

# **Transportation Safety Action Plan (TSAP) Project Advisory Committee Meeting #6 Summary**

**Tuesday, August 11, 2015 1:00 pm – 4:30 pm**

**Location: Chemeketa Center for Business and Industry 626 High St NE, Salem, OR**

## **Committee Members Present**

Michael Laverty (Chair), *Oregon Transportation Safety Committee*  
\*Pam Barlow-Lind, *Confederated Tribes of Siletz, Cascades ACT*  
Jerome Cooper, *Oregon Transportation Safety Committee*  
Troy Costales, *ODOT Safety Division Administrator*  
Tyler Deke, *Bend Metropolitan Planning Organization*  
Marian Owens, *Oregon Transportation Safety Committee*  
Luis Ornelas, *Oregon Transportation Safety Committee*  
Chris Henry, *City of Eugene & Governor's Advisory Committee on Motorcycles*  
Victor Hoffer, *Oregon Transportation Safety Committee*  
Jeff Lewis, *Oregon State Police*  
Scott Kocher, *Oregon Walks*  
\*Michael Tynan, *Oregon Health Authority*  
Brian Ray, *Kittelson & Associates, Inc*  
Kimberly Daily, *Oregon Judicial Department*

## **Committee Members Absent**

Emily Acklund, *Association of Oregon Counties*  
Chuck Hayes, *Governor's Advisory Committee on DUII*  
Craig Honeyman, *League of Oregon Cities*  
David Jostad, *May Trucking*

## **ODOT Project Staff Present**

Erik Havig, *ODOT Planning Director*  
Walt McAllister, *ODOT Safety Project Manager*  
Nancy Murphy, *ODOT Principal Planner, Project Manager*

## **Consultants Present**

Beth Wemple, *Consultant Project Manager– Cambridge Systematics*  
\*Nicole Waldheim, *Consultant Deputy Project Manager – Cambridge Systematics*  
Jeanne Lawson, *Facilitator–JLA Public Involvement*  
Kenya Williams, *JLA Public Involvement*

## **Members of Public & Others Present**

Dan Estes, *ODOT Impaired Driving Program Manager*  
Doug Bish, *ODOT Technical Services*  
Nick Fortey, *Federal Highway Administration*  
Jerri Bohard, *Oregon Transportation Development Division*  
Sandra Doubleday, *Transportation Planner, City of Gresham*  
Joe Marek, *Director, Clackamas Safe Communities Program*  
Amy Joyce, *ODOT Legislative Liaison*  
Daniel Hauser, *AOC, County Road Program Policy Specialist*  
Michael Rock, *ODOT Planner*

---

\*Attended by phone

## **Key Meeting Outcomes**

---

The purpose of the meeting was to refine the goal areas and discuss potential policy themes. The PAC:

- Reviewed safety goals from other Oregon transportation planning documents and identified enforcement and education as gaps.
- Received an overview of the 6 goal areas and advised that leadership, evaluation and implementation needed to be clearly addressed.
- Participated in a workshop and provided feedback for all six goal areas.
- Accepted the 6 goal areas with suggested refinements.

## **Meeting Summary**

---

### **Welcome and Opening Remarks**

Chairperson Mike Laverty opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. Committee members and members of the public introduced themselves.

Jeanne Lawson provided a brief overview of the agenda and reviewed the goals for the meeting. She also asked the committee for comments related to the previous meeting summary and reminded the committee of the protocols. In addition, she introduced the alternates and who they were representing followed by introductions from the committee and members of the public. There were no comments on the Meeting 5 summary.

### **Project Update**

Beth Wemple provided the committee with a project update and informed the committee that the process is close to the half-way mark.

### **Structure of the Transportation Safety Action Plan**

Beth presented the preliminary structure for the Transportation Safety Action Plan in an effort to show the committee a comprehensive view of where the process is heading.

#### *Committee Discussion:*

- A project team member informed the committee that more time is being spent during this plan's development compared to previous plans in an effort to give the committee more ownership of the plan and to align the plan with their vision.

### **Safety Goals in other ODOT Policy Plans**

Nancy Murphy reviewed safety goals and policies from other Oregon transportation planning documents. She also provided an overview of the Bike and Pedestrian Plan Update. The following plans were presented:

- Oregon Transportation Plan (2006)
- Oregon Freight Plan (2011)

- Oregon Rail Plan (2014)
- Oregon Highway Plan (1999 + amendments)
- Oregon Transportation Options Plan (2015)
- Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (1995)
- Draft Bike and Pedestrian Plan Update

*Committee discussion:*

- A project team member commented that the list of plans presented was a compilation of different mode plans that viewed safety from different lens, and not all the plans presented would share the same safety goals as the TSAP.
- The group discussed enforcement. A committee member commented that education was an overlap with several of the presented plans but only saw traffic enforcement once. Another committee member suggested that enforcement should be more evident regardless of the mode. The member also commented that the public often wants to fund enforcement efforts but not fund the people to carry out the enforcement. Counties and cities lack funding for enforcement. If funding cannot be provided then it will be difficult to have enforcement as a goal of the plan.
- When asked if there were other areas that should have more focus, the committee members suggested education of the public at large.
  - A committee member commented that ‘every driver a safe driver’ is a concept that fits between enforcement and education but somewhat slips between the cracks.
  - A project team member commented that typically we talk in terms of modes instead of people and suggested that the attention should focus on behavior and what are people likely to do versus focusing on modes.
  - A committee member mentioned an article about how the blame has shifted over the last century from people to cars and there needs to be a shift back to people instead of inanimate objects. He also noticed that education was a part of several plans but driver education was not explicit and this could be an opportunity to get 15-18 year old drivers on the right track through driver education and continuing education for drivers. Additionally, there was no mention of how to accomplish education.
- A committee member suggested that the committee should take efforts to make this planning process be future-proof since most plans were 20 years old. This plan should capture important elements keeping the future in mind and omitting things in older plans that may not be relevant or current.

## **Goals and Policies**

Beth presented the highlights of the Goals Memo. She gave an overview of what the committee wanted as the six goals areas and the organization of the six goal areas. This presentation was to provide clarity for each of the six goal areas prior to the small group workshop. She reviewed the following six goal areas:

### **Goal Area 1 - Provide Safe Infrastructure**

Goal Area 2 - Safety Culture: Personal and Organizational Responsibility  
Goal Area 3 - Safe and Healthy Communities  
Goal Area 4 - Integrate Technology Enhancements  
Goal Area 5 - Collaboration and Communication  
Goal Area 6 - Strategic Investments

Please view the Goal Statements and Policy Themes Memo for a more detailed overview.

*Outcomes:*

- By consensus, the group accepted the 6 goals areas with the refinements that were discussed.
- Leadership, evaluation and implementation need to be clearly addressed.

*Committee discussion:*

- The committee briefly discussed the word choice of healthy community versus livable community.
- A committee member commented that a healthy community is a sub-component of a livable community.
- A committee member asked where the aspect of testing or evaluating the success of planning implementation is addressed.

The committee was broken into three small groups to participate in a workshop. The six goal areas were paired and each small group discussed the goal areas two at a time before moving to another pair of goal areas until each group had a chance to provide feedback for all six goal areas. At each pair of goals, a staff member facilitated the discussion then provided a report after the workshop was completed. A list and photos of the key outcomes, edits and potential policy areas are listed in Attachment A. The following reflects the key outcomes from each pair of goals:

**Station A**

***Goal 5 - Collaboration and Communication***

- We need to instigate, lead, not just collaborate
- Who else should be included – “Entities” needs more clarification
- Evaluation should not be buried – this must be done
- Quantify the benefits of investments

***Goal 6 - Strategic Investments***

- Timeliness was universal from each group – we need to be action oriented
- Evaluation of investments is important
- Silos of money is an issue – it is making the work harder

## **Station B**

### ***Goal 2 - Safety Culture: Personal and Organizational Responsibility***

- Strengthening personal responsibility was not coming across strong enough
- Education belongs in this goal
- Attitude related to enforcement is hard to change

### ***Goal 3 - Safe and Healthy Communities***

- Is healthy the right word or is livable the right word
- Livability was thought to be a broader word than healthy
- Equity – (economic and geographic)
- Emergency medical services is a key part of keeping a community healthy
- Ultimately we need benchmarks and outcomes
- Qualitative measures will be needed to learn how people feel about safe and healthy communities

## **Station C**

### ***Goal 1 - Provide Safe Infrastructure***

- Goal 1 was all encompassing
- An evaluation component is needed to assess safe facilities
- Good solid data is need for building and designing safe infrastructure
- Need to be able to evaluate effectiveness (return on investment, cost benefit analysis)
- Risk – Are we willing to try new things/do pilots related to design and new facilities?

### ***Goal 4 - Integrate Technology Enhancements***

- Implementation - How do we proactively plan for technology
- Remove barriers to promote and enable innovation
- There are equity issues related to technology – how do we manage this?
- Rural and urban access to technology will differ

### ***Large Group Discussion after the Workshop:***

- A committee member commented that everyone was mindful of each other and it was a very healthy conversation/exercise.
- The committee discussed putting education under safety culture. Collaboration is not education.
- A committee member commented that leadership or promoting a champion was missing and wanted to know who would be the champion for safety or who would be in charge of plan implementation? This comment was followed by a comment from another committee member who wanted to know who would take the plan around or be in charge of saying what needs to be done. It was discussed that this was Oregon's plan and there would be expectations about leadership from several entities and groups and this would be clarified in the implementation plan. Another committee member inquired about how to get the plan into local governments and making local government champions of this plan.

- A committee member suggested wherever evaluation goes, implementation belongs in the same place.
- A committee member commented that performance measures would be included since they are required by the federal government and asked if the committee would consider measures beyond what is required and if so what are the other areas?
- The committee chair commented that things were off to a good start and he was impressed with the work that is being done.

## **White Paper on Emphasis Area Selection Approach**

Beth described the purpose, process and elements of developing the White Paper on Guidance for Emphasis Areas. The presentation included preliminary findings of a review of other plans and how emphasis areas can be selected.

### *Committee discussion:*

- A committee member asked if there was an opportunity for an experimental component or try pilot programs.
- Committee suggestions of other sources of data to consider:
  - A committee member commented that lawyers that represent victims had detailed data about each crash but not comprehensive data.
  - Naturalistic driver studies were mentioned as a source of data but too detailed for the emphasis areas.

## **Next Step**

During the next meeting the committee will reconfirm the goals statements, review draft policy statements and preliminary strategy and emphasis areas.

## **Public Comments**

Mike Laverty opened the discussion for public comment. There were no public comments.

## **Closing Comments & Meeting Wrap Up**

Chairperson Mike Laverty thanked the committee and praised everyone for the good work that is being accomplished.

The next meeting will be October 13<sup>th</sup> from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Salem at the Department of Safety Standards & Training. The committee agreed to start the meeting earlier and have a longer meeting since the Transportation Safety Committee was not meeting due to a transportation conference. Lunch will be provided.

## **Attachment A**

### **Goal Area 1 – Provide Safe Infrastructure**

- All encompassing
  - Preservation?
  - Recognize process life cycle
- Does enforcement fit?
  - User create needs
  - Data analysis/research
- Need to listen to local drivers/users
  - Value oriented/cost effective/ROI?
  - Enhance – system/complete gaps, increment improvement
- Quantitative safety performance
  - Jurisdictional independence
  - Think outside the box (encourage creativity)
  - Willing to accept risk
  - Performance-based outcomes
- Evaluation – systems not static
- Lack of Availability Data (A/T)
  - Accessibility of data
  - Terminology/definitions consistency
  - Reporting requirements (bike/ped)
  - How we set speed limits
  - Cost effectiveness/Cost Benefit Analysis

### **Goal Area 2 – Safety Culture: Personal & Organizational Responsibility**

- Strengthen personal responsibility culture in statement
- “Ensure”?
- Avoid blame/nonjudgmental – where is the “line”?
- Organizations take next step – dig on what happened, why? (Yes)
- Organizational “flexibility”
- Trust
- Personal technology
- Accountability (immediate)
- Public attitudes of enforcement differ
  - Public
  - Law enforcement – tough to change?
- Visible law enforcement with human element
- Real time feedback
- CULTURE
  - Better understanding of actions
- Broad Organizational Culture
- Simplify goals (2<sup>nd</sup> part is key)

- Education – link to enforcement

**Goal Area 3 – Safe & Health Communities**

- “Health” or “livability”
- Context sensitive
  - Education
- Stress “E’s”
- Enforcement beyond “legal”
  - School bus, crossing guards
- Public health/wellness
- All ages
- Equity
- Modes/infrastructure
- Active transportation
- EMS
- Fund positions
- Equity
  - Rural, urban, fringe, high crash corridors
- Level of Service transportation options for people
- Community development
  - Benchmarks – safety outcomes
- Need for data and sharing
- Evaluating community/broad outcomes
- Qualitative measures/survey/interviews

**Goal Area 4 – Integrate Technology Advancements**

- Missing implementation goal
  - Target critical technologies/pilot research
- Research/pilot
  - Proactively plan/leg.
  - Enable new innovation/remove barriers
  - Education
  - Rural & Urban
- Add “appropriately integrate”
  - Analysis component
  - Positively affect safety
- Analysis/impacts
  - Cost responsibility/effectiveness
  - Disparity gap (have/don’t have)
  - Resiliency without technology
- Practically, how do we do it?
- Automated enforcement
  - Driver impairment technology
  - Insurance/risk model

## **Goal Area 5 – Collaboration & Communication**

- Needs to go beyond agencies and entities – reach out/include more stakeholders
- System users?
- Communities
- Consider, coordinate and support
- Policy
  - What about MPO's (Metropolitan Planning Organizations)?
- Traffic Incident Management System – What about their strategic stakeholders
- Leveraging and sharing is communities too
- Instigate collaboration?
  - Facilitated?
- It is not education (if it is, it's a gap in the goals)
- Missing: Don't bury evaluation
- Should include public
- Schools
- Builders/developers
- Grow relationships with private sector
- "Individuals" to cover the gaps "stakeholders"
- Policy
  - Be responsive to larger safety campaigns and movements
  - Data sets need further integration and linkage

## **Goal Area 6 – Strategic Investments**

- Statement
- Timeliness?
- It's not just money – consider the human capital
- Policy comments
  - Identify sources – outside FHWA and NHTSA – who is going to get it?
  - Do we have adequate funding for all our needs
  - Silos of money are a constant challenge – break down walls
- Need to use language that allows us to tackle universal goals
- Some sort of indication that the requests will be data informed and/or targeted
- Add the 5<sup>th</sup> "E" of education
- Funding collaboration opportunities
- Education – does it include "safety culture"? Or should it be listed separately?
- What about quantifying benefits of investment?
- 2<sup>nd</sup> – Timeliness, then: are we using the money most effectively (strategically leverage existing funding)
- Planning for safety endeavors
  - Develop plans that lead to investment
- What can our cities and counties do on the funding issues
- Some method of evaluating safety investments
- Reduce barriers to public and private partnerships