

**Local Assistance
Highway Bridge Program (HBP) Advisory Committee Meeting
December 11, 2025 – Action Items and Summary**

Attendees:

Dee Lam, DLA

Zhongren Wang, DLA

Michael Chung, San Joaquin County

Umer Ahmed, Riverside County

Jesse Gothan, City of Sacramento

Kenneth Kao, MTC

Chris Long, FHWA

Jon Pray, CTC

Vanessa Schoenewald, SBCTA

Parminder Singh, Caltrans D10

Roberta Jensen, DLA

Andy Chou, DLA

Humayra Saba, DLA

Kirk Anderson, Caltrans D6

Jason Chou, SLA

Jeremy Wright, SLA

Rebecca Neves, City of Folsom

Chris Sneddon, Santa Barbara County

Decisions

No decisions were necessary or made.

Action Items

None

Discussions

1. Welcome and Introductions

Dee welcomed the committee. She noted that HBP is in high demand, and the number of high-cost bridges ready to authorize construction soon is high. This is the last year of BFP apportionment from the federal government with IIJA. Local agencies need to come ASAP to obligate the funds.

2. Agenda Review

No comments.

3. Review of 8/21/2025 Draft Action and Summary

HBP managers reviewed the draft Action and Summary from the August meeting. There are no comments.

4A. Financial Status FFY 24/25

HBP Managers shared the FFY 24/25 report as of 9/30/2025 with the following points:

- Carry-over from FFY 23/24 was \$85 million. The carry-over provided additional apportionment and projects were programmed against this additional capacity.
- HBP had \$557 million of apportionment available in FFY 24/25 between core apportionment and BFP funds.

**Local Assistance
Highway Bridge Program (HBP) Advisory Committee Meeting
December 11, 2025 – Action Items and Summary**

- De-obligations were approximately \$18 million, which provided additional capacity.
- HBP obligated approximately \$611 million in FFY 24/25.
- HBP was asked to utilize additional OA because the PROTECT OA was redistributed amongst the various programs as PROTECT OA was not going to be used. HBP OA was at 133% when accounting for the PROTECT OA redistribution. HBP OA was at 158% when not accounting for the PROTECT OA redistribution.

Core Apportionment and BFP funds have been and will continue to be delivered strategically to balance the use of BFP funds and OA delivery. FFY 25/26 is the last year of BFP funds. If BFP level funding is not renewed, demand for On federal-aid system projects will be too high and projects may be delayed.

HBP managers were notified at the last minute that the Locals received TIFIA redistribution. In order for the 60 State/40 Local split work with the State, the HBP's NHPP was reduced. In other words, the TIFIA apportionment that was provided to the local regions ultimately hurt the HBP's apportionment. This is why you see in the final Fund Status that it appears that the HBP over-obligated NHPP funds.

4B. Financial Status FFY 25/26:

HBP Managers shared the current FFY 25/26 report as of 12/3/2025 with the following points:

- Carry-over from FFY 24/25 was \$49 million. The carry-over provides additional apportionment and projects were programmed against this additional capacity.
- HBP has \$566 million of apportionment available in FFY 25/26 between core apportionment and BFP funds.
- De-obligations to date are approximately \$8.5 million, which provides additional capacity.
- \$10 million has already been obligated since the start of the FFY

5. LBSRP Seismic Update:

The Local Bridge Seismic Retrofit Program (LBSRP) manager provided an update of the mandatory seismic retrofit program. There were 31 active projects on the list, which reflects all remaining projects that are currently in progress and receiving Prop 1B funding in the LBSRP. These projects are reporting to CTC on a semi-annual basis. As of December 2025, there are 11 bridges that still need to get to construction. There are 11 bridge projects that are out of compliance with their Project Delivery Agreements (PDA).

LBSRP manager also shared with the committee that Prop 1B is a finite amount of funds, and with projects being delayed and cost increases, there may not be any left.

**Local Assistance
Highway Bridge Program (HBP) Advisory Committee Meeting
December 11, 2025 – Action Items and Summary**

Projects that have not gone to construction by their CON RFA date as approved in their PDA may be at risk of not receiving Prop 1B funds and the match will be the responsibility of the local agency. Local agencies are still held to PDA delivery milestones even once Prop 1B funds are depleted.

6A. HBP CON Authorizations in FFY 24/25:

HBP managers provided a list of projects that authorized the CON phase in FFY 24/25.

- \$305 million of federal dollars were obligated for CON authorization
- \$302 million of local AC was used. This was due to FTIP constraints, high-cost programming rules, or mid-level cost programming rules and not because of lack of federal funding.

6B. HBP Constrained October 2025 Analysis:

- HBP managers shared the demand and capacity of each phase by federal fiscal year between FFY 24/25 through Beyond. Financial Constraint of the 2025 FSTIP was explained for each the Off Federal-Aid system and On Federal-Aid system.
- The HBP targets to be a 15-year program and HBP managers explained the importance of keeping the currently programmed demand to be under 15 years in order to be able to accommodate unforeseen cost increases. Failure to do so will result in the program being oversubscribed.
- HBP managers explained that the 15-year programming demand is just 1 lens to view the program. It is also important to recognize the scheduling of the demand on the program.

6C. HBP Projects by Local Agency:

HBP managers shared a report that shows the number of HBP projects each local agency has and what phase the project(s) is in. The report also shows the number of HBP projects per district. This is shared for information only.

6D. HBP Projects PE over 8:

HBP managers shared a report on projects with PE over 8 years without NEPA clearance. HBP asks for environmental status reports when PE exceeds 8 years without NEPA clearance to investigate why projects are delaying. This report helps identify local agencies that are having structural issues in delivering HBP projects.

6E. HBP Delivery failure in FFY 24/25:

HBP managers shared the list of projects that had “delivery failure” in FFY 24/25.

**Local Assistance
Highway Bridge Program (HBP) Advisory Committee Meeting
December 11, 2025 – Action Items and Summary**

- If a project failed to authorize the PE phase, the project was removed from the program.
- If a project failed to obligate programming (outside PE authorization), the programming is rescheduled to last year of FTIP. The majority of delivery failures in 24/25 were CON authorizations due to RW delays.

6F. HBP High-Cost Cashflow Analysis:

HBP managers provided the high-cost cashflow spreadsheet showing all the high-cost bridge projects currently in the program. The analysis of demand, capacity, and the ability to enter into a new high-cost agreement was explained.

- HBP has 5 high-cost projects that will want to sign a high-cost agreement in FFY 25/26. Depending on the capacity of HBP at that time, HBP may not be able to provide funds to all projects as requested.
- High cost projects continue to take up the majority of HBP programming.

7. High-Cost Programming for FFY 26/27:

- HBP managers discussed to the committee that in August 2022, the Committee granted an exception to increase the ON federal-aid system programming limit from 50% to 60% to FFY 25/26. The intent of this request was to get Advanced Construction (AC) converted closer to the actual construction, to increase the flexibility of BFP funding, and to avoid losing any HBP funding.
- This exception has allowed HBP to provide funds to high-cost projects timely. HBP managers ensured that programming towards non-high-cost projects was not negatively impacted due to this high-cost programming exception.

HBP intends to continue the 60% programming limit to FFY 26/27 if the programming demands show that this is appropriate. In other words, a limit of 60% will be utilized if it does not impact non-high-cost projects in FFY 26/27.

8. Round Table:

- SLA introduced Praneeth as the new SLA engineer for District 6. SLA is hosting a State bridge seminar in the middle of February at the Downtown Secretary building.
- FHWA shared that training is available for the bridge preservation class through AASHTO.
- There has been discussion on capping the projects for PE>15. FHWA suggested that a process review can be used to reduce the time frames of NEPA clearance.