DATE: Thursday, December 5, 2019
2:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Council of San Benito County Governments
Conference Room
330 Tres Pinos Road, Suite C7
Hollister, CA 95023

A TAC Member may be attending the TAC meeting by conference call at the following location. This location shall be accessible to members of the public pursuant to Government Code Section 54953.

Caltrans, District 5
50 Higuera Street
San Luis Obispo, CA

MEMBERS: Mary Gilbert, Council of Governments
Heather Adamson, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
Chris Armstrong, California Highway Patrol
Jill Leal, Caltrans District 5
Danny Hillstock, City of Hollister Engineering Department
Don Reynolds, City of San Juan Bautista
Bryan Swanson, Development Services, City of Hollister
Harry Mavrogenes, San Benito County Resource Management Agency

Persons who wish to address the Technical Advisory Committee must address the Chairperson when public comment is called. Following recognition, persons desiring to speak are requested to state their name for the record. After hearing audience comments, the Public Comment portion of the agenda item will be closed. The opportunity to address the Technical Advisory Committee on items of interest not appearing on the agenda will be provided during Section C. Public Comment.

2:00 P.M. CALL TO ORDER:

A. ACKNOWLEDGE Certificate of Posting

B. Introductions

C. Public Comment. (Opportunity to address the committee on items of interest not appearing on the agenda. No action may be taken unless provided by Govt. Code Sec. 56954.2. Speakers are limited to 3 minutes.)

D. Member Announcements
CONSENT AGENDA:

1. APPROVE TAC Meeting Minutes dated October 3, 2019 – Gomez

REGULAR AGENDA:

2. RECEIVE Information Regarding Federal and State Transportation Performance Management and Target Setting – AMBAG/Hierling

3. San Benito County Measure G – Gilbert
   a. RECEIVE Fiscal Year 2018/2019 Fourth Quarter (April, May, June) and Fiscal Year 2019/2020 First Quarter (July, August, September) Measure G Revenue Statements
   b. RECEIVE Update on Measure G Activities
   c. COMMENT on Proposed Highway 25 Delivery Strategy and Value Analysis Goals

ADJOURN TO SPECIAL MEETING OF JANUARY 9, 2020 AT 2:00 P.M.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), if requested, the Agenda can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability. If an individual wishes to request an alternative agenda format, please contact the Clerk of the Council four (4) days prior to the meeting at (831) 637-7665. The Council of Governments Technical Advisory Committee meeting facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Clerk of the Council’s office at (831) 637-7665 at least 48 hours before the meeting to enable the Council of Governments to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility.
COUNCIL OF SAN BENITO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING

October 3, 2019        2:00 PM

DRAFT MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:  
Mary Gilbert, Council of Governments; Will Condon, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments;  
Harry Mavrogenes, San Benito County Resource Management Agency; Jill Leal, Caltrans District 5(via-teleconference); Don Reynolds, City of San Juan Bautista; Chris Armstrong, California Highway Patrol

OTHERS PRESENT:  
Veronica Lezama, Council of Governments Transportation Planner; Monica Gomez, Council of Governments Secretary

CALL TO ORDER:  
Mary Gilbert called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING:  
A motion was made by Don Reynolds, and seconded by Chris Armstrong, the Committee acknowledged the Certificate of Posting. Vote: 6/0 motion passes

PUBLIC COMMENT:  None

MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS:  

Jill Leal, Caltrans Planner, reminded TAC members that the deadline to submit applications for FY 2020/2021 Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grants is October 11, 2019 by 5:00 p.m. For questions contact Hana Mengsteab, Caltrans District 5 Grant Liaison.

Harry Mavrogenes joined the meeting at 2:07 p.m.

Mary Gilbert provided a Measure G update. She stated that the tax has been collected since April 1, 2019 and COG has received approximately $2.1 million up until July 2019. No Measure G funds have been expended to date, with first distributions to local agencies and COG anticipated later this year. COG staff will be working on finalizing the local agency funding agreements with the Cities and County.

Don Reynolds reported that the City of San Juan Bautista is working on their Pavement Management Program Improvements adding CSGI to it.

Harry Mavrogenes reported that the County has a list of projects going to the County Board of Supervisors on the 8th.

Veronica Lezama reported that COG is a member of the Safe Kids Coalition of San Benito County and staff participated in hosting a Walk to School Day for R.O. Hardin Elementary School children on Wednesday to raise awareness about pedestrian safety. She said the event had a great turn out with over 200 participants and that maybe next year they can host an event in San Juan Bautista.
CONSENT AGENDA:

1. APPROVE TAC Meeting Minutes dated August 1, 2019 – Gomez
2. APPROVE TAC Meeting Minutes dated September 5, 2019 – Gomez

A motion was made by Will Condon, and seconded by Harry Mavrogenes, the Committee approved Items 1 and 2. Vote: 6/0 motion passes

REGULAR AGENDA:

3. State Route 156/25 Roundabout Project – Gilbert
   a. RECEIVE Update from Council of Governments Board Meeting
   b. DISCUSS Proposed Safety Improvement Alternatives in Lieu of a Roundabout at the Intersection

Ms. Gilbert reported that at the last COG meeting the COG Board directed staff to prepare a resolution in opposition to the roundabout concept and directed staff to meet with and coordinate proposed alternatives with the San Benito County Resource Management Agency (RMA). As directed, staff met with the RMA to discuss alternatives to a roundabout at the intersection.

Mr. Mavrogenes provided an overview of the identified two alternatives:
   A. Extend merge lanes on all lanes of the 25/156 intersection by 1 miles each (estimated Construction Cost $5 million)
      • 1,500 ft lane extension at the intersection is included as an interim project in the Highway 25 Design Alternatives Analysis (2016).
   B. Construct a 2-lane overcrossing for Highway 156 eastbound and westbound traffic (estimated Construction Cost $10-15 million).
      • Design should accommodate future interchange/four lanes on SR 156 to minimize throwaway
      • County engineering staff will provide more information on cost estimate and a proposed design sketch

Mr. Mavrogenes mentioned that he along with COG staff will be meeting with State Assemblymember Robert Rivas next week and they are also trying to setup a similar meeting with Senator Ana Caballero for the following week.

CHP Captain Chris Armstrong stated that on behalf of the California Highway Patrol, he completely supports a flyover at SR 25/156. He stated that something has to be done at this intersection and that a lot of the incidents are either in attention, falling asleep, or sunlight in the eyes of drivers, so the signal light is an issue. However, he did not believe a roundabout would be a solution where two state routes join particularly, one that has so much commute traffic one direction and big rig traffic the other direction. He said that he polled his office and it was unanimous that they are against a roundabout at this location. He added that a flyover would be ideal and any other improvements that they could assist with. He said that he would agree with additional rumble strips in the area to alert drivers that a signal light is coming up.

Ms. Gilbert stated that everyone can agree that an interchange/flyover is the ultimate ideal project, however the cost is what was prohibited in the planning phase for this project. Staff is currently researching opportunities to expand on the SHOPP funding for the project area through the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) or Cycle 2 of the Trade Corridors Enhancement Program. Unfortunately, the ITIP funds are not currently programmed and future programming capacity is not available until the 2022 cycle.

Don Reynolds expressed concern stating that if the decision against this roundabout should be substantiated and documented, considering the other roundabouts on the horizon, would they be creating a standard that
says this roundabout doesn’t work, which starts a ripple effect all the way to San Juan Bautista with the Union Road and Bixby roundabouts that are going in.

Mr. Mavrogenes stated that he did not believe it would be an issue for the Bixby roundabout because there is not a lot of side traffic.

Ms. Gilbert stated that it was a good point to mention. She said she would ensure that the resolution staff takes to the COG Board includes some findings that are specific to this location.

Ms. Gilbert also mentioned that Caltrans has committed to a Value Analysis/engineering process to take another look at the entire 4-lane expressway widening project. It’s a five day commitment, Caltrans will convene a group of Caltrans engineers, COG staff, and local agency staff to evaluate, advise, and come up with solutions/alternatives. A pre-study meeting has already been scheduled with team members to look at objectives.

4. RECEIVE Update on Santa Clara/San Benito Mobility Partnership and the SR 25/101 Interchange Project – Gilbert

Mary Gilbert provided an update on the Santa Clara/San Benito Mobility Partnership and the SR 25/101 Interchange Project.

The Mobility Partnership selected Alternative 1 as the preferred alternative for the interchange at its September 11th meeting. The Valley Transportation Authority will continue to finalize the design of the interchange through the standard Caltrans PS&E process. COG, San Benito County, and Caltrans Districts 4 & 5 all participate on the project team for the interchange. The next steps will be to continue the final design of the project. COG and VTA are coordinating to maximize future state and federal funding for the project, including securing additional SB1 funding in the next funding cycle.

Ms. Gilbert mentioned the impacts that the Bolsa Road connection is having to travel time on Highway 25. It has become very clear that Bolsa Road needs to be a right in right out intersection. The left turns coming through to go southbound 25 are hugely impacting travel time. They will be working with Caltrans District 4 because it is a Santa Clara County led project, to define and pursue Highway 25/Bolsa Road intersection improvements. Staff may be reaching out to local jurisdictions for support on these improvements.

The next Mobility Partnership meeting is in December. For those interested in receiving the Mobility Partnership Agenda’s you may go to the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) website and sign up to receive future agendas.

_A motion was made by Harry Mavrogenes, and seconded by Don Reynolds, the Committee voted to Adjourn the TAC meeting at 2:35 p.m. Vote: 6/0 motion passes_

**ADJOURN TO MEETING OF NOVEMBER 7, 2019 AT 2:00 P.M.**
MEMORANDUM

TO: SBT-COG Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Paul Hierling, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Performance Management Requirements and Target Setting

MEETING DATE: November 7, 2019

RECOMMENDATION: INFORMATION

Receive information regarding federal and state transportation performance management and target setting.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The Federal Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), which was signed into law in 2012, included provisions for the establishment of national performance goals for the federal-aid highway program. Signed into law on December 5, 2015, the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act continues MAP-21’s overall performance management approach and establishes nationally consistent metrics. In May 2016, the FTA and FHWA issued The Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning and Metropolitan Transportation Planning Final Rule (23 CFR 450, 771, and 49 CFR 613) which directs States and MPOs to coordinate on target setting.

Caltrans has led a multi-agency effort to develop statewide safety performance targets, including MPOs, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), National Highway Traffic Association, California Highway Patrol, California Office of Traffic Safety and other stakeholders. Safety targets must be approved by AMBAG by February 28, 2020.

Safety Performance Management Rule

The Federal Safety Performance Management Measure rule establishes five performance measures to carry out the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and requires the state to report on the five-year rolling averages for: (1) number of fatalities, (2) rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT), (3) number of serious injuries, (4) rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMT and (5) number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries.
Safety Performance Management Target Setting

Caltrans is required by Federal law to establish statewide targets for safety performance measures. Updated statewide targets were established on August 31, 2019 and will be updated annually as needed. Below is the table of the Statewide 2020 safety targets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>FARS</td>
<td>3518.0</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Fatalities (per 100M VMT)</td>
<td>FARS &amp; HPMS</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>SWITRS</td>
<td>13,740.4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100M VMT)</td>
<td>SWITRS &amp; HPMS</td>
<td>3.994</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Severe Injuries</td>
<td>FARS &amp; SWITRS</td>
<td>4147.4</td>
<td>3.03% for Fatalities and 1.5% for Serious Injuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment 1 provides additional information on PM 1 target setting.

Next Steps

AMBAG will approve the statewide safety measures to support achievement of the state’s safety goals and to maintain compliance with the Federal Performance Management Safety rule.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

This work on performance management is budgeted and funded in the FY 2019/20 Overall Work Program as Work Element 610. There are currently no direct funding repercussions to an MPO or Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) if the statewide targets are not met.

ATTACHMENT:

1. Safety Performance Management Targets for 2020 (Prepared by Caltrans)
Attachment 1: Safety Performance Management Targets for 2020

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in cooperation with the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS), is required to set five annual Safety Performance Management Targets (SPMTs) for all public roads in the State of California by August 31 of each year. This is pursuant to the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21, P.L. 112-141). The Safety Performance Management Final Rule adds Part 490 to Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations to implement the performance management requirements in 23 U.S.C. 150.

Caltrans set SPMTs for the 2020 calendar year by August 31, 2019. Caltrans and OTS have adopted aspirational goals consistent with the California Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>5-Yr. Rolling Average Target for 2020</th>
<th>Percent Reduction for 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>FARS</td>
<td>3518.0</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Fatalities (per 100M VMT)</td>
<td>FARS &amp; HPMS</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>SWITRS</td>
<td>13,740.4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100M VMT)</td>
<td>SWITRS &amp; HPMS</td>
<td>3.994</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Severe Injuries</td>
<td>FARS &amp; SWITRS</td>
<td>4147.4</td>
<td>3.03% for Fatalities and 1.5% for Serious Injuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The targets highlighted in gray are set in coordination with OTS.

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a core Federal-aid program with the purpose to achieve a significant reduction in fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. The HSIP requires a data-driven, strategic approach to improving highway safety on all public roads and focuses on performance. The HSIP regulation under 23 CFR 924 establishes the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) HSIP policy, as well as program structure, planning, implementation, evaluation and reporting requirements for States to successfully administer the HSIP. The overarching highway safety plan for the State of California is the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). In September 2015, California updated its SHSP, which is “a statewide coordinated safety plan that provides a comprehensive framework for reducing highway fatalities and severe injuries on all public roads” (SHSP, 5). It further states that the “SHSP is a multi-disciplinary effort involving Federal, State, and local representatives from the 4Es of safety [i.e. engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency services]” (SHSP, 2015-2019, 34). In support of a data-driven and strategic approach, the HSIP Final Rule contains major policy changes related to: (1) the HSIP report content and schedule, (2) the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) update cycle, and (3) the subset of the model inventory of roadway elements (MIRE), also known as the MIRE fundamental data elements (FDE).
The Safety Performance Measures (PM) Final Rule supports the data-driven performance focus of the HSIP. The Safety PM Final Rule establishes five performance measures to carry out the HSIP: the five-year rolling averages for: (1) Number of Fatalities, (2) Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), (3) Number of Serious Injuries, (4) Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT, and (5) Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries. These safety performance measures are applicable to all public roads regardless of ownership or functional classification. The Safety PM Final Rule also establishes a common national definition for serious injuries.

States must establish statewide targets for each of the safety performance measures. States also have the option to establish any number of urbanized area targets and one non-urbanized area target for any, or all, of the measures. Targets are established annually. For three performance measures (number of fatalities, rate of fatalities and number of serious injuries), targets must be identical to the targets established for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) Highway Safety Grants program that is administered by OTS. The State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) must also coordinate with their Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in their States on establishment of targets, to the maximum extent practicable. States will report targets to the FHWA in the HSIP report due in August of each year.

Each MPO will establish targets for the same five safety performance measures for all public roads in the MPO's planning area within 180 days after the State establishes each target. The targets will be established in coordination with the State, to the maximum extent practicable. The MPO can either agree to support the State DOT target or establish a numerical target specific to the MPO planning area. MPOs’ targets are reported to the State DOT, which must be able to provide the targets to FHWA, upon request.

A State is considered to have met, or made significant progress toward meeting, its safety targets when at least four of the five targets are met or the outcome for the performance measure is better than the baseline performance the year prior to the target year. Optional urbanized area or non-urbanized area targets will not be evaluated. Each year that FHWA determines a State has not met or made significant progress toward meeting its performance targets, the State will be required to use obligation authority equal to the baseline year HSIP apportionment only for safety projects. States must also develop a HSIP Implementation Plan.
Target Selection Methodology

There are three steps to setting safety performance targets, which are: (1) estimating the existing trends to determine where we are now, (2) determining what external factors will impact the target in order to forecast future trends, and (3) estimating targets based on forecasted fatality reductions from safety plans. In line with these steps, on May 8, 2019, a webinar and telephone conference was held to discuss the 2020 Safety Performance Management Targets with the MPOs and other vested stakeholders. During this workshop four possible scenarios for setting the 2020 Targets were presented. They included: (1) a trend line, which extrapolates the existing changes in fatalities and serious Injuries into the future; (2) a flat line scenario, which assumes that there is no change in the future from the current numbers; (3) a match to the Strategic Highway Safety Plan’s goal of -3% for fatalities and -1.5% for serious injuries; (4) a target line of reaching zero fatalities by 2050.

After receiving feedback from the MPOs from the webinar and telephone conference on May 8, 2019, the consensus was to select the fourth scenario, which uses a target line of reaching zero fatalities by 2050. This scenario is similar to the goals adopted by several States in the nation of Toward Zero Deaths TZD by 2050 (with 2016 numbers as the baseline numbers). The next update of the SHSP will be by 2020 and the TZD goals in this future safety plan will be incorporated in the 2021 SPMTs. The rationale for selecting safety targets based on a comprehensive statewide safety plan is to set “empirically derived targets based on quantitative modeling of potential strategies. With this approach, targets are based on empirical evidence of the selected interventions’ previous effectiveness combined with best estimates of future effectiveness, using a model linking inputs and outcomes” (Performance Management Practices and Methodologies for Setting Safety Performance Targets, Federal Highway Administration, 2011). Since safety performance targets pertain to all public roads, in a practical sense for this to work, local jurisdictions need to develop individual performance measures based on the particular needs of the locality and also target the appropriate strategies. If regional implementation is adopted, this denotes a bottoms-up approach where targets are rolled up from the State and local jurisdictions based on safety effectiveness, supported by research, and are more realistic and achievable, which in turn helps secure political support (Joint Transportation Research Centre of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and International Transport Forum, Towards Zero: Ambitious Road Safety Targets and the Safe System Approach, 2008).

The Number of Fatalities

For 2020, the target for fatalities based on the five-year rolling average is 3518.0 with 3275 fatalities projected for the same year. While referring to Figure 2, the blue bars with red text reflect the data that was available in FARS at the time of the target setting process. For the 2020 targets, the last year that data was available in FARS was the 2017 data. The Number of Fatalities 2020 target is set with a target line to decrease fatalities to zero by the end of December 2049. This is denoted by the blue bars with black text that begin in year 2018. The dark blue line represents the 5-year rolling average from the annual fatality numbers.

Figure 2: The Number of Fatalities
Annual Fatality Rate (per 100M VMT)

Statewide traffic volumes are reported in one hundred million vehicle miles traveled (100M VMT). While referring to Figure 3, traffic volumes have been steadily increasing since 2011. For the purposes of safety performance target setting, a 1 percent increase in VMT is forecasted from year-to-year for the years from 2017 to 2020.

FIGURE 3. ANNUAL STATEWIDE TRAFFIC VOLUMES

The fatality rate is calculated by dividing the number of fatalities by 100M VMT. The same assumptions are relevant for the calculation of the number of fatalities and they are (refer to Figure 4):
The blue bars denote the current data that is available in FARS (as of June 2019 when the OTS presented their targets to NHTSA);

The gray bars show a toward zero death target from 2017 to 2020. Caltrans seeks to achieve this goal by December 2049.

**FIGURE 4. THE FATALITY RATE**

The dark blue line represents the five-year rolling average from annual fatality rates that reflect the 2015-2019 SHSP goal, which is 1.023 per 100M VMT. The fatality rate for 2020 is 0.951.

**The Number of Serious Injuries**

The serious injury data for the State of California resides in the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS). The definition of serious injury corresponds to “A” in the KABCO Scale and the corresponding value in the SWITRS database is coded as “2”. This is explained in Table 2 (below).

**TABLE 2. A COMPARISON BETWEEN KABCO AND SWITRS SERIOUS INJURY DEFINITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KABCO Definition (FHWA)</th>
<th>SWITRS Definition (CHP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K: Fatal Serious Injury</td>
<td>1: Fatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Serious Injury</td>
<td>2: Injury (Severe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Minor Injury</td>
<td>3: Injury (Other Visible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Possible Injury</td>
<td>4: Injury (Complaint of Pain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O: Property Damage Only</td>
<td>5: Property Damage Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referring to Figure 5 below, the blue bars with red text denotes the current data that is available in SWITRS (as of June, 2019). The blue bars with black text shows the number of serious injuries that decrease 1.5% from 2017-2050. The target year for serious injury numbers is 13,542. The dark blue line represents a five-year rolling average and for 2020 it is **13,740.4**.
The Rate of Serious Injury

The serious injury rate is the number of serious injuries divided by 100M VMT. While referring to Figure 6 (below), the blue bars denote the current data that is available in SWITRS and HPMS. The serious injury rate in 2020 is 3.933. The dark blue line represents a five-year rolling average of serious injuries. This concept is incorporated in the SHSP. This is a “vision” based or “aspirational” target. The 2020 target for the serious injury rate is 3.994. The Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes are increased 1 percent per year from the 2016 levels for the years from 2017 to 2020 (as is the case in calculating the fatality rate).

FIGURE 5. THE NUMBER OF SERIOUS INJURIES

FIGURE 6. THE RATE OF SERIOUS INJURIES
The Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries (Bicycles and Pedestrians)

While referring to Figure 7 (below), the darker blue bars show the number of fatalities for pedestrians and bicyclists combined. In 2017, the number of combined pedestrian bicycle fatalities is 982 as of June, 2019. The lighter blue bars with red text denote the current data that is available in SWITRS for the number of serious injuries for pedestrians and bicyclists combined. In 2017, the number of combined serious injuries for bicycles and pedestrians is 3,273. The dark blue bars depict the decreasing number of fatalities to zero by the end of December 2049. The dark blue line represents the five-year rolling average for non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries, which for the target year of 2020 is 4147.4.

Summary

For a breakdown of the five SPMTs, refer to Table 1. Appendix A also details the outreach efforts done by Caltrans, OTS, and the FHWA to the MPO’s, counties, and local agencies in order to coordinate and communicate the SMPTs. Further information with regards to the webinars listed in Appendix A is accessible at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/shsp/. Here data is provided from Caltrans, OTS, and the FHWA. For example, traffic volumes from HPMS are broken down by county for 10 years. In addition, the webinars have been recorded and can be accessed from this website.
APPENDIX A: Safety Performance Management Target Setting Outreach Efforts

Background:
Safety Performance Management (Safety PM) is part of the overall Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program, which the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) defines as a strategic approach that uses system information to make investment and policy decision to achieve national performance goals. The Safety PM Final Rule supports the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), as it establishes safety performance measure requirements for the purpose of carrying out the HSIP and to assess fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.

The Safety PM Final Rule establishes five performance measures as the five-year rolling averages to include:

1. Number of Fatalities
2. Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
3. Number of Serious Injuries
4. Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT
5. Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries

The Safety PM Final Rule also establishes the process for State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to establish and report their safety targets, and the process that the FHWA will use to assess whether State DOTs have met or made significant progress toward meeting their safety targets.

Important Dates/Deadlines:
The overall State targets required by FHWA are due on August 31st, annually, while the MPOs set their targets six months after the State sets its targets. Three of the five safety targets must be coordinated with the Highway Safety Plan administered by the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS), which must submit their targets to NHTSA by June 30th of each year.

Performance Targets must also be included in updates to Long-Range Statewide Transportation Plans (LRSTP), metropolitan transportation plans (MTP), state transportation improvement programs (STIP) and transportation improvement programs (TIP) after May 27, 2019.

Engagement Timeline:

- May 8, 2019 – A workshop took place by webinar and phone conference to discuss the 2020 Safety Performance Management Targets with the MPOs and other vested stakeholders. During this workshop four possible scenarios for setting the 2020 Targets were presented. They included: (1) a trend line, which extrapolates the existing changes in fatalities and serious injuries into the future; (2) a flat line scenario, which assumes that there is no change in the future from the current numbers; (3) a match to the Strategic Highway Safety Plan’s goal of -3% for fatalities and -1.5% for serious injuries; (4) a target
line of reaching zero fatalities by 2050. After receiving feedback from the MPOs from the webinar and phone conference, the consensus was to select the fourth scenario.

Contacts:

Srikanth Balasubramanian
Phone: (916) 651-9377
Email: balasubramanian@dot.ca.gov

Thomas Schriber
Phone: (916) 654-7138
Email: thomas.schriber@dot.ca.gov
Staff Report

To: Council of San Benito County
From: Mary Gilbert, Executive Director Phone Number: (831) 637-7665 x.207
Date: December 5, 2019
Subject: San Benito County Measure G

Recommendation:

a. RECEIVE Fiscal Year 2018/2019 Fourth Quarter (April, May, June) and Fiscal Year 2019/2020 First Quarter (July, August, September) Measure G Revenue Statements

b. RECEIVE Update on Measure G Activities

c. COMMENT on Proposed Highway 25 Delivery Strategy and Value Analysis Goals

Background:

Measure G is a 1% sales tax approved by voters in the November 2018 election. COG is responsible for implementation of the measure and ensuring delivery of the projects in the approved expenditure plan.

Financial Impact:

The State Board of Equalization has collected and remitted a total of $2,717,680.53 to the Council of San Benito County Governments’ Measure G fund, which is housed at the County of San Benito Auditor’s Office. Interest on Measure G funds has not yet been allocated by the County Auditor’s Office.

Summary

Staff is continuing steps for implementation of Measure G. The tax has been collected since April 1, 2019 and COG has received approximately $2.7 million in the separate tax account. No Measure G funds have been expended to date, with first distributions to local agencies and COG administration anticipated later this year.

Staff Analysis

Since the passage of Measure G, the CDTFA has collected $2,717,680.53. Once collected, funds are remitted to the Council of San Benito County Governments’ Measure G account, which is housed by the County of San Benito. The first payment of Measure G funds was deposited in May of 2019. The funds collected to date are detailed below:
Fiscal Year 2018/2019 Fourth Quarter (April, May, June) - Revenue: $2,193,232.77.
Fiscal Year 2019/2020 First Quarter (July, August, September) - Revenue: $524,447.76. Funds for the First Quarter FY 2019/20 only reflect revenue received for the month of July. The DTFA has not yet disbursed funds to COG for any revenues collected in August and September.

The enclosed Detailed General Ledger Reports do not include distribution of fund activity, as Measure G funds have yet to been distributed to local agencies or projects. COG staff is currently working on finalizing the local agency agreements with the Cities and County, which will specify the distribution quantities/percentages and terms for obtaining Measure G funds.

The Measure G Strategic Plan includes updating financial forecasting and receiving support in developing a plan for distribution of funds from the Measure. KNN Public Finance, under contract to COG, provided a detailed presentation to the Board at its November meeting. Staff is updating revenue forecasts while matching forecasts to anticipated expenditures.

Tier 1: Highway 25 4-Lane Expressway

The Expressway project is currently included in the model at full build-out from San Felipe Road to the San Benito/Santa Clara County line. In September, COG requested review of the proposed project design. Staff has initiated a contract with WMH Engineering to provide engineering consulting services to COG for the project review. WMH Engineering previously completed the Council of Governments Alternatives Analysis for the highway.

Caltrans has committed to complete a Value Analysis of the project with representatives from Caltrans functional units, COG staff, County and City staff, and regional partners at Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to review project delivery alternatives. The expressway widening project must be coordinated with other regional projects including the Highway 101/State Route 25 Interchange, Bolsa Road & Highway 25 intersection improvement needs, and the State Route 152 Trade Corridor project.

The Value Analysis effort is tentatively scheduled for February 2020. Staff met with Caltrans in early November. Representatives from the City of Hollister and San Benito County were also present. At the meeting, the group identified action items, including the need to designate appropriate representatives to attend the Value Analysis effort. Staff will provide the Committee with proposed goals for the Value Analysis at the December 2 meeting.
In addition to State Route 25 planning, staff is working on the following priorities for the Measure:

- Finalize Local Agency Funding/Tax Sharing Agreements
- Submit request for programming Local Partnership Program Bonus/Incentive funds to the California Transportation Commission
- Hold Required Annual Public Hearing- December

Executive Director Review: ____________ Counsel Review: ___ N/A___

Attachments:

1. Fiscal Year 2018/2019 Fourth Quarter (April, May, June) Measure G Revenue Statement
2. Fiscal Year 2019/2020 First Quarter (July, August, September) Measure G Revenue Statement
### MEASURE G
#### 4TH QUARTER FISCAL YEAR 2018/2019

**Detail General Ledger Report**

**G/L Date Range:** 04/01/19 - 06/30/19

- **Include Sub Ledger Detail**
- **Exclude Accounts with No Activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G/L Date</th>
<th>Journal Type</th>
<th>Sub Ledger</th>
<th>Description/Project</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Debit Amount</th>
<th>Credit Amount</th>
<th>Actual Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/24/2019</td>
<td>JE RA</td>
<td>WF Receipt Deposit Batch 06.12.19</td>
<td>Received From</td>
<td>Council of Governments</td>
<td>06/11/2019</td>
<td>19,797.72</td>
<td>19,797.72</td>
<td>$19,797.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/24/2019</td>
<td>JE RA</td>
<td>WF Receipt Deposit Batch 06.27.19</td>
<td>Received From</td>
<td>Council of Governments</td>
<td>06/25/2019</td>
<td>437,339.42</td>
<td>437,339.42</td>
<td>$437,339.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G/L Account Number</th>
<th>Description/Project</th>
<th>Actual Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>634.95.7391.101.990000000</td>
<td>Cash Cash</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634.95.7391.113.116</td>
<td>Receivables Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>$457,137.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634.95.7391.100.512.001</td>
<td>Sales Tax Sales and Use Tax</td>
<td>$1,736,095.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Account Cash Cash Totals:**
  - Balance To Date: $0.00
  - Actual Balance: $457,137.14

- **Account Receivables Accounts Receivable Totals:**
  - Balance To Date: $0.00
  - Actual Balance: $1,736,095.63

- **Account Sales Tax Sales and Use Tax Totals:**
  - Balance To Date: $0.00
  - Actual Balance: ($2,193,232.77)

---

**MEASURE G tax 1st qtr Council of Governments**

**MEASURE G April 2019 Council of Governments**

**Measure G tax 1st qtr Council of Governments**

**Measure G April-June 2019 Council of Governments**

**Measure G May 2019 Council of Governments**

**Measure G June 2019 Council of Governments**