

Group Memory  
Transportation Coop Committee  
March 3, 2016

Next Meeting dates

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

**-Desired outcome for May 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 <del>11/7/2013 1/9/2014 3/13/2014 5/01/2014 7/31/2014 9/11/2014 11/13/2014 Jan 20, 2015 3/5/2015 5/7/2015 9/24/2015 1/28/2016</del>	3/3/2016

December 5, 2013

Ref. #	Who	What	When
34	<del>John</del> Winton	Send office bulletin/memo on lump sum/pro rata to the group via Lori. (see discussion notes #1) <del>Today 3/13/2014 5/01/2014 7/31/2014 11/13/2014 Jan 20, 2015 5/7/2015</del> <b>Winton will continue to do this and work up some sort of a Q&amp;A (see discussion notes under agenda item # 2 from November meeting)</b>	<del>4/1/2016</del> <del>4/28/2016</del> <del>3/3/2016</del> 5/26/2016

From July 2015

109	<del>John H</del> Robert P	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 <u>Add to the October special meeting of the Bridge Committee</u> (see discussion notes under agenda item # 2.4, from November 2015 please.) <del>11/12/2015 1/28/2016</del>	<del>3/3/2016</del> 5/26/2016
-----	-------------------------------	---	----------------------------------

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 )	<del>4/28/2016</del> 3/3/2016
-----	------	--	----------------------------------

From January 2016

120	All for Ray	<del>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 )</del>	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)	<del>3/3/2016</del> <b>5/26/2016</b>
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)	<del>2/26/2016</del> <b>5/1/2016</b>
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 )	<del>3/3/2016</del> <b>5/26/2016</b>
<del>126</del>	<del>Jean</del>	<del>(Comment from 01-28-2016) — Send memo out to the group on data collection effort. (see discussion notes under agenda item # 15.3)</del>	<del>4/29/2016</del>
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 <b>5/26/2016</b>
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 <b>5/26/2016</b>

From March 3, 2016 meeting

129	Mike	Arrange for a presentation at the next CEAC policy conference for HFST – Robert Peterson.	8/15/2016
-----	------	---	-----------

Critique from this meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
One of our agenda for change items has been solved. Ended on time.	Phone call doesn't work too well. Need face time form membership.

Good full agenda Good presentations	
--	--

Critique from last 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.

<b>Meeting Chair:</b>	<b>Ray Zhang – Chief, Division Of Local Assistance</b>
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; Action Items; Review Agenda	Mike Halverson	Understand meeting process and status of action items
3	9:20	RTPA Update	Adriann Cardoso	Information Sharing

Agenda Item 3. RTPA Update

3. 1. FAST Act – RTPA's are waiting to see how the funds will be distributed between CT and regional agencies,
3. 2. ATP Program guidelines updates – RTPA's have been engaged with this effort.
3. 3. STIP Reduction in the fund estimate – RTPA's are working on how we will address this. CTC staff will be working with a sub group of the RTPA's to grant re-programming priority for projects that were cut. Statute requires us to keep the STIP is for five years, and must be constrained to the fund estimate, which currently is at \$754 MILLION less than the previous estimate, so we cannot just delay projects.

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

Agenda Item 4. Caltrans Update and HSIP / HBP Committee Update

4. 1. HSIP: Cycle 8 is coming up this year. The timeframe for applications and processing will be the same as last year.

4. 2. We got SSARP out – applications are due on March 25. This is a two phase effort. We are hoping for more than the 10 million that has been set aside for the program. Phase 2 will be after the second regional summit, probably the end of April, with applications due in May.
4. 3. HBP: We are working with the FAST Act implementation and the funding split – we want to maintain the funding level for the bridge program. We will have one of our team members work with Caltrans on the funding split. California may be in the penalty phase under MAP-21 because there might be more than 10% of bridges in non-performing rating. This is still up in the air. The new inspection coding method may change this because of the new definitions.
4. 4. On the local side, because of the drop in gas taxes, the federal match funds are in decline. We need to talk about how we can flex toll credits for the next few years to ensure delivery of the federal program. We need to be able to use toll credit on all programs. HBP and HSIP are up to Caltrans. Everything else goes to the regions, and it is up to those regions to determine how toll credits can be used.

5	10:00	CTC Allocation Update	Laurel Janssen	Information Sharing
---	-------	-----------------------	----------------	---------------------

Agenda Item 5. CTC update

5. 1. Hearing on 17<sup>th</sup> (south ) and 24<sup>th</sup> (North) will be held – This is an opportunity to address the Commission about projects that may be on the chopping block.
5. 2. ATP Guidelines for Cycle 3 will be approved at the next CTC meeting. Draft will go out soon.

6	10:10	FHWA Update	Scott McHenry	Information Sharing
---	-------	-------------	---------------	---------------------

Agenda Item 6. FHWA Update

6. 1. We had a video conference with the Deputy Director of the FHWA. HQ policy staff are putting together guidelines and documents and reports. There is a lot of new rulemaking under FAST Act. Information on the internet is available on the FHWA website. FHWA.DOT.GOV/Fastact
6. 2. Collaborative working groups are working with FHWA to determine which issues need to be elevated to the Secretary's level.
6. 3. FHWA has an order for emergency relief that came out on the 22<sup>nd</sup>. The program is clarified, but not really changed. Greater efficiencies are required. We will be working with Caltrans to roll this out.

7	10:20	HFST Presentation (Handout)	Robert Peterson	
---	-------	-----------------------------	-----------------	--

Agenda Item 7. HFST Presentation

7. 1. The high friction surface treatment product has received a lot of attention. California is aggressively using this treatment and has used it at over 100 sites. The treatment dramatically reduces crashes when appropriately deployed.
7. 2. See the handout for detailed presentation.
7. 3. The treatment includes a glue and mix that hardens in about 4 hours and can be opened to traffic.
7. 4. This treatment should go down on a good surface. The specification is very tight. Things have to be done right so the process is successful. You need to have a well-qualified contractor who has experience with the process.
7. 5. Video available at this URL:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k8EJsVYrL8U>
7. 6. For information, contact Robert Peterson, Division of Local Assistance, 916-653-4333 ( e mail , [robert.peterson@dot.ca.gov](mailto:robert.peterson@dot.ca.gov))
7. 7. Outcome
  7. 7. 1. Arrange for a presentation at the next CEAC policy conference for HFST – Robert Peterson.

8	11:00	ADA Compliance Review	Elizabeth Doohar	Discuss the letter Local Agencies received from ADAAC
---	-------	-----------------------	------------------	---

Agenda Item 8. ADA Compliance Review

- 8. 1. This program has been moved to the Office of Business and Economic Opportunity.
- 8. 2. Local agencies are required to have an ADA contact person, have a grievance procedure, a self-evaluation, (outreach) a way to make the public aware of the ADA program, and an ADA transition plan in place to bring all facilities into compliance.
- 8. 3. The ADA law applies to everyone, and is blind to funding.
- 8. 4. CT compliance reviews will continue. The ADAAC contract was terminated in January 2016. Caltrans ADA will resume this task – They will do a full compliance review and verification of information submitted on an annual certification form.
- 8. 5. We will be assessing the procedures and the structure of the Caltrans ADA effort.
- 8. 6. Reviews will be triggered if there are sn forms submitted to Caltrans. Also reviews will be triggered by a high level of complaints.
- 8. 7. You can get information from the CT website [www.dot.ca.gov/hq/bep/ada\\_infrastructure\\_program.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/bep/ada_infrastructure_program.htm)

9	11:15	FAST Act PE at Risk	John Hoole / Ross Mc McKeown	Feedback / Brainstorming
---	-------	---------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------

Agenda Item 9. FAST Act Preliminary Engineering at Risk

- 9. 1. CTC has not changed their regulation on starting work prior to allocation for reimbursable work. On the federal side, the FAST Act allows for subrecipients to incur preliminary engineering costs for an eligible project before receiving project authorization from the State.
- 9. 2. This has been on the agenda for change for decades.
- 9. 3. The group supports the date the funds appear in the federal TIP would be the start date for reimbursement (for the federal side.)
- 9. 4. Issues, concerns and ideas:
  - 9. 4. 1. What exactly is the start date? How do we define a good start date?
  - 9. 4. 2. Can we establish two separate start dates?
  - 9. 4. 3. How would pre-award auditing process go?
  - 9. 4. 4. Could we do this work as 100% federal work?

10	11:30	2016 League Conference Survey	Rick Tippett	
----	-------	-------------------------------	--------------	--

Agenda Item 10. 2016 League Conference Survey

- 10. 1. The outcome from the breakout will probably be a list of things to work on over the next three to four years.
- 10. 2. Our list is just to get the conversation going.
- 10. 3. We want to go over the results of the survey to set the stage, and then at the end see if there is any additional information people want to contribute.
- 10. 4.

11	12:00	2015 Priority Work Groups	Group Leaders	Updates
----	-------	---------------------------	---------------	---------

Agenda Item 11. 2015 Priority Work Groups

- 11. 1. **Where can we best put federal dollars?** Pat D (Lead)– Sharon S, Jean, Ross, John H, Renee, Shawn, Adriann
  - 11. 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

11. 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.

11. 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.

11. 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 complex 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](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 in 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 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" (Ahhhhh!!!) perspective.

#### Next steps for 15.1

11. 1. 5. (Comment from 01-28-2016) We need to keep focused on this issue;
11. 1. 6. Ray will continue the conversation in HQ to market the ideas for the paper, "[WHERE CAN WE BEST PUT OUR FEDERAL DOLLARS? \(see upshot # \)](#)"
11. 1. 7. (Comment from 03-03-2016) No report today.
11. 2. **Tiered Certification system** Winton (Lead) - Michael T, Jean, Adriann, Mike S, Ross
11. 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.
11. 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.
11. 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.
11. 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.

11. 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.

11. 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

11. 2. 7. Review the material distributed by Winton. Can you make any suggestions to streamline or improve it?

11. 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?

11. 2. 9. (Comment from 03-03-2016) We are awaiting comments from the group and will reconvene to see what the next steps are.

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

11. 3. 1. (Comment from March 2015) Hoping to get our group together in the next couple of weeks.

11. 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 -

11. 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).

11. 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.

11. 3. 5. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Suggestions: Collect DBE data. Find data we already collect.

11. 3. 6. (Comment from 7/23/2015) We need to meet and agree on the items we want to take forward.

11. 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.

11. 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.

11. 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.

11. 3. 10. (Comment from 03-03-2016)

#### Next steps for 15.3

11. 3. 1. (Comment from 01-28-2016) Send memo out to the group on data collection effort.

11. 3. 2. Caltrans needs to come back with implementation.

11. 3. 3. (Comment from 03-03-2016) Caltrans will work with FHWA on this.

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

11. 4. 1. (Comment from March 2015) Hoping to schedule the kickoff in the next couple of weeks.

11. 4. 2. (Comment from 5/7/2015) 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.

11. 4. 3. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Suggestion – may need to go with a regional approach.

- 11. 4. 4. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Avoid scope creep, stay focused.
- 11. 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.
- 11. 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.
- 11. 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.
- 11. 4. 8. (Comment from 01-28-2016) On call consultant contracts with tax orders would require legislation
- 11. 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.
- 11. 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 they 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

- 11. 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.
- 11. 4. 12. Survey the RTPA's and the MPO's to see who does pre-qualification list procurement.
- 11. 4. 13. Table the prequalification list option, for small contracts.
- 11. 4. 14. (Comment from 03-03-2016) We will develop the survey and get it out before the next meeting.

12	12:20	Meeting Wrap-up • Review Action Items	All	Preparation for upcoming meeting
13	12:30	Adjourn		