



## Vision Zero Technical Advisory Committee Meeting 2 Summary

**Thursday, December 3, 2015, 1:00 - 2:30 p.m.**  
**Hawthorne Room, 8th floor, Portland Building (1120 SW 5<sup>th</sup> Ave)**

Next meeting: January 14, 2016

**Committee members present:**

Scott Batson, *PBOT*  
Becky Bodonyi, *Multnomah County*  
Teri Brady, *Portland Public Schools*  
Anthony Buczek, *Metro*  
Wendy Cawley, *PBOT*  
Rhonda Danielson, *TriMet*  
Courtney Duke, *PBOT*  
Nick Fortey, *FHWA*  
Katie Frietag, *ODOT*  
Douglas Gunderson, *Portland Police*  
Peter Koonce, *PBOT*  
Kurt Krueger, *PBOT*  
Kate McQuillan, *Multnomah County*  
Dan Layden, *PBOT*  
David Lehrfeld, *Oregon Health Authority*  
Walt McAllister, *ODOT*  
Kate McQuillan, *Multnomah County*  
Young Park, *TriMet*  
Greg Raisman, *PBOT*  
Robert Voepel, *Portland Police*  
Beth Wemple, *Cambridge Systematics*  
Sharon White, *PBOT*  
Faith Winegarden, *PBOT*  
Peter Wojcicki, *PBOT*  
Jody Yates, *PBOT*

**PBOT project staff present:**

Margi Bradway, *Division Manager*  
Gabe Graff, *Operations & Safety Section Manager*  
Clay Veka, *Program Manager*  
Matt Ferris-Smith, *Hatfield Fellow*

**Consultants present:**

Catherine Ciarlo, *CH2M Hill*  
Scott Mansur, *DKS*  
Ben Chaney, *DKS*  
Rebecca Sanders, *Toole Design Group*

## REVIEW OF LAST MEETING

---

PBOT staff briefly summarized material covered in the first TAC meeting, including TAC member roles (“help ensure Portland is making smart, strategic decisions”), an introduction to Vision Zero and the Vision Zero Action Plan vision statement and guiding principles recently drafted by the Task Force.

The guiding principles elaborate on equity, data types and accountability. A committee member noted that people with disabilities are not called out under the guiding principles. PBOT staff replied that the analysis includes a “communities of concern” data layer that includes people with disabilities.

## UPDATED CRASH DATA PRESENTATION

---

Scott Mansur, project consultant, presented data analysis of overall safety trends and indicators. For all modes, the fatal and serious crashes in Portland have been on a downward trend. However for people biking the trend line has been flat and for people walking the trend line has been creeping upward.

Comment: The Portland Police Bureau changed their reporting practices in 2008, lowering the threshold for crash investigations. This likely resulted in a higher number of reported serious injuries; fatality reporting would not have changed because those already triggered investigations. Scott says he will talk with Greg Raisman to make sure this change is noted.

Question: How does Portland compare to other cities in terms of safety?

Gabe: Both San Francisco and Seattle have better safety performance than Portland, especially pedestrian safety.

The data highlights four areas of concern, or “safety indicators.” These include drugs/alcohol, speed, intersections and high crash corridors & intersections.

Comment: Drug use is likely underreported. Once officers find alcohol, they typically don’t report involvement of other drugs. Nationally, about 50 percent of fatalities involving alcohol also involve drugs.

Comment: There are reporting challenges with this data, including lack of alcohol testing for serious injuries.

Scott continued the presentation, identifying contributing factors that typically leads to a drunk person being involved in a serious or fatal crash. For people driving, speeding and roadway departure are at the top of the list. There is no trend for people biking, as there are too few fatal and serious crashes reported to develop a trend. For people walking, the top contributing factors are crossing midblock and disobeying the signal.

Questions: Do we know what proportion of drunk pedestrians involved in crashes are part of the transient population? How does Portland compare to peer cities? What about marijuana?

The project team will identify if this data is readily available and follow-up.

Next, Scott noted trends involving speed -- 32 percent of fatal crashes have a speed-related cause.

Comment: The hard thing about relying on speed data is that there is a threshold; it does not capture people going 1 mile over the posted speed, for example. You have to speed sufficiently for the officer to check the box on the report. So again, there is underreporting. When a crash is fatal, there is a much more detailed investigation.

Comment: Showing this data by street classification would be helpful. Along with street cross sections (2 lane versus 5 lane, etc.).

Scott presented the 25 highest crash intersections and 25 highest crash corridors. He asked the committee if it would make sense to reduce this to 20 each, and commit to tackling two intersections and two corridors each year until 2025.

The high crash intersection and corridors data was overlaid with Portland's communities of concern.

Comment: The communities of concern doesn't seem to correlate with the dangerous locations. There are broad stretches of concern areas that are not in the top 25. The cause is not the communities themselves, though they suffer the biggest impact.

Comment: Actually the correlation is pretty tight, it is just not a causal relationship. The communities of concern in East Portland have the bulk of the most dangerous intersections. The area of concern to the north is sparsely populated, so it makes sense that there are fewer high crash locations there.

Comment: Most of the high crash intersections are signalized. The problem isn't the signals, it's the speed.

Comment: We need to be careful not to imply that communities of concern are "causing" crashes. The impact is from the multiple lanes of traffic, lots of bars, etc. Need to present this information carefully.

Comments: There appear to be gaps in the data. Why are Marine Drive and NE Broadway not highlighted? We know that both see many serious crashes.

Response: More data analysis is required for the High Crash Intersection and High Crash Corridor listings. This is a preliminary cut at the data.

Comment: It may be helpful to rank these dangerous locations against themselves. Show what percentage above and below average they are, in terms of safety. Look at low crash corridors and ask, what is going on there? And what is different about the high crash corridors?

## POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

---

Catherine Ciarlo provided a brief overview of potential actions Portland can take to address the safety challenges identified in the data. She reminded committee members that Vision Zero actions need to be quick and effective—able to provide year by year progress.

Comment: For people with commercial driving licenses, there is zero tolerance for alcohol. This is also the case for all drivers in some European countries.

Question: What about legislative changes? We need to get some policies changed.

Response: Yes, that is part of what we will be considering.

Comment: If the actions are organized by safety indicator (speed, drinking, etc.), we will need a catch-all bucket that captures the actions that are effective across multiple categories. For example, improved data collection. Given the overlap of actions across safety indicators, perhaps a matrix would be a good way to show the overlapping actions.

Comment: Distinguishing between “intersections” and “high crash corridors and intersections” is not working for me. What is the difference? I suggest putting them in one bucket, then teasing out underlying causes of crashes.

Comment: Causes of crashes and locations of crashes—you shouldn’t blur them, they are different.

Question: How will we measure success or failure? Performance measures?

Next steps will be to carry out a risk analysis and look more closely at infrastructure.