



DELAWARE VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION



HIGHLIGHTS OF FUNDING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING December 4, 2006

Attendees

Rosemarie Anderson	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission
Gastonia Anderson	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission
Lou Belmonte	Pennsylvania Department of Transportation
Jaime Johnson	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission
John Long	Mid-Atlantic Foundation for Safety and Education
Jerry Lutin	New Jersey Transit
Raymond Reeve	New Jersey Division of Highway Traffic Safety
Elizabeth Schoonmaker	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission
Carol Thomas	Burlington County
Karen Yunk	Federal Highway Administration – NJ

Introduction & Overview

Rosemarie Anderson, Manger of Office of Safety and Corridor Planning welcomed everyone in attendance. Everyone was given the opportunity to introduce themselves.

Rosemarie spoke of safety in the DVRPC region. She said although the fatality rate in the region was falling there was still a lot of work to be done. She briefly spoke of the development of the Regional Safety Action Plan and pointed out the priority areas.

She informed the group of the purpose of the meeting. She said DVRPC was at the point where progress is being made on the Regional Safety Action Plan and an Implementation Plan will be included. The Implementation Plan is in its preliminary stage and requires the input of the subcommittees. The meeting was to discuss available funding and how these funds can be matched with identified priorities. The group was asked to identify barriers to using available funds; and methods of getting available funds to implementing agencies especially to local agencies. Using the identified funding sources as a guide the subcommittee began the discussion.

The following is a summary of the discussion.

- It was pointed out that no funding was associated with older driver and pedestrian safety; it is only a provision in the bill. It is an unfunded mandate in SAFETEA-LU.
- High Risk Rural road is a set aside from the HSIP funds and can only be used on High Risk Rural roads.
- Highway Rail Grade Crossing funding in both states is limited and has to be supplemented with HSIP funds
- Local Federal Safety Program (NJ) comes from HSIP funding

All identified engineering priority strategies are eligible for HSIP funding

Barriers identified to the use of available funds

- Programming of HSIP funding (un-obligated HSIP funding (obligation limitation), fiscally constraint TIP and STIP)
- Competition for available funds
- Constraints on the Low Cost Safety Program - Matching through HSIP; fiscal year constraints
- Federal process – NEPA process (cumbersome to navigate)
- Problem with low cost safety improvement e.g. (pavement markings requires high maintenance to keep visible)
- Data driven process – many areas (local) no data available.

DVRPC administers its portion of the federal funds – determine the priorities for the region

- DVRPC has approximately \$1 million in Local Federal Safety Program (NJ) unspent.
- Examine changing how projects are fed to this program.
- Money in STIP unspent – this money can be spent on safety projects but because it has to be data driven result in problems finding suitable projects

Non-structural activity

- SAFETEA-LU - 10% of HSIP funding for non-structural activity with demonstrated proof (education and enforcement)
- Section 402 funds – enforcement, education, engineering
- Engineering – very little, usually small projects at municipal level
- Education small amount of funding
- NJDHTS - 3 types of grants – mobilization, invitation, individual grants in individual community
- Local Federal Safety Program can be used for education (typically not but satisfy 10% eligibility)

Barriers

- Education small amount of funding

- Grant writing (projects relatively small compared to engineering (\$5-20,000))
- Available resources – getting into the schools with the materials e.g. Mid-Atlantic Foundation
- Strings to private funding

Methods of Funding

- Education and Enforcement – portion of fines from tickets go to funding safety program
- Establish continuous source of funding for safety education and enforcement
- Foreign Policy Insurance Fund as a means of funding transportation safety projects
- Establish programs to fund themselves
- Automated enforcement
- Legislation – identifying ways of gaining new money instead of solving entanglements for old ones
- Existing Funds – procedure for use of this fund, require a change in the legislation
- Drunk driving enforcement fund (NJ) - \$100 surcharge – 100% for enforcement for drunk driving or 50% for equipment

Procedure

- Local Federal Safety Program – restrictive (tied to data)
- Establish other methods of selecting projects for the program
- Next step identify areas to spend existing/available funds
 - Determine top locations (through data driven process)
 - Focus on priority areas
 - Implement identified strategies as appropriate
- Allow the Regional Safety Action Plan to drive the programs
- Recognize what drives the funding programs

Coordination

- Agency and Organizations
- School Districts
- Police Departments
- County Highway Safety Councils
- Mid Atlantic Foundation for Safety and Education

In summary the barriers identified were – programming HSIP funds, identifying viable projects; spending Local Federal Safety Program funds due to restriction; applications for available grants, lack of a consistent source of funding, establish programs which pay for itself, legislation needed to free existing funds;

cumbersome procedures deter application; establishing focused program; sharing resources through media and internet and coordination of existing resources, tools and expertise.

The meeting ended with a reminder that the next Regional Safety task Force meeting is scheduled for **January 18, 2007**.