

California Local HSIP Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, May 31, 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, Mark Samuelson, Richard Ke, Germaine Balanger, Ross McKeown, Shawn Oliver, Ken Kochevar, Carlos Rios, Chiu Liu, Philip Chu, Stephanie Holloway, Rick Tippett, Bob Goralka, Susan Herman
 Guests: Representatives from the City of Baldwin Park; Tanya Allen, Gaddiel DeMattei, Tuolumne County; Shawn Ankeny, Venton Trotter, Shasta County

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 call for projects is active as of April 30 • Representatives from the City of Baldwin Park, Tuolumne County, and Shasta County will present project extension requests 	Robert/Tom
1:15 pm	<p>Environmental Issues and Safety Projects</p> <p>Germaine Balanger presented an example of Preliminary Environmental Investigation notes to support the PES form submitted for Nevada County’s recent signing project, along with recommendations for how to shorten the timeline for similar low impact projects to obtain a categorical exclusion (CE) under NEPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The preliminary site assessment for the Nevada County project showed that only one of the 40 samples had lead concentration in the soil exceeding 50 mg/kg; all tested negative for naturally occurring asbestos (NOA). • Mitigation measures recommended for construction were 1) wetting area before drilling signposts, 2) providing respirators for contractors • Recommendation: assume that leaded soils and NOA exist in the area and incorporate this information into standard contracts. <p>Shawn noted that because NEPA has been assigned to Caltrans, MOUs or programmatic agreements can be negotiated as part of general business process management (BMP). Not all hazardous material studies should be mandatory; project proponents can decide how they wish to meet the regulations and disclose the project and its impacts to the public.</p>	Shawn/ Germaine

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For example, separate programmatic agreements can be negotiated with BLM, US Forest Service, Regional Air Quality and other regulatory agencies. • Another option is simply to incorporate lead and asbestos compliance or other elements as needed from the county or city’s health and safety plan into the PES form, as in the example that Germaine shared. If the city or county does not have a plan, consultants can help determine which measures to always incorporate into construction contracts, (e.g., dust mitigation, LED lights, masks) • Taking steps such as the above will help avoid situations where other groups exploit a county’s federally-funded environmental investigation to complete their own research projects. <p>Tom Mattson will present this information to the TCC and form a work group to identify best practices for incorporating environmental mitigation measures into project plans. Responses to collect via survey: What studies are project proponents being required to do? How long are they taking? What are standard mitigation measures for the most common environmental issues?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly, MOUs or programmatic agreements can be negotiated with tribes, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to expedite the Section 106 review process, by pre-arranging which areas are likely to have artifacts and are never to be touched. Germaine will invite a speaker from the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) to share more information about this at a future meeting. 	
1:40 pm	<p>Delayed Project Extension Requests</p> <p><u>HSIP5-07-002 Baldwin Park</u></p> <p>The representatives from Baldwin Park presented their request for a one-year extension on an intersection project near a Metrolink transit center and parking structure. They expect to release RFA for construction in April 2019 and begin construction in July. Delays were due to a series of exchanges between Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) and the city to make corrections to the plans (e.g., install quad gates instead of double) and signal timing. A delivery team is in place and an internal point of contact established to process federal invoices and reimbursement requests and to complete quarterly reporting. This is the only HSIP project the City of Baldwin Park has currently.</p> <p>Rick moved to approve the one-year extension of Con Auth to June 30 2019—seconded and passed.</p> <p><u>HSIP6-10-012 Tuolumne County</u></p>	ALL

The Tuolumne Road widening project is expected to enter Con Auth phase by Sept 2019. It will add 2-lane left turns and shoulder—to mitigate crossing center line and pedestrian crashes. Environmental studies are already started, area of potential effect (APE) is not done yet.

Tom moved to approve the revised schedule with the stipulation that the county notify the HSIP advisory committee immediately of further delays, especially environmental—seconded and passed.

HSIP6-10-013, Tuolumne County

The Phoenix Lake Road project had cost increases that were denied; funding is now secured through local RTPA, with Con Auth expected Sep 2019, and construction complete in 2020 season. Scope was changed from realignment to include highly reflective signs, speed alert sign, extended shoulder. B/c is now just over 5.

Committee voted to approve the extension request.

HSIP6-02-004, Shasta County

The widening and shoulder project application originally did not include ROW acquisition, but it has since been determined that the county needs to acquire 40 parcels that were in the 1800s a small rail spur for timber transport. The project will complete a corridor—southern portion is going to construction bid today. The county has agreed to absorb \$473K, the additional cost for ROW (provided SB-1 is not repealed). Environmental and archaeological studies are done. No public meetings have been held yet, property owners have not been notified of the project. Construction completion by 2021 is anticipated, with a cost estimate of \$1.3M (based on the bid amount of the sister project).

- For similar projects in future, note that per California Streets and Highways Code if a county board of supervisors designated a county-maintained road and the owners of underlying property did not appeal within one year, the county owns the 40-foot ROW (see § 900, 901, and 906).
- County standards may also prescribe road width, e.g. 66 feet
- Consider lower cost countermeasures such as no-pass zones and sinusoidal rumble strips if no clear pattern of fatal and severe injury; important to gather feedback from community about this (cyclists will likely prefer widening)

Rick moved to table a decision until after bid opening on Phase I of the project and after a public meeting and property owner notification re: Phase II; County reps to attend July 26 meeting and report. Motion seconded and passed.

2:50 pm	<p>Delivery and OA Status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OA is \$36M obligated (compare to last year \$44M); RFAs for PE are due by July 4 to DLAEs. This will position HSIP favorably for August redistribution. • There are 62 delayed projects in PE and CON phases—39 of these in D7 	Chiu
3:00	<p>Status for Cycle 9 Call for Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Announced call April 30; webinar May 16 • Recording of webinar Q & A maxed out 200-line capacity. Of viewers, about 40% were cities, rest were counties, few MPOs, 2 tribes 	Richard
3:10	<p>STIC Roadway Departure Safety Workshop Summary</p> <p>Final workshop (of 8) was held May 2 in Susanville. Depending on funding, Ken may add 4 more, locations TBA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So far 185 people have been trained, representing 75 agencies. • 160 follow up reports have been received, indicating specific actions taken in last six months as a result of the STIC workshop. • Ken hopes to present to rural counties task force again re: what to cover in the next set of workshops. 	Ken (Rick reported out for Ken)
3:20	<p>NACE Pilot Local Roadway Safety Plan</p> <p>The April 22 LRSP meeting in Wisconsin was successful—25 counties from across the nation started developing local roadway safety plans with their own set of action items. Goal of the pilot was to develop templates to help jurisdictions make their safety plan in 6 months. LSRPs may eventually be required for HSIP applications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Humboldt County’s action items include: stakeholder meetings with EMS and the Sheriff’s office to coordinate trauma care, transport systems to hospitals, edge lines and other countermeasures to target run-off-the road crashes as well as DUI enforcement & education. • Lessons learned will be shared by incorporation into SHSP. • Some sample plans are posted—and could be included in a future California clearinghouse for sample safety plans, along with SSARP templates. • FHWA demonstrated and may soon release a data analytics tool that will generate graphs and other visualizations that are easy to read and present to stakeholders. <p>Tom will share some templates for local road safety plan that resulted from the workshop.</p>	Tom
3:40	SSARP status	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deadline for requesting allocations is today; likely there will be \$687.6K left. • Philip will verify with City of Montclair whether they will request allocation (recent staff change); he will report by June 8. • Ross will present his proposal to use any un-allocated SSARP money for a “state of safety in the region” MPO report as pilot project with estimated cost \$400K. Would be basis for regional analyses moving forward; these will help with developing regional plans for SHSP 15 critical areas. • La Canada Flintridge SSARP is already done—Robert will share it at the next committee meeting. 	
3:50	<p>Roundtable</p> <p>Vision Zero:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oakland scheduled to give Vision Zero presentation in July • How can MPOs assist cities with implementing their Vision Zero projects? Ross noted some city-reported difficulties with design flexibility and scoping of safety projects on state highways that function as their “Main Street.” • Robert noted that some lower-level Caltrans staff may fear being held liable for signing off on “design exceptions” even though these are now treated more neutrally as “design decisions.” Cities can elevate their issues to executive management level if needed. 	ALL
4:00	Adjourn	
<p>*Times are approximate</p> <p>Next Meeting: Thursday, July 26, 2018, 1-4 PM, Air-Media Conference Room</p>		
<p><u>Future Agenda Topics</u></p> <p>TBD</p>		