

California Local HSIP Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, May 30, 2019
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Sacramento International Airport
Terminal A, 2nd Floor, Air-Media Conference Room
(916) 874-0182

Attendees: Jana Cervantes, Uy Tran, Norman Baculinao, Philip Chu, Chiu Liu, Trisha Tillotson, Tom Mattson, Richard Ke, Susan Herman, Ken Kochevar, Ross McKeown, Rick Tippett.

From City of Carson: Jeff Thierry, Acting Interim Traffic Engineer

Note: Decisions and Action items in boldface

Item 1: Welcome/Updates (at 1:05pm by Tom)

- Robert Peterson will attend July meeting; some discussions noted below were shortened today so Robert could participate next time.

Item 2: City of Carson Extension Request on HSIP6-07-004 & -005 (at 1:06 by Jeff Thierry representing public works director Dr. Maria Slaughter)

The Lancaster Extension Request on HSIP6-07-012 & -013 was not made as noted in the agenda because the agency met its milestone and the project is no longer delayed.

Jeff Thierry presented an overview of the two delayed HSIP bike lane projects in the City of Carson and gave an update on their current status and schedule for completion.

- He explained the three factors contributing to project delays. First, a change in the City's enterprise resource planning (ERP) system resulted in some capital project funds not rolling over into the next fiscal year. Local match funds for both affected HSIP projects are now recovered and will be included in the 2019-2020 FY budget. Second, the department had difficulty in the past with hiring external resources; however, a project manager has now been hired. Third, the department had several failed attempts to secure a design firm, but received City Council approval to do so (Council minutes from April 26, 2019 attached showing names of firms).
- Jeff presented the project schedule, which begins June 2019 with design and ends December 2020 with acceptance of completed project.

- The committee had several questions about the City’s consultant procurement process, cost increase estimates for the project, extent of hardscape construction involved in the project and whether environmental or right of way will need to be figured into the schedule. Jeff noted that the City used an RFP hiring process; that the City is willing to devote local funds to cover cost increases (though an estimate of total cost increase was not available); that most of the project consists of striping and road diets, not requiring new widening on pavement.
- The committee also asked about reasons for delay of HSIP 8-07-003, an intersection upgrade project; Jeff did not have information about this at hand.

Tom recommended conditional approval of the City of Carson’s extension request, on resolution of the following four items:

- 1. Verification that the proper federal consultant procurement process was followed per the Caltrans Local Assistance Program Manual (LAPM). If not, this will need to be figured into the project schedule.**
- 2. Cost increase estimated amount to be provided.**
- 3. Status of the \$1.7M Cycle 8 intersection improvement project in the City of Carson—reason for delay to be provided.**
- 4. Updated construction schedule, adjusted as needed per #1 above and for any clearances needed for construction outside of existing pavement.**

The committee voted in favor of Tom’s recommendation. Caltrans will email Jeff with these 4 points so he can provide the information.

Item 3. Delivery and OA Status (at 2:00 by Chiu)

- As of May 2019 \$56M of OA has been obligated for HSIP projects. The total Local Assistance HSIP OA limit is around \$100M, and OA for all programs has been obligated before May 3rd, thus Caltrans cannot process any more HSIP projects until the August re-distribution.
- The delay list has only 25 delayed projects, down from 47 two months ago.

Discussion

Delayed projects list does not include reason for delay & new authorization dates. HSIP committee could be more effective if it were also informed about what each district is doing to help the agencies deliver the projects that are delayed.

Chiu emails DLAEs with information about safety projects that are delayed one week before each committee meeting—going forward, he will attach their letters with reasons for delay to the list.

Item 4. SSARP Update (at 2:20 by Richard)

- 10 final SSARP reports have been received—107 SSARP applications were selected for funding during 2016-2017.
- \$6.3M has been spent so far of the \$17.7M made available with state funds and by exchanging local HSIP funds for State HSIP funds.
- \$10M additional from local HSIP balance will convert to State HSIP for SSARP

Discussion

- What are the reportable measures on the LRSP and how does an agency show that they've met their goals?
- Agencies will have different items being measured (e.g. number of run-off-road crashes with DUI for one area; number of pedestrian-involved crashes in another) and would ideally evaluate results of safety improvements and revise their LRSP every year, at a minimum once every 5 years.

Item 5. LRSP Webinars (at 2:25 by Ken)

Two webinars @ 90 min each, will be given to precede the October LRSP peer exchange in Southern CA. Tentative dates are September 9, 10, 11 (maybe not 9/10).

Agenda for the webinars is as follows:

- Robert: introduction
- Overview of what LRSPs are (Hilary Isebrands & Jerry Roche, FHWA)
- 3 county examples, Julio—San Diego, Trisha—Nevada Co, Bob—Marin Co.
- EDC 5 countermeasures for reducing roadway departure
- Robert: wrap up on future HSIP changes regarding LRSPs “encouraged” in Cycle 10 and “required” for Cycle 11

Item 6. Roundtable (at 2:30 by ALL)

- Ross offered to invite representatives from a Vision Zero city to present. He noted that Fremont is a great example of challenging assumptions, using data to develop policy, and changing funding around to enact their plan.
- Rick said he would like to discuss federal program measurements for evaluating HSIP success.
- Trisha asked whether the committee has ever rejected an agency's appeal for more funds or time? No, but we have down scoped, asked project sponsors to hold public meetings to get local feedback, and so on.
- Ken noted that the SHSP survey will go out soon to all registered participants—feedback from local road owners is important.

Meeting adjourned at 2:37 pm

Item 7. Future Agenda Topics

- Discuss how this committee can exercise more oversight and help agencies deliver safety projects. Caltrans districts that have strong outreach to their local jurisdictions tend not to have delayed projects; how can we support DLAEs in their outreach efforts?

- Discuss whether to broaden language about what type of safety plan is preferred/required in the future HSIP Calls-for-Projects (LRSP only, what about SSARP or Vision Zero plan?). Currently on the website it says:
 - HSIP Cycle 10 (around April 2020): an LRSP will be highly recommended but not required for an agency to apply;
 - HSIP Cycle 11 (around April 2022) and on: an LRSP will be required for an agency to be eligible to apply.

Next meeting: Thursday, July 18, 1-4 PM, Air-Media Conference Room