

July 12, 2013

TO: Members of the MAG Transportation Safety Committee

FROM: Renate Ehm, City of Mesa, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Tuesday, July 23, 2013 9:30 a.m.

(NOTE: Kickoff meeting of the Strategic Transportation Safety Plan project will be held at 10:30 a.m.)

MAG Office Building, 2nd Floor, Ironwood Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Transportation Safety Committee will be held at the time and place noted above. Committee members or their proxies may attend **in person, via videoconference or by telephone conference call**. Those attending video conference must notify the MAG site three business days prior to the meeting. Those attending by telephone conference call please contact MAG offices for conference call instructions.

Please park in the garage under the MAG building, bring your ticket, parking will be validated. For those using transit, Valley Metro/RPTA will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

In 1996, the Regional Council approved a simple majority quorum for all MAG advisory committees. If the Transportation Safety Committee does not meet the quorum requirement, members who have arrived at the meeting will be instructed a legal meeting cannot occur and subsequently be dismissed. Your attendance at the meeting is strongly encouraged.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Jason Stephens at the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

If you have any questions regarding the meeting, please contact Sarath Joshua at (602) 254-6300.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

<u>TENTATIVE AGENDA</u>	
	<u>COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED</u>
1. <u>Call To Order</u>	
2. <u>Approval of June 27, 2013 Meeting Minutes</u>	2. Review and approve minutes of the special meeting held on June 27, 2013.

3. Call to Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Transportation Safety Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Members of the public will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless members request an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items will be given an opportunity at the time the item is heard.

4. Program Managers Report

The following items will be addressed:

- 2013 School Crossing Guard Training
- Strategic Transportation Safety Plan
- FHWA/NHI CMF Training Course
- Presentations at Western ITE

5. HSIP Update

At the previous committee meeting, an update was provided on the FY2014-17 MAG Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) call for projects. The updated HSIP project application form provided by ADOT was reviewed by the committee. Some questions regarding the possible use of MAG-HSIP funds for Project Assessments (PAs) and Design Concept Reviews (DCRs) were noted for future discussion. ADOT has held discussions with FHWA and MAG staff on these questions and will provide guidance and responses to the questions on PAs and DCRs. ADOT will also provide additional guidance for estimating and programming sign management programs for the upcoming call for projects. ADOT has also provided a systemic project checklist for

3. For information.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information and discussion.

local agency use in preparing HSIP systemic project applications (Attachment One).

6. FY2014-17 HSIP Call for Projects

On July 1, 2013 MAG released the FY2014-17 Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) call for projects. A total of \$1.1 million in federal HSIP funds are available for fiscal year 2014, and \$1.3M is available for projects in each fiscal year for 2015 - 2017. An Excel-based project application form that was provided by Arizona DOT has been made available via the MAG website including a template developed by MAG for use in justification of systemic projects. MAG staff will review the MAG HSIP programming process and provide additional guidelines. The deadline to submit the HSIP applications has been extended to Friday August 2, 2013. There will be a special meeting to review and rank the projects on August 20, 2013 in the MAG Ironwood room.

7. Reports by Committee Members on Transportation Safety Activities

Members will be requested to report agency activities or current issues that are related to transportation safety.

9. Next Meeting

A Special Meeting is scheduled to be held at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, August 20, 2013. It will be held in the Ironwood Room on the 2nd Floor of the MAG office building.

Adjournment

6. For information and discussion.

7. For information and discussion.

9. For information and discussion.

DRAFT MINUTES OF
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION SAFETY COMMITTEE

June 27, 2013
Maricopa Association of Governments
Ironwood Room, Suite 200
302 N. 1st Ave,
Phoenix, AZ 85003

MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Linda Gorman, AAA Arizona
*Tom Burch, AARP
Larry Talley for Kohinoor Kar, ADOT
Shane Kiesow, City of Apache Junction
Chris Hamilton, City of Avondale
*Thomas Chlebanowski, Town of Buckeye
*Martin Johnson, City of Chandler
*Jorge Gastelum, City of El Mirage
*Kelly LaRosa, FHWA
Erik Guderian for Mike Gillespie, Town of
Gilbert
Chris Lemka, City of Glendale

*Alberto Gutier, GOHS
Luke Albert for Hugh Bigalk,
City of Goodyear
Nicolaas Swart, Maricopa County
Renate Ehm (Chair), City of Mesa
*Jeremy Knapp, Town of Paradise Valley
+Mannar Tamirisa for Jamal Rahimi, City
of Peoria
*Kerry Wilcoxon, City of Phoenix
+George Williams, City of Scottsdale
*Jason Mahkovtz, City of Surprise
Julian Dresang, City of Tempe
Sam Diggins for Gardner Tabon, RPTA

OTHERS PRESENT

Maria Deeb, City of Mesa
Margaret Boone, MAG
Sarath Joshua, MAG
Leo Luo, MAG
Kiran Guntupalli, MAG
Sean Messner, URS

Mike Manthey, Parsons
Kristin Myers, ADOT
Lee Jimenez, MCDOT
Yung Koprowski, Lee Engineering
Ron Sievwright, City of Goodyear
Matt Tsark, Strand Associates

+Teleconference
Videoconference
*Not present

1. Call to Order

Chair Renate Ehm called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

2. Approval of May 28, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Chair Renate Ehm called for a motion to approve the May 28, 2013 minutes. Sarath Joshua read requested revisions sent by Kelly LaRosa who was not able to attend the meeting. Chris Lemka moved to approve the minutes with revisions, Shane Kiesow seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to Audience

Chair Renate Ehm made a call to the audience providing an opportunity to members of the public to address the Transportation Safety Committee. None requested.

4. Program Manager's Report

The following items were addressed:

- **2013 Crossing Guard Training**
 - Phoenix, July 30th
 - August 1st – Mesa
 - August 6th - Peoria
 - 227 registered to date
 - MAG in the process of purchasing safety vests to be distributed to school districts
- **MAG Metropolitan Planning Area Map**
 - Change to the boundary approved by Governor in May
 - Includes Town of Florence, the City of Maricopa and unincorporated areas of Pinal County
 - Expansion results in increasing the MAG Metropolitan Planning Area, potential of additional applications coming in from these regions
- **Update on MAG STSP**
 - Lee Engineering selection recommended by this committee and approved by Regional Council on 4/15/2013: Contract executed on June 17, 2013
 - \$300,000 budget, 18 month project
 - Oversight by this committee and broader Transportation Safety Stakeholders Group (TSSG). Volunteers and feedback needed to form TSSG to include representation of enforcement, education, and disability groups
 - Feedback on Public Input requested of committee members
 - Kick-off meeting July 23rd at 10:30 a.m. after TSC meeting
 - Visioning Meeting on Sept 23th to follow TSC from 9:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.
 - TSC Meetings through Jan 2015 will be held at 9:30 a.m. and the TSSG meetings will be held immediately after

Sarath mentioned that Margaret Boone, project manager for the MAG STSP will be sending out communications to the group throughout the process. Margaret Boone encouraged any feedback on forming the TSSG as well as any other feedback on the project or process to be sent to MAG in anticipation of the July 23rd meeting. Sarath also pointed out that the Goals and Visioning event held on September 23rd will require participation from members of the TSC as well as the TSSG. He also mentioned that this plan will be closely coordinated with the State Strategic Highways Safety Plan and encouraged member agencies to participate in both processes. Larry Talley stated that ADOT strongly encourages members of this committee to participate in the State's SHSP. He noted that when projects are proposed they would need to meet the goals of the plan

and that local agency participation is a good way to assist in the formulation of the plan. Sarath further expanded with an example of intersection improvements and mentioned that if the State plan did not include that goal that it would handicap the MAG MPA needs for being able to implement intersection safety improvement projects and the HSIP program.

- **FHWA/NHI CMF Training Course**

- Workshop on August 15th in Ironwood from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.
- Case studies needed by June 28th

Larry Talley strongly suggested that staff from local agencies who prepare the data for HSIP projects attend the workshop.

- **Road Safety Performance Targets in the MAG Region – Report to RTP Auditor**

- MAG reported safety performance based on the number of
- Graphic showing number of fatalities in the state in comparison with the MAG region and national trends as well as MAG and State SHSP goals
- Demonstrates the changes since 2009
- Nation shows decline whereas the State and MAG Region trend shows an increase
- Next Gen RTP could see an increase in funding allocated to counter the trend

5. HSIP Project Applications for FY2014-17

Chair Ehm stated the draft HSIP project applications for FY2014-17 have been provided for discussion and reminded the committee that there is \$1.1M to be programmed for 2014 and \$1.3M to be programmed each year thereafter. Sarath Joshua noted that ADOT was asked to refine the previous application based on the new MAP-21 requirements and together with MAG produced the materials presented to the committee. He briefly reviewed the guidelines for systemic and spot safety projects and types of road safety improvement projects, including those more applicable for the new member agencies for rural road improvements. Sarath pointed out that the new template outlines the requirements for the data necessary; including the use of crash modification factors (CMFs) that the local agencies need to plan ahead to utilize the tools provided by FHWA, ADOT, and MAG. In addition, it was shown that the template includes the \$30k ADOT administrative fee that is required for all projects. Each project will need to be split into two projects: a design or study phase and a construction or implementation phase. The \$30k fee will apply for each project programmed with at least one year in between phases. The gap is to make sure that there is sufficient time to complete the study phase before the construction phase can move forward. Margaret Boone pointed out that spot specific projects will still need to demonstrate the cost benefit ratio and that the calculation sheet is provided in the template. Sarath asked for questions on the spot improvements. Nicolaas Swart from the County inquired if the \$30k fee is on a sliding scale or depending on the project and if the project is not selected if the agency gets that money back. Sarath answered that there is no sliding scale and that ADOT is encouraging agencies to submit larger projects or that two or more local agencies join forces to submit one project with one agency as lead. Sarath stated that the approach to the application will be that this committee will review and rank a list of projects and submit to ADOT and that if there are 10 projects funded, for example, those will be submitted with the total list to be determined for eligibility. If a project is deemed ineligible, a project will be advanced from the larger list. Larry Talley agreed with this approach but mentioned that there is no administrative cost if the project is 100% HSIP funded. If there is a shared cost that would be due upon execution of the JPA and that it goes towards the cost of the project.

Maria Deeb asked if the project is \$100k that the city will get reimbursed \$70k and the \$30k will go to ADOT. This was confirmed by Larry Talley who also confirmed that if the project cost is \$100k that the application amount would be \$130k and that it is already built into the application for projects that are not 100% HSIP funded. In addition, Mr. Talley mentioned that projects will go to ADOT Urban Project Management who will hire a consultant to put together the package showing how many signs, types, and sizes for those types of projects as well as go through C& S for preparation of specs, and that those costs are most of what the \$30k will go towards. Margaret Boone asked if that only applies to local agencies that don't have the means of doing the work of packaging the sign management projects themselves. Larry clarified that it would still apply since the project would still need to be prepared for bid. Sarath Joshua asked if the \$30k would be applied to all agencies across the state. Larry Talley stated that it would be assessed to all projects in the state. Nicolaas Swart suggested that the money is not paid by the local agency, but that it is still taxpayer money and that we are looking at \$300k in order to make the projects an efficient use of the funds. Sarath stated that Mr. Swart's statement is correct and this is why ADOT is suggesting that larger projects are submitted for several agencies in one application. Sarath mentioned that the challenge is meeting the needs of all the agencies within one project. Larry Talley suggested that the challenge would be addressed by the consultant who will assess the specific needs of each agency. Sarath asked if there could be a lead local agency to do this work that this could address the challenge. In response Mr. Talley mentioned that some of the smaller agencies in the northern region are all combined into one project being administered by the COG. Kristen Myers from ADOT Local Govt Section was in the audience and she made clarifications as to how the COG is able to administer these joint projects. Sarath stated that MAG will look into this in coordination with ADOT offline. Mr. Swart asked if the agency can do a study/design and then submit a project just for implementation. Larry Talley answered that even agencies that are not self-certified can do that but they should contact ADOT to work through the project details and that the project would still need to have a PM assigned and go through C&S for bid. Mr. Talley mentioned that the \$30k assumes a Category 1 Environmental Exclusion. Chris Lemka mentioned that the committee discussed taking RSAs to the next level to do a DCR or PA and asked how the additional study applies the \$30k fee and if there would be a lesser fee applied to a study. Mr. Talley stated that ADOT would recommend approval and send to FHWA for approval or concurrence, the study has to be data driven, based on a safety improvement that needs to be made or addressed a safety issue. Mr. Talley expanded on that stating that the study intent cannot be to determine what the safety issue is but based on data analyzed by the local agency determine the appropriate, identify a problem and use the worst case scenario cost to submit for funding. Mr. Joshua clarified that Mr. Lemka mentions projects which have already had an RSA completed which establishes the risk and possible recommended countermeasures and asked if these could be submitted to build upon the RSA recommendations with a PA or DCR, and how it fits into the HSIP process and funding. Mr. Talley stated that when FHWA asks if a study has been done that ADOT could point towards the RSA for eligibility determination. He reiterated that the agency should use the most costly recommendation and can use the RSA as a starting point but would still have to demonstrate the b/c ratio. Chris Lemka mentioned that Glendale intends to submit for a PA but feels that doing a b/c ratio would be premature until you do the study and determine the cost of whatever improvement you are submitting for. Dr. Joshua suggested that we table the discussion regarding advancing RSAs to PAs or DCRs and

that an additional discussion with ADOT and FHWA would be needed in order to determine if HSIP funding could be used for that purpose. Maria Deeb had two suggestions to approach the discussion with FHWA and ADOT; that HSIP funding be available for the PA since the design includes this stage and the construction would be the implementation component required for HSIP funding, and that during the 30%, 60% design phase, the local agency can focus on a specific countermeasure but the construction should be applied for the worst case scenario for the application then during the project process the amount can be modified based on your costs determined during the design phase. Ms. Deeb also suggested using MAG design assistance for PAs. Sarath mentioned that there is a possibility of doing PAs with RSA funding but it will need to be discussed with FHWA and ADOT. Julian Dresang asked if the \$1.3M/year programmed through MAG is strictly limited to Type 1 Categorical Exclusion work or can it be programmed for larger projects that would require environmental clearance beyond the Type 1 Categorical Exclusion. Mr. Talley said that those funds are available but that the \$30k fee would be insufficient to cover that necessary for a full blown environmental review. Margaret Boone asked for clarification of the availability of statewide HSIP funds for those types of projects. Larry stated that a \$2M project would be outside that realm of the MAG allocation. Sarath noted that previous programming was for smaller spot improvements and systemic improvements and that the need is to move to the next level of projects. He also stated that the sign maintenance projects that are listed as a systemic improvements and that the list provided has had the ok from ADOT. Sarath then demonstrated the template developed by MAG for demonstration of the justification needed for systemic projects. He stated that the template was developed with input from FHWA and ADOT. This template can be used to show fatalities and serious injuries which is the focus of MAP-21 HSIP requirements and shows the annual tally but also uses a severity index, rank, and the associated CMF for the improvement to show the number of crashes that could potentially be mitigated for that countermeasure. In response to a question from Sarath, Larry Talley noted that this template would provide sufficient information. Sarath also noted that when the local agencies are filling out the template that MAG is available to provide assistance with providing crash data. Chair Renate Ehm asked that if it is not necessary to calculate the cost benefit ratio for systemic improvements why is it necessary to show a crash modification factor. Mr. Talley stated that it is still required to show that the proposed countermeasure will have a reduction in fatal and serious crashes. Margaret Boone stated that this template provides that documentation Mr. Talley had referred to. Ms. Boone pointed out that the example shown for backplates has a given 0.9 CRF which translates to a 1% reduction of crashes, and that when multiplied by the total to show the reduction of crashes that can be anticipated for that countermeasure for each location. Mr. Talley stated that there is no standard that needs to be met for this documentation simply that it is shown that there is a potential for reduction in crashes. Sarath asked the committee to review the application and provide any feedback as soon as possible to be able to release the call for projects. Mr. Talley added that the clearance documents provided in the template are good but do not need to be submitted until after a JPA is executed and requested by ADOT.

6. Reports by Committee Members on Transportation Safety Activities

Chair Renate Ehm called on members to report on safety activities. Julian Dresang mentioned that the City of Tempe is requesting feedback from other local agencies regarding incidents at HAWKs with bicyclist entering a crosswalk during the wig-wag

stage and the concern with conflicts. George Williams said that he would ask Scottsdale bicycle folks if have noted any issues. Erik Guderian said that Gilbert is looking at Madison WI bicycle head to possibly address this issue. Nicolaas Swart stated that the County started a roadway safety project which focuses on intersection and run off road crashes and that construction work should begin soon. Larry Talley mentioned that he has brought printouts of the HSIP and MAP-21 information provided on the ADOT website for anyone wishing to have that information. Mannar Tamirisa noted that the City of Peoria had an RSA conducted on 83rd Avenue and that as a result the City of Peoria will be pursuing HSIP funding to implement some of the recommendations. Chair Renate Ehm noted that Mesa has recently completed their 2011 HSIP projects and that the quotes came in consistent with the estimates. Sarath stated that there have been some changes in the State SHSP and that the task force activities have been delayed and safety summit event will be re-scheduled for a later date, tentatively in November.

7. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Renate Ehm called to members for future agenda items. None recorded.

8. Next Meeting

Chair Renate Ehm noted the next meeting is scheduled to be held on Tuesday, July 23, 2013 at 9:30 a.m. in the MAG Ironwood Room with the Strategic Transportation Safety Plan Kick-off immediately following at 10:30 a.m.

9. Adjournment

Chair Renate Ehm adjourned the meeting at 11:28 AM

Agency: _____
 Date Received: _____
 Reviewed By: _____
 Name of Project: _____
 MPO/COG: _____

HSIP Application Checklist “Systematic” Improvement Project

“Systematic Projects” are projects that use proven safety countermeasures to reduce fatal and serious injury crashes on a corridor or system-wide/region-wide basis. Systematic projects are determined by identifying a pattern of crash types and implementing proposed countermeasures to mitigate the identified safety problem. Some systematic projects have already been identified through the ADOT HSIP Manual (below) or other ADOT statewide safety program analysis tool—systematic projects from this list do not require detailed supporting crash data or a benefit-cost tabulation, but does require the total number of crashes supporting the countermeasure broken out by injury severity. A jurisdiction must justify how the system-wide safety problem was identified, that the proposed countermeasure is to mitigate, and how the locations to be improved were identified and prioritized.

1. Such improvements typically do not involve or require lengthy or complicated environmental review. Many would qualify for Group 1 or Condensed Group 2 Categorical Exclusions. These improvements do not normally involve additional right-of-way and most do not involve utility coordination or adjustments. Refer to ADOT Environmental Planning Group Local Government website for addition information: [ADOT EPG Local Government](#)
2. Study/Preliminary Engineering and Procurement/Construction should be planned in separate Federal FY (October 1 through September 30).

SECTION	QUESTION	YES	NO	Comment
Applicant Information	Is all contact information complete for the LPA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Does the "Name of Project" follow TIP naming requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Arizona Approved – “Systematic” Improvement Projects

The following have been identified as proven countermeasures for systematic projects in Arizona that may be low-cost and approved on a system-wide basis for a jurisdiction or region, *provided that the agency justifies how the safety problem was identified that the selected countermeasure is proposed to mitigate and how the proposed locations were selected and prioritized, such as through a network screening process:*

<u>IMPROVE ROADWAY SEGMENT SAFETY</u>	Improvement Type	Check all that Apply	Comment
	a. Milled in shoulder and edge line rumble strips	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Milled in centerline rumble strips	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c. Milled in transverse rumble strips	<input type="checkbox"/>		
d. Incorporate Safety Edge on pavement projects	<input type="checkbox"/>		
e. Install roadside delineation for guardrail, barriers and obstacles	<input type="checkbox"/>		
f. Chevrons (post mounted or converging pavement markings)	<input type="checkbox"/>		
g. Upgrade pavement markings (wider and/or more durable materials)	<input type="checkbox"/>		
h. Upgrade raised/recessed pavement markers/edge lines	<input type="checkbox"/>		

	materials)		
	Improvement Type	Check all that Apply	
		Comment	
<u>IMPROVE ROADWAY SEGMENT SAFETY (cont.)</u>	i. Sign inventory/management systems to include prioritization and construction of signs	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	j. Upgrade regulatory, warning and guide signs (including compliance with new reflectivity requirements)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	k. Roadside and median cable barrier	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	l. Establish or upgrade mileposts and milepost system	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	m. Shoulder widening	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	n. High Friction course applications through horizontal curves	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	o. Fixed object removal (trees, power pole relocation, light poles, culvert extension, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<u>IMPROVE SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SAFETY</u>	a. Converting from 8-inch incandescent to 12-inch LED signal heads	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	b. Upgrade street name signing with larger font	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	c. Installation of new Advance street name signing	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	d. On-pavement horizontal signing (arrows or words)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	e. Add back-plate sheeting to signal heads (1" to 3" yellow strip) for increased night visibility	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<u>IMPROVE UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SAFETY</u>	a. Upgrade STOP signs – larger and/or retroreflective upgrade	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	b. Advance stop ahead pavement markings	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	c. Install new streetlighting at intersections	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<u>IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE SAFETY</u>	a. Pedestrian crosswalk countdown signals	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	b. Upgrade pedestrian crosswalk pavement markings	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	c. Enhanced school crossing signals, signing and/or pavement markings	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	d. In-street pedestrian crossing signs are regulatory signs placed in the street (on edge lines, centerlines, or in medians)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	e. Provide mid-block crosswalk advance stop bars	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	f. Install streetlighting at crossing locations	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	g. Provide pedestrian crossing refuge areas at existing crossings	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Is this an approved Arizona "Systematic" Project from the list above?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	QUESTION	YES	NO	Comment
Study/Preliminary Engineering	Study and/or Preliminary Engineering (PE) being requested?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Must be supported with crash data, potential countermeasures and address the 4 E's. Construction or countermeasure implementation must result.
	If yes, is Study/PE planned in separate ADOT FY? What FY?	<input type="checkbox"/> FY	<input type="checkbox"/>	Anticipated construction/ countermeasure placeholder should be established. Projects must be planned in separate ADOT FY.
Right of Way and/or Utility Coordination	Is there a need for new Right of Way or Utility Coordination?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is reimbursable but must be identified early in the HSIP Process.
	If yes, Right of Way Acquisition and Utility Coordination planned in separate ADOT FY? What FY?	<input type="checkbox"/> FY	<input type="checkbox"/>	If no, this project is disqualified. Projects must be planned in separate ADOT FY for Study/PE Work, Right of Way/Utility Coordination, Procurement of Equipment and/or Construction.
Procurement/Construction	Is Procurement/Construction being requested?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is reimbursable but must be identified early in the HSIP Process.
	If yes, is Procurement/Construction planned in separate ADOT FY? What FY?	<input type="checkbox"/> FY	<input type="checkbox"/>	If no, this project is disqualified. Projects must be planned in separate ADOT FY for Study/PE Work, Right of Way/Utility Coordination, Procurement of Equipment and/or Construction.
HSIP Funding	Does the project qualify for 100% Safety Funds?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Projects that <i>may</i> qualify for 100% HSIP Funds are: Roundabouts, Signals, Pavement Markings, Signs, Lighting and Guardrail.
	If the project does not qualify for 100% Safety Funding is the match box 94.3%/5.7% checked?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The LPA match is due at the time the JPA is executed.
Administration	Project Administration – By the LPA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, Project Administration by the LPA requires approval from ADOT/FHWA and needs to be identified at the time of HSIP request. Proper Self Administration Agreement form to be submitted with Application.
	LPA – Self Administration Agreement Attached?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required. If no, LPA will be denied Self-Administration. The LPA must have their process reviewed by ADOT ECS and or ADOT Procurement prior to being eligible to Self-Administer.
	Project Administration – By ADOT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ADOT will administer the entire project from PE through Procurement/Construction.

	QUESTION	YES	NO	Comment
Proposed Safety Project - Describe your safety improvement project in detail: (50 words or less)	Did the LPA provide an explanation of why this location was chosen for safety improvement by identifying current or potential safety problems or concerns and proposed cost-effective safety countermeasures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required. If no, then the project will be disqualified.
	Did the LPA provide a good description of the location of the proposed safety project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required. Route Number (or a street name); (Termini 1) to (Termini 2) in (Place Name/name of City, if applicable). If not, use milepost markers. Various Locations in the City of Chandler. A list of locations is required.
	Did the LPA provide how the proposed safety project was identified?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required. If no, then the project will be disqualified.
SHSP	Is the proposed project consistent with the State's SHSP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Does the proposed project support a SHSP emphasis area or strategy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The cover letter should state which area or strategy the countermeasure supports.
Safety Justification	Did the LPA provide the safety justification for each proposed safety improvement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required. If no, then the project will be disqualified.
Clearances	Did the LPA indicate if there will be any ground disturbing activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Systematic improvements typically do not involve or require lengthy or complicated environmental review. Many would qualify for Group 1 or Condensed Group 2 Categorical Exclusions. These improvements do not normally involve additional right-of-way and most do not involve utility coordination or adjustments. If they require any of these items then additional time to develop the project should be allowed.
	Is project within applicants ROW?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Will there be any utility coordination and/or relocation needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Studies, RSA's or Other Evaluations	Did the LPA provide a copy of any studies that were done as supporting justification for the Safety Project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required. If no, then the project will be disqualified. An RSA does not guarantee HSIP Funding.
Cover Letter	Has the LPA completed a cover letter, printed on LPA letterhead, signed and attached with application?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required. If no, then the project will be disqualified.
Cost Estimate	Did the LPA complete the cost estimate and is it attached with the application?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required. If no, then the project will be disqualified.
	Does the cost estimate include cost to do ADOT Administrative costs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required. PE includes all cost necessary for Study, Environmental, Right of Way and Utility clearance, Material Memo, Survey Work, Design, final PS&E package and ADOT Staff.
	Does the cost estimate include ROW, Utility Coordination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required. Typically

Cost Estimate	Does the cost estimate include Procurement/Construction cost?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required. Include mobilization, Traffic Control and any CCP Involvement?
	Does the cost estimate include the 20% for construction administration and contingencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required.
	QUESTION	YES	NO	Comment
	Does the cost estimate include other items such as traffic control, CCP involvement, etc?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Has it been identified who is installing the equipment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required.
	Is the LPA requesting reimbursement for installation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, installation must be done by a contractor. LPA's can not install own equipment and be reimbursed.
Proprietary Items (23CFR 635.411)	Is the LPA requesting any "proprietary items"?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If yes, requires ADOT/FHWA approval for a "Cost Effectiveness"/"Finding in the Public Interest".
	If yes, is a "Cost Effectiveness"/"Finding in the Public Interest" attached?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required.
Vicinity Map	Is a map/list of location of the project attached?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required. If no, then the project will be disqualified.
	Did the LPA identify how the proposed locations will be prioritized for replacement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is required. If no, then the project will be disqualified.

TAC Recommendations:

1.) Meet all the required HSIP Eligibility Requirements for a "Systematic Improvement Project"?

YES

NO

Comments: _____