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NATIONS WITHIN A NATION:

Collaborative Transportation Planning in a Regional Landscape

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Introduction
The U.S. Constitution and treaties recognize Native American communities as separate and independent political communities within the territorial boundaries of the United States—nations within a nation. In the San Diego region, there are 17 federally recognized tribal nations with jurisdiction over 18 reservations—the most in any county in the United States (Attachment A – Tribal Lands Map).

Federal legislation requires that federally recognized tribal governments be consulted in the development of Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) and programs (Title 23, U.S.C. 450.312). In particular, the new federal transportation bill, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), passed in 2005, reinforces federal emphasis on tribal government participation. President Obama in his November 5, 2009, Memorandum on Tribal Consultation (Federal Register, vol. 74, No. 215, 11/9/09) reiterated the directive for public agencies to incorporate tribal consultation into their plans and programs in a timely and meaningful manner.

How this consultation should occur is left to the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and the tribal governments. SANDAG has forged a strong working relationship with the tribal nations in the region, based on a regional framework of communication, coordination, and collaboration with tribal governments in the regional transportation planning process. This white paper is intended to: provide background on the transportation needs as self-identified by the tribal nations in the region; discuss the development of the regional government-to-government framework that has emerged in recent years, document milestones in collaborative transportation planning which have occurred since the 2006 Tribal Summit, and discuss the proposed Tribal Transportation Strategies for the 2050 RTP which have emerged through dialogue with tribal leadership and the Interagency Technical Working Group for Tribal Transportation for consideration at the 2010 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit.

2050 RTP Objectives
The RTP is a long-term blueprint of a region’s transportation system. The plan identifies and analyzes transportation needs of the metropolitan region and creates a framework for project priorities. As the region’s Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), SANDAG is responsible for facilitating the development of the RTP. In the San Diego region, the RTP is updated every four years. Usually, the horizon year for an RTP is 30 years; for this cycle,
SANDAG is thinking ahead 40 years. Each cycle of the RTP is an iterative process in which long-term goals in the region among diverse stakeholders are evaluated in light of existing and potential funding from federal, state, and local sources.

The most recent RTP approved by SANDAG’s Board of Directors in December of 2007 was titled “2030 RTP: Pathways to the Future.” The 2030 RTP is our region’s blueprint for a transportation system that enhances our quality of life and meets our mobility needs now and in the future. The foundation of the 2030 RTP lies in better connecting our freeway, transit, and road networks to our homes, schools, work, shopping, and other activities.

The 2050 RTP builds upon the existing transportation system in place today and the major projects in progress from the 2030 RTP. The objectives for the 2050 RTP with regard to tribal nations and regional transportation planning are to:

- Engage federally recognized tribal governments in the region in the transportation planning process in a timely, meaningful, and effective manner;
- Strengthen the current framework for government-to-government engagement at a regional level; and
- Based on a government-to-government dialogue and negotiation, pursue a set of mutually agreed upon prioritized strategies to improve tribal transportation in the region in four areas: roadways, transit, funding, and information sharing/technical assistance.

BACKGROUND

Historically, the relationship between local governments and federally recognized tribal governments has been contentious. While the federal-tribal relationship is well established, the local-tribal government relationship has not been as clearly defined. Despite efforts to reach out to local governments, tribal governments indicate that for many years they were not received. This has changed considerably in recent years. With the advent of gaming, local perceptions, according to various tribal leaders, have changed. As a condition of the development of gaming compacts, tribes are required to negotiate with the local land use authorities adjacent to them. What has not been clearly delineated by the state or federal government is the mechanism for inclusion of tribal inputs into regional transportation planning processes. The federal government requires ‘consultation’ with tribal governments, however the definition of meaningful consultation, or more in depth coordination and cooperation is being developed on a case by case basis in various parts of the country. There is clearly an increasing need to better coordinate and assess the impacts of tribal development and future plans on the regional transportation system, as well as how regional plans and planning principals, such as smart growth, affect tribal development.

Tribal Nations in San Diego

Of the 107 federally recognized Indian tribes in California, 17 are located in San Diego County (Attachment B - California Native American Trust Lands). Historically, the tribal members of today’s bands represent four Indian cultural/linguistic groups who have
populated this entire 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 Luiseno, 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 Cupeno, 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 mountains and all the way to what is today Baja California (Attachment C – Kumeyaay Historical Map).

In the years just prior to California becoming a state, the federal government developed treaties with Native Nations in the region in an effort 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 Senate floor by pressure from the new California Senators — and the tribal nations who had signed the treaties were never informed. In 1875, President Ulysses S. Grant signed an Executive Order based on several of the “lost treaties” creating tribal reservations for the 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 were established well into the 20th century. Today, these four ethnic groups are distributed over 18 reservations and are represented by 17 federally recognized tribal governments as shown in Table 1.3

As domestic sovereign nations, tribes are subject to federal regulations, but are not subject to local or state regulations, unless the U.S. Congress delegates implementation of federal law to the state. From a governance perspective, tribal governments are considered a separate category of government from the 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 tribal culture and the tribal 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.4 Native American reservations currently cover more than 116,000 acres in the San Diego region—approximately four percent of the region’s land base.

---

1 The Capitan Grande Reservation included the Bands that would later become the Barona Band of Mission Indians relocated to the Barona Valley Ranch (1932) and subsequently the Barona Indian Reservation, and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians who relocated to Baron Long Ranch (1934) and subsequently the Viejas Indian Reservation.
2 The Jamul Indian Village did not receive federal recognition as a reservation until 1975; other bands that are still landless, such as the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians continue to seek recognition.
3 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 jointly managed by the Barona and Viejas governments.
4 For many tribal governments land ownership is complex as often the reservations 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 1
San Diego County Indian Reservations and Federally Recognized Tribal Governments

<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(^5)</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. A Kumeyaay Nation</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 Diegueno 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: SANGIS, Bureau of Indian Affairs

### Current Conditions
A number of planning issues surround these reservations, as they are all located in remote areas outside of incorporated areas. The degree of remoteness ranges 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 maintained county roads, such as Los Coyotes. Inadequate access to and from the reservations often results in a lack of economic opportunities, as well as insufficient health, social, and cultural services.

---

\(^5\) Several official sources alternately refer to the Ewiiaapaayp tribe by the Spanish spelling “Cuyapaipe.”
Tribal Economic Development

Gaming is a traditional social activity among many tribal nations, however, 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 their sovereign right to pursue their own economic interests. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of Cabazon, prompting Congress to pass a federal gaming regulatory act to define how gaming should be conducted nationwide and what role the states should have in that activity. Although several tribes in the San Diego region already had bingo facilities, 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.

Gaming-related and other types of development have led to rapid economic growth for these 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 12,000 permanent jobs in the region, resulting in a $1 billion industry with approximately $500 million in goods and services purchased annually and $500 million in payroll. It should be noted, however, that poverty levels among the Native American population remain below the national average and some gaming tribes have been much more successful than others.

This growth has been accompanied by increases in traffic, jobs-housing accessibility issues, and the need for additional resources such as water and energy. Even those tribes that do not have gaming facilities continue to have economic development, transportation, and infrastructure needs which have not been met.

Since the mid-1990s tribal governments in San Diego have been in the process of developing gaming compacts with the State of California which have allowed them to plan and develop gaming facilities on their reservations. The framework for the RTP is one of concentrating development in existing urban areas and connecting transit to appropriate land use patterns. Neither the 2030 RTP, nor its predecessor Mobility 2030, considered tribal land use patterns in forecast modeling as limited information was available from tribal governments. 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 in place for exchanging information regarding long-term land use and transportation plans on tribal lands into the regional planning process.

---

7 Several new projects or expansions have been approved, but put on hold due to the current economy.
8 For additional discussion on the impact of tribal gaming in California, see The Center for California Native Nations, “An Impact Analysis of Tribal Government Gaming in California.” University of California at Riverside. ND
The County of San Diego, in its capacity as the adjacent land use authority to all tribal developments in this region, conducted traffic needs assessments related to tribal developments which intensified after the 1988 IGRA. In its 2003 report on the impact of tribal development on its roadways, the County requested that SANDAG consider the impacts of tribal development on the regional transportation system.

“It is estimated that 38.5 miles of County-maintained arterials in the vicinity of the Reservations will need additional road capacity improvements. Of those 38.5 miles, approximately 15.6 were identified under Baseline Conditions as needing improvements solely due to non-tribal development in the unincorporated area. The additional 22.9 miles is due to existing and near-term development of tribal projects.” (p. 42).

The County undertook a traffic impact assessment and, based on that information, negotiated cooperative agreements with several tribes for “fair share” funding of traffic impact mitigation. Nonetheless, according to the County report, levels of service (LOS) on several road segments in the State Route (SR 76), State Route (SR 67), and State Route (SR 94) corridors were estimated to deteriorate with increased traffic volume associated with the gaming facilities. Both Caltrans and the County called for additional corridor studies in the unincorporated area associated with gaming facilities.

Currently, the main input required to accurately incorporate tribal land use into forecast modeling for the RTP is the square footage of gaming area which produces the most Average Daily Trips (ADT). Currently, ten tribal gaming facilities are in operation. The square footage is indicated in Attachment D - Square Footage of Gaming Facilities for Trip Generation Estimates. It is anticipated, that through government-to-government discussions with tribal governments, more accurate protocols can be developed for assessing impacts.

At the same time that there is concern about the impact of the development of gaming facilities on the regional transportation system, tribal lands are isolated from the regional transportation system as their lands are located in the unincorporated portion of the county. Although all non-gaming tribes10 in San Diego County receive funding from gaming tribes in the form of a Revenue Sharing Trust Fund (RSTF)11 to support the administration of their nations, their isolation from the transportation system, both in terms of infrastructure and transit services, is a limiting factor in their ability to improve the health and well-being of tribal members who reside on the reservation, as well as their exploration of alternative means of self-sufficiency. As more tribal members return to their reservations to live, this will continue to be an issue regardless of the success of tribal enterprises.

---

10 The 1999 Compact defines a ‘non-gaming’ tribe as a tribe that 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.
11 The State Controller’s Office began distributing checks to tribal governments in August of 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: www.calindian.org/nl_fall2001.htm
Tribal Transportation Needs Assessment

In preparation for the 2030 RTP, to better understand the transportation needs of the tribal nations in the region, Caltrans District 11 and SANDAG designed, developed, and implemented a joint Tribal Transportation Needs Survey in 2005 (Attachment E – Summary Results) as part of the 2030 RTP process. It served as a component of an overall transportation needs assessment to: (a) initiate a process of building better relationships with tribes in San Diego and Imperial Counties, (b) establish a baseline of awareness of the transportation issues affecting each tribe in order to facilitate partnerships between Caltrans, tribal governments, and the regional transportation agencies, and (c) promote more efficient identification of mutual transportation concerns and the development of appropriate solutions.

For the purpose of examining long-range transportation issues, the tribal nations in the region were grouped into three clusters based on key transportation corridors: State Route 76, which runs east-west in North County; State Route 79, which runs north-south in the eastern half of the county; and, Interstate 8, which runs east-west in the southern area of the county (Attachment F – Tribal Lands Transportation Corridors Map).

Technical Workshop – Identifying Strategies

In preparation for the 2006 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit, SANDAG, Caltrans, County of San Diego, SCTCA, and RTA staff worked together to hold a technical transportation workshop to discuss the results of the Tribal Transportation Needs Survey and provide an opportunity for tribal transportation managers to discuss issues and strategies to improve tribal transportation programs in the region with the transportation planning staff from SANDAG, Caltrans, the County, MTS, NCTD, and the BIA.

The group analyzed the current situation of transportation programs in the region discussing first, the obstacles to overcome in order to improve tribal transportation programs, and then, those strengths in the region that could be leveraged for improvement. Among the obstacles tribal representatives mentioned: (a) the lack of communication and follow-up from agencies, (b) complex government processes and a lack of understanding of tribal processes, (c) lack of understanding of the transportation funding process and how to access it, (d) disconnects between transportation planning priorities of agencies and tribal governments, and (e) rigid organizational cultures and legal constraints that limit collaboration.

Among the strengths that could be leveraged to improve tribal transportation-related programs, the group mentioned the following: (a) tribal governments acknowledged that agencies are recognizing the problems and are willing to work on them, (b) that agencies have been working more effectively in recent years, and there is an increased one-on-one respect, (c) the existence of tribal liaisons in the agencies has facilitated communication and coordination, (d) policy mandates from the federal and state level are helping to create the political will to cooperate, (e) intertribal councils such as the RTA and the SCTCA are focusing more on policy-level tribal needs and partnerships, and (f) increasing evidence of a desire on both parts to understand each other and work on collaborative solutions.
The group then developed a set of strategies to improve tribal transportation programs in the region. The policy-level strategies were submitted to the SCTCA and SANDAG boards for consideration as part of the 2006 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit co-hosted by the two intergovernmental councils.

2006 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit

The SANDAG and SCTCA Boards at the Tribal Summit went through the strategies, discussed them, and then participated in an interactive polling exercise to determine where there were areas of mutual concern to identify possible areas of collaboration. Table 2 indicates the cooperative action agenda which emerged out of the Summit and was approved by both Boards and which have been the focus of collaborative planning since that time.

Table 2
2030 RTP – Collaborative Action Agenda on Tribal Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Area</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government-to-Government Framework</td>
<td>a) Pursue formula for tribal representation in the SANDAG structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Develop a collaborative legislative agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Form interagency working group on tribal transportation issues as an ongoing forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Infrastructure</td>
<td>a) Support tribal efforts to update Indian Reservation Roads Inventory (IRR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Identify corridors critical to tribal reservations and coordinate implementation of relevant studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>a) Collaborate with interested tribes on Tribal Transit Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Pursue funding to support tribal transit needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Funding</td>
<td>a) Create opportunities for pooling/leveraging transportation funding for mutually important projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Collaborate and advocate for new transportation funding in the region, including transit and TDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Identify mechanisms for providing ongoing funding for new or additional transportation programs, including transit services and TDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sharing/Technical Assistance</td>
<td>Agencies will provide ongoing training to tribal governments on funding processes, transportation, and regional planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A REGIONAL GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT FRAMEWORK

As reservations continue to develop and interregional planning issues become more related to surrounding jurisdictions rather than federal and state agencies, the need for establishing a government-to-government framework at a regional level has become more and more 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 when engaging Native American tribes. Government-to-government interaction with Native American tribes should follow the principles of coordination, cooperation, and consultation.

The integrated work plan, which was developed in collaboration with the Reservation Transportation Authority, SCTCA, Caltrans, and the County of San Diego for the planning of the 2006 Tribal Summit, 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 transportation planning process. One of the major outcomes of the Summit was the collaborative commitment among various regional partner agencies to develop a framework for engaging tribal nations in the planning process.

Regional Partners

The core of the framework is an ongoing dialogue among key stakeholders at the regional level. Today, all three principal transportation planning agencies in the region have tribal liaisons: SANDAG, Caltrans, and the County of San Diego.

Public Agencies

Caltrans District 11: Caltrans was the first state agency in California to enact an agencywide policy on tribal consultation. Native American Liaison program was established in 2002 to work with the 19 tribes in its jurisdiction. Its objectives are to: (a) establish close coordination and early project involvement with tribal governments to streamline funding, environmental, and project delivery processes in areas on or near reservations; (b) ensure that Caltrans programs do not adversely affect important California Native American sites, traditions, or practices; (c) encourage cooperation between other agencies and local tribal governments; (d) assist with training, information dissemination, and project delivery; and (e) 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: identifying and resolving issues related to impacts of tribal economic development projects on infrastructure and other county services in unincorporated areas; providing support and tracking legislation and policy matters related to tribes for the County Board of Supervisors and the Chief Administrative Officer;
participating in regional land use and transportation planning, economic and services forecasting, funding, and development activities; and assisting tribes with permitting and other issues.

**San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG):** It is through the Borders Committee that SANDAG has been pursuing government-to-government relations with tribal governments in the region. The Borders Committee discusses policy issues related to transboundary planning from three perspectives: interregional, binational, and tribal. In 2005 the Southern California Tribal Chairman’s Association joined the Borders Committee as an intertribal council of governments to engage in a dialogue on transboundary planning issues with other neighboring councils of government, including Imperial Valley, Riverside, and Orange Counties, as well as the Republic of Mexico as represented by the Consul General in San Diego. SANDAG’s Tribal Liaison is a member of the Land Use and Transportation Planning Department which provides technical support to the Borders Committee, as well as the Board of Directors and other Policy Advisory Committees.

**Intertribal Organizations**

Intertribal organizations play a key role as facilitators for this emerging regional government-to-government framework. SANDAG has a strong working relationship with two key intertribal associations to strengthen communication, coordination, and collaboration with area tribes.

**Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA):** The SCTCA is a multiservice, nonprofit corporation established in 1972 by a consortium of 19 federally recognized Indian tribes in Southern California. As an intertribal council, the SCTCA serves as a forum for a wide variety of issues for its member tribes. In June 2005, the SCTCA joined as an advisory member of the Borders Committee, similar to SANDAG’s relationships with other associations of governments, including Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG) and Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG).

**Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA):** The RTA, founded in 1998, is a consortium of Southern California Indian tribal governments designated as a Public Law 93-638 contracting entity that provides transportation education, planning, and program administration for tribal government members. Their intertribal service area includes tribes in San Bernardino, Riverside, San Diego, and Imperial Valley (Attachment G - RTA Intertribal Service Area). At a technical level, SANDAG and the RTA have collaborated on a number of tribal transportation planning projects, particularly in the area of mobility management in recent years.

**Framework – Policy Level**

The regional government-to-government framework for working with tribal nations in the region has been strengthened through the last several years. The priority was to build the institutional trust that would form the basis for future cooperation. It was important to work together on action items that were identified at the 2006 Summit that would have immediate results, as well as to build strategic alliances for more long-term solutions.
Periodic Summits

The 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. By bringing together the entire board of each agency, it offers an opportunity for tribal and non-tribal elected officials from the region to engage in a diplomatic dialogue, identify issues of mutual concern, and develop priority actions that can be carried out through the partnership framework.

SCTCA Representation on SANDAG

One of the key issues raised by the tribal leaders at the 2006 Summit was tribal representation at SANDAG. The SANDAG Board 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 regarding the development of a formula for tribal representation which would respect tribal sovereignty and involve tribal governments in policy decisions at SANDAG. At a policy level, SCTCA and the SANDAG signed a Memorandum of Understanding on January 26, 2007 memorializing the agreement to have the SCTCA join the SANDAG Board of Directors and Policy Advisory Committees, including Transportation, Regional Planning, and Public Safety, as advisory members. Tribal leaders are now part of the regional decision-making process at a policy level, offering a tribal perspective to complex regional issues.

Tribal Liaison to SCTCA Board of Directors

At the policy level, the representatives of the SCTCA sit on the SANDAG Policy Advisory Committees; however, the SCTCA also wanted to ensure that major initiatives in which SANDAG was engaged also were shared directly with the entire tribal leadership. Therefore, the SANDAG Tribal Liaison coordinates with the SCTCA representatives to SANDAG to bring briefings on major, agencywide initiatives to inform the tribal leadership and obtain feedback from all tribal nations to the process. This has included the Coordinated Plan for Health and Human Services Transportation, the Regional Energy Strategy, and the Environmental Mitigation Program, among others. This creates a systematic feedback loop to ensure that all tribal nations are involved in the process and have an opportunity to raise issues and provide direction.

Tribal Issues Brought to SANDAG Policy Advisory Committees

As members of the various SANDAG Policy Advisory Committees, SCTCA representatives have brought tribal issues to their respective committees. Several presentations on a number of issues have been brought to the Policy Advisory Committees, including: background on Public Law 280 and its impact on tribal nations in California, the Intertribal Court System among San Diego tribes, tribal energy planning efforts, intertribal initiatives on fire recovery, and tribal transportation initiatives, among others. On a periodic basis, the SANDAG Tribal Liaison would meet with the SCTCA representatives to discuss current issues, develop an agenda of presentations, and provide technical assistance when requested to bring these briefings to the appropriate Policy Advisory Committees.
Framework – Technical Level

Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues

One of the critical technical outcomes of the 2006 Tribal Summit was the collaborative strategic action of creating an ongoing forum for discussion on tribal transportation issues between the tribal nations and public agencies that have an influence tribal transportation. The Boards of SCTCA and SANDAG approved the charter (Attachment H – Tribal Working Group Charter) for the Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues (Working Group) in the summer of 2006. The Barona Band of Mission Indians hosted the kick off meeting in October of that year. The Working Group forms part of the SANDAG structure and reports to the Borders Committee, and all tribes in San Diego can be members. Currently thirteen of the seventeen tribes in the region are formal members of the Working Group (Attachment I – Current membership roster). The Working Group has co-chairs (a tribal leader and a SANDAG executive staff) at the request of the tribal nations. The Working Group is staffed by SANDAG, meets quarterly, and tribal nations alternate hosting the meetings at different reservations. Since 2006, Pala, Pauma, Rincon, San Pasqual, Barona, Campo, and Viejas have hosted the Working Group.

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 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.

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 provides feedback and comments on current and planned activities and provides 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.

SANDAG-RTA Partnership for Tribal Transportation Planning

SANDAG and the Reservation Transportation Authority signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in 2005 to collaborate on tribal transportation. SANDAG and the RTA have pursued and attained funding for a number of tribal transportation planning projects since the 2006 Summit, which are detailed in the next section. The focus of much of the collaborative planning work between the RTA and SANDAG has been in expanding the RTA’s mission from transportation infrastructure on tribal reservations to mobility, including transit and transportation demand management. In so doing, the RTA becomes SANDAG’s mobility partner, taking the lead on integrating tribal mobility projects into the system, benefiting not only tribes, but the rural population as well.
MILESTONES IN COLLABORATIVE TRIBAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

For the 2030 RTP, a set of objectives was established for tribal transportation planning. Through the consultation process, including a survey of tribal transportation needs, a technical workshop to analyze the results collaboratively, and a policy-level summit, a set of cooperative strategies to improve tribal transportation were developed between the SCTCA and the SANDAG Board of Directors. Attachment J is a timeline matrix which demonstrates the recommendation, action, and the milestone achieved. There are four principal, transportation-related policy areas that were considered in the 2030 RTP that resulted from the bilateral analysis with tribal governments, as well as for future collaboration: roadway infrastructure, funding, transit, and information sharing/data gathering. The matrix highlights the collaborative nature of all of the various efforts. In some cases tribal nations took the lead, while in others the County, SANDAG, or the RTA.

Transportation Infrastructure

As with all land use authorities, improvements in transportation infrastructure are key to improving the potential of each tribal nation’s ability to compete in a global economy and provide access to housing, jobs, education, entertainment, and healthcare for its citizens. Efforts have been made in both assisting tribes in increasing their own transportation planning funding through updating their Reservation Roads Inventory through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as well as tribal governments making significant contributions to county and state road infrastructure as an element of their mitigation agreements with the County of San Diego.

Supported the Indian Reservation Roads Inventory

One of the innovations for tribal nations in the 2005 SAFETEA-LU transportation legislation was significant changes in the Indian Reservation Roads (IRR) program. Traditionally, the formula for tribes to receive transportation funding through the Bureau of Indian Affairs is by the number reservation road miles. For small, land-based tribes like those in California, that has resulted in their receiving minimal funding. However, the current legislation acknowledges that tribal transportation systems for many tribes include access to state highways, as well as county and city roads. Therefore, under the current legislation tribes can include segments of roads and highways not owned by them in their inventory. In order to do that a letter of acknowledgement is required from the owner of the road.

Caltrans headquarters received a grant from the FHWA to support efforts of the tribes in California to update their IRR inventories to increase their share of funding—most of the tribal nations in San Diego were able to participate in the initiative. The tribes and agencies that form the Working Group have been collaborating to ensure that all tribes in San Diego region who want to update their inventory to increase their transportation planning funding have the support to do so. Caltrans hired a consultant to work with tribes to do the technical inventories. Caltrans then sent every participating tribe a compact disc with all of the completed data. Each tribe, then, is responsible for submitting a Tribal Transportation Plan, a resolution indicating the road segments to be considered in their inventory, and letters of acknowledgement from the owners of the non-tribal road segments to be
included. Caltrans and the County of San Diego, through the Working Group, provided the tribes who requested them with letters of acknowledgement for the segments of roads or state highways that are critical to their tribal transportation system.

To date, California tribes have increased their share of IRR funding from 1 percent to 5 percent. The current funding formula has been so successful for California tribes that there is now a controversy among large, land-based tribes and small, land-based tribes as to whether to maintain the current formula. Many of the applications for updating their inventories of San Diego tribes have been held up in the Albuquerque office of the BIA. The National Tribal Advisory Committee to the BIA IRR continues to discuss the formula and whether it will be included in the new authorization.

**Identified Tribal Corridors and Coordinated Relevant Studies/Projects**

**State Routes**

A number of work undertaken in this time period affected State Routes 76, 79, and 67. One particular project highlights the importance of collaboration for infrastructure improvements that has received national attention as the way the Department of Transportation should work on a government-to-government basis with tribal nations. Caltrans and the RTA are conducting a study of SR 76 east of the Interstate 15 to determine what kinds of operational improvements can be made to improve the safety of the SR 76 East corridor. The study identified estimated costs for potential operational improvements, as well as a methodology for allocating fair share contributions to the developing property owners in the corridor. Additionally, this study identified potential alternative funding options from federal, state, local, and private sources. The study was funded by a grant from statewide Caltrans grant; the Pala Band of Mission Indians provided the local match; and the RTA conducted the study. By bringing together the State, the tribes, the County, SANDAG, environmental resource agencies, and the public during the study process, new and innovative measures were explored for strengthening the State’s existing ability to plan and fund transportation improvements.

**County/Reservation Roads**

A number of infrastructure projects have been planned, designed, and implemented since 2007. These projects are a combination of Caltrans-permitted projects, County-permitted projects, and County CIP projects. These were all projects that involved collaborations between the County Department of Public Works and various tribes. For example, the Valley Center Road Widening project (completed 2009) was designed and constructed by the County with funding contributions from San Pasqual, Rincon, Pauma, and Pala. In some cases, the tribe was the lead, such as the Lake Wohlford improvements at the entrance to Valley View or the improvements to Black Canyon Road near Mesa Grand funded by a grant Mesa Grande received. All of these projects listed in the Milestone Matrix (Attachment J) demonstrate the improvements made in infrastructure serving tribal nations and the unincorporated area of the county.
Transit/Mobility Planning

Tribal Transit Feasibility Study

SANDAG was awarded a transit planning grant from Caltrans to determine the feasibility of implementing transit service in one or two key transportation corridors between selected tribal reservations and cities and/or urbanized community planning areas in the unincorporated area of San Diego County. This report examines traditional public transit services, as well as the potential for nontraditional services that could be funded by private sources and/or public-private partnerships.

The study was a collaborative effort between SANDAG, the Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA), and the region’s transit agencies—the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North Country Transit District (NCTD). SANDAG contracted with IBI Group to conduct the technical analysis for this study, which provides the information needed to leverage additional funding for transit service for the 17 federally recognized tribal governments in San Diego County. The Tribal Transit Working Group, composed of tribal members and agency staff advisory members, provided guidance to the consultant throughout the study.

The study identified transportation corridors and service options to make better connections between the tribal reservations and the urban transit system. Recommendations included potential service enhancements to existing services, as well as new rural transit routes focused on connecting the tribal community (Attachments K and L – Tribal Transit Corridor Maps). The study provided a financial assessment, as well as identified potential sources of funding.

FTA Tribal Transit Grant Program

The Tribal Transit Feasibility Study provided the technical basis for the Working Group to pursue funding. The Working Group directed the RTA to develop a proposal for the FTA Tribal Transit program, based on the recommendations of the Tribal Transit Feasibility Study. The RTA applied successfully for FY07, FY08, and FY09 funding. Although the RTA received the highest level of funding for each cycle, the awards were significantly less than the total project costs to fund the entire plan. The Working Group discussed the options available and decided to focus the funds on supporting an enhanced service of one of NCTD’s routes, the 388/389, which runs from the Escondido Transit Center through Valley Center to Pala. One of the principal recommendations for the Northern Corridor was to enhance that service and create an Express portion of the route that would run up and down the Interstate 15 from the Escondido Transit Center to Pala, completing a service loop and permitting those on the SR 76 to take an express bus to and from the Escondido Transit Center (Attachment M – 388 flyer). In addition to the operating funds provided by the Tribal Transit program, the RTA successfully applied for ARRA funds associated with the FY08 funding cycle. Only FY08 Tribal Transit grant recipients could compete for these funds. The RTA recently announced they received $1.2 million for transit capital improvements for the region through this program. The proposal was based on the recommendations in the Tribal Transit Feasibility Study.
**Tribal TDM Outreach – Phase I (San Diego)**

The objective of this collaborative project between the RTA and SANDAG was to strengthen the participation of tribal nations in the San Diego region in the regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program.

The tribal gaming facilities are now major employers in the region, yet their involvement in the region’s commuter services program (iCommute) was limited. Sycuan, Viejas, Barona, and Campo in the Interstate 8 corridor have an approximate total of 9,000 employees. In the SR 76 corridor Pala, Pauma, Rincon, and San Pasqual have a total of 5,500 employees. It is estimated that each gaming facility attracts a daily count of anywhere from 7–15,000 guests. The tribal governments invest extensively in the San Diego region. Statistics show that the Indian gaming industry as a whole purchases approximately $263 million in goods and services annually. As few tribal members currently live on the reservations, tribal members and non-tribal employees travel from all over the region and other counties, including Riverside, Imperial, and even Orange Counties, to jobs on the reservations. As a service-based hospitality industry, the majority of the employees are low-skilled labor and often minorities who travel long distances from neighboring regions where housing is more affordable.

SANDAG, the RTA, and the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA) collaborated on an assessment of the needs of tribal employers; developed a strategy to meet their needs; and SANDAG assisted the RTA in developing a business/marketing plan for establishing a Tribal Transportation Management Association (TTMA) that would collaborate with SANDAG’s TDM program (iCommute). The tribal TMA, a private, nonprofit, member-controlled organization would provide 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, including: Pala, Pauma, Rincon, Viejas, Sycuan, and Santa Ysabel.

**Tribal TDM Outreach – Phase II (Riverside)**

The RTA successfully applied for a Caltrans Environmental Justice–Context-Sensitive grant to expand their Tribal TDM project to their member tribes in Riverside and San Bernardino. That project was initiated in February 2010 and will involve the Southern California Association of Governments, the Riverside County Transportation Commission, and the San Bernardino Association of Governments. The RTA also will continue to refine their business plan for the Tribal Transportation Management Association with SANDAG’s technical assistance.

**Transportation Funding**

One of the action items established at the 2006 Tribal Summit was the importance of creating opportunities for pooling or leveraging transportation funding. During this period, the County of San Diego and several tribal nations negotiated innovative mitigation agreements, which included components for supporting collaborative transit and transportation demand management initiatives.
Pala Mitigation Agreement With County of San Diego

In 2007, the County of San Diego and the Pala Band of Mission Indians entered into an agreement related to the expansion of their gaming facility, which included consideration for future transportation demand management and transit improvements such as: (a) transportation demand management program being developed by the RTA with assistance from SANDAG; (b) possible Park-and-Ride facility at the Interstate 15/State Route 76; (c) Interregional Transit Service Plan being developed by San Diego and Riverside agencies; and (d) support for a North County Transit District bus stop. Pala was an active member of the RTA’s initial TDM Outreach program.

Pauma Mitigation Agreement With County of San Diego

In 2008, the County of San Diego and the Pauma Band of Luiseno Indians entered into an agreement related to the building of a gaming facility and hotel, which included support for transportation demand management and transit, as well as fair share contributions for the operational improvements on the State Route 76 as determined from the Caltrans Operational Improvements Study. The agreement included a commitment to consider membership with a specific contribution based on the RTA’s business plan in the Tribal Transportation Management Association (TTMA) initiative of the RTA—should the TTMA be formed. Pauma also made a commitment to a specific goal of having 20 percent of their employees participate daily in carpools, vanpools, or other rideshare programs.

Information Sharing/Technology Assistance

One of the commitments that resulted from the 2006 Tribal Summit was to systematically provide ongoing training to tribal governments on funding processes and transportation and regional planning. SANDAG has worked closely with the Tribal Transportation Assistance Program currently managed by the National Indian Justice Center (NIJC) contracted by Caltrans, to ensure that tribal nations in San Diego are aware of and have the appropriate and timely information for taking advantage of funding opportunities and other tribal transportation planning training. The NIJC has been invited to the Working Group on a number of occasions to share information and training opportunities with area tribes. The Working Group has resulted in an important venue for discussing statewide transportation issues with San Diego tribes.

In addition, SANDAG, through its Service Bureau, has made available to tribal governments technical support for planning and data analysis services. A number of tribes have taken advantage of the services provided for their own planning efforts.

2050 RTP Process - Recommended Strategies

Building on the successes of the last RTP, the members of the Working Group were asked to review the tribal transportation planning objectives and strategies developed in the last cycle for the 2030 RTP, determine which have been accomplished, which continue to be issues that must be addressed, and identify any new areas that should be considered in the process (Attachment N – RTP Tribal Transportation Strategies).
Several workshops were held with the Working Group, as well as the RTA and the SCTCA Board, between September and November of 2009 to obtain input on updating the 2030 Tribal Transportation Strategies for the 2050 RTP planning process. Their recommendations are listed in Table 3 and will be the subject of discussion at the 2010 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit. The objective is to identify and prioritize a set of strategies to be incorporated into the 2050 RTP.
### Table 3
2050 RTP - Proposed Strategies for Tribal Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Area</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government-to-Government Framework</td>
<td>Public agencies should understand tribal plans, how they are developed and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop collaborative legislative agenda that benefits the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Infrastructure</td>
<td>Identify corridors critical to tribal reservations and coordinate the funding and implementation of relevant studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify critical regional arterials serving tribal nations which should be included in the RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate the incorporation of existing Tribal Transportation Plans (TTP) into the current RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Collaborate on the issue of reverse commuting for tribal enterprise employees and pursuing funding opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate on the pursuit of funding opportunities to implement the recommendations from the Tribal Transit Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate on the development of a Tribal Transportation Management Association (TTMA) for increased tribal participation in TDM programs regionwide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Funding</td>
<td>Create opportunities for pooling/leveraging transportation funding for mutually important projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate and advocate for new transportation funding in the region, including transit and TDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify mechanisms for providing ongoing funding for new or additional transportation programs, including transit services and TDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sharing/Technical Assistance</td>
<td>Agencies will provide ongoing training to tribal governments on funding processes, transportation, and regional planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide information on technical support for planning and data analysis services to tribal governments parallel to member agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## SQUARE FOOTAGE OF GAMING FACILITIES FOR TRIP GENERATION ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name*</th>
<th>Casino Name</th>
<th>Year Opened</th>
<th>Square Footage Of Existing Operation</th>
<th>Number Of Restaurants</th>
<th>Square Footage Of Gaming Floor</th>
<th>Number Of Gaming Machines; Tables</th>
<th>Number Of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR76 Corridor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pala Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Pala Casino Resort &amp; Spa</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>2,250; 85</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauma Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Casino Pauma</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>1,050; 23</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon Band of Luiseño Nation</td>
<td>Harrah’s Rincon Casino &amp; Resort</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>263,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>1,600; 46</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Valley View Casino</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>1,250; 10</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-8 Corridor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barona Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Barona Valley Ranch Resort &amp; Casino</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>712,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>2,000; 63</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campo Band of Kumeyaay Indians</td>
<td>Golden Acorn Casino</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>750; 12</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation</td>
<td>Sycuan Casino &amp; Resort</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>233,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>2,000; 63</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians</td>
<td>Viejas Casino &amp; Turf Club</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>2,240; 96</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 million</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>754,000</td>
<td>13,140; 398</td>
<td>13,714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(2005: 2.3 million)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>754,000</td>
<td>12,680; 388</td>
<td>13,295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

* The Santa Ysabel and La Posta Tribal Governments each have agreements with the County of San Diego for developing gaming facilities with a maximum of 350 gaming machines and are expected to open in early 2007.
Summary Results -- 2005 Tribal Transportation Needs Survey

Identification of Problems

For the purpose of examining long-range transportation issues, the tribal nations in the region were grouped into three clusters based on key transportation corridors: State Route 76 (SR 76) which runs east-west in North County; SR 79 which runs north-south in the eastern half of the county; and Interstate 8 which runs east-west in the southern area of the county (Attachment C - Tribal Lands Transportation Corridors Map). The tribal groupings by transportation corridor are the following:

• State Route 76:
La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians; Pala Band of Mission Indians; Pauma & Yuima Band of Mission Indians; Rincon Band of the Luiseno Nation; and the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians.

• State Route 79:
The tribal governments whose primary corridor is the SR 79 include: Inaja-Cosmit Reservation; Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla Indians; Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians; and Santa Ysabel Band of Mission Indians.

• Interstate 8:
The tribal governments whose primary corridor for their reservation is Interstate 8 include: Barona Band of Mission Indians; Campo Band of Kumeyaay Indians; Ewiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians; Jamul Indian Village, La Posta Band of Mission Indians; Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Indians; Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation; and the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians.

Lack of Mechanism for Communication, Cooperation, and Coordination

The survey revealed that, in general, communication between tribal governments and the three public agencies they must interact with regarding transportation – Caltrans, County of San Diego, and SANDAG – was adequate. However, tribal representatives indicated they were often unclear which agency they should approach on any given transportation related issue. Tribal representatives indicated a need for a better understanding of agency processes and clearer guidelines on how to approach the agencies. In general, there was a lack of understanding regarding the regional transportation planning processes. Two of the main barriers to tribal government involvement in the transportation planning process were: (a) the lack of adequate staff to dedicate exclusively to this area of planning, and (b) information related to these processes was not sufficiently shared among both tribal staff and elected officials.
Lack of Long-Range Transportation Planning

The majority of the tribal governments in the San Diego region do not have Tribal Transportation Plans (TTPs) in place. Most cited the lack of funding and personnel as the reason for not having one. There are several who do have long range transportation plans in place, such as San Pasqual. As tribal developments become more and more complex, the need to incorporate transportation plans into their overall strategies becomes increasingly important. In recent years, several tribes have pooled their resources and developed circulation elements with the assistance of an intertribal transportation organization - the Reservation Transportation Authority.

Lack of Protocols for Sharing Comprehensive Land Use Plans

Eleven tribal governments have a general or comprehensive plan to guide development and facilities. Most indicated that although these are not public documents, under specific circumstances they would be willing to share the information with other agencies. Increasingly, tribal governments are expanding their areas of development from the commercial development of casinos to other forms of land use, including expanding housing options for tribal members.

It will be important in the near-term to establish mutually acceptable protocol for sharing this information with other jurisdictions in the region. At the moment, various tribes are taking significant steps to reach out to neighboring communities in the unincorporated area of the county through liaison meetings with community planning groups, as well as private initiatives such as the Alpine Revitalization effort, the Sycuan-Dehesa Subcommittee, and the North County Inland Regional Leadership forum.

Lack of Training Opportunities

Tribal government representatives have indicated that they have had limited access to relevant training opportunities. They are generally interested in receiving specialized training and/or technical assistance and cited most frequently the following areas: (1) tribal transportation planning, (2) ways to become more involved in the transportation planning process, (3) grant proposal writing, (4) approaches for developing a funding strategy, and (5) transportation engineering.

Lack of Transportation Funding

According to the survey results, most of the tribes in San Diego County do not operate with an annual transportation budget, but rather on an “as needed basis.” The funding is sporadic and largely dependent on funding from the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) for specific projects. Most of the tribes acknowledged that they do not receive funding from outside sources. Of those that do, revenues ranged from $5,000 to $1.9 million annually, depending on the project. Of those tribes that have allocated specific transportation budgets, many indicated that these budgets are a small portion of the overall tribal budget.

The main source of federal funding for tribal roads within the reservations is the BIA Indian Reservations Roads (IRR) Program. However, this funding is very limited. Federal IRR funding is allocated according to a “relative need” formula. Tribes from other states, particularly
those with larger land bases, benefit from the formula because they are able to demonstrate a greater need based upon larger inventories of road miles, vehicle miles traveled, and population figures. California tribes, which generally have smaller reservations, receive a very low allocation, not nearly enough to meet their needs. In 1999, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) identified $275 million in needed road improvements on tribal lands. According to a report by Caltrans, if the funding formula remains as it is, the expected IRR funding over the next 10 years would be just $50 million, only 18 percent of the identified needs. Caltrans concluded that at current funding levels it would take 55 years to fund existing needs, not taking future needs into account. Tribes are also eligible to receive most types of state transportation funds. However, tribes have had limited participation in past regional transportation planning efforts.

Priorities for Transportation Improvements

This section presents the two main transportation improvements identified by the tribes in order of their overall ranked importance and provides examples of some of the concerns/needs that various tribes expressed regarding that issue area. Overall, there was a consensus among the tribal governments surveyed regarding transportation improvement priorities; however, there were some differences when responses were grouped by the three previously described transportation corridors. For the tribes in the SR 76 corridor, they ranked road system as the principal area for improvement, followed by public transit, bikeways, and park/ride facilities. Tribal governments in the SR 79 corridor prioritized road system, emergency vehicles, and bikeways. While the tribal governments in the I-8 corridor prioritized road system, public transit, emergency vehicles, and pedestrian walkways. The two highest ranked transportation needs in the survey were improvements to the road system and public transit.

- Road System

Sixteen of the 17 San Diego tribes who participated in the survey indicated that their highest priority was roads on or accessing their reservation. Current roadway uses include accessing destinations such as health care services, residential areas, educational facilities, and casinos. Tribes in all three corridors rated the need for roadway system improvements as high. Tribal representatives cited a variety of road system needs such as: (a) paving and erosion control; (b) accessibility to the reservation; (c) maintenance of paved roads; (d) safety issues related to specific state routes; (e) alleviating traffic flow; and (f) traffic calming.

An issue mentioned by almost all of the tribes was the complexity of which jurisdiction ultimately has the responsibility for maintenance of the roads on the reservation, as well as a growing concern for engaging in discussions related to access to the reservations from either county roads or state highways.

• Public Transit

For tribal members who have been living on their reservation for many years, access to public transportation is critical to their well-being. In recent years, many tribes in the region have been encouraging the return of tribal members to live on reservation land. In many cases, the first priority is given to tribal elders who have limited mobility. As this population grows, the availability of public transit to meet their transportation needs and service the reservations will need to be addressed.

Eleven tribes currently have bus service on their reservations and indicated that improvements to current bus service are needed. Respondents indicated the following needs: (a) increased hourly stops; (b) additional bus stop locations in general, and specifically near convenient locations; and (c) bus services to accommodate the needs of special populations needing to access medical services, educational facilities, and social services.

Tribal representatives in the SR 76 and I-8 corridors indicated that improvements to bus service were the second most important improvement needed. La Posta, for example, indicated that the closest transit stop is four or five miles from the reservation. The children of Los Coyotes have to be taken by their parents to the La Jolla reservation to catch the school bus; their day begins at 5 a.m. and they do not return home until early evening.

The rural bus routes that service tribal reservations are currently limited (see Attachment D – Proximity of Rural Transit Routes to Tribal Lands). In the spring of 2006, MTS approved the implementation of a large-scale series of changes to its bus services, as part of its Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA). The objective of the COA was to re-align services to best serve productive market segments and develop a financially sustainable service. This will have some impact on the mobility options for people living and working in the rural areas of the region, including where many tribal lands are located.
Tribal Lands in the San Diego Region
COMMITTEE/WORKING GROUP CHARTER
Interagency Technical Working Group
On Tribal Transportation Issues
(Adopted January 2007)

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, which reports 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.

SELECTION OF THE CHAIR
The Working Group shall have a Chair and Vice-Chair, who will be chosen by a vote of the voting members of the Working Group on an annual basis.

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.
The purpose of the 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. 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.

The Working Group reports to the Borders Committee, which reports to the Board of Directors on tribal-related transportation activities.

The Working Group will meet quarterly. The location will rotate among tribal reservations, and, when deemed appropriate, at the SANDAG offices.

Staff contact is: Jane Clough-Riquelme, SANDAG Tribal Liaison (619) 699-1909; jcl@sandag.org

**MEMBERS (Tribal Governments)**

Albert ‘Boxie’ Phoenix (Chair)  
*Barona Band of Mission Indians*

William Micklin, CEO  
*Ewííaapaayp Band of the Kumeyaay Nation*

Richard Tellow, Councilmember  
*Jamul Indian Village*

Milton Campbell, Executive Council  
*Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla/Cupeño Indians*

Mark Romero, Chairman  
*Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians*

Andrew Moro, Business Manager  
*Paia Band of Mission Indians*

Chris Devers, Chairman  
*Pauma Band of Luiseño Indians*

Dick Watenpaugh, Tribal Administrator  
*Rincon Luiseño Band of Indians*

Carmen Mojado, Secretary  
*San Luis Rey Band of Luiseño Indians*

**ADVISORY (Public Agencies)**

Dave Toler, Delegate  
*San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians*

Rodney Kephart, Councilmember  
*Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel*

Alan Barrett, Councilmember  
*Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians*

Jim Fletcher  
*Superintendent of Southern California Bureau of Indian Affairs*

Mark Bobotis, Native American Liaison  
*Caltrans, District 11*

Chantal Saipe, Tribal Liaison  
*County of San Diego*

Kurt Luhrsen,  
*Principal Planner Metropolitan Transit System*

Devin Braun,  
*Senior Transportation Planner North County Transit District*

Boxie Phoenix/Bo Mazzetti  
*Reservation Transportation Authority*
### Collaborative Tribal Transportation Planning Milestones/Accomplishments (2006-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR STRATEGIC AREAS/ACTIONS</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthen the Mechanisms for Engaging Tribal Governments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Held policy-level summit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Developed collaborative action agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Created interagency working group on tribal transportation issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Transportation Infrastructure

| Action: Supported Indian Reservation Roads Inventory process | | | | | |
| **Action:** Identified tribal corridors and coordinate relevant studies/projects | | | | | |
| **1. State Routes** | | | | | |
| * SR76 Operational Improvements Study | | | | | |
| * SR76 East widening to Rosemary Quarry | | | | | |
| * SR79 @ Ipaay Nation entrance | | | | | |
| **2. County/Reservation Roads** | | | | | |
| * Valley Center Road | | | | | |
| * Wildcat Canyon Road | | | | | |
| * Pala Mission Road (culvert improvement) | | | | | |
| * Viejas Grade/Willows Road intersection | | | | | |
| * Dehesa Rd/entrance at Sycuan entrance | | | | | |
| * Lake Wohlford Improvements at Valley View entrance | | | | | |
| * Valley Center Road Bridge Replacement | | | | | |
| * Black Canyon Bridge Replacement | | | | | |
| **2. County/Reservation Roads** | | | | | |
| * Black Canyon Rd Improvement near Mesa Grande | | | | | |

#### Transit/Mobility Planning

| Action: Sought funding and implement tribal-focused transit planning projects | | | | | |
| **Action:** Supported Tribal Transit Feasibility Study | | | | | |
| **Action:** FTA Tribal Transit Program | | | | | |
| **Action:** Tribal TDM Outreach - Phase I (San Diego) | | | | | |
| **Action:** Tribal TDM Outreach - Phase II (Riverside) | | | | | |

#### Transportation Funding

| Action: Created opportunities for pooling/leveraging transportation funding | | | | | |
| **1. Pala Mitigation Agreement with County** | | | | | |
| **2. Pauma Mitigation Agreement with County** | | | | | |

#### Information Sharing/Technical Assistance

| Action: Agencies provided ongoing training to tribal governments on funding processes, transportation, and regional planning | | | | | |

#### Lead Agency/Group

- Caltrans
- County of SD
- Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA)
- SANDAG/ALL
- Tribe(s)
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Working with the Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA) and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), NCTD is revamping BREEZE bus route 388 to include route 389 and operate more buses seven days a week.

Through a special Federal Transit Administration Grant, beginning January 25, BREEZE Routes 388/389 will depart Escondido Transit Center every hour.

Route 388 will travel counterclockwise every two hours through Valley Center to Pala while Route 389 will travel every two hours North on I-15 to Pala and then through Valley Center before returning to Escondido Transit Center.

The RTA is pleased to work with NCTD to improve Route 388 service by reducing travel times and providing more trips to tribal employment areas.

This proposal would reduce travel times to Pala Casino from 65-minutes to 36-minutes on the 389, and expand the total number of trips serving these areas from six to sixteen each day.

Under this plan, service to Valley View Casino will also begin January 25.
# COMPLETE TRIBAL TRANSPORTATION STRATEGIES/ACTIONS MATRIX

*Developed through the 2030 RTP Process*

*Italics = completed  Bold = new for 2050 RTP*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY/ACTION</th>
<th>2030 Priority</th>
<th>2050 Priority</th>
<th>RCP Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Government-to-Government Framework:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Form tribal transportation agencies or committees that can address/discuss regional transportation concerns.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Tribes should be voting members on regional decision-making bodies, such as SANDAG.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Government agencies should understand tribal plans, how they are developed and implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Tribes will each develop an internal consultation policy/agreement and disseminate to other government agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ <strong>Develop collaborative legislative agenda that benefits tribal nations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Create mechanisms for identifying common concerns related to land use developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Transportation Infrastructure:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Tribes and MPOs should develop a collective Indian Reservation Road (IRR) road inventory to assure that California gets its fair share of federal IRR funds</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Identify corridors critical to tribal reservations and coordinate the implementation of relevant studies, including funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Identify critical regional arterials serving tribal nations which should be included in the RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Coordinate the incorporation of existing Tribal Transportation Plans (TTP) into the current RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Transit:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ <strong>Collaborate with interested tribal governments on a Reservation Transit Feasibility Study to examine potential alternatives for transit and private/public partnerships in selected corridors</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ <strong>Collaborate on pursuing financing for recommendations from the Reservation Transit Feasibility Study</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Consider the potential of collaborating on the issue of reverse commuting for tribal enterprise employees to reduce traffic congestion and improve the safety of rural routes to reservations with gaming facilities.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ <strong>Collaborate on the development of a Tribal Transportation Management Association for increased tribal participation in TDM programs regionwide.</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY/ACTION</th>
<th>2030 Priority</th>
<th>2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Transportation Funding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Create opportunities for pooling or leveraging transportation funding for mutually important projects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Collaborate and advocate for new transportation funding for the region</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Identify mechanisms for providing ongoing funding for new or additional transportation programs, including transit services.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Examine existing mechanisms for allocating transportation mitigation funds from tribal compacts</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Information Sharing/Technical Assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Develop a useful, accessible interagency directory of agencies/contact information for specific transportation issues (bus stops, road improvements, etc.) and keep it updated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Create a single Web-based clearinghouse with information on transportation programs and processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Agencies will provide ongoing training to tribal governments on funding processes, transportation, and regional planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Look for opportunities to streamline processes through an audit/evaluation of agency procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Provide information on technical support for planning and data analysis services to tribal governments parallel to member agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Look for opportunities to streamline processes related to tribal governments through an audit/evaluation of agencies procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Develop inter-institutional protocols for sharing land use and transportation data relevant to the development of regional comprehensive and transportation plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td>RCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>