

**California Local HSIP Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday, March 28, 2019**  
**1:00 pm – 4:00 pm**

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

Attendees: Robert Peterson, Bob Goralka, Paul Moore, Trisha Tillotson, Susan Herman, Philip Chu, Chiu Liu, Uy Tran, Tom Mattson, Ross McKeown, Rick Tippett, Lupe Jimenez, José Luis Cáceres, Ken Kochevar, Norman Baculinao (by phone)  
From City of Redding: Amber Kelly, Chuck Aukland, James Triantafyllou  
From City of Pasadena: Brent Maue, Tony An

**Note: Decisions and Action Items in Boldface**

**Item 1: Welcome/Updates (at 1:00PM by Robert/TOM)**

- HSIP Cycle 9 funding applications have been vetted; 221 (of 351) selected
- Cycles 7 and 8 are in delivery phases
- Robert is on the EDC5 team and will be focusing a lot on that this year, as well as planning the next LRSP peer exchange
- Today's goal is to discuss LRSPs and amount to allocate per plan/agency

**Item 2: Pasadena Delay Request on HSIP4-07-012 (by Brent and Tony)**

Pasadena Delay Request on HSIP4-07-012

The City of Pasadena's pedestrian safety enhancement projects begun in 2012 have had large cost increases (\$453,296 up to \$1,014,602) mainly due to Section 106 review under NEPA which took 4.5 years rather than the 4 months originally budgeted. Costs included:

- Additional staff and consultant time
- Historic preservation requirements, e.g. splitting project into two phases—separate contract was required to place new signal poles & mast arms near historic buildings; architectural historian must observe construction
- Increase in square footage of ped bulb-outs
- Construction cost increase (inflation + addl items)

The City has now submitted its construction RFA and requests an additional \$250K from the HSIP program to help ensure completion. This amount maintains the original .65/.35 Federal/Local Match split.

Discussion:

- Current BCR ~8 with new cost estimate
- Project's Phase 2 will use local-only dollars
- \$250K is mainly covering time delay and workarounds rather than actual scope change. Consultant did not consistently follow DLAE guidance
- If additional funding is not granted, Phase 2 will be delayed; Phase 1 will go ahead.

**The committee approved City of Pasadena's fund request of \$250K, and requested that documentation of main cost items final breakdown be provided to committee**

**Item 3: Redding Delay Request on HSIP6-02-002 (by Chuck/Amber/James)**

Redding Delay Request on HSIP6-02-002

The City of Redding's shoulder widening and realignment project on Old Oregon Trail has had cost increases due to recent discovery of cultural resources nearby. The City requests \$910K in additional HSIP funding for new required testing, monitoring by tribal representatives, mitigation efforts, and to cover inflation and increased staff and consultant time.

- It is still unknown whether the project will cause adverse effects.
- The original funding breakdown was .79/.21 local match; current proposal is for .90/.10
- Short of canceling the project, the City has also considered lower-cost countermeasures but ultimately concludes that the curve realignment and additional shoulder recovery area is still the best plan for enhancing safety.

Discussion:

- Most collisions that occur in the project area are caused by overcorrecting after running off the right side of the road.
- Project does not qualify for CMAQ funding
- Since this project was originally accepted into the program HSIP has re-focused on systemic improvements rather than large projects that get bogged down in ROW phase.
- The project currently has approx \$1.5M remaining in budget to potentially use on lower-cost countermeasures while documents are prepared, SHIPO, coordinating

tribal communication—signing and pavement maintenance is already planned for summer 2019.

- Existing bike lane connects local community college to new project area
- No public meetings have been held on specifics of project—but plenty of letters have been received regarding collisions.
- No Section 7 NEPA consultation is needed, no water permitting, so timeline to construction should be less than 36 months assuming all tribes involved can agree on mitigations, e.g. curation of artifacts, educational kiosks.
- Tom proposed that the HSIP committee approve additional funding of up to \$600K (a firm cap) but with a 0.79/0.21 split between HSIP and local funding as an opportunity to deliver project as currently scoped, with 2023 deadline, with the following conditions:
  - That the City move forward over intervening time with low-cost countermeasures such as chevron signage, pavement maintenance, reflective paper markers closer spacing on centerline, and that they consider feasibility of HFST in key spots
  - If environmental clearance for the current project is not obtained, City can come back to HSIP and re-scope the project with remaining funds.
  - Toms' proposal was approved in the meeting.
- In addition, Rick recommended making sure that “no project” alternatives are included in environmental documents

#### **Item 4: Delivery and OA Status (by Chiu)**

- 43 delayed projects total (ck against list), 2/3 of these are in D7; 10% of D7's projects are delayed
- Richard Ke sent out reminders to local agencies with CON RFA approaching deadline. Chiu sent out two SOPs to district DLAE and HSIP safety coordinators, one for RFA extension, and the other for project scope change. Hopefully a proactive approach will help with delivery.
- OA is \$1.9M more this Feb than last year; March will also likely be higher.
- \$180M OA currently on books; the program is projected to deliver ~ \$110M OA this year, with the goal to bring down the additional OA to zero in 2022.
- Deliveries may be delayed because of disasters; some safety projects also may be de-prioritized in favor of delivering SB-1 projects.
- \$10M from local HSIP balance will convert to State HSIP for SSARP

#### **Item 5: Allocations for LRSP in Future HSIP Budget (By Robert)**

Robert reported that at the February 2019 peer exchange on Local Roadway Safety Plans (LRSP), participants said an appropriate per-agency allocation might be around \$250K, up to \$500K for multi-agency collaborations.

- LRSP will be a requirement for Cycle 11 in 2022.
- Its purpose is to be high-level, does not need to be as detailed as SSARP.
- Idea is for the agency itself to buy into safety, rather than simply hire a consultant who scopes out good projects for the agency.
- Data analysis is valuable to agencies that don't have resources to capture and analyze large datasets themselves.
- Facilitation would also be valuable because LRSPs require public works and transportation agencies to coordinate with law enforcement, health systems, other stakeholders.

• Trisha noted that Nevada Co. used STIP planning funds (PPM) to do their LRSP  
**The committee approved allocating \$70K for LRSPs, and including guidance for scope, data analysis, and inter-agency engagement. Agency match = staff costs. Robert will collect additional feedback from committee on guidance specifics.**

#### **Item 6: Cycle 9 Summary of Projects (By Robert)**

Robert provided a handout detailing HSIP Cycle 9 applications; project cost statistics; examples of roadway, intersection, and pedestrian/bike improvements; and distribution of funds by Caltrans district. He concluded that, overall:

- The systemic approach is guiding agencies toward low-cost countermeasures with big safety impact
- SSARP helped more agencies get involved in using HSIP for safety projects and encouraged more competition—Alameda Co. was a big “win”

#### **Item 7: Local Agency Peer Exchange Debriefing and Future Actions (By Robert)**

- Another peer exchange is planned for October in Camarillo, 2-day format with more afternoon workshops
- Working with Hilary Isengard, Robert has asked that the EDC5 initiatives be rolled into the next webinar along with LRSP info, to help launch the Southern CA peer exchange. More info about webinar will be brought to committee in May.
- A State safety peer exchange for all states will be held in Minnesota in July.

### **Item 8: MTC SSARP Update and Suggestion for HSIP Programming (By Ross)**

- Ross will have update on SSARP next time
- Because of HSIP's practice of lump-sum programming in outer FTIP years, funds for the Cycle 9 PE phase are not in the current year FTIP when the PE deadline hits. This is causing confusion and extra paperwork, at least between District 4 staff and agencies. Can Caltrans allow an "automatic EPSP" process?
- Chiu and Robert sent District 4 an email (cc Ross) right after the meeting concerning the EPSP; and this email removes the confusion over programming and project implementation among the local agencies and D04 Local Assistance.

### **Item 9: Round Table (None)**

### **Item 10: Future Agenda Topics**

- MTC SSARP Update
- Discuss cost increases and policy, e.g. set a max, require a set local match percentage. Chiu has sent reminders about standard operating procedure to districts: currently, any increase beyond \$500K requires agency to approach committee.
- Discuss SHSP Regional summits

**Next Meeting: Thursday, May 30, 2019, 1-4 PM, Air-Media Conference Room**