

**California Local HSIP Advisory Committee**

**Meeting Agenda  
Thursday, May 25, 2017  
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm**

**Sacramento International Airport  
Terminal A, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Air-Media Conference Room**

**(916) 874-0182**

Attendees: Tom Mattson, Ross McKeown, Ken Kochevar, Adrian Cardoso, Richard Ke, Bob Goralka, Jana Cervantes, Chiu Liu, Paul Moore

Time	Topic	Lead(s)
1:00 pm	Welcome	Tom
1:05 pm	<p>Report out on HSIP Presentation at CEAC/League of Cities Conference</p> <p>The presentations on “How the HSIP Can Work For You” were well-attended and very well-received. Presentation slides can be found here: <a href="https://www.cacities.org/Education-Events/Public-Works-Officers-Institute-Expo/For-Attendees/Materials">https://www.cacities.org/Education-Events/Public-Works-Officers-Institute-Expo/For-Attendees/Materials</a></p>	Tom
1:15 pm	<p>Updates on STIC – Roadway Departure Safety Workshops</p> <p>State Transportation Innovation Council (STIC) 2 of 4 workshops are done: April 19 in Jackson, May 24 in Red Bluff—total 39 participants so far. Comments have been generally positive but attendance was lower than hoped for. One reason for low numbers may have been that the fliers were distributed only 2-3 weeks ahead of each workshop. Target audience includes engineers, directors, and maintenance supervisors, construction, public works departments, transportation office, tribes. Most attendees are engineers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ken plans to follow up at one month and 12 months with a survey about what action(s) workshop attendees plan to take as a result of what they learned—he is open to feedback about other ways of gathering data from attendees</li> <li>• Ken requested that Local HSIP Advisory Committee members help spread the word about upcoming workshops.</li> </ul> <p>Next workshops are: July 17 in Crescent City Sept 27 in Hanford</p> <p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ken will distribute the workshop flier to advisory committee members</b></li> <li>• <b>Rick will share Oregon-based connections with Ken to generate more invites for the Crescent City workshop</b></li> </ul>	Ken
1:25 pm	<p>Update on SSARP Funding/Projects and HSIP Obligation</p> <p>California Transportation Commission (CTC) allocated \$7.7M state money—in addition to the \$10M allocated earlier—for the SSARP program; Of the 41 agencies that were not</p>	Richard

	<p>selected in 2016, 37 have revalidated their 2016 SSARP applications; 4 have not. Project list was released on 5/12/17.</p> <p>Of the 107 total SSARP projects, so far 50 have had funds allocated already, representing \$8.3M.</p> <p><b>HSIP Obligation</b></p> <p>Of the current fiscal year's \$65M apportionment, \$42M has been authorized as of May 8. Caltrans predicts that for FFY 16-17, total obligation will be around \$129M. This may clear the backlog within two years.</p>	
2:05 pm	<p><b>Timelines for Next Call-for-Projects</b></p> <p>May 2018 will be start of Cycle 9. An estimated \$150M will be available depending on how many Cycle 7 projects get construction authorization by June 1, 2018. Removing con-authorized projects from the FTIP creates room for new projects.</p> <p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The advisory committee's July 2017 meeting will include full discussion and voting on whether Cycle 9 will include set-asides, and if so, what projects will be eligible for set-aside funding, total amounts to budget for set-asides, and whether the cost for set-aside-eligible projects counts toward each agency's \$10M (or TBD) cap for HSIP funding.</b></li> <li>• <b>July 2017 meeting will cover draft Cycle 9 call language more broadly (see below discussion re: Additional Tools)</b></li> <li>• <b>Adrian and Ross will report dates when SCAG and MTC must submit projects for the FTIP so the new projects can be included in the 1<sup>st</sup> amendment of the new cycle FTIP; previously the date when MPOs received the HSIP award list fell too close to FTIP submission deadline and caused some projects not to be included in the 1<sup>st</sup> amendment.</b></li> </ul>	Tom/ALL
2:25 pm	<p><b>Additional Tools for Keeping Projects Moving Forward in addition to Flagging</b></p> <p>Are additional "consequences" needed other than current system of flagging (i.e., if milestones are not met by specified date, the agency cannot apply for next cycle)? Or has the current system served its purpose? Better to focus on incentives instead of consequences?</p> <p>Tools suggested include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DLA website to provide standardized or sample RFPs for consultants for design phase of projects, especially systemic projects such as HFST, corridor safety, city safety study, evaluation of signing and striping on a county highway system (how to get such a project from design all the way to construction). To ease the path of applying for SSARP in the first place.</li> <li>• Prioritize HSIP funds for easier-to-deliver projects</li> <li>• Incentivize shorter-term projects via set-asides, as additional tool along with 100% federal-share-eligible projects</li> <li>• Set shorter timelines for simpler projects</li> <li>• Use toll credits to encourage local agencies to cover their PE phase and thus be better positioned to use HSIP funds</li> <li>• Find other ways to incentivize using local funds for PE before being approved for HSIP; project can be 100% federally funded for next phases. (Still have to satisfy NEPA)</li> </ul>	Tom/ALL

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For bigger projects, separate environmental phase from next phases. Those that finish environmental studies by the deadline get higher priority in second phase of HSIP consideration</li> <li>[additional ideas in list from March 2017 meeting; some repeated here]</li> </ul> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider imposing any additional consequences at the PE phase rather than waiting until a large amount of money is expended.</li> <li>If pulling back funds due to delays, consider status of communication with the agency as well as deliverability of project, as some are more complicated than others</li> </ul> <p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Rick will submit a sample RFP from Trinity County for DLA to review and possibly post on website, and ask his Nevada County contact to submit a sample RFP also</b></li> <li><b>Bob and Stephanie H will send examples of archeological study and other California state requirements that have held up simple projects such as signpost and guardrail installs, so Ken can share these with FHWA and learn whether exemptions may be extended in certain cases to speed up such work.</b></li> </ul>	
2:45 pm	<p>Status of Cycle 7 and 8 Projects</p> <p>For Cycle 8, the PE phase due date is Sept 30, 2017. 22% of the Cycle 7 projects are late to PE. 6 of 12 districts have delays, 6 of 12 do not. Districts 10 &amp; 3 have only one delay each.</p> <p>Districts 7, 8 have many delays—Most delays appear to be due to project management issues (not environmental studies) e.g., when a grant writer applies for the federal money but fails to communicate with engineer about deadlines.</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Chiu will communicate by phone with DLAEs regarding deadlines and consequences of not meeting them (cannot apply for next HSIP cycle). City and county representatives on the HSIP advisory committee will follow up if movement seems lacking.</b></li> </ul>	Chiu
2:55 pm	<p>Applying HFST for Reducing Motorcycle Accidents</p> <p>One of the strategies for the Motorcycle challenge area in the SHSP is to “Conduct research to find best practices in roadway design for motorcycles.” High friction surface treatment (HFST) is a design feature identified from this research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program may have larger impact on rural, locally-owned roads with many curves</li> <li>Would HFST efforts for motorcycle safety target curves and intersections, as with cars and other vehicles?</li> </ul> <p><b>Action:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Ken will get more details from Motorcycle challenge area leads to learn how the motorcycle and roadway departure or other groups could coordinate efforts with HFST.</b></li> </ul>	Tom
3:00 pm	Roundtable	ALL

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first-ever bicycle state plan is now complete (view details here: <a href="http://www.cabikepedplan.org/">http://www.cabikepedplan.org/</a>); projects will be solicited soon.</li> <li>• SB-1 doubles funding for active transportation program. CTC will not do a call for the additional \$100M, they will just draw off the Cycle 3 list. ATP will start workshops next month with special guidelines for this round.</li> <li>• As of 2016, peds/bikes account for 27.5% of crashes in California. Of that, 4.5% is bicycle-related. E.g., Marin County has reported an increase in bike crashes and fatalities. SR-1 may soon have bike turnouts on uphill stretches</li> <li>• Is it possible to gather data from districts that deliver projects efficiently and those that don't, for purpose of sharing best practices?</li> <li>• DLAEs are the “face” of Caltrans to local agencies, so always best to pass communications through them rather than directly to local agencies; good to solicit and share best practices within TCC and other meetings too, since delays affect other areas besides safety</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

3:15 pm	End of Meeting	
---------	----------------	--

**\*Times are approximate**  
**Next Meeting: Thursday, July 27, 2017, 1-4 PM, Air-Media Conference Room**

<p><b><u>Future Agenda Topics</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle 9 language, incentives</li> <li>• Cycle 9 set-asides such as MUTCD signage deadline</li> <li>• New procedure/timeline for sending group listing to MPOs to allow them to meet Dec FTIP deadline</li> <li>• Safety performance targets to address—all info from State should be ready for July meeting</li> </ul> <p>[carried over from March 2017]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Look at L.A. County model of receiving collision reports via ftp directly from CHP and feeding reports (with geocoding) into county system</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>
---