

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

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

Attendees: Heidi Borders, Jose Luis Cáceres, Jana Cervantes, Philip Chu, Bob Goralka, Susan Herman, Stephanie Holloway, Richard Ke, Ken Kochevar, Chiu Liu, Tammy Mar, Tom Mattson, Ross McKeown, Paul Moore, Robert Peterson, Mark Samuelson, Rick Tippett, Uy Tran

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"> • Meeting will focus on Cycle 9 results • New committee members are Uy Tran of City of LA as alternate CLC representative; José Luis Cáceres with SACOG as alternate MPO rep; and Tammy Mar of Caltrans District 5. • Need one or two tribal representatives on committee. Robert sent info to Lenora Graves requesting names. Ken also has contacts and will provide those to Robert. • Robert proposed using left over SSARP funds to execute a MIRE (Model Inventory of Roadway Elements) contract: \$350K for consulting work with local agencies to integrate data standards and practices. The consultant will identify partners, do a gap analysis, establish data standards and communicate them. The committee approved this use of funds. 	Robert/Tom
1:10	<p>MPO Safety Performance Targets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ross shared his presentation for MTC: <i>Federal Performance Target-Setting Update, November 2018</i> • MTC has adopted the same performance standards as State for Infrastructure Condition, System Reliability, and Freight Movement & Economic Vitality. MTC set regional targets for Environmental Sustainability. • For the five safety performance measures to be reported Feb 2019, MTC set three regional targets—for number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries; number and rate of serious injuries, number and rate of fatalities. • State’s goal is zero deaths by 2050—but MTC will deviate from this target by keeping its existing 2030 target 	Ross

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An MTC team will be dedicated to managing Local Streets & Roads safety targets and reporting, with the goal of eventually establishing a regional safety program. The team will aggressively pursue HSIP, ATP, SB1 funds and will ensure local jurisdictions pursue the right projects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ \$500K in SSARP funds are going toward integration of environmental and crash/injury data and to produce a State of Safety in the Region report ○ \$5M over the next few years will be allocated for consultants to collect pavement and other data and feed it into Smart Streets. ○ Expenses for this new safety team are justified because better safety means lower burden for the health care system (San Francisco owns the city’s general hospitals) <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom requested that the Bay Area jurisdictions also increase their involvement with SHSP and Vision Zero. • Ross indicated that other agencies will be able to contract with MTC to provide data integration service (safety + pavement management) and that MTC will be a leader in integrating Crossroads + StreetSavers • Ross noted that, so far, MPO-local agency relationships around safety have been mutually supportive. However, MTC does want to make sure various efforts aren’t duplicative, e.g. will evaluate the recent Solano County Crossroads data collection for this. • Tahoe Regional Planning Agency has recently established MOUs with strategies developed by Kittelson Consulting—these could provide useful models for MTC 	
1:40	<p>Tribal Transportation Safety Workshop Update</p> <p>Ken reported that the latest workshop was Aug. 13-14 at Sacramento’s FWHA office, and had 23 tribal government participants. Goal of workshop was to raise awareness about the HSIP Cycle 9 \$2M tribal set-aside. The workshop dates fell only three weeks before the deadline—not ideal timing, but the set-aside applications came together quickly. All six applications that CalTrans accepted (of nine received) came from workshop attendees.</p>	Ken/Richard
1:50	<p>DDSA Local Agency Peer Exchange Status (Data-driven Safety Analysis)</p> <p>Robert shared the draft agenda for the upcoming peer exchange on Feb 5-6, 2019. Anticipating 30-40 in attendance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scott Davis from Thurston Co, WA was invited to share about how Washington has required all counties to have LRSPs and now are requiring cities to have one. • A representative from SHSP will discuss what efforts are needed to meet performance targets. 	Robert

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of San Diego will report on their use of SSARP to look at characteristics common to crashes (locations, signals, other) with the goal of using a systemic approach to identifying countermeasures for intersections • Robert is thinking of also inviting a Vision Zero jurisdiction, SCAG, or MTC • Robert will work with Tracey Coan to coordinate presenters, invitees. Will target people who put together the safety applications—also some public works directors, if they have not been engaged philosophically in systemic planning 	
2:10	<p>EDC 5 Rural Road Departure Update (Every Day Counts)</p> <p>10 EDC5 initiatives are being rolled out at the summit in Oregon on Nov 8-9; Robert and Tom will attend. STEP is also meeting (Safe Transportation for Every Pedestrian).</p>	Robert
2:30	<p>Project Delivery and OA Status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are only 39 total delayed safety projects, 36 of which are in D7 • Chiu emailed D7 about Cycle 4 delays—must deliver Con RFA this year or lose HSIP funding • OA Status: HSIP committed \$53M in FFY 2018, Caltrans had hoped for that number to be around \$140-150M by this time. • 153 safety projects were authorized by end of 2018 FFY, 80 of these are in CON 	Chiu
2:30	<p>HSIP Cycle 9 Summary</p> <p>All applications have been reviewed. Robert and Richard shared the project selection summary and analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$5M was set aside for high friction surface treatment (HFST) projects. Counting those applications that are for HFST only alongside those that have other countermeasures <i>including</i> HFST, Caltrans staff will verify that at least \$5M is dedicated to these projects. • Richard proposed that, for benefit-cost ratio (BCR) projects that do not include HFST, the program should commit \$134.4M of the \$141M total allotted for this category; but the strategy of fitting HFST to this BCR category is modified slightly to resolve Chairman Tom’s concern. • \$35M was applied to set-aside categories. Some agencies also submitted BCRs in their applications for set-aside countermeasures. Those applications with BCR over 8 can still be funded from the competitive pot. The committee agreed that money can be shifted around among the four categories (guardrail upgrade, horizontal 	Robert/Richard

	<p>curve signing, pedestrian crossing enhancements, tribes) to total \$35M.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The \$5M set aside for horizontal curve signs may have been an overestimate, because many of the jurisdictions do not meet the 1000 ADT threshold to trigger MUTCD requirements. • Rick asked that DLA staff review applications to ensure sure that the ones that combined countermeasures into systemic projects did not inadvertently “dilute” their BCRs. Chiu noted that Caltrans staff does counsel agencies to organize their applications to have high BCRs, as well as systemic groupings of countermeasures. • HSIP will fund \$182M in projects this cycle. Adding in previous cycle deliveries, program should be able to use the \$516M currently in FTIP. • The Cycle 9 list will be finalized in last two weeks of November. Caltrans staff will report on how HSIP is doing as a program. Notably, one-third of the funds are for pedestrian and bike projects. • As soon as list is ready it will be sent to MPOs. That way MPOs can prepare their FTIP amendment. 	
3:10	<p>Countermeasure S4-Dilemma Zone Protection</p> <p>In the Cycle 9 HSIP call for projects a CRF (crash reduction factor) of 40% was noted for CM S-4. But this CRF applies to rural areas only, not for urban. In urban areas the CRF is closer to 20%.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should HSIP fund this countermeasure for urban areas? • In future years, split this CM to two categories with different funding ratios or reduction factors. • For Cycle 9 applications that include this countermeasure, it helped their overall BCR. The committee agreed that while it’s possible that some agencies included it solely to calculate a higher BCR, changing rule now is not appropriate. 	Robert
3:30	<p>SSARP update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert shared a handout showing how many applications for Cycle 9 resulted from SSARP, and from among those, how many agencies had a long interval between their Cycle 9 and any previous HSIP applications. City of Sacramento had 8 applications this cycle that came from SSARP, but they were not newcomers to HSIP. The “SSARP success stories” are Monterey, which last applied for HSIP in Cycle 3, and Tehama County, whose last application was in Cycle 4. • Robert’s analysis showed that 36 HSIP applications for Cycle 9 came from agencies that did SSARPs and had not applied for HSIP at all in the past 2 cycles. 	ALL

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few of these applications were rejected. Robert and Richard will follow up to provide this number. • SSARP was overall successful but \$17M was a lot; maybe agencies could do more with less. 	
	<p>Roundtable</p> <p>José Luis asked for clarification about project delivery estimates—why are they so broad, when regions send their local agencies’ HSIP delivery plans to Caltrans every April 1? In actuality, each RTPA reports their deliveries differently. Some regions are more accurate than others; Caltrans staff has found that it is too time-consuming to get all actual data. Because of the red-flagging process and HSIP’s lump-sum programming, the delivery estimates are considered good enough.</p>	
4:00	Adjourn	
<p><u>Future Agenda Topics</u></p> <p>*Times are approximate</p> <p>Next Meeting: Wednesday, January 23, 1-4 PM, Air-Media Conference Room</p>		