Transportation Safety Action Plan (TSAP)
Project Advisory Committee Meeting #4 Summary

Tuesday, May 11, 2015 1:00 pm – 4:30 pm
Location: Oregon Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, 4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE, Salem

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*
Kimberly Daily, *Oregon Judicial Department*
Tyler Deke, *Bend Metropolitan Planning Organization*
Luis Ornelas, *Oregon Transportation Safety Committee*
Emily Acklund, *Association of Oregon Counties*
Chris Henry, *City of Eugene & Governor's Advisory Committee on Motorcycles*
Victor Hoffer, *Oregon Transportation Safety Committee*
Jeff Lewis, *Oregon State Police*
Chuck Hayes, *Governor's Advisory Committee on DUII*
Scott Kocher, *Oregon Walks*
Michael Tynan, *Oregon Health Authority*
Brian Ray, *Kittelson & Associates, Inc.*

Committee Members Absent
Craig Honeyman, *League of Oregon Cities*
Marian Owens, *Oregon Transportation Safety Committee*
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*
Jeanne Lawson, *Facilitator–JLA Public Involvement*
Kenya Williams, *JLA Public Involvement*
Brian Chandler, *Consultant - Leidos*

Members of Public & Others Present
Joe Marek, *Director, Clackamas Safe Communities Program*
Lynne Mutrie, *Mutrie Consulting*
Kristie Gladhill, *ODOT Region 1 Safety Coordinator*
Doug Zenn, *Zenn Associates*
Talia Jacobson, *ODOT Active Transportation Policy Lead*
Dan Estes, *ODOT Impaired Driving Program Manager*
Tad Blanton, *City of Medford*
Doug Bish, *ODOT Technical Services*
Nick Fortey, *Federal Highway Administration*
Chris Woods, *Federal Highway Administration*
Jerri Bohard, *Oregon Transportation Development Division*

---

*Attended by phone

Key Meeting Outcomes

The purpose of the meeting was to review the results of the online survey, provide feedback and direction for the TSAP vision and discuss the Crash Trend Analysis. The PAC:

- Reviewed the results of the Online Survey. The group discussed the range of priorities, noting some issues that may be of greater or lesser concern to certain groups.
- Provided direction on the alternative Vision statements. The group agreed to use the brevity of the shortest version, but they preferred the inspirational tone of the current vision statement and asked that the statement be reworded to reflect that tone.
- Received an overview of the Crash Trend Analysis. Based on the discussion, it was determined it would be useful to provide additional information identifying who is involved in crashes, why they are involved in crashes and where the crashes are occurring
- Each of the members identified issues they would like to have considered in the emphasis areas discussion at the next meeting.

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Chairperson Mike Laverty opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. He introduced Jeff Lewis to the committee and informed the committee that Jeff would be taking James Rentz's place on the committee.

Jeanne Lawson of JLA Public Involvement reviewed the agenda and the goals for the meeting.

Project Update

Beth Wemple provided the committee with a project update that included where the project is now and where it is heading. The committee's work at this meeting will help shape the work for the next meeting on Emphasis Areas and Goals.

Jeanne then asked the committee to go around the table and introduce themselves followed by the non-committee members who were in attendance.

Online Survey

Doug Zenn presented an overview of the online survey he conducted during the months of March and April. The survey consisted of 11 questions and was designed for anyone with an interest in the project to provide input . It was noted that the raw data for the survey is located on the project website.

The first three questions of the survey sought background information from the participants; the rest of the questions followed the 4 E's (Engineering, Education, Enforcement and Emergency Response). Doug stated that an additional (E) was added: Evaluation. Doug noted that the survey was not a scientific survey with a proven sample size and that it was targeted primarily to people with an interest in transportation. A total of 488 people took the online survey and 2/3 identified as interested citizens and not transportation professionals. Distracted driving was rated as the

DRAFT

highest concern. Doug proceeded to walk through the summary of the survey which is available in the committee member binder and on the project website.

Committee Discussion
A committee member asked for clarification to better understand the meaning of increased police coverage for transportation facilities. Nancy Murphy said this was another way of saying highways and interchanges.

Another committee member asked if the online survey provided any suggestions for distracted driving. Doug directed the group to refer to the detailed questions and responses available on the project website. An additional question was asked if there was a sense of where geographically the respondents were located. Survey participants were not asked to give their address or zip code.

A committee member wanted to know how the survey was promoted and who the audience was. The survey was promoted by working with a number of state level organizations to circulate the survey within their networks. The committee member also wanted to know if the survey was representative of the citizens of the state or the professionals. Doug noted that a majority of the respondents identified themselves as community members. He reiterated that the responses were not a statistically valid sample of the public at large, but instead a good sample of people who had an interest in transportation or are engaged stakeholders. A few committee members noted that they would have expected that the rating of the level of concern about impaired driving would be higher and expressed that they would be curious to see how the numbers would change once marijuana was legal in Oregon. Walt provided more insight about who the survey was sent to: it went to a number of lists, including 5000 people who are subscribed to the Oregon Impact Newsletter.

Vision Statements
Beth reviewed the past vision workshop and presented findings and themes that emerged. She shared the following elements that the PAC identified as part of the vision statement: aspirational, motivational, useful to decision making, and quantifiable. She also presented the themes that emerged from the preliminary vision ideas:

- Zero fatalities and serious injuries
- Thinking out of the box
- Phased achievement of zero fatalities and serious injuries
- All modes and all roads
- Personal responsibility

The current Vision Statement was presented followed by two new alternative Vision Statements. The following Vision Statement was considered to be brief and to the point:

By 2035 there will be no transportation fatalities or serious injuries on any public transportation facilities in Oregon.

The second option was:

Vision for 2035: By investing in a safe transportation system for all travelers and by engaging in the public in making their own and others' safety their number one priority, Oregon has achieved zero transportation-related deaths and serious injuries.

Committee Discussion
Jeanne asked the committee to indicate which vision statement they initially favored. Most committee members liked the first Vision Statement.

A committee member wanted to know if the vision would be tied to the goals and he was informed by Jeanne that they were connected. Another committee member requested an explanatory statement after the vision since the second version of the Vision statement read like a proclamation. He wanted more details about the thought process behind the statements. A different committee member added that the short version of the statement did not have the inspiration or narrative and the second one was okay but the current statement was satisfying in comparison since it did contain more of a "rallying cry." Jeanne conducted a brief exercise to see the level of support for each Vision Statement. While nearly all preferred the first alternative, one committee member did not agree due to the fact that the statement was not motivational. The group reviewed the Vision for the current plan and agreed that they liked the more inspirational tone, particularly the active verb "envision." However, the committee felt that the original Vision Statement included too much and was not succinct enough. Two committee members expressed that they favored the word death instead of fatalities.

Action: By consensus, the committee recommended that the study adopt the more succinct alternative vision statement, but that it be reworded somewhat with a little more inspirational tone.

Crash Trend Analysis
Beth Wemple introduced Brian Chandler who provided a crash trend analysis (see meeting materials and PowerPoint presentation). This analysis offered an examination of the factors such as speed, alcohol-related, safety belt use, etc., that were reported in Oregon traffic collisions resulting in fatalities or "A" level injuries (serious injuries that could be debilitating) between 2009 and 2013. Brian reported on: frequency of the different factors and how they have changed over the five-year period; on regional, seasonal and time of day trends; on which types of collisions have the highest rate of fatalities and serious injuries; the rate of serious collisions on different types of roads; etc. Brian also described how the data is reported in Oregon.

Brian noted that the data can serve as a first step in determining potential emphasis areas for the safety action plan, but not every emphasis area will necessarily be connected to this crash history data. The data is an *indicator* of how and why crashes have occurred and can inform the development of Emphasis Areas. The data analysis tables and the PowerPoint slides provide details; some of the key observations that Brian noted were:

- In Oregon, reports are completed by the individuals involved and an officer if there is a personal injury or property damage greater than $1,500. Generally speaking, the proportion of unreported property-damage-only crashes in Oregon is higher than most states. Therefore, a comparison between Oregon and other states is problematic.

- Fatal collisions decreased over the five year period, though serious injury collisions increased. (Brian noted that there was a change in 2011 related to reporting requirements, which makes it appear that there was an increase).
- The major factors throughout the state were roadway departures and speed, and most crashes involved striking another car.
- The crash trends and contributing factors were relatively consistent throughout the state, except in Region 1, where the roadway departures and speed were still major factors but were significantly smaller proportionally than in the other regions.

Committee Discussion

- A committee member asked where the crash data was for 2014. Brian informed the committee member that crash data is always delayed since the data is provided by paper and often takes 3 to 9 months to process.
- Another committee member requested to see a column that displayed the number of drivers in the state if the data was comparing years.
- Brian was asked what the data sources were and he explained that the data came from the Oregon Crash Database which is based on police officer reports and citizen reports. He also informed the committee that in Oregon crashes are citizen reported and officers do not write reports for every accident.
- A question was asked if there was a standardized definition for A, B or C injuries and Brian responded by stating that the injuries are determined by the opinion of the officer who is writing the crash report based on guidance they are provided during training. Some states have different methods for determining the classification of the injury.
- A committee member asked if it was known where the crash frequency increased, noting that in his town – a college town – the volumes decreased. The reply to this question was that counts are typically higher in urban areas and highly traveled roads.
- "Is there any value looking at this data regionally?" was another questions asked by the committee due to the difference in number of crashes and location of crashes. Brian provided regional information.
- A committee member commented that this information was a great first step because the problems were being identified before trying to find a solution.
- The group discussed the age categories and suggested the lower number for young drivers could be related to the trend of young people getting their licenses later. They suggested extending the category to age 25. Brian noted that the current categories for young and old were based on the FHWA categories, but that some states use different definitions.
- In response to questions about bike and pedestrian data, Brian noted that although some issues such as bicyclist-related crashes did not "rise to the top" of the list of frequent crash types, it did not mean they were unimportant. The project team only selected the

DRAFT

top nine (in terms of the number of fatalities and serious injuries) for this first presentation of data. One committee member stated the belief that over 50% of Portland's traffic fatalities were pedestrians.

- The group discussed the organization of the data at length. They noted that currently it mixes "causes," such as speed and alcohol, with "type of collision," most notably the roadway departures. Brian noted that these were drawn from the factors included on the accident reports and that from the perspective of an engineer seeking solutions, these are useful because different actions can be taken to address different factors. However, he said the information could be reorganized to provide a better understanding of causes.

After the committee discussion, each of the committee members was asked to name a specific category or cause that they wanted to offer for consideration for potential emphasis areas. The following were offered:

- Look at the full list not just the top items
- Don't draw too many conclusions from data, since the way it is reported isn't necessarily consistent. Use common sense.
- Look at speed and alcohol/drugs
- Aggressive/stupid combo driving
- Keep the goals simple…short and sweet…define the terms
- Drowsy driving
- Intersections and failure to yield the right of way, and separate categories versus causes.
- 4E's, alcohol, speed and road departures
- Get this information out to the public in a way that moves them or gets to their emotions
- Use public perception to identify opportunities
- Intersections, education (getting the public involved) and strategies for funding
- Integrated approach
    - Legislative policy
    - Look at each region's context
- Look broadly ahead then scale back to see what we can really accomplish. Cause and effect
    - Increase awareness about the risks of different driving behaviors
    - Commitment from the top in order to achieve the goal of zero deaths
- Blend data with culture and speed in regions – 4E's
- Rural safety needs

Public Comments

Mike Laverty opened the discussion for public comment.

DRAFT

Joe Marek, Clackamas County Traffic Engineering Manager and Director of Clackamas Safe Communities, asked the committee to consider looking at young drivers between the ages of 15-25 instead of 15-20 because this may change the focus and provide additional insight as the committee looks at the data. The committee was also asked to think about the human, the roadway and the vehicle and how they interplay and how they provide direction in terms of how to invest. Joe also suggested two additional resources: the World Health Organization's Decade of Action 2011-2020 and The National Strategy Toward Zero Deaths, located at zerodeaths.org, in an effort to provide background and show what the Safety Action Plan could be as far as the level of collaboration.

The "What's Next" portion of the meeting was omitted given that most of the information had already been discussed.

Closing Comments & Meeting Wrap Up

Chairperson Mike Laverty introduced ODOT Director Matt Garrett who spoke briefly to the committee. He opened his remarks by thanking the committee for the work they have done and the work that is ahead of them as they are tasked with making Oregon's transportation system safer. He stated that he was impressed with the committee and that the diversity of the different perspectives would strengthen the policy debate and form the action plan in a way that has not happened before. He reminded the committee that their work did not end in the room but it would be woven into other work and conversations that are happening at the Department of Transportation. In addition, Director Garrett provided several informative facts and measures about how the State of Oregon is doing at the national level. He asked the committee to challenge themselves, their colleagues and his department in an effort to achieve zero deaths. He closed by thanking the committee again for informing the policy direction of the safety action plan. After Director Garrett's remarks, Chairperson Mike Laverty thanked the committee for their hard work and adjourned the meeting.

The next meeting will be June 9th at 1:00 p.m. in Salem, following the monthly meeting of the Transportation Safety Committee. The meeting will focus on emphasis areas and introducing the goals.

DRAFT