

**California Local HSIP Advisory Committee**

**Meeting Agenda  
Thursday, July 27, 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, Mark Samuelson, Ross McKeown, Ken Kochevar, Chiu Liu, Rick Tippett, Phillip Chu, Pat Proano, Stephanie Holloway, Robert Peterson, Tracy Coan, Susan Herman. By phone: Jana Cervantes, Arsen Mangasarian, Dean Lehman

Time*	Topic	Lead(s)
1:00 pm	<p>Welcome</p> <p>Committee updates: Adriann Cardoso is rotating off the advisory committee, Philip Chu is the RTPA representative.</p> <p><b>DLA will post an updated organization chart on the website by next meeting reflecting all changes to reps and alternates.</b></p>	Tom/Mark
1:05 pm	<p>Update: Survey of counties regarding mandated MUTCD signing upgrades</p> <p>The survey had a low response rate. Of the few respondents, most said they were not aware of the upgrade mandate or that it was not a high priority (due to small number of roads with ADT 1000). San Diego, Los Angeles, and El Dorado counties are up-to-date with cost estimates. Marin, Nevada, and Placer counties are implementing upgrades now.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The B/C ratio is high for signage, so most agencies can go through regular HSIP grant process to comply with the mandate</li> <li>• For signage on forest roads, LA County is exploring how responsibility &amp; liability can be shared with the USFS</li> <li>• Placer County has developed a policy to include crash history data as part of sign safety audit (pending Board of Supervisors approval), to give the county more authority and engineering judgment in implementing the mandate.</li> </ul>	Tom
1:15 pm	<p>Update: 3rd STIC Local Roadway Departure Safety Workshop in Crescent City</p> <p>The 3<sup>rd</sup> of four workshops was held July 17 in Crescent City; evaluation scores ranged widely but the average score was highest yet. Ken has developed a worksheet to collect feedback from attendees on whether they have taken action or plan to take action in any of seven defined opportunities, in response to the</p>	Ken

	<p>workshops. He hopes to use the data to support a request to offer more workshops in Southern California next year.</p> <p>Next workshop is Sept 27 in Hanford; a debriefing meeting from the first three workshops will be held on August 8.</p>	
1:25 pm	<p>Update: Environmental delays on safety projects</p> <p>FHWA has delegated authority for environmental reviews to Caltrans—however, the requirements for safety projects are “extraordinary” in some cases. Ken has collected several agencies’ project timelines reflecting long or multi-stage environmental review and will use it in feedback conversations with both FHWA and Caltrans. He will have another update at next HSIP advisory meeting.</p>	Ken
1:35 pm	<p>Update: HSIP Obligation in FFY 2016/17; Status of HSIP Cycle 7 Projects; Status of SSARP Projects</p> <p>HSIP obligation As of July 12, \$63M has been authorized; expectation is that in two months this will be closer to \$90-95M (reflecting the construction season).</p> <p>The Delayed Cycle 7 Projects list shows that only 14 projects are delayed in PE, down from 40 in May.</p> <p>SSARP project status: 59 projects have had funds allocated; 48 have not requested allocations yet—most are expected to do so by year’s end. SSARP is entirely state funded.</p>	Chiu
2:05 pm	<p>Discussion: Sample RFPs for posting on DLA website</p> <p>DLA will distribute a list of counties for advisory committee members to divide among themselves. Committee members will solicit sample RFPs from the counties on their list for posting on the DLA website. The goal is to make it easier to apply for SSARP. A good sample RFP will show the process of safety evaluation through a project’s design phase, all the way to construction—ideally for a systemic project.</p>	Tom/Bob/ Rick
2:20 pm	<p>Discussion: Timeline of HSIP Cycle 9 Call for Projects</p> <p>A draft Cycle 9 call for projects announcement was provided as a handout. The next call for projects is expected to be announced April 16, 2018.</p> <p><b>Decisions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The September 28 advisory committee meeting is canceled; between now and the November 2 meeting the group will focus on the draft guidelines and send their suggested updates to DLA. All suggested updates will be distributed before the November meeting for discussion of a new draft and final changes.</b></li> </ul>	Chiu/Tom

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The committee approved the following terms for general HSIP applications:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>No limit to number of applications an agency can submit; no maximum fund request per application</b></li> <li>○ <b>\$10M cap per agency, exempting set-aside amounts</b></li> <li>○ <b>Minimum Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR) 2.5</b></li> <li>○ <b>Applications for high-friction surface treatment (HFST) are also subject to the 2.5 BCR and would be funded with toll credits; this will be an incentivized project category</b></li> <li>○ <b>Agencies may submit one application per set-aside category</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Other suggestions for Cycle 9 Call for projects and guidelines (general applications):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include language about posting credit signs, e.g. “Paid for by HSIP and your local gas tax dollars.”</li> <li>• Include note about MUTCD sign mandate on application, to increase awareness</li> <li>• For HFST applications, consider requiring agencies to show minimum PCI, such as 65, for the surface where the product will be installed</li> <li>• Consider including language for soliciting more applications beyond the \$10M per-agency cap with internal priority ranking indicated, e.g., “No max number of applications—however, funds for initial review are limited to \$10M.”</li> <li>• Consider a priority category or set-aside for projects that are “shelf-ready,” especially if demand far exceeds programming capacity</li> </ul> <p>Further Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City of Los Angeles does not support HSIP funding caps, as they penalize agencies with larger population size and more safety needs. If caps are used, consider basing them on population.</li> <li>• In Cycle 8, four agencies, each with multiple separate applications, accounted for about one-sixth of HSIP total funding. Removing caps would allow a few agencies to consume the entire program amount.</li> <li>• Accumulating un-programmed applications creates leverage for advocating with lawmakers the need for a larger HSIP program. In general, HSIP will over-program and create incentives for delivery, to reduce federal obligation balance to \$0.</li> </ul>	
2:50 pm	<p>Discussion: Possible set-asides in HSIP Cycle 9 Call-for-Projects</p> <p><b>Decisions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The committee approved \$40M for set-asides.</b></li> <li>• <b>Set-asides will be awarded in two main categories:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Roadway departure countermeasures—guardrail, edge line, rumble strips</b></li> <li>○ <b>Pedestrian safety—rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RFBs), countdown heads, bulb-outs, striping, signing, pedestrian median islands, crosswalks (list to be refined)</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Tom

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Same ranking logic that applies to competitive HSIP applies to set-aside applications</b></li> </ul> <p>Other suggestions for set-aside guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make sure each countermeasure allowed under a set-aside category is clearly linked to a specific problem, such as roadway departure or pedestrian safety.</li> </ul> <p>Further discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSARP findings will be in soon—create a set-aside category that to reward agencies for being proactive? Or, let these projects compete for HSIP money in a separate category than other applications? No. the purpose of SSARP is to allow more agencies to participate in program—still need to prioritize HSIP awards according to highest BCs.</li> </ul>	
3:20 pm	<p>Roundtable</p> <p>Specs for HFST have changed: now HFST installation must be automated only</p>	ALL
3:25 pm	End of Meeting	
<p><b>*Times are approximate</b>  <b>Next Meeting: November 2, 2017, 1-4 PM, Air-Media Conference Room</b></p>		
<p><b><u>Future Agenda Topics</u></b></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"> <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>		