# FIXING AMERICA’S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION (FAST) ACT IMPLEMENTATION WORKING GROUP MEETING NOTES – May 3, 2016

**Start Time: 3:00 pm**

**End Time: 3:35 pm**

**In-Person Attendees:** Giles Giovinazzi, Mike Duman, John Hoole, Matthew George, Thomas Schriber, Norma Ortega, Tom Hallenbeck, Erin Thompson, Jackie Hodaly, LaNae Van Valen.

**Remote Attendees:** Sarkes Khachek, AMBAG, Caltrans Freight Planning, CTC, SCAG, Lenora Graves, SANDAG, MTC, Placer CTPA, CSAC, California Legislature/Transportation, CALCOG, LA Metro.

## ACTION ITEM:

| **Responsible** | **Action Needed** | **Due Date** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Giles Giovinazzi | Continue discussion on 60/40 split counter-proposal  | Future meeting as needed. |

## INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL UPDATE:

* Giles welcomed all attendees and introductions completed.
	+ Updating website, and previous meetings’ notes have been posted on the webpage.
	+ General update on TIGER and FASTLANE grants and due dates provided; information on new and Notices of Funding Opportunities posted on webpage: Surface Transportation System Funding Alternatives (Dues Date May 20, 2016) and Advanced Transportation and Congestion Management Technologies Deployment Initiative (Dues Date June 3, 2016).

## Federal Highway Administration UPDATE:

* Mike Duman from FHWA reported that FHWA has hosted two webinars on the Performance Management 3 (PM 3) NPRM that provided good overviews.
	+ These webinars are being recorded and Mike suggests to use these as starting points prior to reading the 400 page NPRM.
* On the Caltrans FAST Act / MAP-21 website <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/map21/map21_implementation.htm>, Giles has linked information to the FHWA PM 3 website that includes three new fact sheets on PM 3.
	+ Caltrans will develop comments after a statewide outreach process.
	+ There is a 120 day comment period (comments due August 20th).

## THOMAS SCHRIBER BRIEFING ON RELEASED FINAL HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND SAFETY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT MEASURES FINAL RULES:

Thomas referenced the “Highway Safety Improvement Program and Safety Performance Management Measures Final Rules Overview” attachment (provided with MS Outlook meeting agenda) and discussed the Final Rules’ implementation and involvement.

* + HSIP report: There have been internal changes within Caltrans regarding the online reporting tool that has been used for the past two years.
	+ Will be incorporating reporting requirements needed for the August 2017 deadline.
	+ Will need to come up with methodology for all involved.
	+ Performance Targets to be established for all public roads.
	+ MPOs to adopt their own targets unless they decide to adopt the State’s.
	+ States will also be reporting to NHTSA for Performance Measures regarding Safety.
	+ California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) reports annually, and Caltrans will be meeting with OTS.
	+ The best target setting methodology for MPOs has yet to be determined.

The Final Rule included a fifth Performance Target regarding non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries (bicycles and pedestrians).

* + There is a need to determine performance measurements and targets Statewide; for example, determining how to do counts for non-motorized travel. This could be part of traffic census effort, and the federal government does reimburse State efforts. It could begin with a smaller sample set, or it could begin with coastal “heavy areas” (Bay Area and Southern California). How to include and cover all public roads must be determined.
	+ California also needs to be compliant with the Final Rule’s requirement to collect and use Model Inventory of Roadway Elements (MIRE) data.
	+ California needs a strategy to be MIRE compliant as part of California’s Traffic Records Strategic Plan by July 2017, and have access to complete collection of MIRE data for all public roads by September 30, 2026.
	+ Thomas discussed how OTS is approaching targets.
	+ California needs agreement on methodology to include in reporting processes.
* Questions and Answers included additional discussion on the MIRE Fundamental data elements access requirement by September 30, 2026, and the Traffic Records Strategic Plan July 2, 2017, deadline.

## GENERAL DISCUSSION:

* Giles began discussion on the counter-proposal *FAST-ACT Programmatic Apportionment Distribution* chart (provided with the MS Outlook meeting agenda) developed by the Regions. This is a counter-proposal to Caltrans’ March 9th Funding Apportionment 60 percent state / 40 percent local split proposal.
* Sarkes Khachek from California’s RTPAs discussed how the numbers were developed; keeping to similar format; working with Caltrans staff over the past two weeks.
	+ Two “Take Aways” highlighted:
		- Reflect additional information regarding the penalty levied on repeat drunk drivers; recording/illustrating that some funds are being levied against certain programs.
		- SP&R (State Planning & Research) 2 ½ percent take down regarding certain programs.
	+ Believes there is agreement on the 60 percent state /40 percent local split, but wants to focus now on the 40 percent side and how funds will be distributed amongst the Regions.
	+ The Regions’ priority is in making sure certain programs are staying at the levels they were previously:
		- For example, the Regions wanted to preserve at least the status quo National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) share of funding for locally-owned bridges.
		- The Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program is particularly important to the locals because it is the most flexible.
		- Keeping Region’s funding levels consistent through the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and the Transportation Alternatives programs.
	+ Want to maintain high-level of delivery to leverage any federal funding opportunities.
* Some participants raised the question regarding whether there was a possibility of a 50 percent / 50 percent funding split? There was further discussion on the flexibility of HSIP funding versus STBG.
* Sarkes Kharchek concluded that the Regions stand by their proposal.
* Giles asked if CSAC was working with the Regions and CALCOG on this proposal, but this is the first time CSAC had seen these numbers; however, an initial look at the Regions’ Funding Apportionment Distribution counter-proposal appears OK to CSAC. There were no more questions at this time.

## NEXT STEPS:

* Giles advised the Group that this is the last scheduled meeting, and discussed whether or not there is a need for another meeting specifically regarding the Region’s funding proposal. He will set up another meeting at the end of the month if needed, and will post appropriate details on the webpage.
* The Subgroups’ initial White Papers have been posted on the webpage, and any needed revisions are being completed. There are no significant changes anticipated at this time.
* Will continue to work for an agreement on the Apportionment Table.
* There were no further questions or discussion, and Giles adjourned the meeting.