By the numbers.....

• By the numbers.....last 3 years of Fatal + Serious Injury crashes - 2015 to 2017
  o 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 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:
  
  o Use obligation authority equal to the HSIP apportionment for 2017 only for HSIP projects and

  o Submit an annual **HSIP Implementation Plan** that describes action the State will take to meet or make significant progress toward meeting its subsequent targets.

  o 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
  o Make LRSP or equivalent as a requirement
    • Some agencies are already adopting Vision Zero or have other Safety Plans
  o Utilize LTAP resources by focused training efforts on agencies where the needle can be moved
  o 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
  o In both cycles, SSARP, Vision Zero Plans, Tribal Safety Plans will be acceptable, as equivalent
  o Other plans approved on a case by case basis.
  o 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
  o Good data is needed to not only select the right projects but to evaluate effectiveness once implemented
  
  o Start implementation with the low hanging fruit and low-cost safety improvements to achieve a track record of success
  
  o 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!