



# Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan Assessment Interviews Summary September and October 2014

## Introduction

Doug Zenn from Zenn Associates conducted 22 interviews among several ODOT Divisions in September and October, 2014, to assess perceptions about the current 2011 Transportation Safety Action Plan (TSAP) and to seek suggestions for the development of the next iteration of the plan. The interviews spanned ODOT including Maintenance, Driver and Motor Vehicle Services, Project Delivery, Motor Carrier, Transportation Development, Crash Data, and Bike and Pedestrian programs, as well as representatives from ODOT's Region offices. An interview list is included with *Appendix A*.

The interviews were conducted in a conversational manner covering a wide variety of topic areas with the intention of making the best use-of the interviewees' areas of expertise. The format of the questions focused on the "Four Es": Engineering, Education, Enforcement and Emergency Management Services. It was expected that interviewees would address their areas of expertise and could be prompted, as needed, with questions about their perceptions in other areas.

The primary objectives of the interviews included:

- 1) Seeking levels of knowledge and levels of understanding across disciplines about the plan,
- 2) Developing a better understanding of the strengths of the existing plan as well as areas that might need improvement,
- 3) Identifying major issues to be addressed and new developments or programs that might be added.
- 4) Exploring ways to better achieve involvement between and among ODOT Divisions.

Topics for discussion and sample questions are included in *Appendix B (page 6)*.

Compiled and sorted notes from the interviews are included in *Appendix C (page 8)*.

## **OVERVIEW**

Overall, the TSAP was well-regarded among most interviewees for its thoroughness and ability to keep safety as part of the discussion within ODOT. Most interviewees appreciated the progress that ODOT is showing in safety and most said that while the agency is moving in the right direction, there is still much progress to be made. A number of interviewees credited the TSAP development with bringing safety to the forefront of transportation discussions.

Though general familiarity with the TSAP is relatively high among interviewees, only a few use or reference it on a regular basis. Several interviewees said that even with the TSAP, most safety issues and initiatives are decentralized within ODOT, which may cause the agency to sometimes miss opportunities to collaborate. The TSAP, at its best, could provide the central, unifying structure for such collaboration, interviewees said. Some said that ODOT's more integrated, multi-modal approach to transportation planning may provide a further step in that direction.

Several challenges were recognized among interviewees, often with strong opinions. Three most frequently cited were:

- how to find the right balance between traditional retrofitting approaches and newer proactive design approaches to safety,
- how to keep all ODOT divisions and safety-related state agencies engaged as partners in safety, and
- how to use limited funding in the most effective way.

Most said the TSAP could play a significant role in addressing these challenges.

## **COMMON INTERVIEW THEMES**

Among the 22 interviews, several common suggestions emerged, though the details around each varied greatly. The most frequent comments and suggestions emerged around areas including 1) data needs, 2) document organization and use, 3) integrating participating partners, and 4) priorities.

### **Data Needs**

The need for data (usually more of it) was the most frequently unsolicited topic among most interviewees. The need for more data was not often cited as a weakness in the existing plan, but instead a reality for future planning efforts. Some stated that data needs continue to grow and will continue to do so. Several cited MAP-21 and federal

requirements for more data-driven decision making. With data requests at such a premium, several suggested a more comprehensive conversation about where additional data would have the greatest impacts.

On the flip side of this discussion, several interviewees lauded some of the “socially driven” and harder-to-measure elements of the existing plan. These include education programs, data development and some programs that “push the envelope,” particularly in areas that are not data rich, such as bike, pedestrian, and ADA. These, they said, should not be lost in the quest for exclusively data-driven answers. Several said that this is a component in the Oregon plan that differentiates it from other plans nationally and should, to some degree be maintained in the next iteration.

The degree to which these elements should be retained varied greatly among interviewees. Many cited the need for data-based decisions in most cases, but also recognized that some of those items that are less data driven may need to be retained because of dedicated funding sources. Moreover, those items that are less data driven should not be dropped simply because the value is more difficult to measure. In such cases, however, measurements for accountability still need to be considered. Several noted that priorities don’t need to be exclusively data driven, but should be explained when data is not driving the decision. The most frequently mentioned areas where this might apply are with education programs, emerging technologies and data development.

## **Document Organization and Use**

While a number of interviewees complimented the existing plan for its comprehensive scope, the single most frequently expressed area of concern was the number of actions in the existing plan. Interviewees expressed a number of reasons for this concern. A number of interviewees said the volume of actions diluted the plan, making it difficult to identify the items of true importance. In most cases, the fact that the plan identifies emphasis areas did not change this perception. Some noted the emphasis areas as a potentially strong element of the plan, but that it was not clear why these emerged above others.

The way the actions are presented created confusion, some interviewees said. Some said the actions could be tiered or grouped in a way that would make them easier to find and track. Others suggested that more distinctions be made among short-, medium- and long-term actions. It was suggested by several that the long list be part of the appendix, but not part of the plan and that the agency work hard to clearly prioritize its actions, though all recognized the many challenges in doing so.

A few interviewees felt that the actions were inconsistent relative to each other. Some are highly aspirational, almost visionary while others are very specific. The interviewees

said that a distinction should be made between such actions and that this is a possible improvement area for a future plan.

### **Integrating participating partners**

Most interviewees were able to identify some contribution they or their department made in the development of the current Transportation Safety Action Plan. A few expressed a high familiarity with the plan and its implementation. However, most expressed some level of uncertainty about their current roles in TSAP implementation and how their programs were directly linked to the TSAP.

Some identified and complimented the annual safety workshops (Silver Falls was mentioned numerous times) as one means to bring groups together to continue transportation safety discussions. Even in this instance, the direct link to the TSAP was often not clear.

Several interviewees recommended more direct links between their programs and the TSAP. More frequent conversations during the plan's development might help make the direct link more apparent. A few said they provided input into the plan but were uncertain how it was used. Others said the TSAP provided initial guidance on their program-specific plans, but implementation of the plan and their programs were not linked together systematically after that. Because of this, the TSAP can become lost behind other program-specific statewide plans. Department or division planning documents tend to guide safety initiatives, a number of interviewees said. Several suggested that the specific plans and the TSAP should be side by side, not one in front or behind the other. Timing is one factor in this as department plans are not always on the same timeline as the TSAP.

Several interviewees expressed concern about the coordination among non-ODOT agencies. Some pointed out that while this is a statewide plan, it seems ODOT-centric. They said the links and coordination with partner agencies in enforcement and emergency management are less clear. This is also true for ODOT divisions and programs other than the Safety Division.

Some said that improved coordination among all of the entities with safety responsibilities —both ODOT and non-ODOT—would be helpful. An ongoing “dashboard” for progress that is highly visible across ODOT agencies might help in this regard, a few stakeholders said. Also, finding the right balance of activities to involve ODOT divisions and other state agencies as partners on an ongoing basis, would help maintain the visibility of the plan. Most recognized the challenges associated with this given the limited resources within the divisions and other state agencies.

Some interviewees identified specific partnerships and relationships that could be enhanced including those with the bicycle/pedestrian communities, health and emergency response partners.

## **Plan Prioritization**

Parallel to concerns about the numbers of actions in the plan are expressed needs for more clarity about action priorities. Some interviewees linked this with the needs for more data and a better understanding about the TSAP as a decision-making tool. A number of interviewees expressed confusion about how the TSAP drives ODOT decisions, the impact it has on partnering agencies and its relationship to other ODOT plans. Several interviewees recognized the challenges in aligning the TSAP with other plans because of timing—some other plans are already complete; others are just beginning.

Some of the issues regarding prioritization are more systematic and the result of past practices, some suggested. A focus on mobility over safety was cited by a number of interviewees. Also, the data gaps tend to exist more in areas where data hasn't been collected traditionally, which can skew decisions more toward engineered solutions that enhance motor vehicle mobility and away from non-traditional approaches, they said.

On the other hand, a number of interviewees suggested that the more data-rich decision making is allowing ODOT to truly fine tune its approaches in areas where it can show results and make the most difference in transportation safety.

## **Other comments and suggestions**

Interviewees offered numerous comments and suggestions, some specific to actions and sections of the plan and others more general. Most comments among these dealt with specific ties to interviewee programs, such as the motor carrier division, DMV, or rail.

Interviewees also identified a number of possible emerging issues that might be considered with an eye toward the future. These included automated vehicle issues and driving habits related to changing demographics. Several suggested a higher understanding about the habits of aging drivers and millennials. Some suggested looking to ITS programs as part of future planning.

Some interviewees also made general comments about the role of the TSAP in moving ODOT toward a multi-modal approach.



### **OTSAP Assessment Interviewees List** *September/October 2014*

Jerri Bohard , Transportation Development Division Administrator  
Erik Havig, Planning Section Manager  
Troy Costales , Transportation Safety Division Administrator  
Walt McAllister , Safe Communities and Public Information Program Manager

#### **Technical Services Division, Traffic Engineering Services Unit**

Doug Bish, Traffic Services Engineer  
Kevin Haas, Traffic Investigations Engineer

#### **Bikes and Pedestrians**

Sheila Lyons, Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Specialist, TDD Active Transportation  
Steve Lindland, Roadway Engineering Unit Manager (ADA Standards)

#### **Motor Carrier Transportation Division**

Gregg DalPonte, Motor Carrier Division Administrator  
Dave McKane, Safety, Investment and Federal Program Manager  
Rick Listella, Salem Motor Carrier Services Section Manager

#### **TDD Transportation Planning and Analysis Unit**

Doug Norval, Transportation Analyst Engineer, Planning Section  
Christy McDaniel-Wilson, Senior Transportation Analyst, Planning Section

#### **Region Planning and Development**

Jim West, Region 2 Access Management Engineer  
Kirsten Pennington, Planning Manager, Region 1  
Kelly Brooks, Governmental Liaison, Region 1

Gary Farnsworth, Area Manager, Region 4

Art Anderson, Rogue Valley Area Manager, Region 3

**Maintenance**

Larry Olson District 2C Manager, Region 1

**Driver and Motor Vehicle Services**

Tom McClellan, Driver and Motor Vehicle Services Administrator

Lana Tribbey, Program Services Manager, Driver and Motor Vehicle

**Crash Data**

Robin Ness, CAR/Automation Manager

*\*Contacted but not interviewed*

Brad Payton, Transportation Maintenance Manager, District 13, Region 5

Lisa Nell, Planning and Development Manager, Region 2



# OTSAP Assessment Interviews Guide

*DRAFT Aug 21, 2014*

This guide provides topics for open ended discussion along with question prompts to fill gaps, where necessary. The interviews are expected to take about one hour with opportunities to provide follow-up information, as necessary. Where possible, interviews will be conducted in person. While not confidential, interviews are expected to be frank conversations. Results will be compiled, without attribution, with the purpose of identifying areas of common concern and opportunities for improvement. The interviews will help establish a broader list of interests for future input opportunities.

### **Primary Interview Objectives:**

- 1) Identify perceived strengths of the existing plan and areas that might need improvements, including data enhancements
- 2) Understand the levels of understanding among key stakeholders and possible information gaps
- 3) Identify opportunities for involvement among the variety of stakeholders and groups and the best ways to achieve this involvement
- 4) Identify other key stakeholders and groups that should be involved in the revision process.

### **Broad Topics for Discussion**

The format for interviews will follow three major topic areas with open ended questions to launch each conversation followed by questions to fill gaps of missing information or further probe the depth of the responses. The interviews also include an opportunity for any additional information that may not have been discussed.

The interviews recognize the obvious primary ties of stakeholders to **Education, Engineering, Enforcement, or Emergency Response** based on the interviewee. We expect interviewees will respond to their primary interest or interests. However, for each interview, we will prompt them on secondary interests, where applicable, to make the best uses of the knowledge they bring to the discussion.

The topics are listed on the next page along with sample prompt questions.

**TOPIC #1 -- Interviewee Background (where applicable) -- overview of agency/department/division/program(s) as they relates to transportation safety.**

- *What is your position and what are your responsibilities related to transportation safety planning or programs?*
- *What transportation safety areas are of interest for your program/agency/region?*
- *Who is affected by those programs?*
- *How successful, in your opinion, have the programs been?*
- *How are the programs measured/evaluated?*
  - *Is this as useful as it can be? / can it be improved?*
- *What challenges have you faced with your transportation safety planning or program delivery?*
  - *Budget?*
  - *Public Support?*
  - *Other?*

**TOPIC #2 -- Strengths of and areas to be improved in the 2011 Oregon Transportation Safety Plan (assumes a level of familiarity with at least portions of the plan)**

- *Are there specific areas (beyond the obvious for that person) of interest or focus for you?*
- *Can you identify areas of the plan that you felt were effective? Which ones and how were they effective?*
- *What areas could be improved? How might they be improved?*
- *Are there additional gaps that should be addressed?*
- *Are there areas that are no longer applicable or that should be revised significantly?*
- *What are the key areas, in your opinion, that the plan MUST address to be successful*
- *Are there emerging issues that have yet to be addressed*
- *What data or additional information do you know of that would be helpful or needed in developing the next Plan?*
  - *Do you have or could you develop/compile this for contribution to the plan?*

**TOPIC #3 -- Opportunities for further and ongoing involvement**

- *What area(s) would you be interested in tracking or participating in the development of in the upcoming plan?*
- *What is the best way to involve you and your colleagues/constituents in the upcoming plan development?*
- *Can you identify others who should be involved in the plan updates and/or implementation?*
  - *List*

**TOPIC #4 – Other**

- *Is there anything else you would like to add, or items we have not yet discussed that you would like to include in this conversation*
  - *List/discuss*



## OTSAP Assessment Interviews Notes

*November 2014*

### Description

The notes in this section are compiled from all interviews. It is important to note that some comments are personal perceptions, which may not be fully accurate. The notes are sorted into frequently expressed topics of discussion that emerged from the full set of interviews. They are further sorted in sub-categories reflecting similar subject areas within each category, where applicable. The notes are not verbatim comments in most cases, though key phrases are retained in quotation marks. Multiple references to the same note are marked with asterisks indicating the numbers of times mentioned. The commonly expressed topics of discussion under which these notes are organized are:

- 1. **Data** Pg. 11
- 2. **Document Organization and Use** Pg. 12
- 3. **Integrating Participating Partners** Pg. 12
  - 3.1 **General Partnerships**
  - 3.2 **Bike/Pedestrian Partners**
  - 3.3 **Health Partners**
  - 3.4 **Emergency Response Partners**
- 4. **Prioritization** Pg. 14

The remainder of the notes are sorted into two categories (specific and general comments) and subcategories within each that reflect related topics:

- 5. **Specific Comments and Suggestions** Pg. 14
  - 5.1 **Program and Future Issues**
  - 5.2 **Bike/pedestrian Issues**
  - 5.3 **Other issues**
- 6. **General Comments and Suggestions** Pg. 15
  - 6.1 **Areas to Build Upon**
  - 6.2 **Areas for Possible Improvements**
  - 6.3 **General Suggestions for the Next Plan**
  - 6.4 **Other General Comments**

# Notes

## 1. DATA

- Needs to be data driven (achievable and measurable)\*\*\*\*\*
- Consider data on 6-lane arterial safety
- Prioritization should be guided by data \*\*\*
- Not nearly enough data on pedestrians vs. bikes \*\*
- Data for bikes and pedestrians needed\*\*\*\*
- Data-driven process needed but don't want to lose flexibility with "softer" educational activities
- Priorities are not data driven so it's difficult to see how they are prioritized
- Plan is used to get funding, so we don't want to lose funding when gathering data
- Some activities could be collecting data that could drive future activities
- Address data collection\*\*\*
- Needs to be more research-based with measurable results
- Need to upgrade areas where there is not good data\*\*
- Understand individual perceptions about whether things got safer
- Crash reporting needs to be better, more efficient\*
- More clear and transparent linkages with research
- It is a challenge to measure bike ped data\*\*
- Embrace idea of passenger safety and perceptions- need data
- Transit doesn't always have good data\*
- Need data in design & conveyance
- Have data on fatalities; but need better data elsewhere
- Stats are outdated- need update
- Need better injury related data
- Need data "in people's faces", more visible, more understandable. Currently have dashboard
- Need more frequent routine report outs

## **2. DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION AND USE**

- Needs policy framework/direction/ to be more policy-driven because it is not self-evident currently\*\*\*\*
- There's a challenge in how to organize this plan as policy document with the different lead agencies for various actions\*\*
- Numbers of actions can be overwhelming \*\*\*\*\*. There are some benefits to this, but the volume of actions "waters it down." (see prioritization comments)
- Needs to be topical and focused on objectives- build around 4 E's\*\*\*
- TSAP should be usable: a user-friendly guide
- Actions need to be more consistent with each other (some are easy to achieve and some are purely aspirational)\*\*
- Actions could be divided into short, medium, and long range
- Actions could be divided by areas of interest (may make it easier to use among ODOT departments)
- Emphasis area (section 3) focuses program well but there are many actions and they are not consistent
- Meld together with TSP (regional) guidelines for safety
- Needs better definitions of TSAP versus implementation plan
- Currently TSAP is a combination of business plan and work plan, but not necessarily a policy or strategic document
- Themes need to be more at the forefront
- Definition of safety should be aligned to various modes
- Need ongoing collaboration throughout development and implementation

## **3. INTEGRATING PARTICIPATING PARTNERS**

### **3.1 General Partnerships**

- Public advisory committee needs to be integrated as partners and representative of the safety areas
- Liaisons or representative project team members need to be involved and come with updates\*\*\*
- Community design/land use should to be included in or as safety actions
- Regional/modal coordinators need to be involved
- Integrate emergency response groups at front end and align crash reports

- Need to coordinate more with aviation, rail, truck, infrastructure planning.
- Development will need to span across ODOT, not just planners\*
- Need a better understanding between safety divisions and other divisions (including non-ODOT) and how they fit together\*\*
- TSAP could serve to increase cooperation among departments, which would be good (technical/ roadway departure/ traffic records)
- Bring key groups together for implementation
- Create core teams needed to bridge agency gaps (like in modal plans)
- Not a connection between this plan and regional plan- how to integrate to local level
- Need better integration across business lines
- Needs to be put into cross benefit models
- Need to close gap with MPO plans and relationships
- Need input on the hard safety and enforcement of safety (MPO's)

### **3.2 Bike/Ped Partners**

- Huge challenge with integrating bicycle advocacy groups and creating a greater understanding of safety issues\*\*
- Ped, bike, and motorcycle groups represent big issues this plan must address
- Leverage education programs with partners: Safe Routes to School program is a great example

### **3.3 Health Partners**

- The public health field needs to be more integrated in the document's actions. Perhaps this could be an initiative
- Address challenge with integrating other (non-ODOT) agencies (Health & Safety) \*\*\*

### **3.4 Emergency Response Partners**

- Need more inclusive process between implementation and TSAP development
- Disconnect between action plan and implementation partners
- The project team needs to close the loop with how information provided *for* the plan is used *in* the plan.
- Progress reports miss opportunity to tie together
- Need better communication circle to have better partnerships

## **4. PRIORITIZATION**

- Lacks some prioritization
- Challenging to think about prioritization of plan\*\*\*\*
- Needs clarity with prioritization (i.e.: hotspots)
- Prioritization of hotspots is important and this is not always consistent\*\*
- Prioritization should be guided by data\*\*\*\*
- Prioritization within groups is a possibility
- Make clear upfront how decisions are made- how to decide/prioritize
- Need more technical vetting to justify expenses
- Focus on 4 E's \*\*\*
- Focus on areas that can have the highest impacts\*\* (example: seatbelt use is important but does this still need emphasis?)
- Number of system priorities is awkward
- Would be helpful to understand priorities across plans
- Use asset management approach: lives saved by new barriers, for instance

## **5. SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

### **5.1 Programs and Future Issues**

- Automation of cars/trucks need to be addressed
- Plan could articulate some ways of dealing with advocacy
- Work on programs to make sure drivers are safe to operate vehicles
- Autonomous vehicles, drug impairment, reliance on law/rules
- Lifecycle costs and "biggest bang for the buck" need to be considered for long term
- Lots of behavioral issues emerging. Distracted driving is a growing issue.\*
- Plan makes it hard to reach things outside focus areas (distracted driving, for instance)
- Need to target Integration of public health
- In next 25 years, 25-30% of fleets will drive themselves. This will change infrastructure and the way we do planning. ODOT will need to adapt how we get info
- As cars get smarter, have access to learn more for safety of highway. Keep an eye on these interfaces (smarter cars)
- Change of culture for millennials is an issue, as well as aging baby boomers . Need to understand how this might affect transportation.
- Consider e-based economies and deliveries via unmanned vehicles

- Where is health and wellness in the plan? Need to fully engage this field.
- Climate change is a factor: pay more attention to earthquakes and resilience of road system.

## 5.2 Bicycle/Pedestrian Issues

- Education needed among cyclists and pedestrians
- Additional driver education needed with regard to bike/peds
- Certain things are more vulnerable (motorcycles as example)
- Bikes have false sense of safety sometimes
- Bike/ped safety is upcoming- need more info
- Looking at NHTSA reports on bike/ped rates- these are going up while all other decrease (due to additional bike/ped activity)
- Should integrate ADA issues
- Bike and pedestrian safety will be addressed in an updated Bike and Pedestrian plan that is currently under development.

## 5.3 Other Issues

- Could include more about motor carriers
- The safety implications of having different speed limits for trucks needs to be considered
- Rail crossings need to be addressed
- Motor carriers would like to be very involved
- Pictures are good but make it hard to read
- Promotion of sharing road with larger vehicles could be included\*
- Older drivers and freight/rail could be involved in advocacy
- Work with DMV on statute changes
- Work with engineers on definitions of collisions/ integrating info and integrating guardrail with crash data
- Make clear the nexus between TSAP and implementation
- DMV might have input from customers that could be included

## 6. OTHER GENERAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTION

### 6.1 Areas to Build Upon

- Exciting and offers opportunity for plan to be smarter
- Good plan, there's a lot to it\*\*\*

- The plan is comprehensive
- Struggle to find pertinence from planning perspective
- May not cover policy and implementation as well as it can
- Need to be careful not to lose the successful factors of existing plan\*
- Plan changes should be subtle
- TSAP is difficult because other policy plans do not have as many behavioral aspects
- Annual safety workshops are valuable (Silver Falls)\*\*\*

## 6.2 Areas for Possible Improvements

- DMV crash reports: collection of information could be better and more efficient.
- Safety conversations of ODOT are backwards sometimes; conversations should be occurring in design, not retrofitting (expensive)
- TSAP needs to be more focused  
Needs to be a cross understanding of TSAP and an implementation plan
- The TSAP needs to be more clear on how are emphasis areas determined
- May not cover policy and implementation as well as it can
- Not as visionary as it might be
- Concern about project creep and ability to complete (reference to plan being not focused)
- Needs more widespread agency buy in on bike/ped programs and relationship to mobility
- Concern about agency talking about multi-modal but focuses primarily on mobility
- Road safety audits could be more valuable if improved
- Not as visionary as it might be
- Need to make clear how and when follow through must occur
- ODOT agencies and project partners need more opportunity to have a say on the plan
- Some of the charts not readable
- Modal conflicts are not being dealt with

## 6.3 General Suggestions for Next Plan

- It's a challenge to keep safety at forefront at a state level; personalizing the message to hit home could be effective
- Could use more measurements
- Should invest in where there are highest returns
- Enhancement for end product is how to make safe for all systems
- Needs to be more proactive
- Include local systems funding suggestions
- Ensure actions can be accomplished

- Include local systems funding suggestions\*
- Creation of core teams needed to bridge agency gaps (like in modal plans)
- More widespread agency buy in on bike/ped programs and relationship to mobility
- The intermodal approach needs to give high consideration of the most vulnerable system users
- Needs to be more focus on non motorists and interactions\*\*\*
- Need to sync with highway plan
- Need to think about multi modes?
- Needs to have strong ties to ITS systems (cars talking to each other, education/engineering, Waze navigation app, etc.)
- Constructing document: needs more background, policy framework and then actions
- Existing conditions section of plan could include modal discussion
- Access for people with disabilities needs to be mentioned
- Could be better tool for driver education programs
- Recognize and address significant differences in motor vehicle versus other modes\*\*

#### **6.4 Other Comments**

- Concern about ODOT talking about multi-modal but focusing primarily on mobility
- TSAP role should be more directional
- Plan changes will be subtle
- Agency needs administrative leadership for safety as number one priority
- Combination of DUI plus bike/ped need to be dealt with
- Chronic speeding is much too accepted
- Divisions can provide resources, info, stats, etc.
- Actions that require more flexibility should be stated generally to allow for this flexibility
- Does not feel like a plan
- Needs to be more focused and pulled together for implementation
- Too many goals and doesn't circle back
- When it's so broad, there are ownership issues
- Maintenance needs to be considered for design, which relates to safety
- Partner participation is totally unclear\* A lot of good work is not ODOT
- Condense to what's relevant for ODOT at some place in the plan
- Need to think more fully through all interactions (bike, motorcycle, runners, etc)
- Construction area work zones need much attention
- Updates need to be built in with related documents and plans

- The plan needs to be careful with how it addresses “initiative of the day”: Older drivers, for example.
- Need better communication circle to have better partnerships
- We do a good job with safety but could do better (re: construction, using better monitoring)
- Action statements are very specific
- Question for planners: which is lead document? OTP? Is it TSAP? Is it department? Not always clear.
- “Siloed” actions for safety may miss the mark in some cases
- Needs to be distinguished: transit providers/ FTA authorities
- Plan needs to address “Intermodal Oregon” as one agency
- Find balance between traditional NHTSA function and state safety plan
- Have chapters on modes; start creating modal safety
- Transit role on the highway: how do we manage on an ongoing basis?
- Bikes have false sense of safety sometimes
- Need to better understand best practices
- Consider how to reconcile competitive solution bases- like bike/ped safety
- Lack of clarity on engineering solutions
- Bigger and faster facilities need to account for adjacent land uses
- Lots of overlap of plans
- Agency has taken on Intermodal Oregon, which needs both internal and cultural change.
- Needs are highways and roadways
- Have all standards and highway design manual added and make sure TSAP is consistent
- Some designs are safety directed but take away from sidewalk systems. We need to do both.
- How do we make clear design speeds versus posted speeds versus safe speeds?
- Replace barriers where most needed
- We spend on crossing manage the trade-offs?
- It’s a struggle to find pertinence from planning perspective on some Action Plan priorities. For example, why is TSAP Action 104 (*Consider legislation requiring the inclusion of helmets, reflective gear and lighting with new bicycles*) in the emphasis area?