, Alpine and Crest-Dehesa Mobility Element Networks. Dehesa Road is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided roadway. The posted speed limit is 45 mph between Granite Hills Drive and Willow Glen Drive, and 50 mph between Willow Glen Drive and Tavern Road.

**Harbison Canyon Road** is classified as a 2.2E Light Collector on the County of San Diego General Plan, Crest-Dehesa Mobility Element Network. Harbison Canyon Road is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided roadway north of Dehesa Road. Bike lanes are provided on both sides of the roadway, and on-street parking is generally not permitted. The posted speed limit is 40 mph.

**Willow Glen Drive** is classified as a 4.1B Major Road between Jamacha Road and Hillsdale Road and as a 2.1D Community Collector between Hillsdale Road and Camino de la Piedras on the County of San Diego General Plan, Valle de Oro Mobility Element Network. North of Camino de las Piedras, Willow Glen Drive is classified as a 2.1C Community Collector on the County of San Diego General Plan, Crest-Dehesa Mobility Element Network. Willow Glen Drive is currently constructed as a four-lane undivided roadway with intermittent turn lanes between Jamacha Road and Steele Canyon Road, as a three-lane roadway with a two-way left turn lane between Steele Canyon Road and the Cottonwood Golf Club, and as a two-lane undivided roadway between the Cottonwood Golf Club and Dehesa Road. Bike lanes are provided on both sides of the roadway and on-street parking is generally not permitted. The posted speed limit is 45 mph.
**Goals and Objectives**

The goals and objectives for Sycuan is to provide reliable transit system that safely and effectively meets the transportation needs of Tribal residents, Tribal Government and operations, as well as those enterprise operations that generate guests and visitors to the Reservation.

1. Develop a comprehensive plan that will address short and long-term transportation needs for the residential, government and enterprise operations.
   - Evaluate existing traffic loads
   - Identify and prioritize transportation projects that will improve tribal mobility
   - Address fire/life/safety transportation needs for ingress/egress to/from the Reservation and for the safety of Sycuan Reservation residents and guests and

2. Develop an implementation plan that facilitates the planning and implementation of a transportation plan that effectively meets the residential, operational, government and enterprise needs of Sycuan, while maintaining the integrity of its status as a sovereign nation.
   - Estimate costs for identified projects
   - Develop a long-term maintenance for the existing road infrastructure.
   - Identify potential funding sources
Priority Projects

Please include a list of short- and long-term projects, including at least one project that involves the regional transportation network (transit, highway...). Please tailor the number projects to the specific needs of your tribe.

1. Secondary access road (short-term project).
   
   • Currently, there is only one ingress and egress to/from the reservation. The road is used by the reservation’s residents, all tribal and casino employees, as well as casino/resort guests. Given the rural settings of the reservation, combined with heavy casino traffic, and a history of wildland fires within close proximity to the reservation, a secondary access road is a critical path issue from the fire/life safety perspective. When constructed, the road will provide much needed evacuation route for the residents/guests and staff, as well as provide a secondary access point for the emergency vehicles.

2. Transportation infrastructure for future housing developments (short/mid-term project).
   
   • Critical infrastructure planning and construction is required as part of proposed housing development on the reservation and connectivity to existing county and reservation transportation systems.

3. Bridge (mid-term project).
   
   • Also addressing a fire/life/safety condition, Sycuan proposes a bridge to span the “Arizona” crossing at the intersection of Kwaaypaay Road and Sycuan Road. This will provide guests and employees an alternate point of egress from the Reservation.

4. Transportation infrastructure to support future enterprise expansion (long-term project).
Sycuan Transportation System
DRAFT
April 5, 2021

Hon. Catherine Blakespear, Chairwoman  
San Diego Association of Governments  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, Ca 92101  

RE: Viejas Tribal Long Range Transportation Plan  

Dear Chair Blakespear,

For the last two cycles of the Regional Plan, the tribes in the San Diego region submitted summaries of their Long Range Transportation Plans as a diplomatic courtesy to share their priorities with SANDAG. The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, (SCTCA), believes that sharing this information is an important step to understanding the linkages between regional and tribal priorities. In that continued spirit of sharing, our tribe, the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians, submits a summary of our current Tribal Transportation Plan for inclusion in the San Diego Forward document.

The Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians, (appearing in the U.S. Federal Register at Vol. 83, No. 20, p. 4236, Tuesday, January 30, 2018, as the Viejas (Baron Long) Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians of the Viejas Reservation, California) (the “Viejas Band”) is a self-governing federally recognized Indian Tribe exercising sovereign authority over the lands of the Viejas Indian Reservation.

We are pleased to work with you to highlight the importance of tribal transportation planning in the regional process. Should you need additional information, please contact Ray Teran at 619-659-2312, or rteran@viejas-nsn.gov.

Respectfully,

[Signature]
John A. Christman  
Chairman Tribal Council
Viejas Transportation Plan Summary (2021-2041)

Per 25 CFR Part 170 at subsection 170.414, this summary narrative serves as justification of that Viejas’s FY2021 to 2041 LRTP (Long Range Transportation Plan) update is consistent with State and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), hence San Diego Forward: the 2021 Regional Plan.

Background Information

The Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians (Viejas) is a self-governing federally recognized Indian Tribe exercising sovereign authority over the lands of the Viejas Indian Reservation.

The Viejas Band has lived in the vicinity since pre-historic times. The Viejas Band moved onto the current Viejas Reservation, following their forced removal from Capitan Grande Reservation, when a portion was condemned by a special act of Congress to convert it into a reservoir and a water source for the City of San Diego in 1932. The Viejas Reservation consists of 1,699 acres, and is located approximately three miles east of the unincorporated community of Alpine. The Tribe has approximately 496 members. The Reservation is bordered by Cleveland National Forest of the west, north, and east, Interstate 8 (I-8) crosses four acres of the Reservation on the southern boundary and by various privately held parcels on the southwest, southeast, and northeast. The main access to the Reservation is via, Willows Road, a two-lane County road which interchanges with I-8 to the west and to the east of the Reservation.

The Viejas Tribal Government provides a full range of governmental services to its Tribal Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Viejas population</th>
<th>496</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years to 24 years</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 64 years</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 85 years and over</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age (years)</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One race</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Transportation Conditions

Bureau of Indian Affairs – there are approximately 4 routes on the FY2020 road inventory list, which consist of approximately 2.7 miles of BIA roads.

Tribal Roads – there are five tribal routes on the FY2020 road inventory list, which consist of approximately 15.8 miles of Tribal roads.

State – there are nine State routes on the FY2020 road inventory list, which consist of approximately 21.6 miles of State roads.

County – there is one County route on the FY2020 road inventory list, which consist of approximately 9.2 miles of State roads.

Viejas Reservation

### Indian Reservation Road System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route No. Name</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>Surface Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>General Condition</th>
<th>Maint. Resp.</th>
<th>Design Adequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>3: Rural Local</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>22/0</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4: Rural Local</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12/0</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>3: Rural Local</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>18/0</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3: Rural Local</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>20/0</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Brown Rd</td>
<td>3: Rural Local</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>22/0</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>3: Rural Local</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>12/0</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Sub-division Rd</td>
<td>4: Rural Local</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>24/0</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viejas Grade Rd</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>22/0</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E85 Willows Rd</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>24/2p</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10 – Off Res</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 30 – Off Res</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 40 – Off Res</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 40 – Off Res</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 50 – Off Res</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 60 – Off Res</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 70 – Off Res</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E85 Section 10 – Off Res</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 20 – Off Res</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 30 – Off Res</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals and Objectives

1. Reconstruct Browns Road from Willows Road to Viejas Grade Road (Intragregional Tribal Transportation Strategy ITTS #24, included in the Regional Transportation Plan)
   - Specs and Engineering
   - Construction contract

2. Reconstruct all feeder roads and driveways that connect to Browns and Viejas Grade Roads
   - Specs and Engineering
• Construction contract

3. Reconstruct Viejas Grade Road (ITTS #28)
   • Work cooperatively with San Diego County Transportation Department

4. Widen east and west I-8 Willows Road on and off ramps (ITTS #25 & 26)
   • Work cooperatively with CalTrans

4. Make safety improvements to Browns Road
   • Roadway striping
   • Safety signage
   • Departure and center lane rumble bumps

Priority Projects

1. Browns Road
   • Roadway reconstruction

2. Safety Improvements to Browns Road
   • Striping, signage and lane delineators

3. I-8 on and off ramps on east and west Willow Road
   • Make lanes larger to accommodate high traffic volume

Existing Transportation and Land Use

![Map of Viejas Transportation – Existing Routes](image)
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