Group Memory

Transportation Coop Committee

January 28, 2016

Next Meeting dates

Next Meeting Date:	January 28, 2016 (all-day), March 3, 2016, May 26, 2016, July 21, 2016,	All meetings to be held at Terminal A – 2nd Floor, Media Room,

-Desired outcome for January meeting:

Start 9 and go till 5

Work group progress reports.

Regular business, upshot reports.

Planning meeting:

Allow time to think about who we are and where we are going, what we are doing.

Are there things we are missing?

What do new members think is important? Hear from them – what are they looking for?

What do we expect out of this group, for it to be effective and successful?

What are the priorities and goals for the next year? What else should we work on?

Overview for new members as to what we are working on.

Invite Director, Deputy Director and Chief Deputy Director.

Desired outcome for November Meeting

Discussion on safe harbor rates with A&I

UPSHOT item 105: LRS data

UPSHOT item 109

UPSHOT item 110

Report on the October special meeting of the bridge committee

Desired outcome for the next meeting

Agenda Committee

Ray

Adriann

Mike P

Robert N

Jean

Bin List & Great Ideas

Report - Ohio experiment on Safe Harbor Indirect Cost Rate (after June 2014) (Ray Z, 12/5/2013)

Some sort of a press release to our different channels on what we are working on, etc. (Colleen, 1/29/2015)

Charter / PURPOSE - California Transportation Coop Committee serves to:

- Address transportation funding, procedural and legislative issues related to project delivery from a local perspective. (modified January 2015).
- Enhance the working relationship between cities & counties, COGs and RTPAs, Caltrans, CTC and FHWA. This extends to improving communication with all stakeholders. Collaboration is a key method. (modified January 2015)
- Spread information and improve access to all stakeholders through the use of technology.(modified January 2015)
- Partner with Caltrans and FHWA to improve efficiency and enhance the ability to meet all stakeholder needs. (modified January 2015)

Ground Rules:

Start on time. End on time or early.

Identify if you have to leave early and have an agenda item.

Consensus decisions. You must be able to live with it.

Keep side conversations silent.

Send alternate if you are not able to attend.

Upshot

These are the assignments made at the meeting. As new ones are added they will be appended to the list. As assignments are completed they will be lined out with ~~a strike-through~~, but left on the list for one meeting. This will provide a running record of assignments made at these meetings.

September 19, 2013

Ref. #	Who	What	When
32	Ray Z	get the statutes or the foundation of the Caltrans legal opinion relating to software and data sharing~~11/7/2013 1/9/2014 3/13/2014 5/01/2014 7/31/2014 9/11/2014 11/13/2014 Jan 29, 2015 3/5/2015 5/7/2015 9/24/2015 1/28/2016~~	**3/3/2016**

December 5, 2013

Ref. #	Who	What	When
34	~~John~~ Winton	Send office bulletin/memo on lump sum/pro rata to the group via Lori. (see discussion notes #1) ~~**Today 3/13/2014 5/01/2014 7/31/2014**~~ 11/13/2014 ~~**Jan 29, 2015 5/7/2015**~~ **Winton will continue to do this and work up some sort of a Q&A (see discussion notes under agenda item # 2 from November meeting)**	~~**1/1/2016**~~ ~~**1/28/2016**~~ **3/3/2016**

May 29, 2014

~~65~~	~~Tom~~	~~Tom will take utility relocation issues back to CEAC for further discussion. (See discussion under agenda item # 13) 7/31/2014 9/11/2014 **Jan 29, 2015 5/7/2015** July 23, 2015 9/24/2015 **11/12/02015**~~	~~**1/28/2016**~~

From November 13, 2014

~~83~~	~~Winton~~	~~needs to work off line on Allocation for STIP and ATP -- How do we pair the allocation process so the E76 does not lag too~~	~~11/12/2015~~

		~~far behind the allocation process? Work off line and report back to the group. (See discussion under agenda item # 7) March meeting 2015 5/7/2015 July 23, 2015 9/24/2015~~	~~1/28/2016~~

From July 2015

109	John H	We need to take the bike and pedestrian component eligibility issue to the next HBP meeting in August. (SEE AGENDA ITEM # 3) Desired outcome is report in September meeting on the understanding of the existing practices for allowing or disallowing bike and ped components on HBP projects. 8/20/2015 **Add to the October special meeting of the Bridge Committee** (see discussion notes under agenda item # 2.4, from November 2015 please.) ~~11/12/2015 1/28/201~~	3/3/2016
~~111~~	~~Ray~~	~~Compile results from pilot Caltrans needs to establish metrics to assess this Central Federal Lands pilot effort. There needs to be follow up reports to this group, with discussion, as each major milestone is met. (SEE AGENDA ITEM # 7) 9/24/2015 11/12/2015~~	~~1/28/2016~~
~~117~~	~~Ray~~	~~Final report on the survey pilot to the TCC 9/24/2015 11/12/2015~~	~~1/28/2016~~

From November 2015

119	Matt	Check to see if the FHWA memo went out on trinity guardrail end treatment design. Work with Ray. (see discussion notes under agenda item # 2.3)	~~1/28/2016~~ 3/3/2016

From January 2016

120	All for Ray	Local agencies interested in joining the working group to work on the Environmental Issues legislation changes for the CEQA/NEPA reciprocity, engage in the federal rule making and improving the program, let Ray know. (see discussion notes under agenda item # 8)	3/1/2016
121	Winton	have a procedure posted for simultaneous submittal of allocation/authorization request before the next meeting. (see discussion notes under agenda item # 11)	3/3/2016

122	Shawn	WHERE CAN WE BEST PUT OUR FEDERAL DOLLARS? Share the ideas with committee members and keep this item on the list to be worked on. We need examples. Collect the examples. (see discussion notes under agenda item # 15.1) and revise the report from group 1	3/3/2015
123	Shawn	Make a presentation at the summer meeting of the RTPA on "WHERE CAN WE BEST PUT OUR FEDERAL DOLLARS? Work with Adriann (see discussion notes under agenda item # 15.1)	7/1/2016
124	All for Winton	Review the material distributed by Winton. (Minimum Qualification) Can you make any suggestions to streamline or improve it? Comment on staffing, fiscal and delivery. (see discussion notes under agenda item # 15.2)	2/26/2016
125	Winton	The team will continue to refine the definitions. How do we define "struggling?" ? How do we work with existing agencies who are already in the federal aid process? How do we implement this? (see discussion notes under agenda item # 15.2)	3/3/2016
126	Jean	(Comment from 01-28-2016) Send memo out to the group on data collection effort. (see discussion notes under agenda item # 15.3)	1/29/2016
127	Mohammad	Survey local agencies to see if there is a lot of interest in pursuing both the Oregon model (On-call contracts) and the Iowa Model (Pre-qual list) Find out who will support what and who would want to use the service if we pursue the legislation needed to take this forward? (see discussion notes under agenda item # 15.4)	3/3/2016
128	Mohammad	Survey the RTPA's and the MPO's to see who does on-call or pre-qualification list procurement for their local agencies (see discussion notes under agenda item # 15.4)	3/3/2016

Critique from last meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Very good attendance. On time.	Agenda was not on the Caltrans website. Would like to have everything posted on the website before the meeting. If it was on line it would be easier for us to prepare for the meeting. Action item reports – they should not create any discussion unless they are on the agenda.

Critique from this meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Good attendance early Good discussion, good ideas. Generated a lot of good action items. Good reports from the priority groups. Vince's FAST presentation Good to have Coco here. All but two of the action items are CT or FHWA.	Less than ideal city representative attendance. Bring drinks and mayo – mayo WITH the sandwiches.

\

Meeting Chair:	**Ray Zhang – Chief, Division Of Local Assistance**
Invitees:	Chris Lee, Pat DeChellis, Dave Flynn, Patty Romo, Mike Penrose, Mike Selling, Tom Mattson, Richard Tippett, Jennifer Whiting, Shawn Cunningham, Robert Newman, Martin Pastucha, Jay Walter, Colleen Ferguson, Todd Capurso, Michael Throne, Adriann Cardoso, Ross McKeown, Juan Perez, Jerry Barton, Mike Woodman, Laurel Janssen, Sharon Scherzinger, Matt Schmitz, Jean Mazur, Steve Pyburn, Mike Johnson, Susan

1	9:00	Introductions	All	

2	9:05	Ground Rules; Review Agenda, group expectations, upshot review	Halverson / All	Understand meeting process and status of action items

3	9:20	RTPA Update	Adriann Cardoso	Information Sharing

Agenda Item 3. RTPA Update

3. 1. We discussed the STIP fund guidelines and update that went to CTC – RTPA's will have to cut or delay projects to stay within their allocation.
3. 2. Next cycle of STIP guidelines has already been kicked off by the CTC.
3. 3. We got an update on the FAST program – distribution of funds.

4	9:30	Caltrans & HSIP / HBP Committee Update	Ray Zhang	Information Sharing

Agenda Item 4. Caltrans & HSIP / HBP Committee Update

4. 1. We are analyzing the FAST Act
4. 2. We need to improve our oversight of A&E consultant contractors. We want to proactively look at contracts before they go out and provide information. We are looking for 5 positions in a BCP to support this oversight effort for oversight on federal aid porjects. The process will be concurrent review.
4. 3. HSIP – Call for federal aid projects in April. There will be $150 million. Giuidelines for next cycle will be pretty much the same as this cycle.
4. 4. HSIP - We have a new systemic safety analysis report program – This will be implemented in two phases – each agency can have up to $250,000. Guidelines and processes will be approved soon and will be posted on

the website. The target for this program is for agencies that have tried and never succeeded in developing safety projects, or have never applied before.

4. 5. HBP – Comittee made decisions on low water crossing and function obsolete projects. We have a $1 billion annual on-system bridge replacement need, and funding level of $350 million. We need to be sure we are selecting the right projects, rather than going first-come, first-served.
4. 6. HBP - Bridge Investment Credit Program – (BIC) is a valuable tool tso earn credit for future projects, when you do an on-system bridge with local funds.

5	9:50	CTC Allocation Update	Laurel Janssen	Information Sharing

Agenda Item 5. CTC Allocation update

5. 1. No report

6	10:00	FHWA Update	Jean Mazur	Information Sharing

Agenda Item 6. FHWA update

6. 1. We have to respond the Cargo Preference Act. There are new Federal Aid contract requirements. For material or equipment purchased from a foreigh source, at least 50% of that foreign cargo – material or equipment - must be shipped on a vessel under the US flag. Guidelines and procedures to follow. Ca;ltrans has already announced this and has updated the contract boilerplate language. If you are using the most current langiuage you will be in compliance.
6. 2. "Buy America" FHWA Dec 21, 2012 memo exempting certain products has been vacated by the courts – We are working tro decide how to implement this recent court decision. Guidance will be out shortly. If you have anything on a prject which has a contracnt that has already been awarded, do not make any changes. We will be working to identify the specific changes.

7	10:10	Joint Spring 2016 CEAC Conference update		Discuss survey results, determine if we are ready to send the survey out.

Agenda Item 7. Joint Spring 2016 CEAC Conference update

7. 1. Our beta test of the survey went out to this group a couple of weeks ago. We did find that many times written comments did not necessarily line up with the the marks.
7. 2. There were a lot of comments in the survey about funding and evironmental We want to focus in on environmental and funding areas – we think. We will re-do the survey and send it out.

8	10:40	FAST Act: FHWA Presentation (handout) Implementing Update	Jean Mazur Ray Zhang Jennifer Heichael / Tammy Massengale	Highlights of the new legislation: Timeline Bridge Program CEQA = NEPA

Agenda Item 8. Highlights of the new legislation, Timeline, Bridge Program and CEQA = NEPA

8. 1. See power point presentations on FAST and CEQA/NEPA
8. 2. There may be several years in making any changes to the existing NEPA process.
8. 3. Outcome
    8. 3. 1. Local agencies interested in joining the working group to work on legislation changes for the Statute of limitations, engage in the federal rule making and improving the program, let Ray know. (see upshot # 120)

9	11:15	HBP / CFL Pilot Update	Ray Zhang / Rick Tippett	Discuss the pilot metrics

Agenda Item 9. HBP / CFL Pilot Update

9. 1. The CFL/HBP pilot is intended to showcase what Central Federal Lands can do for local agencies to deliver bridge projects on federal lands.

9. 2. There is a design-build project under way in Trinity County. We want to see how fast the environmental process can be completed, since CFL has processes not available to local agencies.

9. 3. This is a positive thing and another delivery tool in the toolbox, especially for smaller agencies. Stay tuned.

9. 4.

10	11:30	Allocation / E76	Winton Emmett	

Agenda Item 10. Allocation / E76

10. 1. If you choose to do so you can submit both the authorization request and the allocation request packages at the same time, if they are both ready.

10. 2. The procedure will be published on the internet. This is a procedural option, not a policy change.

10. 3. CTC requirements for allocation request were diffrerent than what the FHWA requirements were for authoriziation on the federal side. We are hoping that there will be a HQ review that happens before the allocation is made by the CTC, so that we can move ahead immediately upon getting the allocation from the CTC.

10. 4. Outcome

10. 4. 1. Winton will have a procedure posted for simultaneous submittal of allocation/authorization request before the next meeting. (see upshot # 121)

11	11:45	New Business – As time allows	All	Any new items from the floor?

	12:00	LUNCH		

12	1:00	Opening comments and purpose of the afternoon annual planning session – Review the agenda		What are our goals? What have we accomplished? Identify key TCC accomplishments from the last two (+/-) years.

Agenda Item 12.

12. 1. Our primary goals have not changed.

12. 2. Acoomplishments

12. 2. 1. The four teams working on their projects are important, but there are little things that we do that are not even on the agenda that help streamline the processes.

12. 2. 2. We take up items as they emerge, every day issues that we bring to the table. Examples are Parallel processing of E76 and allocation request, and

12. 2. 3. People have no complaints now because we continue to work on, and resolve issues.

12. 2. 4. Invoice checklist

12. 2. 5. HSIP Committee

12. 2. 6. We have documented and memorialized process improvements so they don't get lost.

12. 2. 7. 2013 Action Plan – most issues have been resolved. Interaction of local agencies and Caltrans on federal aid projects.

12. 2. 8. Getting delayed implementation on Buy America.

12. 2. 9. E76 status on line.

12. 2. 10. ICRP effort

12. 2. 11. Utilities issues resolved for our counties.

12. 3. Things yet to do

12. 3. 1. A&E Oversight process

12. 3. 2. Invoice review

12. 3. 3. Many items need legislative action. As a group, how can we focus more on that?

13	1:10	Caltrans Update	Coco Briseno	Sharing strategies and priorities

14		Review activities under way	Ray Zhang	Overview for new members as to what we are working on. The four projects, Big picture.

Agenda Item 14. Review activities under way

14. 1.

15		Priority Work Group progress reports	Group Leaders	Shared understanding of where each of the four groups is on their work. (15 minutes per group) What are our next steps? Where can we best put Federal Dollars? Tiered Certification System Unobtrusive Project performance data collection methods A&E Procurement Oversight

Agenda Item 15. 2015 Priority Work Groups

15. 1. **Where can we best put federal dollars?** Pat D (Lead)– Sharon S, Jean, Ross, John H, Renee, Shawn, Adriann

15. 1. 1. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Having trouble getting information from others. We are looking for ways to minimize the number of projects with federal dollar participation. Is there a way to pool federal funds for exchange? Any way to provide an incentive? Pat will set up a conference call for the group members

15. 1. 2. (Comment from 7/23/2015) We had a conference call meeting in June. We will get together again. This is really a regional issue. It is very hard to get the local agencies engaged. There is an RTPA report out on this already.

15. 1. 3. (Comment from 9/23/2015) We have not had time to follow up with regional contacts on implementation. There is nothing we can do at a statewide level. Regions have to take the lead on this. We cannot trade federal funds on a statewide basis, from one region to another. Federal guidelines restrict the application of federal funds. The federal funds are set for specific things, and for specific projects only, and we cannot make those federal funds more general, available statewide, with less restrictions, in their application. We will get the regions more involved, to wrap this up.

15. 1. 4. (Comment from 11-12- 2015) Progress has lagged. Pat will reach out to the regional partners on this. Regions are so different that things that would work in one region would not necessarily work for others. Pat hopes to summarize the information and send it out prior to the January meeting.

Transportation Co-op Committee

2015 Priority Goal No. 1

Where can we best put our federal dollars?

WHERE CAN WE BEST PUT OUR FEDERAL DOLLARS?

This is something that this Committee has talked about off-and-on for many, many years. Each of us will answer the question differently.

According to the notes from the January 2015 Planning meeting, the following are the thoughts/ideas:

- Develop a pilot program to broker these funds i.e. those that have the capability to purchase federal funds from others (probably at some discount) who wanted to save the time and expense of using federal funds.
  - ✓ Not quite sure how we would get started on such a pilot program. We would need some "seed" federal dollars.
  - ✓ Probably some restrictions on the use of the federal funds that would be bought by one Region from another Region.
- Focus federal money to make most efficient use – as I always heard it stated, concentrate the federal funding on the fewest projects possible.
  - ✓ It seems that a lot of programs wanting to spread the money around, give out less than the maximum amount of federal funds to each project and there doesn't seem to be a way to consolidate the local funds to maximize the use of federal funds.
  - ✓ How can we require that the local match funds on Statewide programs are to be provided to the State for consolidation purposes in exchange for more federal funds or Toll Credits?

CONCLUSION

1) There is no simple, global, magic solution to a **c**omplex problem. The problem is complex due to the specific/special funding allocations in the State. Pointing to the State (Caltrans) and telling them that the answer is very simple – just exchange all of the federal funds for clean State funding before allocation ignores the fact that State gas tax revenues have declined and will continue to decline with the low price of oil/gasoline.

2) It might be possible to include this exchange as part of a State-wide increase in transportation funding, if the increase was of sufficient size.
   a) Not all of Caltrans work (such as routine maintenance work) is eligible for federal funding.

3) Developing a Statewide plan for reducing the federal footprint of transportation projects can be achieved on Programs managed at the State level, such as the Local Highway Bridge Program and the Local Safety Program. A Statewide Plan cannot be developed for Programs managed by the Regions because each Region operates differently and there is not a desire to give up local control.
   a) For Statewide Programs, Caltrans is concerned about dictating changes without a strong consensus from the Regions and local agencies. Thus, Caltrans will develop tools for the toolbox such as the Bridge Investment Credit Program but will not mandate its use. Caltrans will defer to others to make the mandates.
      i) For changes to be mandated on Statewide Programs, the Regions and local agencies will have to demand the mandates.
   b) For those Programs managed by the Regions, the changes must be initiated by the Regions and will not necessarily be uniform or even implemented by each Region because of the differing needs of each Region.
4) There is a desire to do something to lessen the footprint of federally-funded transportation projects, but the **conclusion** is that it will be up to the Statewide Program Managers/Committees and the Regions to determine what is best for their Program or Region.

IDEAS

1) Set a minimum $ threshold to federally fund projects. At the State, Caltrans does this with the SHOPP Program. They federalize only those SHOPP projects over $1mil (Construction Cap), or any Safety project over $300k. Projects with CON CAP costs less than these minimums are funded with State-Only funds.
2) Maximize federal reimbursement percentages. As mentioned, any time project sponsors have more skin-in-the-game than the standard 88.53/11.47 ratio (which is typically viewed as a good thing), it has the unintended consequence of INCREASING the federal footprint by spreading the federal dollars over more projects, rather than fewer. Ultimately to

reduce the federal footprint we'll have to push for more large $$$ projects, fewer small $$$ projects, and higher/maximized reimbursement rates.

3) For a certain threshold of project, say under $2mil CON contract, we could federalize ONLY the CON/CE phase. Agencies would fund the PE and/or RW phases with "other" funds then, through either Tapered/Flexible Match or Toll Credits, would get their CON/CE Authorization at 100% fed reimbursement. We probably can't impose this on larger projects where we would be asking agencies to float large PE and/or RW efforts, but perhaps smaller efforts could be handled this way. A side benefit is that agencies would not have to follow federal contract law for the PE/RW phases……just state contract law. Considering all the issues project sponsors are having with A&E Consultant Contracts, pulling some of these efforts out of the federal requirements seems like a worthwhile endeavor to at least investigate. This also keeps us out of PE>10 issues, or having to pull funds back from projects that go through multiple design/scope/concept iterations.

4) Establish a model similar to the Bridge Investment Credit Program (refer to this link http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/DLA_OB/2015/ob15-04.pdf) for other funding programs. It is a similar idea to the tapered match – perform certain work using local funds earning credit for the match on larger projects thereby consolidating the federal funds to few projects.
5) Promote the exchange of (or, sale of) federal funds for local funds to encourage the consolidation of federal funds on fewer projects
6) Use of Toll Credits to also promote the consolidation of federal funds
7) Require that match funds be available to others for use on projects to be non-federalized

FACTS

- Federally funded projects are typically process intensive, and therefore resource intensive. This makes delivery difficult for smaller agencies that don't have either the resources or the technical knowledge to navigate the federal process.
- There are some 450 municipalities and 58 counties in the state competing for federal funds. The Caltrans Division of Local Assistance burden to administer federalized projects for all those jurisdictions with varying degrees of resources and competence within those jurisdictions managing the projects is obviously overwhelming.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

A. Caltrans accepts all of the available federal transportation funding, and exchanges that money with STIP, Bridge Toll, or whatever source of state funding, funneling state money back through the MPO's to distribute to the CMA's or local jurisdictions as the case may be. In this scenario, the same match could be applied to the state money to extend the funding, or not.
   - In this scenario, the "swap" occurs at the grant source. i.e. – when a call for projects is prepared for $100 million worth of CMAQ funding for bike and ped improvements, for example, that money is purchased by Caltrans at that time, and the grant is then funded with state money.
   - Once the grant funding is replaced with state money, the money is allocated to the various MPO's using similar formulas, and projects compete as they would if it were federal funding.
B. Second to Option A, would be very large jurisdictions combine to buy federal funding. For example LA County, Sacramento County, Santa Clara County and Caltrans would be established as exclusive agencies that are willing and capable of delivering federal projects efficiently, AND have available capital to purchase federal money. Similar to Option A, at the grant source (when a call for projects is being established), these jurisdictions buy the federal money at an exchange of 90 cents on the dollar, and the grant funding is replaced with various sources of local money.
   - As an incentive to these jurisdictions, in addition to the 10% gain, would be that Caltrans issues toll credits to these jurisdictions to pay any required match associated with the federal funding.
   - Once the grant funding is replaced with state money, the money is allocated to the various MPO's using similar formulas, and projects compete as they would if it were federal funding.
   - Obviously, these designated jurisdictions could also compete for the various grants just as they normally would.
C. Purchasing federal funding at the CMA or local level. Where within a county one jurisdiction has a federalized project and is need of additional funding, that jurisdiction could take federal funding from another jurisdiction that is not able to use their federal funding allocation. Similar to Option B, this is done for 90 cents on the dollar
   - May not be a preferred option primarily because it is done after the fact and there is too much uncertainty. Also, it is dependent upon a local agency having adequate local funding capital to buy the federal dollars.
   - One way to mitigate the local capital issue would be for Caltrans to issue toll credits to the agency taking the federal money to be used as match.
   - This Option is worth discussing only because it was actually done, and demonstrates that something similar to what this committee is pursuing is very possible if folks are willing to move out of the box.

D. If we were to be successful pushing back the bureaucratic tide, and actually develop an approved a way to "clean" federal money for the majority of California jurisdictions, we still would identify those jurisdictions in the state, with proven track records of delivering federally funded projects, to be eligible to compete to deliver federal grant projects.

PROS:

- Gives smaller jurisdictions a better opportunity to deliver much needed transportation projects with their limited resources.
- Relieves the burden on Caltrans Division of Local Assistance. This point cannot be overstated enough. Think about the workload for local assistance dealing with the same 5 to 10 well trained and well equipped jurisdictions on federal projects, versus 200.
- By placing the federal money in the hands of those agencies that are well equipped to deliver federalized projects, the delivery rate on federal projects improves. Process becomes more easily standardized, less cumbersome, and easier to control/administer. Makes locals, Caltrans, MPO's, CMA's and FHWA happy.

CONS:

- None are obvious other than the fact that Caltrans and FHWA need to look at funding from a "new" (Ahhhhhh!!!) perspective.

Next steps for 15.1

15. 1. 5. (Comment from 01-28-2016) We need to keep focused on this issue;

15. 1. 6. Ray will continue the conversation in HQ to market the ideas for the paper, "**WHERE CAN WE BEST PUT OUR FEDERAL DOLLARS? (see upshot #)**

15. 2. **Tiered Certification system** Winton (Lead) - Michael T, Jean, Adriann, Mike S, Ross

15. 2. 1. (Comment from March 2015) Working on what the minimum qualifications would be. Not working on the tiered aspect now. Jean will be sending information out on certification programs in other states to the work group lead.

15. 2. 2. (Comment from 5/7/2015) We had a conference call a week ago. Team decided the goal is establish MQ's for all local agencies to be able to qualify to administer federally funded projects; develop a draft set of the MQ's and present to this group by the end of the year – last meeting for 2015; November meeting. We also want to present this to the League/CEAC meeting in March 2016. We are focusing on local public agencies, vs. NGO's. We are meeting monthly – next meeting will be June 2; then following the July TCC meeting. We will be researching various states for best practices.

15. 2. 3. (Comment from 7/23/2015) We have met a few times. We are combining parallel efforts. We looked at five different states' processes. Based on those, we are tabulating the information that will be applicable to California. We will be putting something on the table by November, for presentation to the TCC.

15. 2. 4. (Comment from 9/23/2015) We had a brief discussion and put together a matrix of new MQ's for agencies to enter into the federal aid process. This is intended to ensure they have the proper financial reporting system in place, and verify they have the ability to actually deliver the projects. Also this is intended to enable them to administer the process more efficiently. The next step would be to certify or tier more experienced agencies – They would be at a higher level of certification with more privileges associated with that level; agencies at lower levels of certifications would require more oversight. Agencies that do not meet the MQ's would have items identified for them which would need to be in place for them to administer federal funds. We would encourage them to partner with agencies that are more experienced.

15. 2. 5. (Comment from 11-12- 2015) We are looking at Fiscal, Staffing and Delivery as three domains. We have taken examples from other states. If you have any comments on the matrix send them to provide Winton comments.

15. 2. 6. (Comment from 01-28-2016) We have a matrix of minimum qualifications. Three areas: Staffing, fiscal and delivery. With new agencies entering into the system, we need to be able to help them through. For agencies struggling, we need to help them get back on track. By spending more time at the front end to help agencies move forward, we can spend less time on the back end. This needs to be marketed properly- "This is your path to success."

Next steps for 15.2

15. 2. 7. Review the material distributed by Winton. Can you make any suggestions to streamline or improve it?

15. 2. 8. We will continue to refine the definitions. How do we define deficiencies? How do we work with existing agencies who are already in the federal aid process? How do we implement this?

15. 3. Unobtrusive project performance data collection methods Jean (Lead) - Mark, Mike P, Ross, Renee.

15. 3. 1. (Comment from March 2015) Hoping to get our group together in the next couple of weeks.

15. 3. 2. (Comment from 5/7/2015) developed out charter. We will be focusing on milestones we need to collect from all the potential milestones. – Post construction Project Milestones were identified. Collect proposed and actual. We are looking for information that is already being gathered. The next step will be to get feedback which milestones among all the possible milestones we would collect. We want to see where projects are in the project development process, and help us identify slippage -

15. 3. 3. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Group comment is that project performance data should be able to help us to see if progress is being made. (Field and agency – dates can be as much as a year apart on federal projects).

15. 3. 4. (Comment from 5/7/2015) It was mentioned as a question, would dates be kept from each progress report rather than overwriting previous dates, so we can see if progress is being made.

15. 3. 5. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Suggestions: Collect DBE data. Find data we already collect.

15. 3. 6. (Comment from 7/23/2015) We need to meet and agree on the items we want to take forward.

15. 3. 7. (Comment from 9/23/2015) We are looking at long term options for data collection – on-line and real time data, and will be identifying pros and cons.

15. 3. 8. (Comment from 11-12- 2015) FHWA for the short term data collection will be data already provided by local agencies. This will only require that CT tabulates the data and sends it to FHWA. Long term: We will be looking at options. There will be a short memo out to the group on this.

15. 3. 9. (Comment from 01-28-2016) Comment from group: We would like to track the completion date - We need to collect this all once, in a way that ensures consistency.

Next steps for 15.3

15. 3. 1. (Comment from 01-28-2016) Send memo out to the group on data collection effort.

15. 3. 2. Caltrans needs to come back with implementation.

15. 4. **A&E Procurement Oversight** Mark – overall lead, Rick, Tom, Jean and Mike P

15. 4. 1. (Comment from March 2015) Hoping to schedule the kickoff in the next couple of weeks.

15. 4. 2. (Comment from 5/72015) We had a kickoff meeting – We identified four items: On call consultants, pre-qualification, oversight and training. We are collecting issues we need to resolve. We will have further discussions for clarity. For on-call, we are going to look at State of Missouri and Oregon to see what their best practices are. We will be contacting Iowa for pre-qualification information. For oversight, we will try to find agencies that have done well – For Training – we will be looking a guidance in the procedures manual. For our team, the next step is contacting the other states. We will meet in the next couple of weeks. We hope to have the meetings set up with the other states by the end of May.

15. 4. 3. (Comment from 5/72015) Suggestion – may need to go with a regional approach.

15. 4. 4. (Comment from 5/72015) Avoid scope creep, stay focused.

15. 4. 5. (Comment from 7/23/2015) We have looked at Oregon and Iowa information. We will be following up with at least Oregon. We are moving on oversight and training aspects. We have 5 more A&E contract training sessions. There will be a need for legislative action to support this strategy and give Caltrans the authority to do this.

15. 4. 6. (Comment from 9/23/2015) We have looked at best practices. We will be meeting today to determine our next step. We are following two strategies – on-call contracts and pre-qualification of consultants. We have a meeting with CT Legal to discuss our approach with them.

15. 4. 7. (Comment from 11-12- 2015) We have legal advice on what we can actually do. We do not have a plan at this time, but we hope to have something to report on before the January meeting. On the training side, we delivered 5 trainings. There is one more training set for January.

15. 4. 8. (Comment from 01-28-2016) On call consultant contradcts with taxk orders would require legislation

15. 4. 9. (Comment from 01-28-2016) Pre-qualified A&E contractor list would be easier to implement than the procurement model, with on-call contractors.

15. 4. 10. (Comment from 01-28-2016) Caltrans proposed a Budget Change Request to conduct a robust, pro-active oversight of local agency consultant procurement process. To do this theyu would establish a Consultant Contract Oversight Unit, similar to Construction Oversight Engineer role. They would Identify and advise on deficiencies before they become penalties/sanctions; LGA corrects and recovers. They

would perform up to 150 contract procurement reviews annually. Reviews would be conducted for Pre-advertisement, Pre-selection and Pre-execution phases

Next steps for 15.4

15. 4. 11. Survey agencies to see if there is a lot of interest in pursuing the Oregon model. (On-call contracts) Find out who will support it and who would want to use the service if we move forward with it.

15. 4. 12. Survey the RTPA's and the MPO's to see who does pre-qualification list procurement.

15. 4. 13. Table the prequalification list option, for small contracts.

		BREAK		

16		Assess Effectiveness of the TCC	Halverson / All	How can we make the TCC more effective? How can we communicate more effectively with all stakeholders?

16. 1. We need to track our successes.

17		New Business for 2016	All	What else do we need to be doing?

Agenda Item 17. New Business

17. 1. We will continue on with the three priority areas that we have – We will move the data collection item in-house for Caltrans.

17. 2. After the Public Works 2016 spring conference we will have a better ida about any new priority items we should pursue.

18		Meeting Wrap-up, evaluation, next steps	All	Close oualified ut

19		Adjourn	Ray Zhang	
Next Meeting Date:		March 3, 2016, May 26, 2016, July 21, 2016, September 22,	All meetings to be held at Terminal A – 2nd Floor, Media Room, Sacramento Airport (unless otherwise noted)	

12	12:20	Meeting Wrap-up • Review Action Items	All	Preparation for upcoming meeting

13	12:30	Adjourn		
Next Meeting Dates:		January 28, 2016 (all-day), March 3, 2016, May 26, 2016, July 21, 2016, September 22, 2016, November 10, 2016	All meetings to be held at Terminal A – 2nd Floor, Media Room, Sacramento Airport (unless otherwise noted)	