

California Local HSIP Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, January 25, 2017
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm
Sacramento International Airport
Terminal A, 2nd Floor, Air-Media Conference Room

Attendees: Dean Lehman, Richard Ke, Tom Mattson, Adrian Cardoso, Ross McKeown, Ken Kochevar, Jana Cervantes, Chiu Liu, Carlos Rios, Susan Herman

By phone: Bob Goralka, Andrew Maximous

Time	Topic	Lead(s)
1:00 pm	Welcome	Tom/Richard
1:05 pm	<p>Cycle 8 FTIP Programming and SSARP New Funding Request to CTC/Others</p> <p>(1) FTIP programming [handout provided]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project selection for Cycle 8 is completed; MPOs are now amending all projects into 2017 FTIP • Total amount currently programmed for the 4-year period is \$437M • 207 of 225 Cycle 8 projects are fully programmed into FTIP • The other 18 projects from Cycle 8 are 25% programmed in the current FTIP. If any of these are ready for construction they can be amended in; all have anticipated construction dates beyond March 2020. They will be fully funded in 2018, so their current partial-programmed status should not impact delivery • An agency’s “clock” starts for deliverables on January 1, regardless of the actual FTIP amendment date. This was done to align milestone dates. To accommodate the change, the deadline for PE authorization was extended from 6 months to 9 months. All projects should be formally amended into the FTIP by March 31. • Construction authorization is due in 36 months—Jan 1, 2020 <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <p>Q: Some Cycle 1-6 projects with approved extensions did not get obligated for the 2017 FTIP. What is Caltrans Local Assistance process for managing the HSIP Group Listing to ensure projects are properly programmed in the TIP and carried forward when new TIPs are approved every other year?</p>	Richard

	<p>A: MPOs can choose not to program Cycle 8 projects now. Also, DLA can send email to MPOs to notify them they can use Administrative Modification to amend older projects into FTIP, instead of having to get FHWA approval. Finally, the FTIP Backup Lists (which include older/delayed projects) are posted here: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/FTIP_Info.html. These are not official but they can be used as a resource both by MPOs and within Caltrans. [see future agenda items]</p> <p>(2) SSARP new funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 107 SSARP applications were received in 2016. 61 of them were funded from the \$10 million SSARP funds allocated by CTC. The remaining 46 applications could not be funded. \$7.7M of additional SSARP funds was requested through CTC at the Jan 18 meeting. This amount will fund the remaining applications; there will not be a call for any new SSARP apps • DLA is following up with agencies that have not yet requested their allocation; 6 applications still under review to ensure their scope is systemic/whole corridor • Two agencies canceled their SSARP application rather than provide details requested by DLA • For the scope of a SSARP to be considered “systemic,” an agency must demonstrate analysis of entire system to identify hot spots—pre-selecting specific areas for SSARP encourages “political” applications. 	
1:35 pm	<p>Local Guardrail Training Video and Website Posting of Training Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live trainings were held Nov 15, 17 in Alhambra and at CSUS. Attendees represented approximately 50/50 road-office workers. • Creative Solutions filmed the Sacramento training; an FHWA consultant then reviewed the modules, which were then edited for length. The seven modules now range from 31 minutes to 1 hour and 15 min. • The advisory committee approved the videos on Ken’s recommendation and declined to do a second-round review. • DLA website will have links to video modules; 5 technical briefs, PowerPoint slides, and a quick reference pocket guide (90 pp in small format). • Availability announcements will go out from LTAP, DLA, CEAC (via Tom Mattson), League of Cities (via Gordon McKay/Tom), 	Ken

	technical advisory list (via Adrian Cardoso), RTPA committee members (via Andrew Maximous)	
1:50 pm	<p>STIC Initiative Roadway Departure Safety Workshop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workshop is one of 3 innovations that went forward with \$100K from STIC awarded in 2016. A committee comprising 7-8 regular contributors is in place. • Four 1-day workshops are planned for this this year [agenda provided for Jackson, CA workshop on 4/19/17] • Each workshop will include presentations to define problems, explain countermeasures, and show attendees how to apply for HSIP funds • Ken’s committee will notify counties outside the immediate area for each workshop of any available seats after registration is complete 	Ken
2:10 pm	<p>Pilot Mid-cycle Call/HFST</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The idea behind piloting a mid-cycle call for projects (with specific countermeasures such as HFST or signage) is to spend the apportionment as efficiently and cost-effectively as possible. • If it’s likely the construction phase of selected Cycle 8 projects will begin late, does it make sense to move these projects out of the current FTIP in favor of low-cost countermeasures that can be done quickly? <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good opportunity to reach out to agencies and clarify whether they need funding for all project phases in the 4-year timeframe • Mid-cycle call could focus on fulfilling MUTCD signage mandate by the Dec 31, 2019 compliance date • With storm damage capital improvement programs affecting many agencies and 30 counties having declared emergencies, a mid-cycle call for projects may divert energy away from other priorities • Risky to take money away from jurisdictions that are meeting deadlines; need to make sure any mid-cycle call doesn’t result in over-commitment • Only makes sense to continue overbooking the FTIP if DLA can reach out to agencies that may have delays (due to storms etc). Need to identify \$40M to free up • Currently Caltrans does not proactively monitor projects that could volunteer to be bumped out of FTIP due to delay <p>Decision: No mid-cycle call will be issued.</p>	Richard

2:40 pm	<p>Delivery Delay List for HSIP Projects [handout provided]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The delay list includes only 11 projects from Cycle 7 • One Cycle 1 project will be deprogrammed; the agency may re-apply for a future cycle <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <p>Q: What outreach is being done to agencies with past due dates?</p> <p>A: Currently DLA relies on agencies to check the delay list, but an auto email reminder system could be implemented (similar procedures as with SSARP allocation reminders). Caltrans can bypass District offices to contact agencies directly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some districts are active, others not active about meeting with agencies and notifying them directly re: flags, to submit billing, when projects will fall outside FTIP. Spotty responses from District 7 agencies when Dean Lehman has tried to reach out • Current consequence for not meeting PE/CON milestone deadlines is loss of eligibility to apply for next cycle; only if the project does not have CON authorization within 5 years will cause funding de-programmed. Now might be a good time to introduce additional consequences for missing the delivery milestones. • Important to make sure any new penalties aren't imposed due to environmental issues out of agencies' control; TCC already gathers info on different environmental-related delays by district • Ideally, Caltrans, MPOs, and Districts should already know the status of the projects before the deadlines hit; knowing that Caltrans is actively managing projects should encourage agencies to avoid delays. <p>Decision: DLA will work with District offices reminding/notifying them to follow up with agencies that will (or did) miss milestones. Notifications to local agencies will include guidance on potential ineligibility (see memo— http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/delivery_status.htm) and any other consequences for missing milestones.</p>	Chiu
2:50 pm	<p>Roundtable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MUTCD signing mandate—possible exemptions. To be discussed in March meeting with FHWA representative. • Committee agreed to continue \$10M cap for projects but to approve specific set-asides such as guardrail that are not part of the \$10M 	All

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reminder to focus on 4Es of traffic safety identified in SHSP: Engineering, Enforcement, Education, and Emergency Services. Recognize Gretchen Chavez and her efforts with SHSP whenever possible 	
--	---	--

3:45 pm	End of Meeting	
---------	----------------	--

Next Meeting: Thursday, March 9, 2017, 1-4 PM, Air-Media Conference Room

<p>Future Agenda Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss ways to get traffic data faster. Possibly examine systems in states with 24-hour turnaround; look at LA County model of receiving collision reports via ftp directly from CHP and feeding reports (with geocoding) into county system—currently this has a 2-3 month turnaround. Develop boilerplate/sample RFPs and contracts agencies can use to hire engineering firms and a list of pre-approved engineers Discuss how agencies can apply a template such as the Bridge Investment Credit (BIC) to their plans to utilize HSIP funding; i.e., do federally-qualifiable work with own funds, then use that work as a match or “internal toll credit” for HSIP-funded construction. Update from DLA on process and procedures for managing the HSIP Group Listing to ensure projects are properly programmed in the TIP and carried forward when new TIPs are approved every other year Update after SSARPs are complete: what are differences in projects funded at \$250K vs. lower amounts in similar regions? Did some agencies simply request the max amount? Update on FHWA assistance to resolve categorical exclusion for signage with NEPA requirements in California; Germaine Belanger of Caltrans Local Assistance is contact—she is already working on streamlining process across environmental groups in State districts Establish guidelines for Cycle 9 about additional repercussions for missing delivery milestones (more than just ineligibility for next call for projects) Discuss project delays due to Caltrans re-scoping during the encroachment permit review/approval process. Can these projects have their deadlines officially moved back? For March 2017: MUTCD signing mandate—possible exemptions. To be discussed with FHWA representative. 		
---	--	--