

**California Local HSIP Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, September 23, 2021  
1:00 pm – 3:30 pm  
Via Zoom**

**Attendees:**

Robert Peterson, Richard Ke, Chiu Liu, Trisha Tillotson, Lisa Davey-Bates, John Asuncion, Tom Mattson, Patricia Chen, Darlene Wulff, Maria Bhatti, Cindy Utter, Tracy Coan, Susan Herman

Ernesto Munoz, City of Compton  
Eric Miller, County of Marin  
Jim Boltz, County of San Diego  
David Chin, County of San Diego  
Stephen Capuno, Caltrans Local Assistance

**Note: Decisions and Action items in boldface**

**Item 1. Welcome and Update**

**Item 2. Org Chart Review**

This item was discussed after the project updates and extension requests.

- Cindy Utter, the SHSP Coordinator for Division of Safety Programs, is now the SHSP contact for this committee.
- Org chart currently has a spot for a Transportation Co-op Committee (TCC) rep. Is this still needed? Robert Peterson reports regularly to TCC so the partnership is established.
- Trisha Tillotson mentioned that Panos Kokkas may be interested if he goes on to TCC as a County rep. Leave open for now.
- A Northern county rep (Trisha) is currently Local HSIP advisory committee co-chair. Tom Mattson volunteered to be the named CSAC rep for Northern counties rather than alternate for Southern counties. He will ask Dennis Acuna if Dennis would like to be co-chair alternate; if no, Tom will volunteer for that as well.
- Lisa Davey-Bates will discuss with Rural Counties Task Force to find a replacement and/or alternate
- One California League of Cities (CLC) seat and two CLC Alternate spots are still open

### **Item 3. Project Update Brief, City of Compton**

Ernesto Muñoz reported for the City of Compton, filling in for Dan Garcia who is on vacation until November 11. Ernesto brought some questions regarding H8-07-005 (enhancing ped crossing at 15 intersections) and H8-07-006 (20 additional pedestrian heads). He did not report on the progress of HSIP07-07-005.

- Compton had previously reported at January's HSIP committee meeting that the E-76 Con RFA would be submitted by April 2021 to implement the pedestrian head rapid flashing beacons.
- Questions put to the committee today: What process should be used to request the E-76? Will NEPA be required? Can a single RFP be issued for all 35 pedestrian heads, covering both projects?
- Process questions needed to have been discussed with Caltrans District staff. Robert will ask Steve Novotny to set up a separate meeting with the City for more focused attention; Patricia Chen will also be included.

### **Item 4. Project RFA Extensions, Marin County and San Diego County**

Eric Miller reviewed the project scope of HSIP7-04-011 Marin County, reviewed the project's challenges, and requested a time extension until April 1, 2022 to complete ROW Certification and E-76.

**Trisha moved, Tom seconded. Committee voted to approve the County's project extension request.**

- Grant awarded in 2015 for arterial and collector sign inventory on ~425 miles of road. Consultant analyzed whether any regulatory or curve warning signs are needed and if current signs met MUTCD requirements.
- Consultant made a first pass and identified about 2000 sign locations. Cultural and archeological clearance slowed down progress. County submitted time extension request in June 2019 for an additional 18 months.
- A few locations were in culturally sensitive areas. These were dropped from project scope. Now it covers 990 signs. All the signs dropped from scope will be replaced using local funds.
- Requested 2<sup>nd</sup> time extension which was approved through June 2021.
- NEPA authorization was completed this week thanks to assistance from District 4 staff. Project will need a few more months to get ROW Certification and E-76 RFA. Until April 1, 2022.
- An important lesson learned was not to seek federal funding for projects that involve so many locations.
- Trisha recommended supporting the County's request.
- Tom: until MOU is revised to remove the "we shall" language (NEPA assignment to Caltrans) environmental studies will continue to belabor project timelines. Going forward with State-only funding in future cycles means project sponsors

will still need to satisfy CEQA, which still includes time for tribal approval. However, it eliminates the long study period currently required under NEPA.

Jim Boltz, Richard Chin, and Stephen Capuno (D11) reviewed the project scope of H8-11-016 in San Diego County, reviewed the project's challenges, and requested a time extension until June 1, 2023 for the E-76 Con RFA and approval for HSIP to absorb a cost increase from \$7.7M to \$9.9M.

**Trisha moved; Patricia seconded. Committee approved the extension of Con RFA deadline to June 1, 2023. The cost increase was not approved.**

- Project is on a 1.25-mile corridor of Woodside Ave from Marilla Dr. to Chestnut St. in Lakeside, CA. In the most recent Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) this corridor ranked highest for total fatal AND severe injury collisions. Since the project application was approved and PE authorized in 2017, there have been two additional fatal accidents.
- Improvements were original to construct continuous sidewalks and bike lanes. Add advanced dilemma zone detection, add streetlights.
- 12 meetings with community stakeholders have helped shape the project including the chamber of commerce, school district, fire dept
- Challenges: in August 2018, there was a fatal pedestrian crash in an area that lacked a sidewalk segment and had insufficient lighting. Agency added lighting to project scope.
- In Dec 2020 there was a transit-related pedestrian crash. Agency added a section of sidewalk not included in the original scope.
- Right of way resource constraints. 50+ properties are being affected. Per a new county policy, the agency must obtain real property contracts, rather than temporary construction easements as originally planned. None of the acquisitions are controversial; however, costs have significantly increased.
- Project is in 100% design. Final PS & E design January 2022. Agency will be requesting ROW authorization shortly, as it moves into appraisals and acquisition of 50+ properties. NEPA was cleared last week.
- Using 2020 HSIP analyzer, we re-calculated the B/C ratio. It improved, despite the increased cost. Went from 4.0 to 4.2.
- Cost up 28% from \$7.7M to \$9.9M—most due to ROW acquisition and increased construction scope. Would like to include this additional funding with the RFA request. Currently \$772K are coming from local funds.
- Anticipated timeline: ROW Certification anticipated by Spring 2023. Begin construction Summer 2023, complete by Late 2024.
- Requesting another two years for construction authorization, and funding increase to cover the additional hard costs and ROW.
- Tom recommended the committee approve the new timeline.

- Per HSIP policy, to approve the cost increase the B/C has to be above the 3-year running average cutoff which is 7.67. Program managers' preference would be for County to add more local funding. Cost increase to be discussed separately.

Commented [S1]: Chiu please confirm: Is this the number that must be above the 3-year running average?

#### Item 5. OA Update and Project Delivery

Chiu Liu provided the update.

- This FFY the program has authorized \$102M for federal-funded safety projects. Anticipate \$150M by end of the 21/22 FFY.
- \$40M was converted to State funds last year, plus \$60M this year.
- Additional OA for federal-funded projects will open up in May 2022; can begin spending down apportionment at that point also.
- As of September, there are only 8 delayed projects now, representing ~\$8.4M. Chiu solicits updates regularly.
- Two projects in D10 are likely to deliver by December 31 deadline but may need a Con RFA extension—Chiu will advise them of upcoming milestones and next steps.

#### Item 6. HSIP Project Guideline Revision

Richard Ke provided the update.

- Guidelines now include a new section describing the Local HSIP advisory committee
- Added section about Local Roadway Safety Plan as a prerequisite for applying for HSIP Cycle 11.
  - Tribes have a special source of funding for developing LRSP; most have already completed these.
  - Caltrans strongly recommends that LRSP be approved by County Board/City Council—however, as long as the agency self-certifies that they have a completed plan, their applications are eligible.
  - Patricia suggested that the application's self-certification field include a link to where the LRSP is posted on the agency website.
- Added section on State funding of the program
- Project Implementation section now broken down to include FTIP, EPSP, and State-funded projects process for allocation
- Delivery requirements are the same for Federal/State but language differs slightly
- More details under Cost and Scope Change section
- Single form for Time Extension and Scope/Cost Change. DLAE must agree to change first before form is submitted to Caltrans HQ.
- Guidelines to be issued in Office Bulletin

#### Item 7. Discussion of Local HSIP Cycle 11

Robert reported on feedback received during Cycle 10 and solicited committee members' input on what kinds of projects to encourage/prioritize during Cycle 11 and how best to do that.

- Too soon to specify the dollar amount that will be available for Cycle 11. Depends on federal legislation; will likely be less than \$220M
- Can discuss whether to keep \$10M cap on cost of projects or change it.
- Go forward with the same four set-asides as in Cycle 10? Will discuss in-depth in November and look at the breakdown of the effectiveness of each type of set-aside.
  - Pedestrian crossing enhancement has been very popular, HSIP funded \$17M of these under set-aside and \$20M in the competitive program. Some set-aside funds unused from other areas were moved over to allow more ped crossing enhancements.
  - Tribal set-asides had zero uptakes in Cycle 10
  - Tom suggested offering set-asides on a first-come, first-serve basis.
  - Current criteria for set-asides: has agency applied for HSIP before?, number of fatal and severe injuries.
- Road diet countermeasure may need to be expanded and made more flexible in terms of which roadway re-configurations are valid
- Large roundabouts do not compete well in HSIP program due to their high cost. Possibly make mini roundabouts a separate countermeasure. Will need incorporate more studies into application to quantify safety and operational benefits. Sometimes roundabouts are installed for beautification purposes, not safety.
- Advanced dilemma zone—meant for rural areas, high-speed signals. Reduction factor is 40%. Many applicants from Cycle 10 stretched the definition of this countermeasure and used it in areas with speeds under 45 MPH, to increase their B/C. Reduction factors and speeds may be adjusted.

#### **Item 8. Roundtable**

- Robert: The SHSP Lane Departure group is looking at using high injury networks as a tool to identify countermeasure locations. Methodology for determining this is still evolving.
- Tom: The Pedestrian and Bicycle group has action items related to this also.
- Cindy: Highlighted SHSP's resources, particularly the crash data dashboard. Latest newsletter shows progress and action items in all 16 SHSP Challenge areas.
- Caltrans is looking at creating District Safety Plans. Hopefully this will provide an avenue for District staff to meet with agencies and discuss alongside CHP, public health. Will be consultant-led, one or two consultants for entire state.

- Maria: true amounts being spent on pedestrian and bicycle related safety projects on local roads aren't being well tracked in HSIP reports to FHWA. She hopes that with LRSP development, more of this detail could be captured.
- Maria posted a link for benefits of roundabouts: <https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/provencountermeasures/roundabouts/>. It doesn't cover discrepancies in safety benefits between large and mini-roundabouts. She will follow up with Hillary Isebrands regarding whether large vs. mini should be broken out as a separate type of countermeasure.
- Patricia shared that District 7 had started monthly meetings with city agencies, but with recent staff turnover, this has not gotten re-started. She would like to use the upcoming conversation with Compton to see if these regular meetings can get going again.

### **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:20pm.