

**California Local HSIP Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday, March 15, 2018**  
**1:00 pm – 4:00 pm**

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

Attendees: Robert Peterson, Tom Mattson, Richard Ke, Chiu Liu, Trisha Tillotson, Stephanie Holloway, Shawn Oliver, Ross McKeown, Rick Tippett, Carlos Rios, Norman Baculinao, Ken Kochevar, Kevin Ordway, Phil Vassion, Tammy Massengale, Heidi Borders, Paul Moore, Tracy Coan, Susan Herman

Time*	Topic	Lead(s)
1:00 pm	<p><b>Note: Decisions and Action Items in Boldface</b></p> <p>Welcome/Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The committee welcomed Trisha Tillotson of Nevada County as an alternate member representing CSAC and Norman Baculinao of Ventura County as a voting member representing CSAC [see updated organization chart].</li> <li>• Along with some realignment and staffing changes after passage of SB-1, Robert’s office will be called Office of Federal Programs; April Nitso’s office name will be called Office of State Programs.</li> </ul>	Robert/Tom
1:15 pm	<p>Environmental Issues and Safety Projects</p> <p>Shawn Oliver of FHWA and Tammy Massengale of Caltrans GNEIS shared insights on why environmental permitting is slowing down safety projects and provided some ideas for reducing delays moving forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Categorical exclusions (CEs) are designed to streamline safety projects that have no impact on a pristine environment (e.g., new sign post holes in existing gravel shoulder, signalization, replace guardrail); however, local road owners and contractors may be expending more effort than needed to reduce risk.</li> <li>• Caltrans has never been sued on environmental grounds for a safety project that involved a CE</li> <li>• Using specific verbiage on the Preliminary Environmental Study (PES) form will avoid triggering requests for further studies and documentation.</li> <li>• For Section 106 (historic preservation) issues, Shawn recommended building relationships with local tribes and hiring them to monitor and investigate excavations.</li> </ul>	Ken

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For hazardous waste, Tammy recommended that owners run GeoTracker software to identify affected sites, and indicate their findings ahead of time, rather than relying on Caltrans scientists to give the go-ahead for signposts.</li> <li>• FHWA guidance needs regarding obtaining CEs needs to be clearer, because of frequent personnel turnover in districts.</li> <li>• <b>Tammy offered to create a model PES form with Nevada County for their upcoming sign project. The “test PES” will be used for comparison: with Tammy’s recommended responses on the form, will CE can be completed faster than those projects Kevin and Phil described? The outcome could feed into any additional guidance or training.</b></li> <li>• <b>Robert will put Trisha, Bob, and other interested county reps in touch with Tammy.</b></li> </ul>	
2:15 pm	<p>Project Delivery and OA Status</p> <p>Chiu provided a list of 17 HSIP projects from Cycles 1-5 that are at risk of being removed from the program in April 2018. Of these, 3 will move to construction (CON) next week.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The committee agreed that a firm response date of April 8 was appropriate—for agencies that do not respond at all, their projects will be deprogrammed. Those that would like to appeal to the committee for a one-time extension (or re-scope) will be invited to do so at the May 31 meeting.</b></li> <li>• <b>Robert will present at next DLAE meeting and suggest that they be more proactive to help projects in their districts stay on track</b></li> </ul> <p>Approximately \$25M of OA has been authorized since October 2017. As more projects in Cycles 5 &amp; 6 move into CON or get deprogrammed, more will be authorized. OA is expected to pick up near end of 2018 when Cycle 7 projects approach the CON authorization deadline.</p>	Chiu
2:25	<p>Status of SSARP Projects</p> <p>Richard distributed a list of SSARP projects for which agencies have not requested their allocations. These represent about \$2.5M in awarded funds. Those that do not request their allocations by May 31 will lose funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That \$2.5M could be offered as a set-aside in Cycle 9 for MPOs to do their SSARP, either on a first-come, first-serve basis, or with priority to the 3 MPOs where 80-90% of all crashes occur.</li> <li>• Final decision to be made May 31.</li> </ul>	Richard
2:40	<p>Cycle 9 Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The call-for-projects will be issued in late April and a webinar offered May 9.</li> </ul>	Richard

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IT will give Richard a version of the electronic application form to test 3/16/18.</li> <li>• Updates to the HSIP guidelines and local roadways manual were minimal—revision to SHSP requirement and updated crash costs to 2018 dollars, removed RRFPP and some web links.</li> <li>• After several tests the HSIP Analyzer should work well, instructions are 70% ready</li> <li>• Benefit/Cost ratio (B/C) is 3.5 (equivalent to old 2.7); serious &amp; fatal injury uses same crash cost</li> <li>• Dollar amount available for Cycle 9 to be updated by December, currently estimated at \$140-160M</li> <li>• Application deadline August 31, 2018; agencies will be encouraged to submit early because Caltrans will be able to review apps immediately</li> <li>• If more applications come in for set-asides than money available, a statewide ranking will be used to determine highest priority (this step wasn't needed in C8). Set asides do not apply toward \$10M.</li> <li>• Applications will include a question about whether the agency did a SSARP</li> <li>• Expect requests for cost increases because of construction labor shortages (due to 2017 storm damage and SB-1)</li> </ul>	
2:55	<p>NACE Pilot Local Road Safety Plan Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2<sup>nd</sup> of 3 webinars in the series occurred on Feb 21, and focused on types of safety data that can be collected. States gave presentations on high-priority focus areas based on safety data.</li> <li>• The 3<sup>rd</sup> webinar will be March 21, on how to identify high-priority focus areas and start writing a local roadway safety plan (LSRP)</li> <li>• The goal of the LRSP workshop on April 22 at the Chula Vista Resort in Wisconsin is for it to be hands-on, so participants can actually start creating their LRSP.</li> </ul>	Ken
3:05	<p>In-State Peer Exchange Update</p> <p>Robert applied for Every Day Counts grant funding for an in-state peer exchange and received it: \$20M + some LTAP funds. Anticipated date is in September 2018 for the 1-day or 1.5-day exchange. Robert provided a handout with topic ideas and requested additional committee input.</p> <p>Other ideas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHSP update could be interactive/breakout format</li> <li>• SSARP update could also involve a report-out element, e.g. report out “What did you use your SSARP for?”</li> <li>• Different ways of approaching Vision Zero, e.g. Fremont. How did they prioritize? What was their process? Oakland has a good presentation too.</li> <li>• How to address NIMBY-ism with countermeasures such as road diets</li> </ul>	Robert

3:15	<p>FHWA TTP 101 Workshop Update</p> <p>Richard recently attended a Redding workshop with Tribe Transportation Planning and FHWA; he's been invited to San Diego also</p> <p>Cycle 9 includes \$2M in set asides, \$250K per tribe to encourage tribes to apply for HSIP</p> <p>Options for programming these funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to TTP</li> <li>• through BIA</li> <li>• through counties</li> <li>• though Caltrans agreement</li> </ul>	Richard
3:30	<p>Roundtable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Placer County's signing project is going to bid this summer, with two funding sources.</li> <li>• Pasadena's curb extension bulb-out project (ADA update) is near an historical building and will likely be abandoned.</li> <li>• What is DLA's guidance for requesting additional construction funds for current HSIP projects? If increase is in the 5-10% range the answer is most likely yes. If cost increase goes much higher than this (especially after delay), then HSIP needs to look into the project details. Any additional funding request beyond \$50-100K triggers a flag. DLA would want to review the bid items—does each one fit a countermeasure? E.g., "rewiring entire intersection" may not fit a CM S6 for adding left-turn phase to certain traffic approaches. Any Lump Sum project cost increase will not be supported by HSIP unless a HSIP manager knows exactly what the project Lump Sum entails and decides to add additional funding. Additional funding may be offered for community outreach in some phases if the expense remains within the implementation limit for those phases.</li> </ul>	
3:45	Adjourn	
<p><b>*Times are approximate</b></p> <p><b>Next Meeting: Thursday, May 31, 2018, 1-4 PM, Air-Media Conference Room</b></p>		
<p><b><u>Future Agenda Topics</u></b></p> <p>TBD</p>		