Group Memory

Transportation Coop Committee

September 22, 2016

Next Meeting dates

Next Meeting Date:	November 3	Terminal "A" Media Room

-Desired outcome for November meeting:

NEPA update

Spring Conference Update

Update on the bridge pilot program

Funding for LTAP (Mike P)

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~~ Mark	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**~~ ~~**9/22/16**~~ **11/03/2016**

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~~ ~~5/26/2016~~ ~~**9/22/16**~~ **11/3/2016**

From July 2015

109	~~John H~~ 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 **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~~ Discussed at 7/21/16 meeting…memo is currently being circulated to TCC and Bridge Advisory Committee. Will be finalized and added to LAPM Chapter 6. Need status of this item. (added 9/22/2016)	~~3/3/2016~~ ~~5/26/2016~~ **9/22/16** **9/29//16**

From January 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~~ ~~9/22/16~~
~~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)~~ ~~Draft Application & Interview Questions have been sent out to the Committee for comment.~~	~~2/26/2016~~ ~~5/1/2016~~ ~~**9/22/16**~~
~~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~~ ~~5/26/2016~~ ~~**9/22/16**~~
~~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~~ ~~5/26/2016~~ ~~9/22/16~~

From March 3, 2016 meeting

From July 21, 2016 meeting

130	Scott	Send CAP Review list and questions to Lori for distribution to the Committee	9/22/16 9/29/2016
131			

From September 22, 2016 meeting

131	Ray	Follow up with Ct Budgets on HSIP funding swap (See agenda item # 3)	11/3/2016
132	All for Winton	Comment on the handout for self-certification - **this is your last chance.**	10/7/2016

Critique from last meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
~~One of our agenda for change items has been solved.~~ Ended on time. Good full agenda Good presentations	Need to start the meeting on-time. Better attendance

Critique from this meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Reasonable attendance. Good documentation, presented ahead of time.	

\

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, Mitch Weiss, Sharon Scherzinger, Matt Schmitz, Scott McHenry, Tracey Frost,

1	9:00	Introductions	All	

Agenda Item 1. NEPA update

1. 1. We are going through NEPA agreement discussions with FHWA to frame a new MOU/
1. 2. This will be close to the existing MOU. Plan is to get it renewed before end of December.
1. 3. Legislative action is required for soveriegn immunity issue. This may possibly cause a temproary lapse, in which case FHWA will not allow us to continue our oversight. We hope to introduce a bill in early January.

2	9:05	Ground Rules; Action Items; Review Agenda	Mike Halverson	Understand meeting process and status of action items

Agenda Item 2.

3	9:20	Caltrans Update and HSIP / HBP Committee Update	Ray Zhang	Information Sharing

Agenda Item 3.

3. 1. Transportation Planning Div. Chief will retire in November. Jim Davis will take it as acting chief.
3. 2. OA end of the year update: We delivered all the OA, and this year marks the highest year ever in August Redistribution OA. Earmark repurposing status will be updated on our Local Assistance web site. This included about 192 projects worth 160 million.
3. 3. HSIP update: There will be a meeting today. Cycle is closed – we had $17 million in applications for a $10 million dollar allocation. (see upshot #
3. 4.

4	9:50	RTPA Update	Adriann Cardoso	Information Sharing

Agenda Item 4. RTPA Update

4. 1. Met on August 17th. We started working on the 2018 STIP guidelines – what we want to move forward.
4. 2. Draft the RTP and California Transporation Plan has been sent out for comment.
4. 3. The ATP program and policies relating to scope changes and advance allocation of funds have been approved.

5	10:00	CTC Allocation Update	Mitch Weiss	Information Sharing

Agenda Item 5. CTC update

5. 1. STIP.: We have some capacity to advance projects in the October meeting. We will be allocating construction projects from the 2014 STIP that were programmed in 16/17, first come, first served.
5. 2. Active Transporation Program: – we adopted a policy for project scope changes – We will be advancing projects for construction.
5. 3. A week ago the Governor has approved using greenhouse gas funds for active transportation projects. This is a one-time appropriation. These projects have to be allocated by the CTC in 17/18. Look for a workshop in October.

6	10:10	FHWA Update	Scott McHenry	Information Sharing

Agenda Item 6. FHWA update

6. 1. We are working to develop the next NEPA MOU with California.

7	10:20	Pavement & Green House Gases	Dr. John Harvey	Presentation

Agenda Item 7.

7. 1. See powerpoint presentation –
7. 2. Compaction specification needs to be enforced. Proper compaction will contribute to pavelemernt life.
7. 3. Smoothness is important to reduce fuel consumption. Roughness increasesd vehicle fuel use up to 8 percent -
7. 4. There is a lot of knowledge for improving pavement sustainability . Improving sustainability will also often bring lower life cycle cost.

7. 5. Contact Dr. HARVEYT AT udc Davis if any questions,.

8	10:50	Qualification / Agency Certification	Winton Emmett	Review draft application and interview questions

Agenda Item 8. Qualification / Agency Certification

8. 1. Refer to 11.2 below.

8. 2.

9	11:25	Caltrans Cooperative Agreement Articles	Carl Anderson	Discuss proposed changes to the CT Coop Agreements

Agenda Item 9. Cooperative Agreement Articles

9. 1. CT will be updating the language in cooperative agrfeements – update will be relatively minor.

9. 2. Projects that are complex or over a million dollars typically have a coop agreement that defines everyone's roles and responsibilities.

9. 3. CT uses templates to simplify the process of generating coop agreements as well as assuring consistency in the language.

9. 4. Changes will be effective October 1, 2016.

9. 5.

10	11:45	2016 Spring Conference Recap	Ray Zhang / Rick Tippett	

Agenda Item 10. 2016 Spring Conference Recap

10. 1. Moved to next meeting -

11	12:00	2015 Priority Work Groups	Group Leaders	Updates

2015 Priority Work Group Reports

Agenda Item 11. **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 nu mber 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 **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 11.1

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. 1. 8. (Comment from 07-21-2016) No report today.

11. 1. 9. (comment from 9/22/2016) I am proposing to use the OBAG2 grant as a case study for how federal dollars can be purchased by larger agencies with federal projects from smaller agencies, providing the smaller agencies with "clean" non-federalized funding. This is being set up currently at the CMA level with the Solano Transportation Authority. I will discuss this with Adriann and the rest of the committee. I would like to report to TCC on the outcome of this and how it worked.

11. 1. 10.

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 11.2

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. 2. 10. (Comment from 07-21-2016) Review Handout (Draft application & interview questions) and provide comments / input to Winton prior to 9/22 meeting

11. 2. 11. (comment from 9/22/2016) MQ Matrix was produced. We borrowed from other states – Arizona, Washington state. Initially there will be a provisional master agreement with the agency. We will have agencies do pilot projects, followed by compliance review. The result of this will ultimately allow agencies to receive certification allowing them to self-administer projects. (see handout, "Local Agency Certification to Administer Federal/State Transportation Projects.)

11. 2. 12. (comment from 9/22/2016) Next steps: Probvide comments to Winton on the handout – We will get an update on Nov 3. (see upshot # 132)

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 11.3

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

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

11. 3. 4. (Comment from 07-21-2016) Caltrans needs to find a way to collect the data (preferable electronically)

11. 3. 5. (comment from 9/22/2016) No report today

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 5/72015) 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.

11. 4. 3. (Comment from 5/72015) Suggestion – may need to go with a regional approach.

11. 4. 4. (Comment from 5/72015) 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 taxk 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 11.4

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.

11. 4. 15. (Comment from 07-21-2016) Survery was sent out and completed…now compiling results

11. 4. 16. (comment from 9/22/2016) Porposal – option 1 Caltrans manages on call A&E consultant contracts. Option 2: Caltrans maintains a list of pre-qualified consultants for local agencies. This would require legislation. Roughly one out of four responses said they would receive benefits from on-call consultant process. Smaller agencies in rural areas would be most likely to benefit. "Pre-Qualified consultant list" has much more broad appeal, with a fifty-fifty split. The majority of agencies would prefer prequalified list over an on-call list. These statistics do ont weigh agencies in terms of their size – The intention was to have one response per agency, but we are unsure this was actually the case. Detailed results are aviailable on the website for Local Assistance. We will be meeting again to discuss the next steps. The survey was conducted in April and May of this year, and there were 370 responses.

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

13	12:30	Adjourn		
Next Meeting Dates:		November 10, 2016	All meetings to be held at Terminal A – 2nd Floor, Media Room, Sacramento Airport (unless otherwise noted)	