

California Local HSIP Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 26, 2018
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Sacramento International Airport
Terminal A, 2nd Floor, Air-Media Conference Room
(916) 874-0182

Attendees: Tom Mattson, Robert Peterson, Richard Ke, Ross McKeown, Ken Kochevar, Chiu Liu, Philip Chu, Stephanie Holloway, Jana Cervantes, Paul Moore, Rick Tippett (phone), Bob Goralka (phone), Norman Baculinao (phone), Heidi Borders (phone) Susan Herman

Guests: Shawn Ankeny, Venton Trotter—Shasta County; Jesse Eckenroth, Jeff Benson—Rancho Mirage; Ryan Russo, Mohamed Alaoui, Nicole Ferrara—City of Oakland

Time*	Topic	Lead(s)
1:00 pm	<p>Note: Decisions and Action Items in Boldface</p> <p>Welcome/Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle 9 HSIP applications are due August 31; early submissions are being reviewed so applicants can revise if needed. Caltrans HQ and the agency’s DLAE receive the applications immediately once submitted. • Caltrans is tracking how many HSIP applications base their projects on SSARP results and will get feedback from users about SSARP • Every Day Counts-5 (EDC) Innovations have been announced—among them is Reducing Rural Roadway Departures. Robert will serve on the national committee for this initiative; he participated in today’s online kick-off workshop 	Robert/Tom
1:10 pm	<p>Delayed Project Extension Requests</p> <p><u>HSIP6-02-004 Shasta County Update</u></p> <p>Shasta County has received public comments and approved a bid for the Deschutes Rd. widening project, Phase II (see minutes from May 2018 meeting for background). The project cost estimate increased from \$1.3M to \$2.12M, due to the need to obtain more parcels for right of way. The County requested approval from the HSIP committee to share costs for the remainder of the ROW and extend the completion deadline to summer 2020.</p> <p>The committee voted to approve the additional funding and time extension.</p> <p>Comments:</p>	ALL

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of road and shoulder widening is to provide a clear zone for recovery from center line crossing and for turning into driveways; also as space for speeders to be pulled over safely • Rumble strips had been considered as a lower cost countermeasure but rejected because of noise and danger to cyclists • Original BCR was 6.5 and is now 4.3 • Concerns arising from the public meeting included tree preservation and driving behaviors (illegal passing, speeding) that widening may exacerbate. The County will work with law enforcement and will consider 1) using a flashing speed radar feedback sign; and 2) center line rumble strip to discourage illegal passing <p><u>HSIP6-08-013 Rancho Mirage</u></p> <p>Project numbers 5412-014 and -015 involve light synchronization and pedestrian safety—updating traffic safety cabinets, installing countdown heads at 40 intersections, upgrading from copper to fiber optic cable. NEPA clearance occurred 4 years from project start date due to unforeseen conditions with the area of potential effect (APE): investigation of tribal artifacts, which led to project scope changes to limit environmental impact (e.g. lateral boring instead of trenching). Multiple rounds of contract negotiations and council approvals delayed the project. This is now resolved; the project’s anticipated completion date is June 30, 2019. The agency requests a 6-month time extension (no additional funds) for completion of the project by June 30, 2019.</p> <p>The committee voted to approve the time extension.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project’s original construction schedule has not changed • Every other square mile is tribal (checkerboard pattern) so the City works with tribes often. Tom noted that in Humboldt County he has found it saves time to hire cultural monitors from the tribe proactively, before NEPA process begins. Rather than bidding, this is handled as government-to-government work. • Caltrans can provide guidance on how to work with tribal monitors in sensitive areas; Robert will bring this as an agenda item to the next DLAE council meeting; he will also share it with Germaine Balanger. 	
1:45 pm	<p>Vision Zero Presentation</p> <p>The City of Oakland has its own Department of Transportation, as of May 2017. Ryan, Mohamed, and Nicole shared some city-level strategies for Vision Zero and challenges for linking VZ with HSIP projects; they asked for</p>	City of Oakland

ideas from the committee for how the HSIP program could better support VZ goals and projects.

Key points from presentation:

- Whereas air transit has essentially “designed deaths out of their system,” this is not so for surface transportation
- 14% increase in traffic deaths since 2015; not talked about publicly in the same way as opioids and gun deaths
- California has 3400+ traffic deaths/year and the most pedestrian traffic deaths in the USA
- The Vision Zero design approach assumes: human failure will occur, deaths are preventable, a systems approach (not individual responsibility), and that saving lives is not “too expensive.” It focuses on preventing fatal and severe crashes.
- Data from New York City’s VZ efforts shows a decrease in deaths by approx. 300 since 2014, due to aggressive striping, changing the default speed limit from 30 to 25. The public policy campaign for this was successful due to involving family members of people who died in traffic crashes.
- Local governments can be more data-driven (rather than “squeaky wheel” approach to resources deployment) to target high-incidence crash areas, and to prove that new solutions work, e.g. green bike lanes, road diets.
- Most vulnerable users are pedestrians and cyclists; in Oakland, pedestrian fatalities are concentrated among Asians (4x), Black and Latino 2x more than white.

Hurdles to working with HSIP to implement Vision Zero

- Long implementation timelines. Applying for grant, getting council approvals, each signoff step costs time; e.g., Grant Ave—5 years for pedestrian beacon
- Countermeasures don’t always reflect recent trends, e.g., upgrades to parking-protected bike lanes wouldn’t be competitive because application would not show the required BCR
- Need more flexibility to implement effective tools
- Coordinating with other funds is challenging
- Funding caps impact large jurisdictions
- Contracting costs create a barrier to implementation

How HSIP can adapt

- Because a single crash reduction factor (CRF) doesn’t capture all potential improvements, HSIP can allow designers to present their safety case, provided a set of guidelines to determine effectiveness
- To reduce timelines, reduce the number of E76s needed or base the number on project cost
- increase funding caps

- reduce construction costs by allowing use of in-house construction teams rather than federally procured contractors; e.g., New York City and FHWA/FTA had a 3-year MOU to coordinate directly for reimbursement

Comments:

- The HSIP program has already raised funding caps, and has developed set-asides over and above the \$10M cap, with no requirement for BCR.
- HSIP encourages jurisdictions to combine many small projects into larger, systemic ones
- Caltrans will sign off on public interest findings (PIFs) if cost effectiveness is clearly shown; bid process is gone and only one E-76
- Could there be a blanket PIF that stays valid for 2-3 years—what policies would need to change?
- Vision Zero cities can help with education statewide
- VZ cities can provide feedback about other possible HSIP set-asides
- This is a perfect time for cities to partner with SHSP and get in touch with Gretchen Chavez, SHSP manager to get city action items into workshop content; countermeasures and their crash reduction factors beyond the 75 that are currently listed
- As cities start succeeding in preventing crime, VZ provides a good frame that allows participation from families, public health, other partners to overcome resident and local business owner opposition to traffic safety upgrades.
- Since Los Angeles declared VZ, there's been more walking/biking, more vulnerable street users, more drivers (Uber etc.), and the fatality numbers are going the wrong way. But VZ does encourage measuring impact differently, e.g. what percentage of drivers yield to pedestrians in an upgraded intersection? vs number of deaths before and after the upgrade
- Sea change movements like VZ take 10 years (e.g., MADD). Importance of movement is raising urgency and education
- NTSB has “go” teams that go out for train and airplane crashes but not for vehicle. San Francisco is starting vehicle crash investigations. Roseville has a CHP team investigate all crashes, collecting data
- VZ cities have talked with CHP, DMV re: 85th percentile speed standard. Cities have had to *increase* speeds on high-crash corridors. Culture change is needed at MUTCD level and state DOT. Need to design for people in communities, not those that pass through communities.

Robert said that if SB-1 survives repeal vote, then his office will look into exchanging set-aside funds to make them state-only funds. No guarantees as approval is needed from the Budget office within Caltrans.

3:10 pm	<p>Tribal Transportation Safety Workshop Announcement</p> <p>On August 13-14 there will be a 1.5 day workshop at FHWA in Sacramento. Richard Ke will demonstrate HSIP Analyzer and HSIP application form, timeline; Q & A opportunity. 45 attendees expected; of these 33 are tribal members. Ken shared the registration info with the committee by email.</p>	Ken
3:15	<p>Status of LRSPs</p> <p>Humboldt County will wrap up its LRSP by fall; Tom sent templates to Stephanie and Ross. Marin County plans to have their draft complete by end of September—still tbd whether adoption process will be by individual jurisdiction or regional transit authority. Trinity County’s LRSP will get underway after new sheriff starts in November.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robert recommended bringing examples of these to the Rural Counties Task Force and TAC. 	Tom
3:20	<p>Status of Cycle 9 Applications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only a few applications received so far, more should come in once ATP deadline passes. Robert proposed pushing out the LRSP peer exchange currently set for Oct 10-11, to December 2018 or early 2019 to allow time for HSIP application review. He’d like to invite Offer Grembek, co-director at UC Berkeley SafeTREC, to present about data collection and analysis tools for finding predominant type of crash and risk factors at intersections. 	Richard
3:35	<p>Delivery and OA Status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District 7 has 51 delayed projects Of the whole list there are only 15 delayed projects from Cycles 4, 5, 6 From 7/1/2017 to 6/30/2018, \$70M in OA has been authorized on safety projects, around \$60M obligated for CON and \$19.5M for PE Delivery is lagging this year (\$44M) compared to this time last FFY (\$51M) Cycle 7 projects CON due date is Dec 31 2018; high delivery rate is expected 	Chiu
xxx	<p>MIRE for SHSP Update</p> <p>Mandy will attend the next HSIP committee meeting</p>	Mandy Chu
3:40	<p>Roundtable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sept 15-16 is the LTAP peer exchange in Kansas City, MO. Robert, Tracy, and Trisha will attend. Where can safety utilize LTAP more? What are other states doing with their LTAP? 	ALL

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Next week is MTC data integration peer exchange. Ross, Chiu, and Richard will attend. Subject is how to get funding for putting MIRE data into a central system.	
4:00	Adjourn	

Future Agenda Topics

Collecting MIRE data is HSIP eligible—committee should talk about creating set aside for this.

***Times are approximate**

Next Meeting: Thursday, November 1, 2018, 1-4 PM, Air-Media Conference Room