

California Local HSIP Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes

Thursday, November 2, 2017

1:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Sacramento International Airport
Terminal A, 2nd Floor, Air-Media Conference Room

(916) 874-0182

Attendees: Jana Cervantes, Paul Moore, Tom Mattson, Ken Kochevar, Chiu Liu, Ross McKeown, Philip Chu, Rick Tippett, Robert Peterson, Richard Ke, Heidi Borders, Pauline Cueva, Mark Samuelson, Sunil Rajpal, Carlos Rios, Bob Goralka, Susan Herman. By phone: Norman Baculinao, Stephanie Holloway

Time*	Topic	Lead(s)
1:00 pm	<p>Welcome and committee updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dean Lehman has been promoted to another position in LA County so is stepping down from the advisory committee.• Current county representatives (CSAC) are Stephanie Holloway and Bob Goralka. Bob has been an alternate and may, according to the charter, move up to member status, but CSAC can also nominate someone else if they wish. Alternates are always encouraged to attend; ideally both rural and urban counties are represented.• Tom Mattson recommended keeping Bob as an alternate until first-time attendee Norman Baculinao determines whether he would like to be a voting committee member. His county (Ventura) is urban; Bob's (Marin) is more suburban.• Stephanie will follow up with Tricia Tillotson (Nevada County), who had volunteered to be her alternate, about whether attending meetings is feasible for her.• Carlos Rios will contact Meghan McKelvey at CLC to follow through the process to be voting committee member; he will then nominate an alternate.• Philip Chu will find an alternate RTPA rep	Robert/Tom
1:15 pm	<p>STIC Update and Future Directions for Safety Workshops</p> <p>Ken reported on the roadway departure workshops July 17 in Crescent City and September 27 in Hanford. They were well attended—Hanford had 31 participants. Ken thanked Rick Tippett for his assistance.</p> <p>Ken will attend the STIC council meeting on November 13 and learn whether STIC has budget authority to spend remaining amount originally allocated for workshops. If so, 4 more workshops will take place between January and late April 2018 in all new locations, with data help from David Ragland of UCB. Locations chosen so far:</p>	Ken

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kearney Mesa • Riverside or San Bernardino • Salinas, San Jose or Santa Cruz • Susanville 	
1:20 pm	<p>Environmental Clearance Update</p> <p>Regarding NEPA delegation from FHWA to Caltrans and the consequent burden placed on agencies to perform environmental responsibilities for highway projects (i.e., going over and above federal requirements): Ken will follow up with Shawn Oliver at FHWA after his upcoming talks with Caltrans environmental staff. Ken suggests local agency reps present issues to their Caltrans district boards.</p> <p>Some of the issues include general failure of some districts to follow best management practices where NEPA is concerned, as well as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment impact work with Caltrans D3 during a sign audit project on 500 miles of roadway in Placer Co is only now, after 3 years, nearing completion of environmental review. By contrast, Nevada County did smaller RSSA project that was implemented more quickly. For large projects that might incur environmental exposure, Caltrans seems to use a “check every box” approach. • Caltrans D7 has done a good job coordinating with EPA & FHWA such that HSIP projects are routinely recognized as exempt from CEQA when they fall under certain guidelines (14 CCR Section 15300-15331). The process has not moved as quickly with historic preservation impacts. • In Districts 2, 4, and 11 NEPA takes on average only 1-3 months; D7 is working toward a more streamlined process. • A 5-bridge project in a national forest (pilot project with Trinity County & Central Federal Lands Highway Division) needed only a 5-month environmental review. <p>Agencies are encouraged to document and report whether the NEPA delegation ultimately results in delaying project completion (and by how much). Goal is to encourage local agencies to apply for HSIP, assured that the NEPA process is consistent and not too burdensome. Having to meet the 2019 MUTCD deadline is additional motivation.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ken will report on the above-mentioned issues to Shawn at FHWA. • Robert will invite Germaine Belanger (NEPA Delegation & Environmental Compliance, Caltrans) and Shawn Oliver to the January HSIP advisory committee meeting for support with regulatory compliance issues. 	Ken
1:42 pm	<p>FHWA’s MIRE Update (Model of Inventory Roadway Elements) and Safety Performance Management reporting for MPOs</p>	Robert

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per MAP-21, by 2026 all CA roadways must be MIRE compliant. A portion of HSIP funds may be made available for local agencies to invest in systems that will collect crash, roadway, and traffic data. MPOs must report on 5 areas (e.g. fatalities, serious injuries) in their annual HSIP report; most will use state targets for report rather than create their own targets. FHWA will hold MPOs accountable through certification reviews, which require documentation about planning to reach safety targets MOUs for Planning and Programming will be issued soon to MPOs In the next TIP update, every local project sponsor must report qualitatively on how the project is aiming for Vision Zero target and provide metrics to measure progress <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress toward Vision Zero may bound ahead with autonomous vehicles; however, with legalized marijuana crash rates may go up first Hopefully MIRE will standardize data collection for the smaller jurisdictions; unknown how FHWA will enforce 	
2:05 pm	<p>SSARP Status (handout)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 72 projects have had funds allocated since 2016 The remaining 35 projects should all be asking for their allocations by May 31, 2018 HSIP Cycle 9 application will include a question about whether the project resulted from SSARP Hopefully at least a few of the 2016 SSARP recipients will apply for HSIP funds in Cycle 9 using the SSARP results; all have 3 years max from allocation date to finish SSARP & report 	Tom/ Richard
2:15 pm	<p>Delivery Status for Projects in All Cycles (handout)</p> <p>Agencies sponsoring 63 projects from Cycles 1-6 haven't asked for money to start construction. If all these are de-programmed \$41.2M will be freed up for Cycle 9 call. De-programming will start March 31, 2018 barring exceptional reasons for delay. Links to information about the process for requesting project extensions are included in all email reminders to agencies.</p>	Chiu
2:32 pm	<p>Potential LTAP Funding Discussion</p> <p>The LTAP center has a budget to help with outreach and training for local agencies. LTAP is funded through FHWA, state match, and the Cooperative Training Assistance Program (CTAP). LTAP completed a city-county survey earlier this year to learn of needs.</p> <p>Could LTAP funding be used for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roadway safety assessments from UCB traffic engineers/consultants (also leveraging OTS grants)? Expert grant writers for local agencies to do HSIP application? Education specifically for tribes on how to apply for HSIP? 	Pauline/ Robert

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specialized equipment, e.g. for skid testing, ped/bike counts (Miovision system)? <p>Other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Louisiana is a good model for safety components in its LTAP Under the FHWA Everyday Counts (EDC 4) Data Driven Safety Analysis Initiative, Ken is coordinating stakeholders for a peer exchange in April 2018 in Wisconsin (just before NACE annual conference in the Wisconsin Dells). The exchange will be on creating a template for counties to quickly develop their Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP; see http://www.countyengineers.org/nace-news-17jul_19) <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ken will provide a short list of California counties participating in the EDC 4 conference by November 17—Tom and Bob volunteer Humboldt and Marin Counties; Rick will confirm whether Trinity County will also participate. Tom will contact Scott at CSAC re: soliciting volunteers 	
3pm	<p>Cycle 9 Size and Guidelines (handout including proposed set-aside categories)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cycle 9 applications will be the first paperless submissions; IT needs time to create & test database and the procedure. To do this IT needs guidelines decisions and documentation of set-asides by end of 2017. There will be a new “HSIP Analyzer” that integrates construction estimate, overall project cost estimate, countermeasures, crash data, benefit and benefit cost ratio calculation. The new tool should eliminate quite some attachments; many fields will populate automatically depending on user selection. Depending on the project delivery, Cycle 9 call could be as much as \$215M-\$282M based on programming capacity; However, OA balance is predicted to be negative in just two years, because of the \$390M in existing ongoing HSIP projects. We should try not to have a big call in Cycle 9 and then a significant less call in future Cycle 10. On the other hand, we may try to obtain more funds for safety, such as Section 164 funds transfer (~\$30M). Re-establishing the 50-50 State and Local split for HSIP funds is a priority and if accomplished this will also add to the total dollar amount available for Cycle 9 (split was 64% State-36% Local in 2017). <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some current project sponsors will have to ask for additional funds due to SB-1 influenced construction cost increases—important to maintain commitment to those Outreach and new easier application system may encourage more applications 	Richard

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom moved to cap Cycle 9 at \$200M total (\$160M competitive and \$40M set-aside), noting that this will position Local Assistance well to approach decision makers and advocate for the 50-50 split <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final determination of Cycle 9 cap amount will be made at the next meeting. • The committee approved the following set-asides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guardrail upgrades \$20M ○ High friction surface treatment \$5M ○ Horizontal signing \$5M ○ Pedestrian crossing enhancements \$5M ○ Tribes for Countermeasures R26-35 \$2M (for all tribes regardless of other revenue sources) • Richard will send link to HSIP committee members who want to beta test the new “HSIP Analyzer” tool. 	
4:15 pm	Roundtable (none), End of meeting	
Next Meeting: January 17, 2018, 1-4 PM, Air-Media Conference Room		
<p><u>Future Agenda Topics</u></p> <p>[from May 2017]: New procedure/timeline for sending group listing to MPOs to allow them to meet Dec FTIP deadline</p> <p>[from March 2017]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at L.A. County model of receiving collision reports via ftp directly from CHP and feeding reports (with geocoding) into county system • 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? 		