



## Vision Zero Technical Advisory Committee Meeting 1 Summary

**Thursday, October 29, 2015, 1:00-2:30 p.m.**

**Portland Building, 1120 SW 5<sup>th</sup> Ave.**

Next meeting: Thursday, December 3 (same time, same place)

**Committee members present:**

Scott Batson, *PBOT*  
Becky Bodonyi, *Multnomah County*  
Anthony Buczek, *Metro*  
Wendy Cawley, *PBOT*  
Courtney Duke, *PBOT*  
Nick Fortey, *FHWA*  
Dennis Mitchell (alternate), *ODOT*  
Bob Hillier, *PBOT*  
Kurt Krueger, *PBOT*  
Kate McQuillan, *Multnomah County*  
Walt McAllister, *ODOT*  
Young Park, *TriMet*  
Sharon White, *PBOT*  
Faith Winegarden, *PBOT*  
Peter Wojcicki, *PBOT*  
Jody Yates, *PBOT*

**Committee members absent:**

David Lehrfeld, *Oregon Health Authority*  
Peter Koonce, *PBOT*  
Rhonda Danielson, *TriMet*  
Teri Brady, *Portland Public Schools*  
Douglas Gunderson, *Portland Police*  
Carlos Hernandez, *PBOT*  
Greg Raisman, *PBOT*  
Robert Voepel, *Portland Police*  
Beth Wemple, *Cambridge Systematics*

**PBOT project staff present:**

Gabe Graff, *PBOT*  
Clay Veka, *PBOT*  
Matt Ferris-Smith, *PBOT*

**Members of public and others present:**

none

**Consultants present:**

Catherine Ciarlo, *CH2M*  
Scott Mansur, *DKS*

## **INTRODUCTIONS**

---

PBOT staff welcomed and thanked members of the committee, and invited everyone to introduce themselves.

## **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ROLES**

---

Members will serve as technical experts and advise on policy, community outreach, engineering, data analysis, enforcement and education. Meetings are scheduled every month. The plan will be completed October 2016.

## **VISION ZERO PROJECT BACKGROUND**

---

Gabe Graff of PBOT explained Vision Zero, described trends in traffic fatalities across the world, and what policies other countries have used to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries. The presentation included brief overview of Vision Zero policies in New York, San Francisco and Seattle, as well as a timeline for Portland's Vision Zero Action Plan creation and adoption.

## **VISION STATEMENT**

---

The draft vision statement reads: *Working together, we will take equitable and data-driven actions that will eliminate serious injuries and deaths for all who share Portland streets by 2025.*

A committee member suggested swapping out the word "streets" for a more inclusive term or phrase. Some committee members voiced support for an alternative term, such as "transportation system."

## **SAFETY ANALYSIS**

---

Scott Mansur of DKS high-level findings from preliminary (about 20%) data analysis. The goal is to get input from the TAC to ensure the project team is asking the right questions and using the best data.

Scott described the safety indicators (e.g. age, drugs, weather) being analyzed to identify patterns in how, where and why crashes occur, as well as the data sources.

Comment: Make sure you capture pre-hospital admission data, which is embedded in the 911 data, including duration of ambulance presence and condition of patient. The Portland region is covered very well.

Question: Difference between PBOT and DMV data? PBOT reports have additional data, e.g. distracted driving, that are not present in DMV data.

Question: Will you look at actual vehicle speed data, not just posted speed data? We will consider 85<sup>th</sup> percentile data.

Comment: If goals are to reduce speed limits, having message of how much longer it will take to get from one point to another can be helpful. Commute times are helpful on messaging side: people will be complaining that it may take you longer to travel if speeds are changed.

Question: What about transit data? Is there correlation between transit boardings and alightings and pedestrian crashes? For example, bus riders getting off on Barbur and not having a safe place to cross. Response from another committee members: Metro's State of Safety Report tried to correlate alightings and boardings with crash rates, but found a closer correlations between crash rates and biking/walking.

Data analysis includes last ten years of serious and fatal crashes. All modes combined show a downward crash trend but pedestrian and bike crashes broken out show serious crash trend flat and rising, respectively.

Question: Is there data on whether the pedestrians killed are new Portlanders, English speaking or immigrants? This could help with messaging, education, and outreach.

Question: Regarding crashes by roadway characteristics (intersections, straights, etc)—if you broke that out by mode, what would it look like?

Question: Most pedestrian issues are at intersections. Do those crashes result in serious/fatal injuries? Response: No, serious and fatal pedestrian crashes tend to be midblock, not at intersections.

Comment: With functional classification, consider using PBOT classifications instead of federal. Would want to see by bike, pedestrian and transit classifications.

Question: What is the relationship to posted speeds? One issue: not all speed zone data is loaded into PBOT GIS.

Causes of serious crashes include: no yield (permissive lefts, right turn on red, right hook), following too close (rear-ends), speed (driving too fast for conditions and speeding), signal disregard (red light running).

Comment on speeding: "too fast for conditions" does not mean exceeding the posted speed. "Too fast for conditions" is a popular checkoff for police officers.

Regarding "Causes," if you stack up the causes that include drivers making bad choices — it comprises a huge percentage of the crashes. Purely bad behavior, you can't design your way out of those issues.

Question: Are you segmenting out motorcycle operators? Also, it would be helpful to pull out pedestrians and bicycles separately. Impairment on both parties' is a part of the problem.

Comment: With high crash corridor data, it would be helpful to identify which corridors are ODOT facilities and who operates and maintains those facilities. Do you also break out high crash intersections? Response: Yes, we have corridors as well as hot spots.

Comment: It seems that the number of drunk pedestrians involved in serious and fatal crashes has increased in the last five years.

Question: What is the Portland Police Bureau policy on testing for impairment of participants involved in serious or fatal crashes? If testing is not currently required, is this a policy change recommendation we want to consider?

Trends related to age: Teens drive fewer miles but have a much higher serious crash rate, with a spike in the 18- to 28-year old range. The data shared included all participants in serious and fatal collisions, but should break out just the drivers.

Comment: Within the age analysis, also look at pedestrians, bicycles, and possibly gender.

Question: What about race/ethnicity data? Response: There is a "Race" check box but it is often left blank in the crash reports.

The project team will also consider social equity data, asking if more serious and fatal crashes are occurring in communities of concern. Comment: Some studies have found that more serious crashes in communities of concern can be related to the quality and age of cars (cheaper cars lacking newer safety features), conditions of the roadways, and adequate street lighting, among other factors. Contributing factors need to be considered in assessing crashes in communities of concern.

Additional analysis the project team will undertake includes: breaking out data by mode (e.g. are more pedestrian crashes happening at night?) and crashes by time of year, time of day, and day of week. More data is needed on aggressive and distracted driving.

Question: What about breaking out injuries and fatalities for vehicles specifically? This presentation lumps everybody together, then pulls out bikes and pedestrians separately. Comment: On an absolute level, many more drivers are injured or killed so vehicle numbers dominate the data trends.

Comment: There is a correlation between being overserved alcohol and crashing. Clackamas County got addresses of over-serve establishments for alcohol and overlaid it with crash data. May find clusters of alcohol over-serving areas to help with targeted intervention.

Comment: Need to note pot legalization and track the effects on road safety.

Question: Is eliminating serious injuries and fatalities by 2025 our *vision* or our *target*? You can't engineer a perfect system.

Response: We will have to change system design and change traffic culture. The value of the target is that it forces different types of decision-making and challenges how to talk about those

decisions. As staff working on Vision Zero, one of the benefits of zero as our target is the decision-tree that it leads to.

Question: Are you looking at the serious and fatal crashes against population change? As more people bike, has it become more or less safe? Are facilities changing (arterial v collector v local streets) and if so, how have crashes on facility type change?