



2017-18 Vision Zero Task Force

Meeting #3 Summary

Thursday, June 15, 2017 | 9:30 a.m. – noon
Portland Building, 1120 SW 5th Ave, 2nd floor, Room C

Next meeting: Thursday, September 21, 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

Marie Dodds, AAA

Jae Douglas, Multnomah County Health

Duncan Hwang, APANO

Jana Jarvis, Oregon Trucking Association

Brook McCall, Oregon Spinal Cord Injury Connection

Lake McTighe, Metro

Noel Mickelberry and Izzy Armenta, Oregon Walks

Stephanie Noll, The Street Trust

Jeff Owen, TriMet

Andre Plambeck, ODOT Region 1

Don Russ, Portland Fire & Rescue

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

PBOT staff present: Margi Bradway, Wendy Cawley, Dana Dickman, Matt Ferris-Smith, Clay Veka

Welcome and introductions (Leah Treat)

PBOT Director and Vision Zero Task Force chair, Leah Treat, noted recent Vision Zero highlights, including City Council's dedication of almost \$1.5 million ongoing Vision Zero funding from recreational marijuana tax fund revenue and Governor Brown's recent signing of the legislative bill giving Portland authority to reduce speeds on streets in residential districts from 25 to 20 mph. She reminded Task Force members about discussions from the previous meeting, including Art Pearce's presentation on PBOT project identification and funding. The previous discussion set the back-drop for this meeting agenda, where members would be asked to help prioritize projects to move forward.

Legislative update (Margi Bradway)

State funding measure is still in flux. Includes \$10 million each for Safe Routes to School and All Roads Transportation Safety program through ODOT.

Governor Brown just signed bill into law that allows Portland to reduce statutory speed by 5 mph on residential streets, down to 20 mph. Has the potential to impact about 70 percent of Portland's street network. It will have some fiscal impact and the law has some nuances. For example, it likely allows Portland to lower speeds on other streets, including collectors, where no designated speed is in place. This new speed reduction mostly does not include streets on the High Crash Network.

We plan to do a communications plan to talk about impact of speed on severity of crashes and encourage people to obey speed limits. This communications campaign will be paired with the reduction in speed limits.

Question: Will you be changing all the signs, and adding more—or will you be saying 20 mph unless otherwise posted?

Response: We are still determining how we will implement the law.

Question: When will the communications campaign on speed start to roll out?

Response: Even though the bill has become law, we are going to wait to make a big push to the public until City Council adopts the new speed on city streets and we are ready to change out the necessary speed signs.

Additionally, Margi shared that a bill allowing speed citations through red light cameras passed the legislature and was expected to be signed into law. Portland is in a contract on our red light camera program until April 1, 2019. Within that contract, our flexibility is constrained, but we will begin looking at how we might make use of new law.

There are still two bills alive at the legislature that address distracted driving. One is in the Senate Rules Committee and one is in the Senate Ways & Means Committee. PBOT supports the House version because it is less punitive and has diversion program. The House bill is still expected to pass this session.

Vision Zero Project Concept List and Map review, discussion, & vote (Clay Veka)

A priority of the Vision Zero Task Force has been to advance safe streets through street design. We have an opportunity to update Portland's Transportation System Plan (TSP) and Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with important multi-modal safety projects on the High Crash Network. The RTP call for projects is out now, so it is an important time to ensure that projects of regional significance, with a cost of \$1M or more, are integrated into the RTP in order to be eligible for federal funding. After reviewing projects on the High Crash Network (HCN) that are currently funded or identified in a transportation plan, it was clear that there were some gaps. Our Vision Zero team has identified the gaps and projects that should be added to the TSP and RTP to fill in those gaps. We will be going to City Council on July 13 with a project list.

The Vision Zero concept project map in front of you was developed through a multi-step process. The first question we asked was, on which HCN segments have we made significant investments or the crash data merits monitoring? There are segments around the city where we've made investments or the crash data doesn't show safety needs. On those segments, we drew green lines.

The second question: where do we have projects funded that have a strong safety focus? These are the gray lines on the map.

Third question: where do we have TSP projects identified on the HCN with a strong safety focus but not funded? There are a lot of them. These are orange lines on the map. On some streets, funded projects (gray lines) overlap with TSP projects (orange lines) because even after the funded project is implemented, we believe that additional investment will be necessary to meet the safety needs of the streets. So we retained the TSP projects.

Fourth question: where do we have TSP projects that should be modified to meet Vision Zero goals? Example is 92nd Ave where an existing TSP project added bike lanes, but crash analysis shows pedestrian crashes—so we extended the project definition to include walking and biking safety, as well as expanded the extents of the project to cover the entire High Crash Network segment. These are the solid red lines on the map.

Fifth question: on which remaining segments, those with no funded or no identified, unfunded projects, should a new TSP project be added? These are the dotted red lines on the map.

Final question: on which remaining segments are there safety needs that could be met with projects less than \$500,000? These segments will be funded through TSP "buckets," which also includes Safe Routes to School, Neighborhood Greenways, and Transit Priority. These are the yellow lines on the map.

Question: Are there any cases in which you are recommending shrinking the scope of a TSP project? No.

Question: Does this map and the associated projects reflect the RTP pending update call for projects and the projects that are a shared investment strategy for two ongoing corridor planning efforts?

Response: Yes, we are trying to do that. There are many moving, parallel efforts. For any of them, we want to be sure that the High Crash Network is in those plans because we want to be consistent with state, regional, and local plans.

Follow-up question: Within a given corridor plan, there are two types of projects: one will be built by the transit project itself, and the other bucket are those that need to be there to support transit project but that still need to be funded. For example, you have Barbur, TSP# 90017. Huge project with unknown costs. If you go to TriMet and Metro, many smaller projects are critical to the success of light rail projects if it's ever built.

Follow-up point: There are funded/proposed projects on both Division and SW Corridor. Are they coordinated?

Response: Yes, we are adding projects, but not taking away. Just making sure that projects currently in TSP meet Vision Zero goals.

Question: There is a funded project on Barbur that is not on your map. Regional Flexible Funds money has been committed and should be added.

Response: Thank you for the heads-up, we will add it.

Comment: The map is hard to read; the colors are not distinct enough.

Comment: First, I like the way you've organized this work. I was going to mention the Barbur project, too. Also, the Central City: is that symbolized with Broadway?

Response: We have a key to the map—a full spreadsheet that identifies the projects that correspond to each of these lines.

Comment: There is a fair amount of technical language in this document. If I shared this, most people wouldn't understand it. Also, when will these projects be funded and built and what is the sense of timing or urgency?

Response: You're right, this is a lot of detail. What would be helpful for you to share? We do have the 2017 construction map, which is probably more relevant to community members. During the second half of meeting today will be asking for help to prioritize funding to spend on construction projects in the next two fiscal years, which better responds to the sense of urgency to get critical safety projects on the ground.

Comment: Please use more pictures, less language.

Response: A lot of these projects aren't scoped enough for us to say much about them. That's part of the issue here. Some of these are long-range and we don't have level of detail yet.

Comment: I show people the High Crash Network when I share this information, because that gets people talking. I think having a version of the overall project map would have merit, and I would be happy to work with you on that.

On July 13, we will be going to City Council with a resolution that has three functions: amend the Vision Zero Action Plan to attach this proposed Vision Zero Project List, direct PBOT to amend the TSP to incorporate relevant Vision Zero projects, and also to submit appropriate

projects during the RTP call for projects process. Taking these steps will make Vision Zero projects eligible for funding.

Question: Are these projects on the constrained or unconstrained RTP and TSP lists? What is the proposed time-frame on those lists?

Response: We will share a project spreadsheet that identifies which proposed list each project is on: constrained 1-10 years, constrained 11-20 years or unconstrained.

Question: On the green lines, "monitoring." Is there a chance these will come off monitoring?

Response: VZ analysis was done at the corridor level. Every two years we will re-run crash analysis to identify which corridors fall off and which ones pop on. I don't anticipate taking any parts of HCN off the monitoring status.

Question: Regarding classification of major emergency response routes—will that process change?

Response: No, the process will be the same. We still want your input on all those projects and no classifications will change. Additionally, none of the projects going to Council are that specific.

Comment: It's not clear to me how the Portland vs. ODOT jurisdiction is handled, especially given jurisdictional transfer issue.

Response: On ODOT streets, we still scope projects, and then that goes into TSP as a general safety need. Then it is up to PBOT and ODOT to negotiate the design and funding.

Question: Why isn't Highway 30 a high crash street?

Response: It didn't make the cut for the top 20 for people walking, biking, or driving. When we redo analysis, that could change.

Is there interest in having a motion to endorse the project list? The purpose for going to City Council is threefold. First, for City Council to amend the Vision Zero Action Plan to attach this Vision Zero project list that identifies projects on all streets on the High Crash Network. Second, to update the TSP with the new and revised projects on the High Crash Network. Third, to incorporate some projects into the RTP. This action would communicate to City Council that the Vision Zero Task Force is supportive of having a project list adopted and moved into the TSP and RTP.

Question: What happens if council resolution is not successful?

Response: These projects would not be eligible for higher levels of funding.

Comment: I want to make sure that the individual projects are staff recommendations for what would do the most good.

Response: This list is not meant to be a prioritization. It's a list to make sure that the High Crash Network is covered; it is setting us up to get funding. To go after funding, we will work with you on how to prioritize projects.

MOTION: I move that the VZ Task Force supports the adoption of Vision Zero Project List and that select projects be added to the TSP and to the RTP. (Lake McTighe)

Seconded (Jana Jarvis)

The motion was unanimously approved.

FY 2017-18 project prioritization – Small group exercise

Within PBOT's capital funding, there is not a lot of flexible spending. We rely heavily on grants and other restricted funding. However, over the years we have had a small set aside (\$300,000) to do small improvements. With the marijuana funding that Council approved in their adopted budget, now we have \$1.4 million of ongoing funding. We propose using \$1 million for capital projects for the 2017-18 fiscal year and \$300,000 on education campaigns. We propose also allocating \$1.3 million for capital projects in the 2018-19 fiscal year. Today is an opportunity to program this new funding.

We have worked to identify projects on the High Crash Network with significant safety benefits that we can build this fiscal year or next fiscal year. Some are more expansive; some are more point improvements. The list that we have developed totals almost \$5 million. Would like to program about \$2.3 million. And we are asking you to help prioritize.

Question: Does the money need to be spent each year or can you carry it over?

Response: It won't revert to the general fund, but it won't look good to not spend it. It will be important for us to point to successful projects on the ground during next year's budget discussions.

Question: Are we required to spend the funding on impaired driving specifically?

Answer: No, it is flexible money that can be spent on Vision Zero generally.

The Task Force members broke into four groups to consider how to prioritize \$2.3 million of projects out of the nearly \$5 million of potential projects. There were four project packages proposed for their consideration: Communities of Concern, Transit Access, Leverage Existing Projects, and Geographic Spread.

Report Back:

Group 1 report: We built off the Communities of Concern package. Added to it some geographic spread including Capitol/49th project, crosswalk at Killingsworth & 9th and the transit crossing at MLK & Beech. Our thinking was to prioritize Communities of Concern and a few other projects to provide geographic spread. Close to \$2.3 million.

Group 2 report: We started by assuming that all projects are necessary and good. We didn't delve into individual projects, but instead looked at projects that overlapped in the Transit package, Communities of Concern package and Leverage package. There was quite a bit of overlap. We also looked at projects that were high injury for every mode, and those in Communities of Concern to further refine. We ended up selecting 12 projects on 8 corridors.

Group 3 report: We also looked at overlap between the packages. The transit package was where we wanted to go, and looking for the highest level of investment. We overlaid the Leverage and Communities of Concern projects with the transit package. We selected 15 projects total. On the Transit package, we took off Capitol and Broadway, and added the Killingsworth projects.

Group 4: We started with the Communities of Concern package. We wanted to prioritize roads that ranked high in fatalities vs. injuries. In looking at Communities of Concern list, 92nd doesn't have any fatals. We thought we could add in other roads that overlap with other projects, so we added Foster, Broadway and Capitol. We prioritized projects in the Transit package that are high ranking for peds in particular in terms of fatalities. We also talked about education programming—wanting to find ways to encourage people who have been drinking to use other modes. Work with TNC and transit providers to provide free options for people to get home.

Response: We will take each group's recommendations and look for overlap. At broad brush, Communities of Concern and Transit Access seem to be getting a lot of support. We will share out what we are recommending to move forward based on your input. Also, regarding DUII prevention we are working on education specific to the transportation network companies and private-for-hire companies using permit fee revenue. That funding is restricted on what it can be spent on. We have proposed using permit money to educate people about DUII and safe travel modes available. That proposal has been approved and will start July 1 with a \$150,000 pilot. We can use part of that money to educate drivers as well.

Public comment

None provided

Agenda build and next steps

We want to be sure in these meetings we are addressing issues you want to address.

Question: At what point during scoping can we provide input on specific project elements? I would like to have input into what elements go into projects.

Response: Can I take read of the room? Do you all want to get into project-level details?

Question: Are you suggesting all projects, or specific ones?

Response: I'm not sure. We have done a good job at short and long term project implementation, but I don't have a good sense of what happens next.

Comment: One thing that could be helpful for the whole group would be explaining how we scope a project. Wendy Cawley could take you through a scoping process to take you through how project elements are selected. (Yes: committee expressed interest in this.)

Comment: We will have RTP draft in September or October. If committee is interested, I would be happy to share that with committee and get input.

We met with Gresham last week. Coordinating on RTP projects on safety fixes. Also Commissioner Saltzman and I will be presenting on Vision Zero to the Multnomah County Commission, with Jae Douglas and Joanna Valencia, on June 22nd at 9:30am. Perhaps there is a tie-in to our agenda item on regional coordination that we can touch on.

For other agenda topic requests, please email Clay.

Adjourn

See attached: Ranked Order of Potential Vision Zero Projects through Task Force Prioritization Exercise – Funding for Fiscal Years 2017-18 and 2018-19

Ranked Order of Potential Vision Zero Projects through Task Force Prioritization Exercise Funding for Fiscal Years 2017-18 and 2018-19

# Votes	Street	Quad	Extent or intersection	Description	Communities of Concern	Transit access	Leveraged funded prjts	Geographic spread	4 Votes	4+3 Votes	4+3+2 Votes
4	Capitol/49th	SW	Huber-Hidalgo	Construct pedestrian crossings, lighting and transit stop improvements to complement existing project.		✓	✓	✓	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000
4	Glisan	NE	82nd-162nd (city limit)	Add pedestrian crossings at 4 transit stops, including at 90th Ave, in conjunction with road reorganization project.	✓	✓	✓		\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
4	Holgate	SE	67th, 78th, 79th	Add RRFBs to three existing marked crosswalks that serve two schools, a transit stop and the Holgate Library.	✓	✓	✓	✓	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000
4	Holgate	SE	I-205-122nd	Demonstration of PBOT guidelines for pedestrian crossings, bike facilities and street lighting. Convert buffered bike lanes to protected bike lanes; add bus islands and ped crossings at 108th Pl, 115th Ave, 117th Ave; add enhanced ped crossing around 120th Ave; street lighting upgrades.	✓	✓			\$ 362,500	\$ 362,500	\$ 362,500
4	Stark	SE	109th-162nd (city limit)	Design multi-modal safety improvements.	✓	✓		✓	\$ 145,000	\$ 145,000	\$ 145,000
4	*Stark	SE	109th-162nd (city limit)	Construct multi-modal safety improvements.	✓	✓		✓	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
3	92nd	SE	Stark-Sun Crest (city limit)	Design pedestrian crossings, transit access and enhanced bicycle facilities.	✓	✓		✓		\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
3	*92nd	SE	Stark-Sun Crest (city limit)	Construct pedestrian crossings, transit access and enhanced bicycle facilities.	✓	✓		✓		\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
3	Broadway	NE	24th-Cesar E. Chavez	Design road reorganization to accommodate pedestrian crossings to transit stops and bike lanes.		✓		✓		\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
3	*Broadway	NE	24th-Cesar E. Chavez	Construct road reorganization to accommodate pedestrian crossings to transit stops and bike lanes.		✓		✓		\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
3	Killingsworth	NE	Cully-Lombard	Redesign right-of-way to limit access on this segment of Killingsworth and create shared space by all users to connect Hacienda and Living Cully Plaza.	✓			✓		\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000
3	*Killingsworth	NE	Cully-Lombard	Construct limited access right-of-way on this segment of Killingsworth and create shared space by all users to connect Hacienda and Living Cully Plaza.	✓			✓		\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
2	MLK	NE	Beech	Construct enhanced pedestrian crossing at transit stop to match other new crossings that are part of the MLK Pedestrian Safety Project.		✓	✓				\$ 100,000
1	Foster	SE	I-205 - 139th	Design project that supports multi-modal safety and ties into proposed BES project.		✓					
1	*Foster	SE	I-205-139th	Construct project that supports multi-modal safety and ties into proposed BES project.		✓					
1	Foster	SE	139th-Jenne (city limit)	Install best practices for rural road design, including rumble strips, curve warning signs and guardrail in certain segments.				✓			

Ranked Order of Potential Vision Zero Projects through Task Force Prioritization Exercise Funding for Fiscal Years 2017-18 and 2018-19

# Votes	Street	Quad	Extent or intersection	Description	Communities of Concern	Transit access	Leverage funded prjts	Geographic spread	4 Votes	4+3 Votes	4+3+2 Votes
1	Halsey	NE	88th	Add crossing enhancements and access to existing, substandard crossing at transit stop.		✓	✓				
1	Killingsworth	NE	9th	Construct marked pedestrian crossing .				✓			
0	Fremont	NE	102nd-122nd	Pending PF&R approval, install fire truck-friendly speed bumps to address speeding.				✓			
0	Halsey	NE	70th-80th	Demonstration segment of PBOT guidelines for pedestrian crossings and lighting. Road reorganization to reduce crashes 40%; and add ped crossings at 4 transit stops.		✓					
0	Interstate	N	Oregon-Columbia	Enhance existing bike facilities with green paint, limited parking removal, temporary curb and flexible posts in select locations.				✓			
0	Lombard / Marine	N	Kelly Point Park	Construct enhanced pedestrian crossing at Kelly Point Park (RRFB).				✓			
0	MLK	NE	Going	Add hybrid beacon to coordinate with signal timing at existing Neighborhood Greenway crossing.			✓				
0	Sandy	NE	48th-79th	Design project with improved pedestrian crossings, transit access, lighting to meet City guidelines.		✓					
0	*Sandy	NE	48th-79th	Construct project with improved pedestrian crossings, transit access, lighting to meet City guidelines.		✓					
0	BH	SW	21st-30th; 39th-45th	Add flexible posts and concrete curb to provide separation to the new shared use path.			✓	✓			
Sum of prioritized project									\$ 1,657,500	\$ 2,412,500	\$ 2,512,500