



Local Road Safety Peer Exchange – Region 9

An RSPCB Peer Exchange

Introduction and Background

This report provides a summary of the proceedings of the Region 9 Local Road Safety Peer Exchange held in Sacramento, California on September 17 and 18, 2013. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Office of Safety (HSA) sponsored the peer exchange in coordination with Region 9 of the National Local Technical Assistance Program Association (NLTA). The goal of the peer exchange was to facilitate the exchange of information on local road safety and explore opportunities for greater coordination and communication between FHWA, State Departments of Transportation (DOTs), Local/Tribal Technical Assistance Program (LTAP/TTAP) Centers, and local officials/practitioners within the States. The Peer Exchange covered the following key topics:

- Improving local road safety data collection and analysis;
- Encouraging local involvement in the development and implementation of Strategic Highway Safety Plans (SHSPs);
- Increasing local agency participation in the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP);
- Addressing new requirements under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21); and
- Improving interagency collaboration.

Region 9 States in attendance included: Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Nevada, Utah, and Washington. Representatives from the following local agencies participated in this event: the City of Sacramento, CA; Nevada County, CA; Placer County, CA; Trinity County, CA; the Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Logan, UT; Gila River Community, Sacaton, AZ; and Thurston County, WA (see Appendix A for a complete list of participants).

Peer Exchange Proceedings

The format of the Peer Exchange consisted of a series of presentations and roundtable and breakout group discussions (see Appendix B for the full agenda). Participants from each State were charged with developing action plans at the end of the workshop to address the key topics noted above in their respective States. The action plans identify strategies to address each issue, as well as resources and champions to advance those objectives.

A brief description of the peer exchange proceedings is provided below.

ABOUT THE PEER EXCHANGE

FHWA's RSPCB Technical Assistance Program supports and sponsors peer exchanges and workshops hosted by agencies.

Date

September 17 and 18, 2013

Host

California Local Technical Assistance Program

California Department of Transportation

Participants

Alaska

Arizona

California

Idaho

Nevada

Utah

Washington

FHWA Office of Safety

FHWA Resource Center

U.S. DOT Volpe Center

FHWA Technology Partnership Program

FHWA Office of Safety sponsors P2P events.

[Learn more.](#)





Welcoming Remarks

The FHWA California Division Director for National Programs and the Caltrans Office Chief for Local Assistance Bridge and Safety Programs welcomed participants to the peer exchange. The presenters discussed the challenges and opportunities that the implementation of MAP-21 presents to local road safety. The presenters also provided an overview of local road safety issues in California and stressed the value of collaboration and the free exchange of ideas.

The FHWA Office of Safety Local and Rural Road Safety (LRRS) Program Manager provided an overview of the workshop event and asked participants to introduce themselves and share their expectations. Expectations included the following:

- To gain insights on innovative ideas for improving roadway safety;
- To learn how others have involved local agencies in SHSPs;
- To gain information on creating focused action plans that prioritize local road safety;
- To brainstorm strategies for incorporating tribal communities in local road safety;
- To learn about other States' HSIP programs;
- To meet other practitioners from the field of roadway safety;
- To discover noteworthy practices to bring back to the States;
- To discuss differing rural and urban perspectives on safety;
- To share and to benefit from the perspective of local agencies;
- To brainstorm creative ways to fund local improvements;
- To acquire information that supports the development of stronger local safety projects;
- To discuss the roles and responsibilities of State and local agencies; and
- To promote local participation in State safety programs.

Highway Safety Improvement Program Overview

The FHWA Office of Safety HSIP Program Manager gave an overview of HSIP to inform the conversation of the event. She also reviewed changes to the program under MAP-21.

HSIP is a core Federal-aid program with the purpose of reducing fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. HSIP is Federally-funded and State-administered. The program underwent many changes as a result of MAP-21. MAP-21 increased HSIP funding, ended the High Risk Rural Roads Program set-aside, eliminated the requirement for States to submit a transparency report, and increased eligibility for non-infrastructure safety projects. MAP-21 also introduced a regular SHSP update cycle.

Federal requirements and support for SHSPs fall under HSIP, as does the Railway-Highway Crossing Program. SHSPs are data-driven, Statewide, comprehensive transportation safety plans that identify safety emphasis areas and strategies to facilitate coordination among State safety stakeholders. The SHSP is intended to guide HSIP investment decisions. This approach results in a systematic and repeatable process, defensible decisions, and, ultimately, the prevention of traffic fatalities and serious injury crashes. Increasing and sustaining local involvement in HSIP and SHSP processes is a major challenge and a key focus of the peer exchange.

Local Technical Assistance Program Safety Data Program Performance

The Program Manager for LTAP/TTAP at the FHWA Technology Partnership Program presented an overview of the activities and accomplishments of LTAP/TTAP Centers across the country. There is an LTAP Center in every State and Puerto Rico and there are seven TTAP Centers. Most LTAPs are housed within universities or State DOTs. The flexibility of LTAP/TTAP allows Centers to partner with State DOTs to address the needs of local agencies through training, technical assistance, technology transfer, and communications and marketing.

NLTAPA represents the 58 LTAP and TTAP Centers in the United States. The Federal Highway Administration and NLTAPA have instituted the Joint Safety Program to support the integration of roadway safety into LTAP/TTAP. An overview of the LTAP/TTAP roadway safety accomplishments report for 2012 identified ongoing successes and areas of opportunity for LTAP/TTAP Centers to improve roadway safety through the training, technical assistance, communications, and other services that they provide. Common



training and education activities at LTAP/TTAP Centers include: offering relevant National Highway Institute (NHI) and Resource Center trainings, identifying gaps in road safety training available, and delivering original courses to address specific needs. Although every LTAP /TTAP Center operates differently a number of Centers provide local agencies access to safety data, assist local agencies in solving local safety problems, and coordinate among local agencies and connect them to State DOTs.

Developing Safety Plans: A Manual for Local and Rural Road Owners

A representative from the FHWA Resource Center explained the benefits of Local Road Safety Plans (LRSPs) as part of the local road safety planning process and discussed the steps in the development of an LRSP.

LRSPs are locally-coordinated safety plans that provide a comprehensive, flexible framework that draws upon the 4Es of safety: engineering, enforcement, education, and emergency medical services. LRSPs may result in increased funding for safety improvements in locations where such funding has not traditionally been available, as they help local agencies identify potential safety projects and funding sources for those projects. LRSPs also raise the safety awareness of local officials and may help to establish productive partnerships among local, regional and State officials. The success of an LRSP often depends upon the presence of a local champion, the clarity of the plan's mission, collaboration between partners, and open lines of communication.

Steps in the development of an LRSP include the following:

- Establishing leadership roles;
- Developing vision, mission, and achievable goals;
- Collecting and analyzing safety data;
- Selecting emphasis areas that target issues of local importance;
- Identifying strategies;
- Prioritizing strategies;
- Implementing projects; and
- Evaluating and updating the LRSP.

The FHWA Office of Safety document "[Developing Safety Plans: A Manual for Local Rural Road Owners](#)" provides more detailed information on the development of LRSPs.

State Summary Presentations

Representatives from each State offered a brief overview of local safety efforts in their State, emphasizing challenges and best practices associated with safety data, management of the HSIP, and local involvement in the SHSP. The presentations were followed by a roundtable discussion of noteworthy practices mentioned in the presentations. Examples of noteworthy practices highlighted by participants included the following:

- **Alaska DOT and Public Facilities (ADOT&PF)** has strong local participation in the development and implementation of their SHSP, including thirteen government entities and over one hundred local agencies and tribal communities. However, many remote communities are not able to be involved in any portion of the SHSP process. To address this problem, Alaska has set up meetings in different areas of the State, which allows more participants to be involved in SHSP development and gives others in the State an opportunity to be heard.
- **Arizona DOT (AZDOT)** administers HSIP funding for State and local roads through the AZDOT Traffic Safety Section (TSS). The agency reserves 20 percent of its HSIP funds for safety projects on local roads, but allows local agencies to apply for the remaining 80 percent of HSIP funds through the TSS. Applications for the 20 percent of HSIP funds allocated for local agencies must be submitted through local MPOs or councils of government (COGs). AZDOT also encourages MPOs and COGs to apply for State HSIP funds for projects.
- **California Division of Local Assistance (Caltrans DLA)** provides technical assistance and training to local agencies and communities that may not have the resources to employ private consultants. Along with the California LTAP and other partners, Caltrans DLA has fostered the development of a traffic safety focus area of training and local outreach and is currently identifying one point of contact for training at each local agency.



- **Idaho Transportation Department (ITD)** generates an annual report for all crashes in the State. Additionally, Idaho's Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) receives data from ITD and distributes crash data to local highway jurisdictions. LHTAC helps local agencies administer their projects. LHTAC reaches out to communities and walks them through the process of receiving funding for safety projects.
- **Nevada DOT (NDOT)** takes an innovative approach to reaching local communities by holding biennial outreach events known as "Road Shows" and "Safety Summits." During "Road Shows," NDOT staff travel from community to community to raise interest among local agencies and solicit their input on the State's safety programs. "Road Shows" alternate annually with Nevada's Safety Summit, which is a Statewide meeting held in a centralized location. "Road Shows" help generate local interest and involvement in SHSP development and implementation.
- **Utah DOT (UDOT)** promotes local involvement during SHSP development through the LTAP and County Health Departments. As the manager of Utah's HSIP program, UDOT is currently developing a project request process for MPOs and rural counties to solicit more applications for funding from local and rural areas.
- **Washington State DOT (WSDOT)** is working to resolve crash data inconsistencies on local roads by collecting latitude and longitude coordinate data, which eliminates data challenges caused by non-standard naming conventions. WSDOT manages all data collection and reporting for the State.

Strategy Highway Safety Plans Noteworthy Practices

Participants heard from three select peers regarding strategies for including local agencies in the development of SHSPs. These presentations were followed by a break-out group discussion highlighting the challenges of encouraging local involvement and identifying possible strategies to engage locals in the development of SHSPs.

Washington Noteworthy Practices

As a Target Zero State, Washington has set a goal of zero fatalities and serious injury crashes Statewide by 2030. Washington State is currently on their fourth version of the SHSP. Their update process includes local involvement in the following ways:

- The Steering Committee, which is WSDOT's main decisionmaking body in their SHSP update process, takes in feedback from local partners through a bottom-up approach. As such, the Steering Committee hears local concerns and input during the first step of the update process.
- Different geographic areas of Washington prioritize the SHSP emphasis areas according to their local needs. For example, in Walla Walla County, commercial motor vehicles are a Priority One emphasis area, even though they constitute a Priority Three emphasis in the SHSP.
- WSDOT involves tribal communities at the Steering Committee and Project Team levels. WSDOT uses data analysis to highlight fatality rates by "people-group," which demonstrates fatality rates across demographic groups and helps identify concerns specific to tribal communities.

Idaho Noteworthy Practices

ITD is currently on the third update of its SHSP. The agency selects emphasis areas based on the economic cost of crashes, the breakdown for which is included in their SHSP. ITD's SHSP update process includes local involvement in the following ways:

- In the selection of their strategies, ITD's focus has been on facilitating a Statewide culture change, developing an awareness of roadway safety, and fostering the healthy growth of an active safety culture.
- Idaho's SHSP planning process includes peer exchanges, meetings, and collaboration with other States. The planning process begins with research, which is followed by organizational planning. During the final step, stakeholder outreach, ITD identifies and recruits champions, facilitators, and working group leaders, and shares relevant materials and handouts with local partners.
- Idaho's Highway Safety Coalition includes local and regional partners that present information to the community on highway safety.



Gila River Indian Community Noteworthy Practices

The Gila River Indian Community is located south of the Phoenix Metropolitan Area. The Gila River Indian Community Department of Transportation (GRICDOT) includes multiple departments, including Planning, Construction and Engineering, and Road Maintenance. Gila River is currently developing the first Tribal Safety Plan in Arizona. GRICDOT's SHSP process involves the following actions:

- GRICDOT is acting as the project champion and has sought to incorporate additional local partners.
- Gila River held a workshop to develop the plan and defined emphasis areas, including Speed Management, Law and Policy Improvements, and Data Management. A second workshop is being planned.
- All major decisions related to the plan must be approved by GRIC's leadership through the Tribe's official approval process. This process is necessary for tribal endorsement and acceptance of the safety plan.

Break-out Group Discussion

Table 1 summarizes the result of facilitated discussions on the challenges of getting local involvement in the SHSP, whether the SHSP is tailored for local involvement, and possible strategies to get local agencies involved in the SHSP and maintain their interest.

Table 1. Local Involvement in the SHSP: Challenges and Strategies

Challenges	Strategies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many local agencies fail to see the value of the SHSP or are not aware that it exists. • Local agencies may not understand the SHSP process and how it fits into safety expenditures. • The location of meetings requires travel for many stakeholders, which hinders local participation. • There is a perception that participation in the SHSP is not appropriate for local agencies. • Participation in the SHSP is not a top priority for local agencies. • Local agencies lack the staff time or other resources necessary to be involved in the SHSP. • Emphasis areas and Statewide trends may not collectively apply to rural and urban areas. • Local agencies struggle to collect, coordinate, and analyze data on local roads. • Tribal safety issues may go unreported. • It is challenging to maintain local commitment in the long term. • The available tools do not correspond to the challenges faced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate that the initiatives and outputs of the SHSP directly affect the daily business of local agencies. • Identify local safety champions to foster excitement for and participation in the SHSP process. • Use regional meetings or videoconferencing technology to lessen travel barriers; fund travel for local agency participation • Have State DOT visit local government units. • Hold a rotating safety summit across the State, or organize county-level safety summits. • Demonstrate the value of data for local road safety improvements to those responsible for its collection. • Develop a systematic approach to addressing anecdotal data • Form coalitions with representation from MPOs, LTAP/TTAP Centers, county commissioners, etc. • Use the LTAP Center as a local coordinator to facilitate change. • Organize an annual executive leadership meeting—with Federal, State, and local leadership—to keep stakeholders on the same page. • Promote the SHSP through organizations such as the American Public Works Association or the National Association of Regional Councils.

Transportation Safety Performance Measures

The FHWA Office of Safety HSIP Program Manager gave an overview of transportation safety performance measures under MAP-21. MAP-21 requirements establish safety as one of seven performance goals. MAP-21 will require States and MPOs to:

- Set safety targets;
- Submit a report describing progress toward safety targets; and



- Develop a safety implementation plan if significant progress toward safety targets is not made.

One key issue related to safety performance management is defining performance in terms of serious injuries by rate and number. As a performance measure, the term “serious injuries” presents a challenge due to the lack of a consistent definition, the lack of consistent coding conventions, and inconsistent data collection based on the determinations of law enforcement officials.

The notice of proposed rulemaking for Transportation Safety Performance Measures under MAP-21 is expected in Spring 2014. An effective date of all performance management rulemaking has tentatively been set for Spring 2015.

Although the final performance management rule is not yet in place, quantifiable data is already helping States measure safety impacts and set usable performance measures; 47 States currently incorporate quantitative safety goals in their SHSP.

Highway Safety Improvement Program Noteworthy Practices

Participants heard from three select peers regarding strategies to improve highway safety through HSIP.

Caltrans Noteworthy Practices

California’s local rollout of HSIP under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) funded a number of projects that were not fully ready for implementation. In recent years, Caltrans DLA has shifted to a more data-driven program that uses existing Statewide crash data. California’s HSIP process now recognizes a variety of safety needs and effectively compares widely-varying projects: urban and rural projects, systemic and spot location projects, and motorized and non-motorized projects. Caltrans DLA was able to make this transition through the following measures:

- Adopted the Highway Safety Manual (HSM) and simplified its statistical analysis in order to apply its methodology more readily. This HSM methodology eliminated the mistakes and deliberate errors that were common prior to HSIP benefit/cost ratios.
- Applied proven countermeasures and crash modification factors (CMFs) from FHWA “2008 Desktop Reference” to all project types, including systemic projects.
- Developed a Local Roadway Safety Manual (LRSM), which is a customized version of the HSM for California. The LRSM provides and explains countermeasures, CMFs, and basic cost info. It helps urban and rural communities select the best countermeasures and apply for HSIP funding. The LRSM also allows Caltrans DLA to make apples-to-apples comparisons among proposed safety projects.
- As a result of the LRSM and the University of California’s Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIM) web-tool, California has seen increased accuracy of average HSIP benefit/cost ratios, increased HSIP funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects, and increased HSIP funding for projects that may have been overlooked in previous years.

Alaska Noteworthy Practices

As a sparsely-populated State without a contiguous Statewide roadway network, Alaska does not have traditional local roads initiatives. The State’s extreme geography and abundant wildlife present several challenges to local road safety. In the State’s remote communities, many trips are made by all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) and snowmobiles, which present crash reporting issues. In administering Alaska’s HSIP program, ADOT & PF has adopted the following strategies:

- Alaska has implemented the Tunnel Vision program for its HSIP program. Tunnel Vision focuses on lives saved and major injuries eliminated per dollar spent. Although this program does not limit local road project funding, only six percent of HSIP funds were obligated to local roads in 2013.
- Alaska encourages the use of systemic treatments to address problems before they happen. Although Alaska is attempting to improve data and address trends as they become known, many fatal crashes in the State go unreported and the State’s low population density makes trend identification difficult.

Under the HSIP program, Alaska’s LTAP and TTAP Centers plan to facilitate the creation of safety plans for tribal governments, develop web-based training tools, and host “rural modes” safety summits.



Thurston County, WA Noteworthy Practices

Thurston County's HSIP-funded projects have increased greatly in recent years. In 2005, Thurston County was awarded \$500,000 in HSIP funding, with a focus on updating existing infrastructure. In 2009, \$550,000 was awarded. In 2010 and 2013, \$2.4 million was allocated to Thurston County. Many of the improvements were made based on a pilot study that reviewed projects through a prioritized process using the new Systemic Safety Project Selection Tool. These improvement projects included guardrail and delineation, rumble strips, curve sign warning, and extension lines at curves. As a result of this shift toward data-driven improvement projects, Thurston County has experienced a 31 percent total crash rate reduction and a 30 percent reduction in fatal crash rates since 2005.

Safety tools currently used by Thurston County Public Works in the HSIP application process include:

- The Statewide MOBILITY database, which imports crash data, traffic volumes, functional classification, and other roadway attributes that play an important role in crash analysis.
- Crash Rate Analysis, which incorporates a crash severity index and includes 5-year crash rates.
- The Systemic Safety Project Selection Tool, which provides a step-by-step process for conducting systemic safety planning, considerations for determining a balance between spot and systemic safety improvements, and analytical techniques for quantifying the benefits of a systemic safety program.

Table 2 summarizes the result of facilitated discussions on challenges to allocating HSIP funds to local agencies, strategies that address these challenges, and noteworthy practices for managing local projects.

Table 2. HSIP Project Selection and Implementation: Challenges and Noteworthy Practices

Challenges	Strategies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local and tribal resources to administer projects or conduct data analysis to identify safety needs are limited. • Local partners do not understand how HSIP decisions are made due to lack of transparency. • A lack of understanding of HSIP discourages local agencies from applying. • Tribal roads are often left out of HSIP projects and Tribes may be reluctant to work with State DOTs on safety. • Local agencies do not see the value of applying for HSIP funds. • Once an agency has been denied funds it perceives the application process as difficult. • There are too many local agencies to select all local applications for HSIP funds. • Local governments are at a disadvantage due to a lack of data on local roads. • Competing priorities (e.g., rural vs. urban; spot vs. systemic improvements) frustrate potential applicants. • Benefit/cost ratios are often biased toward urban areas due to the high population density. The perception of inequitable funding allocation discourages smaller counties from applying for funding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional training and technical assistance for local agencies (e.g., CMF workshops, rural-only HSIP webinars, advance notice of opportunities). • Establish a data-driven, procedural application and selection process to minimize the political nature of project selection. • Conduct quarterly meetings with MPOs, counties, and other jurisdictions to answer questions about funding availability and project timeframes. • Conduct a tribal safety summit to communicate the value of HSIP-funded projects. • Assign project managers from the State DOT to manage or shepherd local HSIP projects. • Elevate safety culture by developing a local focus guidance document and specifying minimum data requirements for HSIP applications. • Set aside funding for specific districts, counties, or groups of counties. • Take advantage of the Resource Center's safety training, which can be adjusted to suit local needs. • Provide data directly to local agencies or conduct data analysis on their behalf.



Opportunities for LTAP/TTAP Center and Local/Tribal Agency Involvement in the State Safety Program

After each group reported back from their respective break-out sessions, the facilitator led a roundtable discussion on opportunities for engaging the LTAP/TTAP Centers and local/tribal practitioners. Participants were encouraged to note ideas about how to involve LTAP/TTAP and local and tribal personnel in the State safety process. They identified the following practices for Centers and State DOTs to accomplish together:

- Clearly establish roles for all safety stakeholders in a State, including the FHWA Division Office. California, for example, has held meetings to discuss improvements to the State's LTAP program—these meetings have resulted in a summary of safety-related programs and have clarified the connection between Caltrans DLA, the LTAP program, and local public agencies;
- Coordinate opportunities for State DOTs to connect with local agencies;
- Align LTAP/TTAP and State DOT safety initiatives to avoid duplication of effort; and
- Work as partners to convey a consistent message to local public agencies about safety programs.

Recommended activities where LTAP/TTAP Centers should take the lead were identified, as follows:

- Serve as a clearinghouse for safety-related resources;
- Facilitate coordination between the DOT and local public agencies by engaging a DOT's local program coordinator;
- Inventory the LTAP/TTAP Center's resources and identify where LTAP/TTAP staff can make the most positive or meaningful contributions to local road safety;
- Communicate directly with the Division Office and DOTs to understand the State safety program;
- Act as the conduit for local safety agencies;
- Respond to direct calls from local public agencies for technical assistance;
- Put Tribes and local public agencies in touch with the right contacts for their specific issues;
- Transfer knowledge from the DOT to the locals agencies; and
- Communicate with other LTAP/TTAP Centers regionally to share strategies and knowledge.

Action Plan Highlights

At the end of the event, the State DOT, FHWA Division Office, and LTAP/TTAP representatives of each State met together to discuss actions and strategies for improving their local road safety programs. The resulting action plan also set goals and objectives and identified the resources and champions needed to move actions forward. Representatives from each State reported out to the group the results of their action planning sessions.

Key actions included:

- Increasing the number of HSIP-funded projects that address locally-owned roads;
- Sharing HSIP success stories with tribal communities;
- Setting aside HSIP funds for tribal safety;
- Providing training on HSIP funding applications and use of the SHSP;
- Assisting local agencies in creating quality HSIP applications, particularly agencies that have not received HSIP funding previously;
- Convening city and county advisory teams to participate in the HSIP program;
- Targeting assistance to local agencies with the most pressing safety issues and the fewest resources;
- Generating more local involvement in the SHSP update process;
- Establishing a local data emphasis area in the next SHSP update;
- Adding an LTAP/TTAP representative to the SHSP executive committee;



- Strengthening outreach to MPOs and local agencies through “Road Shows,” conferences, and other events;
- Reaching out to local agencies through LTAP/TTAP Centers and State DOT Districts;
- Creating a centralized website for local road safety as a clearinghouse for resources related to HSIP, SHSP, and training opportunities;
- Analyzing and evaluating data from a local perspective;
- Providing training for local agencies on data analysis techniques and the use of data tools; and
- Improving access to data for local agencies.

Feedback and Suggestions

In the evaluations, participants stated that they appreciated learning that they are not alone in facing local road safety challenges. They noted that it was valuable to learn about the flexibility in how HSIP is used in different States, as well as the variation in how safety programs are administered. The most valuable aspects of the event included the opportunity to learn from peer presentations, network with peers, discuss issues in breakout sessions, and develop Action Plans to coordinate actions for improving local road safety. Suggestions for improvements to the event included adding more discussion on project implementation and tribal involvement in SHSP and HSIP. Participants consistently noted their interest in following up with the Action Plans. One attendee wrote, “Will there be follow-up on Action Plans? If we want this Peer Exchange to be beneficial, there should be!”



Appendix A: Event Registrants

FHWA/Volpe	
Craig Allred Transportation Specialist FHWA Resource Center Business Phone: 720-963-3236 Business Email: craig.allred@dot.gov	Karen Scurry Transportation Specialist FHWA Office of Safety Business Phone: 609-637-4207 Business Email: karen.scurry@dot.gov
Rosemarie Anderson Transportation Specialist FHWA Office of Safety Business Phone: 202-366-5007 Business Email: rosemarie.anderson@dot.gov	Greg Schertz Safety Discipline Champion FHWA Office of Federal Lands Highway Business Phone: 720-963-3764 Business Email: greg.schertz@dot.gov
Andrew Berthaume Community Planner U.S. DOT Volpe Center Business Phone: 617-494-3159 Business Email: andrew.berthaume@dot.gov	Susan Smichenko Community Planner U.S. DOT Volpe Center Business Phone: 617-494-3438 Business Email: susan.smichenko@dot.gov
Cameron Ishaq Management Consultant Fasterhorse LLC Business Phone: 301-661-9110 Business Email: cameron.ishaq@fasterhorse.com	Jeffrey Zaharewicz LTAP/TTAP Program Manager FHWA Office of Technical Services Business Phone: 703-235-0991 Business Email: jeffrey.zaharewicz@dot.gov
Adam Larsen Federal Lands Highway TPP Tribal Coordinator Business Phone: 360-619-7751 Business Email: adam.larsen@dot.gov	
Alaska	
Al Fletcher Field Operations Engineer/Safety Team Leader FHWA Alaska Division Office Business Phone: 907-586-7245 Business Email: al.fletcher@dot.gov	Matt Walker Asst. State Traffic & Safety Engineer Alaska DOT & Public Facilities Business Phone: 907-465-6963 Business Email: matthew.walker@alaska.gov
Arizona	
Mona Aglan-Swick HSIP State Manager Arizona Department of Transportation Business Phone: 602-712-7374 Business Email: maglan-swick@azdot.gov	Rebecca Mayher AZLTAP/ITD Tech Program Manager AZ LTAP/Arizona Department of Transportation Business Phone: 602-687-2940 Business Email: rmayher@azdot.gov
Kelly LaRosa Transportation Safety Specialist FHWA Arizona Division Office Business Phone: 602-382-8991 Business Email: kelly.larosa@dot.gov	Patrick Stone Local Public Agency Program Manager Arizona Department of Transportation Business Phone: 602-712-4428 Business Email: pstone@azdot.gov



California	
Hector Barron City Traffic Engineer City of Sacramento, Department of Public Works Business Phone: 916-808-2669 Business Email: hbarron@cityofsacramento.org	Stephanie Holloway Associate Civil Engineer/Traffic Safety Placer County Department of Public Works - Transportation Business Phone: 530-745-7551 Business Email: shollow@placer.ca.gov
Jesse Bhullar Chief, Bridge and Safety Programs Caltrans Business Phone: 916-653-4231 Business Email: jesse_bhullar@dot.ca.gov	Richard Ke Safety Program Coordinator Caltrans Business Phone: 916-653-4727 Business Email: richard.ke@dot.ca.gov
Steven Castleberry Public Works Director Nevada County Public Works Business Phone: 530-265-1718 Business Email: steven.castleberry@co.nevada.ca.us	Lori Kempley HQ - Asst. Training Coordinator - Local Assistance Caltrans - Local Assistance Business Phone: 916-651-6548 Business Email: lori_kempley@dot.ca.gov
Ted Davini Local Safety Program Manager Caltrans Business Phone: 916-651-8256 Business Email: ted.davini@dot.ca.gov	Ken Kochevar Safety Program Manager FHWA - California Division Office Business Phone: 916-498-5853 Business Email: ken.kochevar@dot.gov
Chris Engelmann Transportation Engineer Caltrans Business Phone: 805-542-4690 Business Email: chris.engelmann@dot.ca.gov	Kevan Shafizadeh Technical Director California LTAP Business Phone: 916-278-5348 Business Email: shafizadeh@csus.edu
Michelle Gianini Project Director California LTAP- California State University, Sacramento Business Phone: 916-278-6174 Business Email: gianinim@csus.edu	Rick Tippett Director of Transportation Trinity County Business Phone: 530-623-1365 Business Email: rtippett@trinitycounty.org
Gabe Hernandez Program Manager Sacramento State/CA LTAP Business Phone: 916-278-4805 Business Email: ghernandez@csus.edu	Arianna Valle Safety Engineer FHWA - California Division Office Business Phone: 916-498-5992 Business Email: arianna.valle@dot.gov
Idaho	
Kelly Campbell Research Analyst, Principal Idaho Transportation Dept./Office of Highway Safety Business Phone: 208-334-8105 Business Email: kelly.campbell@itd.idaho.gov	Laila Kral T2 Manager Idaho Technology Transfer Center/LHTAC Business Phone: 208-344-0565 Business Email: lkral@lhtac.org
Bruce Drewes Idaho Technology Transfer Center/LHTAC Business Phone: 208-344-0565 Business Email: bdrewes@lhtac.org	
Nevada	
Juan Balbuena Safety/Local Public Agency Program Engineer FHWA Nevada Division Office Business Phone: 775-687-8582 Business Email: juan.balbuena@dot.gov	Ken Mammen Acting Chief Safety Engineer Nevada Department of Transportation Business Phone: 778-888-7459 Business Email: kmammen@dot.state.nv.us



Jim Nichols, P.E. Program Director Truckee Meadows Community College Business Phone: 775-829.9022 Business Email: jnichols@tmcc.edu	Leah Sirmin Planning & Research Program Manager FHWA Nevada Division Office Business Phone: 775-687-8580 Business Email: leah.sirmin@dot.gov
Utah	
Nicholas Jones Director Utah LTAP Business Phone: 435-770-6873 Business Email: nick.jones@usu.edu	Jeff Gilbert Transportation Planner Cache MPO - Logan, UT Business Phone: 435-755-7634 Business Email: jeff.gilbert@cachecounty.org
Washington	
Don Petersen Safety & Geometric Design Engineer FHWA Washington Division Office Business Phone: 360-534-9323 Business Email: don.petersen@dot.gov	Matthew Enders Technical Services Manager WSDOT Business Phone: 360-705-6907 Business Email: matthew.enders@wsdot.wa.gov
Scott Davis, P.E. Traffic Engineering & Operations Manager Thurston County Public Works Business Phone: 360-867-2345 Business Email: davissa@co.thurston.wa.us	
Tribal Representatives	
Byron Bluehorse Program Manager Alaska TTAP Fairbanks, Alaska Business Phone: 907-474-1580 Business Email: bdbluehorse@alaska.edu	Sasha Saliego Transportation Planner Gila River Indian Community Sacaton, Arizona Business Phone: 520-562-6306 Business Email: sasha.pachito@gmail.com



Appendix B: Event Agenda

REGION 9 - LOCAL ROAD SAFETY PEER EXCHANGE AGENDA Sacramento, CA September 17 and 18, 2013

DAY 1

8:00 – 8:30 AM	Welcoming Remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Maiser Khaled, Director for National Programs, FHWA CA Division</i>• <i>Jesse Bhullar, CalTrans</i> Workshop Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Rosemarie Anderson, FHWA Office of Safety</i>
8:30 – 9:00 AM	Participant Introductions
9:00 – 10:00 AM	Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Highway Safety Improvement Program Overview <i>Karen Scurry, FHWA Office of Safety</i>• FHWA LTAP/TTAP Safety Data Program Performance <i>Jeffrey Zaharewicz, LTAP/TTAP Program Manager, TPP, FHWA</i>• County Road Safety Plans <i>Craig Allred, FHWA Safety & Design Technical Services Team</i>
10:00 – 10:15 AM	BREAK
10:15 – 12:00 PM	State Presentations —Brief presentation by each State on local safety efforts in data, SHSP, and HSIP— Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Nevada, Utah, Washington
12:00 – 1:00 PM	LUNCH
1:00 – 1:45 PM	Facilitated Roundtable Discussion Noteworthy practices from the State presentations
1:45 – 2:45 PM	Presentations - Strategic Highway Safety Plans —LTAP/TTAP and Local/Tribal Agency involvement in the State SHSP process—Development, Implementation & Marketing <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Matthew Enders, Washington DOT• Kelly Campbell, Idaho DOT and Laila Kral, Idaho Technology Transfer Center• Sasha Pachito, Gila River Indian Community Department of Transportation
2:45 – 3:00 PM	BREAK
3:00 – 4:00 PM	Breakout Groups - SHSP and Local Involvement Challenges <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Challenges getting local involvement• Is the SHSP tailored for local involvement?• Strategies to get locals involved and maintain their interest
4:00 – 4:30 PM	Report Back
4:30 – 5:00 PM	Wrap Up



DAY 2

8:00 – 8:30 AM

Recap of DAY 1

8:30 – 9:15 AM

Facilitated Roundtable Discussion - Safety Performance Measures

- Overview Presentation
 - FHWA MAP-21 Performance Measures
Karen Scurry, FHWA Office of Safety
- Open Discussion
 - Data requirements
 - How will local agencies support State performance targets?

9:15 – 10:15 AM

Presentations—Highway Safety Improvement Program—Administration, Project Selection, Collaboration, Allocation of Funds to Locals/Tribes

- *Ted Davini, Caltrans*
- *Matt Walker, Alaska DOT*
- *Scott Davis, Thurston County, WA*

10:15 – 10:30 AM

BREAK

10:30 – 11:30 AM

Breakout Groups - Highway Safety Improvement Program Project Selection and Implementation

- Challenges to Allocating Funds to Locals
- Strategies Addressing Identified Challenges
- Managing Local Projects
- Identify Each Agency's Role

11:30 – 12:00 PM

Report Back

12:00 – 1:00 PM

LUNCH

1:00 – 1:45 PM

Facilitated Roundtable Discussion

- Lead-in presentation
 - Future CA LTAP Safety Efforts, Steven Castleberry, Nevada County, CA
- Open Discussion
 - Opportunities for LTAP/TTAP Centers and Local/Tribal Agency Involvement in the State Safety Program

1:45 – 3:00 PM

Action Planning - Breakout Groups by State

Each State will develop an Action Plan based on Lessons Learned

3:00 – 3:45 PM

Report Back

3:45 – 4:00 PM

Wrap Up (Next Steps), Adjourn