



2017-18 Vision Zero Task Force

Meeting #2 Summary

Thursday, April 20, 2017 | 9:30 a.m. – noon

Portland Building, 1120 SW 5th Ave, 8th floor, Hawthorne Room

Next meeting: Thursday, June 15, 2017 | 9:30 a.m. – noon

Portland Building, 2nd floor, Room C

Task Force Members in attendance

Leah Treat, PBOT (chair)

Roger Averbeck, Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Geri Bartz, Legacy Emanuel Trauma Services

Michael Crebs, Portland Police Bureau

Jae Douglas, Multnomah County Health

Kristi Finney-Dunn, Oregon & SW Washington Families for Safe Streets

Duncan Hwang, APANO

Lake McTighe, Metro

Noel Mickelberry, Oregon Walks

Michael Morrison, Legacy Emanuel Trauma Services

Stephanie Noll, The Street Trust

Andre Plambeck, ODOT Region 1

Alan Lehto, TriMet

Vivian Satterfield, OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon

Kari Schlosshauer, Safe Routes to School National Partnership and Bicycle Advisory Committee

Bandana Shrestha, AARP

Karis Stoudamire-Phillips, Moda Health

Steven A. Todd, Multnomah County Circuit Court

Staff members present: Margi Bradway, Dana Dickman, Matt Ferris-Smith, Providence Nagy, Art Pearce, Carl Snyder, Irene Schwoffermann, Clay Veka, Lewis Wardrip, Millicent Williams

Welcome and introductions (Leah Treat)

How a project becomes a project (Art Pearce, Dana Dickman, Millicent Williams)

Art Pearce, PBOT Group Manager of Projects, Planning, Policies, and Active Transportation and Safety, explained how PBOT creates, funds, and constructs capital transportation projects. He also highlighted the critical link between transportation and land use.

There is a process to select projects for inclusion on PBOT's 5-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The process begins by considering all of the projects in the Transportation

Systems Plan (TSP) or other City Council adopted plans. Any projects that are less than \$500,000 are not identified as a TSP project, but will live in one of the TSP Program buckets, which addresses building the smaller projects. There are ten TSP program buckets, one of which is Vision Zero /High Crash Corridor.

Of the TSP projects (above \$500,000), eight evaluation criteria are used to sort projects into a Constrained List for 1-10 years, a Constrained List for 11-20 years, or an Unconstrained List. Safety/Vision Zero and equity are two of the eight criteria.

- Question: Is there weighing in the criteria?
 - Currently, no.

PBOT's selection criteria is similar to the performance measures Metro uses to select projects for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Some of PBOT's TSP projects are pushed up into the RTP, they tend to be bigger projects that will require federal funding.

- Question: Is there a difference between health and safety in terms of criteria?
 - The "health" criteria primarily refers to air quality impacts.

PBOT has calculated TSP project spending across neighborhood coalitions. East Portland and Southwest are projected to get more investment relative to expected growth.

The next step in project selection is evaluating performance of projects based on ten factors, again Vision Zero and equity are two of those ten factors. At this time, we also look to leverage partnerships, existing plans and funding opportunities for priority projects. East Portland in Motion (EPIM) is a good example of how planning work and community partnerships can elevate projects for funding.

- Question: This is an excellent presentation; can we get copies?
 - Yes.
- Comment: Back to evaluation criteria and the 10 program categories; what are the criteria used to select the smaller (<\$500,000) projects in the program buckets?
 - We are still working on the program buckets and developing a nimble approach to project selection. Additionally, some of the TSP programs don't have funding yet. For example, the Freight Priority program was essentially dormant until the Heavy Vehicle Use Tax (HVUT) was passed.
 - The Pedestrian Network Completion has the least bones attached to it. Safe Routes to School, in contrast, is very developed. Our hope is that PedPDX will generate a list of TSP projects to inform Pedestrian Network Completion.
- Question: I'd like more information about the selection process for the smaller projects in the program buckets. Without numerical scoring, does project selection rely on staff judgement?
 - We can provide the program list for this year. These projects tend to be quite small and we often pair them with maintenance projects in order to stretch the dollars. We have \$2,000,000 total for the ten programs buckets so we are chasing opportunities to pair projects.
- Question: I like the Fixing Our Streets (FOS) project list. Is that a separate process?

- For the “street preservation and maintenance projects” of FOS, those projects were selected solely on road condition. For the “safety projects” of FOS, we worked through the existing TSP list. We didn’t have all the criteria we do now, but safety was a strong component. So all of the FOS projects are now on PBOT’s 5-year CIP.
- Question: Is it safe to say that putting a project on the TSP will make it eligible for future FOS funding?
 - Yes.

Dana Dickman, PBOT Safety Section Manager, explained that staff are currently mapping projects and plans against the High Crash Network (HCN), including funded projects, TSP identified unfunded projects, and gaps with no projects or plans. This process is identifying areas where we need to work on project development, work on plan development, and do more to get funding lined up.

Outer NE Halsey and Glisan are two good examples. They were both identified in the TSP as 11-20 year safety projects, but through Vision Zero we are accelerating those projects. On outer NE Glisan, we had three federally-funded neighborhood greenway crossings of Glisan. By committing additional funding to the corridor, we are leveraging those crossing improvements to consider a potential road reconfiguration that will change the whole corridor. We have a similar process on outer NE Halsey.

Outer SE Division is another example of a street with significant safety needs, where we are bundling several projects to create a comprehensive safety project leveraging a number of funding sources.

We are looking now at where we have TSP projects. Are the extents sufficient? Do the projects sufficiently address the safety needs? We will be putting together a recommended list of TSP project additions and changes to present to City Council in coming months.

- Question: Black dashed line. What does unscoped mean in this context?
 - It means we are about to go into planning to determine specific street design changes, and match that with funding available.
- Question: Is this map just showing the High Crash Network?
 - Yes, but includes TSP projects that run off the HCN in some cases.
- Question: Are there projects that are scoped but unfunded? “Planned improvements” sounds like PBOT will do it in the future. There should be a distinction between planned improvements that are scoped versus those that are unscoped.
 - Good point, we will clarify what “Planned improvements” means.
- Question: How is this process different from ODOT projects?
 - This process will identify projects, some of which will be submitted for STIP and/or HSIP funding.
- Question: Is the main difference the type of funding you are pursuing?
 - Yes. City and State funding I blending more now based more on needs rather than jurisdictions. ARTS funding is good example: jurisdictionally blind, a technical process.

Millicent Williams, PBOT's Capital Projects Division Manager, explained how PBOT ensures that funded projects are engineered and involve the community throughout the process. Six to nine months are baked into projects specifically for community engagement to inform planning and outcomes. Once community input is incorporated, we go back to the planning/design staff and the community to make sure the projects will fulfill expectations, will fulfill Vision Zero, and other priorities

Some projects come to the Capital Projects Division funded, some come partially funded, others are unfunded but with ideas for funding. We combine funding, identify a project manager, make sure the funding mechanisms get lined up. The process involves a lot of coordination and communication. For example, we have to know what the Bureau of Environmental Services is doing that could overlap with PBOT's work.

A project example of this coordination is the SE Foster Road Safety Project. We are working with ODOT to ensure that the project is done well and comprehensively. Originally, the project included 30 blocks. An opportunity arose to extend the scope, which we wanted to take advantage of, but the extension triggered some additional federal funding requirements. We expected to start construction this summer, but now it will be delayed a year. The benefits are expanded scope and a shorter construction timeframe, so the delay is worth the gains.

Public official and public meeting rules (Irene Schwoeffermann)

Irene Schwoeffermann, PBOT's Community Outreach Coordinator, described PBOT's guidelines for volunteer boards and commissions, which include the Vision Zero Task Force.

Irene described Task Force members' roles within PBOT and explained how to identify conflicts of interest. If the committee meets quorum, the meeting becomes public, which means PBOT must provide notice ahead of time and provide meeting notes publicly.

Public record is anything that relates to the business of this group and anything that we share with you written or electronically. It is important that when you share Vision Zero-specific information that you share it with PBOT, which is legally required to keep the public record.

In emails, Clay uses BCC now as a best practice when emailing the entire Task Force. Please include Clay on group emails among Task Force members.

Public comment

(No members of the public comment)

Vision Zero actions implementation reporting (Margi Bradway, Clay Veka, Carl Snyder, Providance Nagy)

Margi Bradway, PBOT's Active Transportation and Safety Division Manager, provided a legislative update on bills related to Vision Zero. The bills that had been through a work session in either chamber are considered still alive.

Regarding the state funding package, we remain optimistic that something will pass this session. Portland is strongly advocating for multimodal funding and are engaged in state and regional conversations.

HB 3230 for Safe Routes to School would take about \$15 million from the state general fund, ODOT would spend \$20 million. This bill will likely become part of a transportation package, it is up to the Ways & Means Committee. In the final version, this bill likely won't get general fund money.

HB2682-2 impacts posted speed limits. This original bill (HB2682) was amended because some counties and cities don't feel they have capacity to take on the authority to set speeds. So the amended bill is now specific to Portland, and specific to "highways in residential districts." We believe it would apply to local streets, which make up about 70 percent of Portland's street network. It would allow for a 5 mph speed reduction to 20 mph and it has significant support in legislature.

- Question: Do you need support for any bills currently in motion? Timing is unclear.
 - We will do our best to inform you of opportunities to engage.
- Comment: We have lobbying available. Happy to personally go testify.

The automated enforcement bill did not get a work session and therefore is not moving forward.

The distracted driving bills have had work sessions. The House version has more legs, and we are supportive of it because the fines are lower and it includes a diversion class option in lieu of paying the fine. The bills need a work session between the House and Senate to get to a compromise. We feel optimistic that a distracted driving bill will pass this session.

HB 2667 on Vision Zero did not get work session. However, I think it helped get the term Vision Zero into the public realm and in discussions with legislators. So even though it is not moving forward, it made an influence in talking with legislators.

- Comment: Still hoping concepts can come alive in the larger transportation funding bill.

Margi discussed PBOT's ongoing efforts to set safe speed limits in Portland. Taking a multipronged approach, we are working to change state law, as well as use an alternative request method. Lewis Wardrip, the City Traffic Engineer, and Carl Snyder, PBOT's Traffic Operations Division Manager, are involved in this work.

When PBOT receives requests from the public to lower speed limits, or identifies streets on which we want to lower speeds, today there are three options: 1) use a traditional request method, 2) use an alternative request method, and 3) rescind the existing speed zone order for residential or business district streets.

The traditional request method is labor and time intensive, and based on vehicle delay. It relies heavily on the 85th percentile speed, the speed that most people are driving.

Alternative request method is faster and it is based on multi-modal and safety needs, including evaluation of street design, mixing of different modes, and existing separation between modes.

- Question: Knowing so many crashes involve speed, do we know which streets have the most speed-related crashes?
 - Not yet. We are working on a scope of work to do that fine-grained analysis. My vision is to have a full time crash data analyst. Right now staff are stretched thin. Currently, we generally only do that analysis at during capital project development phase.
- Comment: I wonder if high speed limit roads have fewer crashes involving people walking and biking because posted speeds are so high.
- Comment: This prioritization makes sense. You are taking an opportunistic approach. One thing I would add is that the place where this matters most is where metal is likely to meet flesh. Among the options, we should target speed limits that would have the most likely health benefits as quickly as possible.
- Comment: Please keep in mind the impacts on transit that lowered speeds may have. It is not a reason to not reduce speeds, but please keep it in the discussion.
- Question: Declaration of emergency by council on outer Division. Not reflected on the map. What is future of that?
 - The emergency speed is a matter of last resort; it shouldn't become a matter of practice.
- Question: So emergency speed is not something you would replicate?
 - Statute says the emergency speed must be renewed every 120 days, so it would be lot of work to go to City Council with this every four months.
- Comment: I like the approach you are taking.

In negotiating the alternative method, ODOT told PBOT that arterials were off the table. So the alternative method does not capture many streets on the High Crash Network.

- Question: What about what NYC did? 25 mph except on very few streets. That is really clear to the public.
 - Our Vision Zero Action Plan does include an action to prioritize getting Portland authority for setting speeds.
- Comment: I recognize this all takes a lot of staff time. In terms of prioritization, I would want to make sure the most vulnerable road users have the most urgency. I would suggest being very intentional—prioritizing slower speeds on streets that provide pedestrian and bike network connectivity.
- Comment: We need to look at the current level of speed compliance. I don't like the 85th percentile but looking at current behavior still matters. I commonly hear, "I've been driving like this for years and I've never gotten a ticket." It's a complicated issue.
- Comment: Lowering speed limits is a great idea. Enforcement can be tricky.

Our engineers constantly remind us about design speed. We look for opportunities to pair capital projects with speed reductions.

- Question: Is citywide lowered speed limit a goal?
 - Director Treat: Absolutely.

- Question: Why are there gaps in the speed limits map?
 - Gaps indicate where statutory speeds are in effect. Those are primarily residential streets so we can assume 25 mph in most cases.
- Comment: Please make colors on the speed map more distinct: 40-45 is difficult to differentiate.

Providence Nagy, PBOT's automated enforcement coordinator, provided a brief summary of early results of PBOT's speed safety camera program. Three camera systems are installed currently. The latest two sets of cameras have similar results to the first set on Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway with a very significant drop in top end speeding.

Adjourn