

California Local HSIP Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, March 12, 2020
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm
Sacramento State University, Modoc Hall-Willow Suites 1

Attendees: Chiu Liu, Richard Ke, Darlene Wulff, Robert Peterson, Ken Kochevar, Ross McKeown, Susan Herman, Tracy Coan

By Phone: Tom Mattson, Dick McKinley, Jodi Almassy, Tammy Marr, Patricia Chen, Maria Bhatti, Abdel Beshair

Note: Decisions and Action items in boldface

Item 1. Welcome and Updates

- DLA Division Chief Ray Zhang has retired, acting chief is Dee Lam
- April is approximate date of Cycle 10 call for projects; final date depends on IT preparedness
- Webinar on Cycle 10 will roll out in May

Item 2. Safety Project Delivery Status and OA Delivery

- Chiu shared OA delivery data as of Feb 29: the HSIP program has authorized \$88M for fiscal year so far; target by end of FY is \$160M.
- This is a record high for project deliveries. Robert attributed this to a more narrowly-defined set of countermeasures that would be funded as well as DLA's diligence in holding local agencies accountable for timely delivery.
- Re: San Luis Obispo's project HSIP6-05-003, Tammy said the district is awaiting agency response on whether they want an extension
- Chiu recommended dropping Compton's three projects from the current FTIP.
 - Agency has not been responsive, either with HSIP or other federal programs. Need to know whether they are committed to delivering.
 - Patricia asked about whether "negative points" would be attached if the agency were re-apply in Cycle 10; answer is no.
 - DLA has been working with Dale Benson, HSIP coordinator in D7; Chiu has notified district about likely deprogramming action—but has not yet communicated this to city manager or council level. Dick recommended waiting to deprogram until city staff confirms they have received notice.
 - Compton has been under audit; cannot submit RFA per State Controller's office until corrective action is taken. Patricia asked DLA to verify length of time Compton has been on controller's list. **Robert will follow up on**

status of Compton with State Controller's office.

- Tom recommended sending “final notice” to city manager/council that project will be deprogramed at May 28 HSIP advisory meeting, pending receipt of detailed schedule for getting off State Controller's “bad” list and communicating about project plans with DLA. **The committee voted to take this recommended action.**
- Chiu will also send Monrovia a “final notice” to submit their CON RFA package by May 28 or prepare to speak to the HSIP advisory committee on that date; he has communicated this to the District.
 - Jodi suggested requesting documentation ahead of the May 28 meeting to provide context for why the project has been delayed 6 years.
 - Delivery commitments began to be enforced ~2013-14, this reset the clock for older cycles. Monrovia is a Cycle 4 project (2007) so is one of these still to be “cleaned up” from delay list
 - Tom suggested that going forward all agency appeals to the HSIP advisory committee be made into a 2-step process, where documentation is provided a week ahead of time, before project sponsor comes to present in person.
 - Patricia suggested that, in addition to the protocol just mentioned, the **committee also provide agencies a “likely no” or “likely yes” recommendation, based on documents provided, before project sponsors travel to defend their HSIP grants. This step will be added to the May 28 agenda regarding Monrovia, HSIP4-07-037.**
- Patricia reported status of Carson project H8-07-003—there had previously been an email glitch between district and city staff. She met with Carson on February 22; communication process seems to be resolved. She will provide another update next time.

Item 3. SHSP Lane Departure Update

Robert presented the Lane Departure action items:

- Targeted training for the 20% of agencies that generate 80% of lane departures
- Curve shoulder widening
- White paper (and later, hopefully, a pilot) for “edge lane roads”—low volume roads with a single lane striped and shoulders for pulling over
- Edge line countermeasure

Item 4. Survey on the Local Agency Training done by CSUS

Ken reported on the Feb 10-22 survey. Received 56 responses from 56 agencies, of 4000 who received the survey. Lower than desired response rate.

Ken would like to re-open the survey to get more responses. Once the second round of comments are in, Tracy will send responders a thank-you. She and Ken will then match up those that requested trainings with those who were willing to host trainings + those with highest need for targeted training on lane departure.

Summary of survey responses:

- Which countermeasures of the 20 FHWA proven ones is your agency currently using? Median/ped crossing islands, pedestrian hybrid beacons, roundabouts, LRSPs
- What countermeasures would you like to know more about? Systemic application of multiple low-cost CMs at stop-controlled intersections was highest
- Does your agency use other countermeasures not listed among the 20? Signal and guardrail audits, RRFBs, crosswalk enhancements
- With which countermeasures do you need technical assistance? Ped/bike category had most responses, followed by intersections and roadway departure.
- Multi-agency cross-cutting areas for tech assistance? Incremental/systemic approaches, road safety audits, LRSPs, local HSIP application process
- 23 responders said “yes” to hosting trainings. Proposed dates spread out from March 2020 through 2021
- Ken will work with Tracy on developing content, determining when/where to travel for in-person training, and how to deliver distance learning

Item 5. Update on 2nd Round LRSP Funding and Training

Richard reported that 160 LRSPs have been funded so far. DLA will request another \$8M from CTC for additional plans. \$72K per agency may not be enough for large agency—new criteria for funding will be more flexible and based on centerline mileage. Low-mileage agencies can create combined LRSPs.

- 200 miles or less—\$72K max
- Between 250-500 miles—\$140K
- above 500 miles—\$200K

Pending the CTC’s approval of the additional funding, agencies that already received an allocation can come in for additional money (e.g., if they initially had a large local contribution)

Tom is concerned that consultants may need better guidance; for example, a small city in his county with 3 miles of road and no crash history was quoted \$45K for data analysis + a few stakeholder meetings. This city’s plan ultimately was absorbed into the county’s plan. Robert noted that Kern County is incorporating small cities as well. Chiu suggested that this strategy be written into the LRSP guidance.

Bruce de Terra did a training in Camarillo in February, 25 local agencies attended. He plans to do 2 more trainings—Walnut Creek and Fresno.

Item 6. Update on SB 137 Federal/State Funds Exchange

Robert reported in January he had spoken to Fardad in the Caltrans budget office about SB 137 exchange money being applied toward Cycle 9 projects. Due to recision threats last year a lot of money was shifted over to HSIP. As of January, the budget office was in no position to process the federal/state funds exchange. Will discuss again at end of this FY.

Richard has inventoried Cycle 9 projects and found 95 agencies that could be eligible to take advantage of the funds exchange. No further action will be taken with districts or agencies at this time. Objective is to use all \$100M for HSIP, though a small amount could be used for the Local Highway Bridge Program.

Item 7. Finalize the Set-aside Amounts in Cycle 10 Call-for-Projects

- Proposed total Cycle 10 funding amount total: \$220M, up from \$180M in previous cycle
- Set-asides \$42M total for guardrail upgrade, installing edgelines, ped crossing enhancements, tribes.
- There is flexibility in case the need for pedestrian crossing enhancements exceeds \$15M, money can be moved over from other set-asides.
- Solano transportation agency asked whether per-agency amounts for ped crossing enhancements can be higher than \$250K? No, at least a 20% savings will be realized because federal funds will have been exchanged for state funds. **Committee voted to keep the per-agency cap for set-asides at \$250K.**
- When the call is announced the federal/state funds exchange information, and associated savings, will be clear.
- Ken clarified whether the program will prioritize set-asides to agencies that have never applied for HSIP grants before? Yes. The criteria are:
 - Agency is new to HSIP
 - HSIP application doesn't have BCR projects
 - Agency has an approved LRSP
 - 3 or more fatal crashes in past year

Item 8. New Countermeasures for Cycle 10

Richard presented a table of proposed countermeasures. The new CMs include:

- Improve pavement friction (higher crash reduction factor or CRF, now 0.55 up from 0.4)

- Pedestrian scramble
- Reduced left-turn conflict intersections
- Upgrade pedestrian crossing
- Widen shoulder
- Curve shoulder widening, outside only
- Rectangular rapid flashing beacon
- Install separated (buffered) bike lanes

Deleted: Widen shoulder unpaved, improve horizontal and vertical alignments

Specific criteria are included in the countermeasure descriptions regarding preference for incremental changes/upgrades, i.e. try cheaper & simpler countermeasures first before more expensive & complex.

Other Cycle 10 notes:

- All-electronic application submittal. Original application will not be attached in response back to agencies. Multiple forms will be downloaded in a bundle rather than as separate. District safety coordinators will also receive notification that agency application was received.
- Application includes area to check which SHSP Challenge Area is being addressed
- For systemic applications of the same countermeasure, an agency can separate out data on locations where the countermeasure will have a high benefit to cost ratio (BCR), rather than having to average the BCR across all the locations.
- Removed criterion that projects with more than 3 different countermeasures provide more 15% or more benefit (review will still flag applications if it seems like an agency is trying to “game” the BCR calculation).
- Crash cost methodology remains the same, though constants will be updated. With more money available this time a 3.5 BCR will likely be the cutoff for programming prioritization, which is lower than in previous years.
- Having more SSARP-informed HSIP applications means the quality of proposed projects will be better overall.
- Agencies can use crash history from past 3-5 years; data in TIMS dates from 2018 as of now.

Item 9. HSIP Program Assessment Gap Analysis for Local HSIP Projects

Ken reported Local HSIP program now has enough BCR data from completed projects to analyze three years of before- vs. after-project crash data. Annual HSIP report is due from Caltrans in August and must now include this data.

- Caltrans will use its own database and work with DLAEs to identify which projects were completed and now have three years of crash data, then will reach

out to agencies with a template for providing the data.

- In the report, projects with similar countermeasures will be grouped together to generate aggregate collision reduction percentages
- In future when local agencies first apply for funds, they will be notified about after-completion crash data collection requirement. This will be included in the upcoming Cycle 10 webinar.

Item 10. Roundtable

- During the meeting Patricia emailed several District 7 agencies for updates on their delayed projects—Long Beach already responded.
- She also asked: is there any expectation of Local HSIP Advisory Committee members to review HSIP applications? No—this is done at headquarters.
- Chiu noted that agencies should make sure that the countermeasures they choose match the right category and subtype: intersection, roadway, pedestrian/bike, etc.