

Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: March 24 – 25, 2021

From: MITCH WEISS, Executive Director

Reference Number: 4.4, Action Item

Prepared By: Timothy Sobelman
Chief Engineer

Published Date: March 19, 2021

Subject: Comments on the Draft 2021 State Highway System Management Plan

Recommendation:

Commission Transportation Commission (Commission) staff recommend the Commission approve and transmit the comments set forth in Attachment A on the Final 2021 State Highway System Management Plan to Caltrans.

Issue:

Caltrans is required to update the State Highway System Management Plan every two years pursuant to Section 164.6 of the Streets and Highway Code and submit the draft State Highway System Management Plan to the Commission for review and comment no later than February 15 of each odd-numbered year. Caltrans must also make the plan available to regional transportation agencies for review and comment and shall include and respond to comments from the Commission and these agencies in the final plan.

The Commission has received the draft 2021 State Highways System Management Plan and is submitting comments for consideration as set forth in Attachment A.

Background:

The State Highway System Management Plan is an integrated management plan that fulfills requirements contained in California Streets and Highways Code Section 164.6 for the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) ten-year plan and the five-year maintenance plan. The State Highway System Management Plan integrates maintenance, rehabilitation, and operation into a single management plan. The State Highway System Management Plan utilizes national performance measures for pavement and bridges, presents performance targets approved under provisions of Senate Bill 486 (DeSaulnier, Chapter 917, Statutes of 2014), includes asset classes and their performance targets as adopted by the Commission, and implements ongoing asset management improvements into a single plan.

The plan is required to include specific quantifiable accomplishments, goals, objectives, costs and performance measures consistent with the asset management plan required by Section 14526.4 of the Government Code. Caltrans is required to prepare an update to this plan every two years.

The State Highway System Management Plan includes both a needs assessment and an investment plan that will guide the management of the State Highway System. The needs assessment presents the total needs assessment of the existing State Highway System from a performance management analysis that estimates the costs necessary to close all condition and performance gaps on the State Highway System. The needs assessment is not constrained by current funding levels for the management of the State Highway System. The investment plan defines how available funding with budget constraints is recommended to be allocated and prioritizes where available resources should be focused.

Assembly Bill 515 (Frazier, Chapter 314, Statutes of 2017) revised Section 164.6 of the Streets and Highway Code and requires Caltrans to prepare a State Highway System Management Plan that includes a ten-year plan for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of all state highways and bridges owned by the state. Pursuant to Streets and Highways Code 164.6(a)(2), the State Highway System Management Plan must include a five-year maintenance plan that addresses the maintenance needs of the State Highway System, limited to maintenance activities that if not performed, could result in increased SHOPP costs in the future. The maintenance plan is required to identify any existing backlog in those activities and recommend a strategy, specific activities, and an associated funding level to reduce or prevent any backlog during the five-year period of the plan. The maintenance plan shall be updated every two years.

The integration of the investments made in the SHOPP ten-year plan and the five-year maintenance plan must attempt to balance resources between SHOPP activities and maintenance activities to achieve identified milestones and goals at the lowest possible long-term cost. The maintenance plan must identify projected future SHOPP costs that would be avoided if the plan recommends an increase in maintenance spending.

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Transmittal Letter- Comments on the Draft 2021 State Highway System Management Plan.

HILARY NORTON, Chair
BOB ALVARADO, Vice Chair
YVONNE B. BURKE
JON ROCCO DAVIS
LEE ANN EAGER
CARL GUARDINO
FRAN INMAN
CHRISTINE KEHOE
JOSEPH K. LYOU, PH.D.
MICHELE MARTINEZ
JOSEPH TAVAGLIONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor



ASSEMBLY MEMBER LAURA FRIEDMAN, Ex Officio
SENATOR JOSH NEWMAN, Ex-Officio

MITCH WEISS, Executive Director

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

1120 N STREET, MS-52
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
P. O. BOX 942873
SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001
(916) 654-4245
FAX (916) 653-2134
<http://www.catc.ca.gov>

March 24, 2021

Mr. Toks Omishakin, Director
California Department of Transportation
1120 N Street, MS 49
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Comments to the Draft 2021 State Highway System Management Plan

Dear Director Omishakin:

California Streets and Highways Code Section 164.6 requires the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) prepare and submit the draft State Highway System Management Plan (SHSMP) to the California Transportation Commission (Commission) for review and comment not later than February 15 of each odd numbered year, and the final plan shall be transmitted to the Governor and the Legislature not later than June 1 of each odd numbered year. This biennial plan, along with the Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) approved by the Commission in March 2018, will establish the policy foundation and performance framework for future Commission actions related to the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP).

The Commission appreciates Caltrans' efforts to develop a comprehensive and performance-based plan to manage all assets on the State Highway System. It should be acknowledged that balancing the needs of such a large inventory of assets with limited resources is not a simple task.

The draft State Highway System Management Plan (SHSMP) provides significant detail on the baseline condition of each asset, as well as the unconstrained need and performance based on the investment plan. Table 4-4 provides an excellent depiction of the baseline and projected conditions of Primary and Supplementary Assets and a comparison to the Transportation Asset Management Plan Targets. Evaluating the information in Table 4-4 shows the need to reassess the Commission approved Targets for Supplementary Assets. Over the next year, the Commission requests Caltrans to work with Commission staff to assess the existing targets and propose new Supplementary Asset Transportation Asset Management Plan Targets for inclusion in the 2023 SHSMP.

Mr. Toks Omishakin

RE: Transmittal of Comments on the Draft 2021 State Highway System Management Plan

March 24, 2021

Page 2

Throughout the draft SHSMP, the Transportation Asset Management Plan Targets for Culverts and Bridges/Tunnels are listed in the State Highway System Management Plan as being revised and pending approval by the Commission. While we recognize additional information will be provided at the March Commission meeting, the Commission requests language be added to describe the need to revise the targets and how these revisions impact the overall investment plan, specifically as it relates to these assets.

In addition, the Commission has provided a list of specific technical comments on the Draft 2021 State Highway System Management Plan in Attachment 1.

We understand that regional transportation agencies and other stakeholders are also providing comments and appreciate your consideration of their input prior to plan finalization. If you have any questions or wish to discuss the Commission comments further, please contact Tim Sobelman, Chief Engineer, at (916) 825-6674.

Sincerely,

HILARY NORTON
Chair

c: Commissioners, California Transportation Commission
Mitch Weiss, Executive Director, California Transportation Commission

Attachment:

- Attachment 1: Commission Comments on the Draft 2021 State Highway System Management Plan.

The Commission offers the following comments on the Draft 2021 State Highway System Management Plan:

1. On page 4, under the Managing State Highway System (SHS) needs, it describes the \$122.9 billion total need is solely to “maintain the existing assets on the SHS (in Table A).” Revise the language to recognize the Needs Assessment is based on more objectives than are shown in Table A.
2. On page 4, Table B, clarify why the total 10-Year need is listed as \$116.3 billion as compared to the previous language showing \$122.9 billion.
3. On page 7, Table E, the Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) targets for Culverts and Bridges/Tunnels are shown as being revised. Consider adding a row to show the prior TAMP targets, as well as the proposed TAMP Targets. In addition, include a brief description within the Executive Summary to describe the basis of the changes to the TAMP Targets.
4. On page 1-1, third paragraph, it mentions this SHSMP provides “more flexibility in achieving multiple objectives within a single project.” What changed in the 2021 SHSMP that provides more flexibility?
5. On page 2-13, under Section 2-7 Addressing Needs through Other Programs, it discusses other programs outside the SHOPP and Maintenance programs that will address needs on the SHS (STIP, ATP, etc.). Clarify how these improvements (assets) are documented and incorporated into the Caltrans Asset Management framework and describe how they are evaluated as part of the unconstrained needs assessment for the SHSMP.
6. On page 4-10, Table 4-3, the reduction in collisions shown for both proactive and reactive safety objectives are difficult to correlate with the rest of the SHSMP. Please describe the basis to these values.
7. On page 4-13, Table 4-4, it shows the poor condition TAMP target for Bridge and Tunnel Health target will not be met. Earlier in the SHSMP, it states that TAMP targets for the primary assets will be met. Please clarify the discrepancy.
8. On page 4-13, Table 4-4, it shows that most of the TAMP targets for Supplementary assets will not be met for multiple conditions. Provide a narrative to describe how the TAMP targets were factored into the investment plan for the Supplementary Assets.
9. On page 5-2, last paragraph, it is estimated the State will reduce fatalities by three percent and serious injuries by one and a half percent over the next ten years. With objectives of Proactive Safety and Reactive Safety, describe how these reductions goals can be estimated, measured and monitored.
10. On page 5-16, Table 5-7, the total inventory for Bridge and Tunnel Health appears to only include the Bridge inventory. Consider updating the table or provide language to describe why the Tunnel inventory was not included.

11. On page 5-20, Table 5-10, the Bridge Goods Movement Upgrades Inventory and Conditions appear to relatively close to the Desired State of Repair (Table 5-11), however, the unconstrained need shows a large gap receiving no investment. Verify the values are correct.
12. On page 5-47, first paragraph, Major Damage Restoration is listed as a Reservation Model performance objective. Consider language to describe the basis of the amount of reservation set aside for this objective. (*This comment is typical for all reservation model performance objectives.*)
13. On page 5-112, third paragraph, it states “For the purposed of the 2021 SHSMP, the 2030 projection (for sea level rise) with a cost of \$11.1B is used...” With the Sea Level Rise Objective being new in the draft 2021 SHSMP, why wasn’t any of the unconstrained need (\$11.1B) funded as part of the investment plan?
14. On page 5-116, under Inventory of Deficiencies, it states “Table 5-78 presents the unaddressed proportion of the ADA, the value of the inventory of deficiencies relative to the proportion of deficiencies that have been addressed.” Review the value in the table and the use of the word “proportion.” In addition, it appears only about 8% of the non-compliant elements identified in 2010 have been addressed. Confirm the values in this section are accurate.
15. On page 5-121, first line, it says the Caltrans Strategic Plan has the goal of increasing the annual number of Complete Streets projects by 20%. Provide language to describe what is intended by this goal and how the SHSMP will help meet this goal.
16. On page 5-125, under Complete Streets (Build New), consider adding language to discuss the basis of the investment for this new objective. Implementing Complete Streets as an asset is new and has a large unconstrained need. How many years is expected to meet the performance target?
17. On page 5-135, under Overview, it mentions Advanced Mitigation is a Reservation Model performance objective. It also states that a separate reserve not performance objective has been set. Explain how Advanced Mitigation is accounted for in the SHSMP.

Commission Staff is working directly with Caltrans on clarifications to several other technical and editorial comments.