

Closing Discussion

By the numbers.....

- By the numbers.....last 3 years of Fatal + Serious Injury crashes - 2015 to 2017
 - 20 counties (35%) (not including cities) make up 76% of the F+SI crashes
 - Los Angeles County
 - San Francisco
 - Sacramento County
 - San Diego County
 - Fresno County
 - Riverside County
 - Kern
 - San Bernardino County
 - San Joaquin County
 - Sonoma County
 - Tulare
 - Stanislaus
 - Monterey
 - Merced
 - El Dorado
 - Santa Cruz
 - Butte
 - Alameda
 - Placer
 - Contra Costa

By the numbers.....

- By the numbers.....last 3 years of Fatal + Serious Injury crashes - 2015 to 2017
 - 17 counties (29%) including cities make up 82.4% of the F+SI crashes
 - Los Angeles
 - San Diego
 - Orange
 - Riverside
 - Sacramento
 - San Bernardino
 - Alameda
 - Santa Clara
 - San Francisco
 - Fresno
 - Kern
 - San Joaquin
 - Contra Costa
 - Stanislaus
 - Ventura
 - Sonoma
 - Tulare

By the numbers....

- By the numbers.....last 3 years of Fatal + Serious Injury crashes - 2015 to 2017
 - 11 counties (19%) **cities only** make up 81.8% of the F+SI crashes
 - Los Angeles
 - Orange
 - San Diego
 - Riverside
 - San Bernardino
 - Alameda
 - San Francisco
 - Santa Clara
 - Sacramento
 - Contra Costa
 - San Joaquin

Safety Performance Management (SPM)

- The Safety PM Final Rule establishes five performance measures as the five-year rolling averages to include:
 - 1.Number of Fatalities
 - 2.Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
 - 3.Number of Serious Injuries
 - 4.Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT
 - 5.Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries
- DOTs report targets and MPO's can either adopt the state targets or establish their own.

SPMs

- End of 2019 FHWA will conduct the first assessment to determine whether or not each /state met or made significant progress towards achieving their safety performance targets.
- By March 31, 2020, results of assessment will be reported.
- Plans are due back to FHWA by June 30, 2020
- If State doesn't not meet or make significant progress towards meeting its 2018 targets then states need to take steps for federal fiscal year 20/21.

SPMs

- States must:
 - Use obligation authority equal to the HSIP apportionment for 2017 only for HSIP projects and
 - Submit an annual **HSIP Implementation Plan** that describes action the State will take to meet or make significant progress toward meeting its subsequent targets.
 - Plans are due June 2020
- It is expected that California will not meet its safety PM targets

Proposed Plan of Action

- Info to Add to Implementation Plan
 - Make LRSP or equivalent as a requirement
 - Some agencies are already adopting Vision Zero or have other Safety Plans
 - Utilize LTAP resources by focused training efforts on agencies where the needle can be moved
 - Propose to increase Local HSIP funding to match the % of F+SI within California – (62%)

Local HSIP Changes

- LRSPs requirements – as approved by Local HSIP Advisory Committee
 - Cycle 10 – call will be April 2020
 - LRSP's will be recommended but not required
 - Agencies with LRSPs or equivalent will be given priority should there be more applications than funding
 - Cycle 11 – call will be April 2022
 - LRSP or equivalent will be required in order to compete for HSIP grant funding

Local HSIP Changes

- LRSP requirements
 - In both cycles, SSARP, Vision Zero Plans, Tribal Safety Plans will be acceptable, as equivalent
 - Other plans approved on a case by case basis.
 - We have notified current SSAR recipients that if they have time and funding, to add components of the LRSP to their SSAR report

LRSP Funding

- \$80,000 will be available for each Plan
 - \$72,000 LRSP funds
 - \$8,000 Local Funds
 - Additional funds may be added if agency wants more details/ analysis added to the plan such as safety project scoping, etc (like the SSAR)
 - A call for LRSP funding has gone out
 - Agencies with SSARP's can ask for additional funding after Jan 1, should there be state funds remaining

LRSP Implementation

- Research Findings for successful implementation
 - Have a champion that can advocate for the LRSP and gathers the political support to assist in implementation
 - Develop and clear vision and mission to unite all stakeholders with a common goal
 - Level of support and assistance from the DOT is critical

LRSP Implementation

- Research Findings for successful implementation
 - Good data is needed to not only select the right projects but to evaluate effectiveness once implemented
 - Start implementation with the low hanging fruit and low-cost safety improvements to achieve a track record of success
 - Implementing the systemic safety approach is beneficial but may require extra education to officials and the public on why the approach is beneficial

LRSP Implementation

- Research Findings
 - More successful in implementation when a consultant leads the effort – development and implementation
 - Not all safety projects are positively received by the public.
 - Project prioritization information and tools are needed for effective LRSP implementation given the complexity of the data and a lack of staff and resources at the local level

LRSP Implementation

- Research Findings
 - Project bundling and implementation of projects through maintenance should be encouraged
 - Greater outreach is needed to agencies other than DOT and LTAP such as law enforcement or behavioral highway safety specialists
 - Implementation requires greater emphasis on marketing and communication to keep interest in the LRSP active and alive

LRSP Training

- LTAP will be providing LRSP training on an as needed basis.
 - Currently have two LRSP classes scheduled (month/yr).
 - November 2019 - CSUS
 - February 2020 – Camarillo
 - Look for registration through LTAP on the classes

- **Any other support?**

Key Takeaways from Breakout Sessions?

Any other support
needed?

Thanks for participating!