



Vision Zero Task Force Meeting #2 Summary – DRAFT

Thursday, November 5, 2015, 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Portland City Hall, 1221 SW 4th Ave, Rose Room

Next meeting:

Thursday, February 25, 2016, 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Committee members present:

Roger Averbeck, *Pedestrian Advisory Committee*
Kelly Brooks, *ODOT Region 1*
Tony DeFalco, *Verde / Living Cully*
Kristi Finney Dunn, *Oregon and SW Washington Families for Safe Streets*
JoAnn Herrigel, *Elders in Action*
Duncan Hwang, *Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon*
Anne Marie King, *Disability Rights Oregon*
Tom Kloster, *Metro*
Leo Krick, *Portland Fire & Rescue*
Kari McFarlan (as alternate for Jae P. Douglas),
Multnomah County Health Department
Noel Mickelberry, *Oregon Walks*
Chris Monsere, *TREC Research*
Michael Morrison, *Legacy Emanuel Hospital Trauma Nurses Talk Tough*
Stephanie Noll, *Bicycle Transportation Alliance*
Jeff Owen (as alternate for Alan Lehto), *TriMet*
Vivian Satterfield, *OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon*
Kari Schlosshauer, *Safe Routes to School National Partnership / Bicycle Advisory Committee*
Kelli Sheffer, *Portland Police Bureau*
Bandana Shrestha, *AARP*
Steven A. Todd, *Multnomah County Circuit Court*
Leah Treat, *PBOT*

PBOT project staff present:

Maurice Henderson
Margi Bradway
Zan Gibbs
Gabe Graff
Clay Veka
Matt Ferris-Smith

Consultants present:

Catherine Ciarlo, *CH2M Hill*
Kate Drennan, *CH2M Hill*
Scott Mansur, *DKS*
Joy Alise Davis, *Design+Culture Lab*

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AGENDA REVIEW

Director Treat welcomed members and shared information from the recent Railvolution and NACTO conferences. Vision Zero had a strong presence at both conferences and Director Treat highlighted that Portland is one of only ten U.S. cities with an adopted VZ policy and is helping to pave the way for other cities to join the Vision Zero movement.

Catherine Ciarlo, as the meeting facilitator, outlined the agenda and reviewed the agreed-upon meeting guidelines.

VISION STATEMENT & GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Clay Veka (PBOT staff) described the process by which the project team took input from Task Force members and developed the recommended vision statement. Task Force members consistently requested that the vision statement include equity, a data-driven focus, and a date, and that it be both concise and repeatable. In addition, members requested that it reflect the human-element of Vision Zero. Finally, some members wanted to see the vision statement address elimination of disparities in infrastructure and racial profiling.

Proposed vision statement:

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.

Clay also share that as a response to Task Force members' desire to be specific about what "equity" means in the vision statement and to define "data-driven," the project team developed three guiding principles to follow the vision statement.

Proposed guiding principles:

These principles will guide the actions and performance measures of the Vision Zero Action Plan:

*The plan will be **equitable***

- It will reaffirm our commitment against racial profiling*
- It will address the disproportionate burden of traffic fatalities and serious injuries on lower-income communities*
- It will prioritize action and investment in infrastructure-deficient areas*

*Actions in the plan will be **data-driven** to address the factors that lead to serious injury and death on Portland's roadways*

- **Safety data** that identifies the location, behaviors, and circumstances surrounding traffic fatalities and serious injuries will be gathered from both traditional and innovative sources*

- **Equity data** – including demographic data and infrastructure gaps – will be used to ensure the plan prioritizes the needs of underserved communities

The plan will be **accountable**, setting out clear objectives and measuring performance against them

- Progress will be communicated in annual reports and in an easily accessible dashboard
- Success will be measured by the level of investment in underserved communities, equity outcomes and safety metrics

Catherine Ciarlo then opened the discussion to Task Force members, asking for feedback on the guiding principles: do they work, what is missing, what should be changed, do they reflect the Task Force's values and desires?

Task Force Member Feedback

Vision statement comments

- Infrastructure and racial profiling should be in the vision statement.
- There is a strong tie between enforcement and education. The education piece should be linked to enforcement.
- San Francisco's equity statement specifies the "communities of concern." I like how it talks specifically about low income communities and people who rely on transit, etc.

Equity principle comments

- Under the equitable guideline, about racial profiling—is this referring to specific policy?

PBOT Response: Language about racial profiling is in the council resolution adopting Vision Zero, it reads (entire resolution found at www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/545880)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that City Council directs the Vision Zero Safety Committee to develop assurances against racial profiling and targeting as it pertains to Vision Zero enforcement and to ensure that communities of color, police bureau and community leadership are included in the decision-making and development of enforcement plans or policies.

Police Response: We collect data on who gets stopped. Data shows that traffic enforcement officers are stopping people across the city proportional to population groups. This doesn't answer the *perception* of racial profiling, which is valid. I appreciate the language being included in the vision statement and principles because we are not looking to stop one group more than another.

- The word “vulnerable” should be included in the equity bullet points.

- While "who" is getting stopped is one side of racial profiling, another side is what happens after the stop. Officers have a lot of discretion and it can be hard to figure out what actions and penalties officers take and why.
- Exchange "reaffirm" for stronger language. Vision Zero "will not result in racial profiling."
- Switch the order of bullets for infrastructure and racial profiling. Prioritize infrastructure, avoid "trickle-down" equity results.
- Racial profiling should not be listed as number one.
- Define more clearly who we are talking about when identifying communities of concern or vulnerable communities: race, income, age?

Data-driven principle comments

- Vulnerable users should be identified. I appreciate the definition from San Francisco of their communities of concern. In the draft principles, I see two communities defined: lower-income and under-served. It looks like San Francisco is using the term "communities of concern" for the same populations that we often call "vulnerable communities."
- For me, "vulnerable populations" include bike/ped, seniors, children, transit dependent. That isn't spelled out in the bullet points right now.
- Focus on mitigation rather than reaction to behaviors.
- Include risk factors to vulnerable users in the data.
- Include equity data/info on traffic stops, warnings, tickets, etc.
- Consider different data to get at the vulnerable users, like NearlyKilledMe grassroots data.
- Use the full suite of data sources that are available, not just what has been used in the past.
- What about mitigating behaviors? Can we identify risky behavior and mitigate those behaviors? Go beyond just where the data shows crashes?
- When using data around enforcement, ensure there are no unintended consequences on specific communities.
- In infrastructure-deficient areas, vulnerable user crash rates may be depressed because people are infrequently walking and biking on those facilities. This should be called out more clearly in the safety data. How can Vision Zero address this and yet keep the focus on fatalities and serious injuries?

PBOT Response: The primary focus of Vision Zero is reducing fatalities and serious injuries, however we will be conducting a risk analysis to identify roadway typologies that lead to these crashes and where pedestrian and bicycle use may be suppressed. We may be able to look at information like reports from NearlyKilledMe to see if comfort levels are increasing.

Accountability principle comments

- Regarding the process. What is the community voice in Vision Zero? How can community members be involved?
PBOT Response: In order to get Vision Zero moving quickly, we will be conducting outreach with smaller, target groups in early spring, then doing some broader outreach on the Vision Zero Action Plan in late spring, early summer. We will be looking at creative ways to work with community groups to address traffic safety on or near the high crash network.
- If I'm recognizing the street near me feels unsafe—can I get a crosswalk here?
PBOT Response: Due to limited resources, PBOT needs to prioritize safety investments based on identified safety needs and data helps us do this.
- We need to incorporate public voice into both the planning and implementation phases.
PBOT Response: We appreciate this feedback and will work to develop a recommendation that does both.
- Perhaps you can add some language to “accountable” to ensure there is ongoing engagement and communication.

Members participate in two straw polls:

- All agree (green cards) that having these three principles makes sense.
- Five members have questions or concerns (yellow cards) on the content of the principles.

Follow-up comments on the content of the principles:

- Infrastructure deficiency does not rise to the top of factors contributing to fatalities and serious injuries.
- Need to work through the racial profiling language and ensure that we do not to overstep bounds of this committee.
- Need to be careful in framing racial profiling and ensure that we don't imply there are problems if the data doesn't back it up.
- Focus on fatalities and serious injuries.
- Keep the vision statement and principles crisp.
- Vulnerable users should be included in equity and data-driven principles.
- Prioritize traffic fatalities.
- Keep Portland on the forefront of positive change. Focus more on infrastructure disparities.
- Reframe the messaging: use positive, affirmative language around eliminating racial profiling, rather than promise to “not” do something.
- Accountability is not included in the vision statement.

Additional discussion of infrastructure disparities (equity principle)

- From emergency responder perspective, I would put more weight on infrastructure disparities -- intersections that are unlit, crossings that are unlit, etc. Would prefer to put infrastructure disparities bullet above racial profiling bullet.
- It seems odd that we will prioritize action in infrastructure deficient areas. We should prioritize actions that improve safety.

PBOT Response: The data presentation will show overlap between infrastructure gaps and serious crashes. With the goal to reduce serious injuries and fatalities, crash data is an important tool to guide investments. In addition, addressing infrastructure deficiencies alone doesn't necessarily direct investments in low-income communities and communities of concern.

- I like the statement and principles. I want to be sure that we don't slip into system completeness. We need to ensure that we make infrastructure investments with safety benefits.
- I don't want data on serious injuries and fatalities to be the only inputs considered. Just because there haven't been serious crashes along a street segment doesn't mean that the street is safe. I don't want people to say that we can't make safety improvements because bad things haven't happened yet.
- Crash rates are suppressed in some cases because people avoid certain streets or modes.
- I would like PBOT to recognize that we don't have crashes in certain location because people aren't walking or biking there, but we want to make safety improvements so that people can walk and bike in those locations.

PBOT Response: If we are going to get to zero in ten years, we have to keep the focus on where we know the serious and fatal crashes are taking place. Ten years is hugely ambitious. At the same time however, the team will work on a risk analysis to identify road typologies that lead to serious and fatal crashes. This analysis will help address existing crash concerns and identify roads where walking and biking may be suppressed due to perceived unsafe conditions.

Members vote on whether they are comfortable with the Vision Statement if changes are made to the principles.

- 1 Red vote: *Want racial profiling and infrastructure in Vision Statement.*
- 1 Yellow vote: *Want Portland to be leader in eliminating infrastructure disparities.*
- Remaining Green votes

DATA PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION

Scott Mansur, project consultant, presented preliminary crash data analysis and safety indicators. The goal is that the data informs recommended actions.

Questions from committee members:

- What is the percent of older people involved in fatalities/injuries?
- What are the design speeds at which crashes are happening?
- Can you break-out intoxication in serious injuries and fatalities by mode? Who is impaired?
- Does data show that hit-and-runs or suicides are significant contributors to serious and fatal crashes?
- Can you share data on distracted driving? Consider enhanced enforcement of distracted driving laws.
- Is it possible to separate out intoxication and marijuana? How intoxicated are people involved in serious and fatal crashes, particularly drivers?
- Regarding drug and alcohol testing, who is tested, the victim or the driver?

Comment: From my experience, my son who was biking was tested for drugs and alcohol, and the person who hit him was not tested. We need to change this.

- How does intoxication data intersect with communities of concern? One conclusion people might make is that there are more drunk drivers in communities of concern. Is that actually the case? Is drunk and reckless driving uniform across the city? Does it vary by infrastructure? Enforcement? Why are they so concentrated? I want to be sure we don't imply communities of concern are using more drugs if that isn't the case.
- Do we have data for actual speeding?
- Are people driving without drivers' licenses?
- What are the data inputs that make up the "communities of concern" layer used in the maps?
- Differentiate which urban facilities are ODOT-owned and which are PBOT-owned.
- Is the downward trend for motor vehicle serious and fatal crashes due to safer vehicle technology such as airbags?

PBOT Response: Yes, safer vehicle technologies and improved medical care are largely responsible for improved driver safety outcomes.

- How is serious injury defined? Is it a hospitalization?
- PBOT Response: A serious injury is coded as an Injury A, which is defined as an incapacitating injury that prevents a person from walking and includes severe lacerations, broken limbs or abdominal injuries.
- Can you break-down data between 2-lane roads and 4- or more travel lane roadways?
 - While evening is not the peak time for pedestrian crashes, the level of risk is higher at that time.
 - Is law enforcement able to enforce distracted driving laws?

Police Response: Yes, we can make a stop for distracted driving and cite them.

Multnomah County Judge Response: A recent court case requires that we prove they were on their phone (talking or texting) at the exact time of the crash. This makes it tougher for police. The issue should be whether you are using the device, period. Many stops are at traffic signals because it is easier to make a stop.

BEST PRACTICES / BIG IDEAS

Gabe Graff (PBOT staff) reiterated the importance of vehicle speed in determining the health outcomes of crashes. High speed crashes are very likely to kill pedestrians and cyclists. Gabe noted examples of specific strategies other cities have taken as part of their Vision Zero efforts.

Suggestions, questions, comments from committee members:

- Institute license retesting. Make driving education mandatory for all users.
- Provide access to drivers' licenses for all residents.
- Separate modes. Focus on buffers on high speed roads.
- Look at the penalty structure for DUI in Oregon versus other states. And look at how Oregon compares in terms of DUI violations.
- Use positive, proactive messaging encouraging drivers to slow down and look at each other.
- All stops/crashes in communities of concern may involve people who do not actually live in the area/community, but instead may be passing through.
- Portland is growing and changing. Pay attention to demographic trends. How do we plan for Portland in the future and now?
- Track the effects of marijuana on crashes.
- Leverage Census Bureau outreach approach for Vision Zero outreach to communities of concern. Leverage Safe Routes to School and partners here to reach out with positive safety messaging.
- Pedestrian and bicyclist visibility is a big issue.

COMMENTS FROM POST-IT NOTES

- What about demographic trends? If the region will have 720,000 new residents in 20 years, how does that impact traffic? Demographics in 2025 will look very different from 2015. Need to go to where the “puck” will be, not where it is now—Wayne Gretzky.
- How do we evaluate effectiveness of safety campaigns? Are PSAs/media campaigns worth the investment?
- Raise the driving age. Mandatory driver education for new drivers. More frequent driver testing. It could be treated like jury duty.

- Licenses for all drivers (legal residents and non-legal)
- Portland Police data has confirmed disproportionate traffic stops for African American drivers. Don't ignore this.
- Tiered penalty system is a good idea, but it should be the reverse of what was presented. Please look at the racial equity lens Seattle/King County used.
- Limit "right on red"
- Fun Theory: Use reward system for maintaining legal speeds rather than punitive system for speeding (google "fun theory speeding")
- Look not only at posted speed, but also at the number of lanes and the design speed.
- Don't just use infrastructure data as an equity metric, you also need to add secondary data of demographics.
- Need clear community involvement
 - Education after enforcement
 - Schools teach future users positive road use behavior
- Need to show data about racial profiling of people of color in cars and bikes.
- Need to get a handle on an estimate of ped/bike fatalities in areas where people are not walking or biking because there is no infrastructure.
- Suggested reading for task force members: *The New Jim Crow* by Michelle Alexander
- Enforcement strategy rooted in education, such as diversion/high risk drivers classes, etc.
- Stronger penalties for repeat offenders, especially DUII. Need more information about DUII, i.e. what is enforcement outcome, would Oregon benefit from penalty increases. How to monitor marijuana impact on DUII.
- SF's High Injury Network builds in accountability measures
- Inbound commute from other places (lower income suburbs). Suburbanization of poverty
- Data deficiencies are greater than the corollary out where there are infrastructure disparities/level of deaths
- Percent versus numbers is greater than the proportional communities of color
- Separate modes as much as possible, especially on identified routes with high speeds, volumes or specific functions. Make this standard!
 - Put planters or parked cars between bikes and peds. Allow for truck turns at intersections.
- Transit stop access: minimum guidelines (midblock crossing concerns: where/why are people crossing?)

- “Radar reminder”- speed reader boards that flash travel speed
- Minimum marked crossing spacing on transit corridors.
- Ped-activated flashers at midblock crossings.
- Crash post mortem. Not whose “fault,” but what could we have done to reduce crashes at this location or situation?

NEXT STEPS

Between now and our next meeting, staff will rework the guiding principles and do a more extensive best practices analysis. At the next meeting, we will bring some draft actions and performance measures. In the interim, if you have questions or issues that we have not had the opportunity to address, please get in touch.