**Cooper Jones Bicyclist Safety Advisory Council**

## Meeting #6 – Summary Meeting Report

## May 1, 2018, 9:00 am – 3:00 pm, Spokane Regional Health District

### In Attendance: Andrew Beagle, Barb Chamberlain, Dongho Chang, Charlotte Claybrooke, Liz McNett Crowl, Chris Comeau, Amy D’Avignon, Josh Diekmann, Steve Durrant, Darren Flusche, David Jones, Liz Kaster, Rep. Shelly Kloba, Nancy Lillquist, Nancy McClenny-Walters, Stacey McShane, Katherine Miller, Annette Nesse, Amy Person, Matthew Rollosson, Amy Shuman, Annie Szotkowski, Jon Snyder, Scott Waller, Chris Workman, Heidi Keller (Facilitator)

1. **Announcements and Updates – Scott Waller**

2017 Annual Report accepted by Governor’s Office. Changes include the addition of an executive summary and responses to a number of questions. Special thanks to Barb Chamberlain and Charlotte Claybrooke who did the “heavy lifting” to get the report completed and approved.

1. **Follow up on case reviews – Scott Waller, All**

The Council concluded that case reviews are helpful and agreed to do more, tentatively scheduled for August. Some requests for future reviews:

* Some cases had more documentation and gave a fuller picture. it will be helpful in selecting future cases to select cases with more descriptive documentation.
* Some cases included photos that were no longer accurate because crash scenes change over time. If including photos make sure they are accurate to the scene at the time of the crash.
* Include driving records since the crash. It could help us determine whether there were citations or if anything happened as a result. Knowing this will also help craft updates to the vulnerable user law. Is it being used? What was the ticket?
* The steering committee will propose a focus of the next set of case reviews and send it to the Council in advance.

1. **Where is the money for bicycle safety and how are we spending it now?**

Presentations by Barb Chamberlain, WSDOT, and Chris Workman, Transportation Improvement Board, laid out various sources of funding that can contribute to bicyclist safety. Presentations will be transmitted along with this summary.

1. **Best Practices: Vision Zero and Systematic Safety Principles**

Charlotte Claybrooke, WSDOT, introduced Vision Zero and the 5 Principles of Systematic Safety. Video is available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5aNtsWvNYKE>

5 Principles of Systematic Safety

1. Speed control and separation
2. Functional harmony
3. Predictability and simplicity
4. Forgivingness and restrictiveness
5. State awareness

Dongho Chang, City of Seattle, discussed Seattle’s Vision Zero ordinance, which started as policy, then was enacted by the city council. He demonstrated the city’s “Streets Illustrated Map,” an interactive tool that shows street designations, street standards, and how it is listed in transit and bicycle master plans. It can be viewed at <http://streetsillustrated.seattle.gov/map/>

Discussion:

* More is being done on bike projects than we can track because it is folded into larger projects.
* Funding criteria that require local jurisdictions to have a complete streets policy have incentivized their adoption across the state. Can this Council recommend a similar mechanism for bicyclist safety improvements?
* The “mobility” band in TIB funding criteria refers to vehicles. Can it be recalibrated to include bicycles and fixing the gaps in the bicycle network?
* TIB incentivizes complete streets ordinances and it has resulted in an increase in adoption. Is there something parallel with Vision Zero through a pot of money that would incentivize the adoption of the 5 Principles of Systematic Safety?

1. **Best Practices: Understanding the Various Guides and What They Tell Us About Self-Enforcing Safety Measures and Designing For All Ages and Abilities**

Steve Durrant, Alta Planning, provided an overview of five design guides relevant to bicycle mobility and safety. They can be used together to plan and support local plans and projects.

* Fietsberaad CROW Design Manual for Bicycle Traffic
* (NACTO) Urban Street Design Guide
* NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide
* USDOT/FHighway Admin: Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks

Darren Flusche, Toole Design Group, American Association of State Highway & Transportation Officials (AASHTO), discussed updates to the AASHTO Bike Guide, publication expected later this year. The Bike Guide is typically AASHTO’s best-selling guide. The 2018 volume is shifting focus from the “Experienced and Confident” cyclist (focus of the last volume), to people who are “Interested but Concerned” about bicycle transportation and safety. The goal: make bicycle transportation more inviting and viable for more people.

Andrew Beagle presented the WSDOT Design Manual, Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), and other sources. Applies to all state and interstate highways. Some counties and cities have adopted it for their county roads as well.

1. **What are relevant laws and policies?**

Discussion:

* Current laws do not address the use of E bikes. They are one answer to increasing equity and access for people who are less fit, older, families. Current laws are not adequate to answer potential concerns like speed and sidewalk riding. Are they considered non-motorized?
* TIB interested in updating statutes; some give authority to TIB to address bicycling including the establishment of statewide bike routes. What are the needed updates? Is this authority best kept with TIB, or are there good reasons to shift to WSDOT?
* Washington does not have laws that:
* Require 3-foot passing clearance (3-foot law)
* State code on electric personal assistive mobility devices (e.g. E scooters)
* Address skateboards and long boards
* Permit use of bicycle traffic signals
* Also mentioned: Desirability of laws not specific to bikes but about shared spaces
* Questions about enforcement of Washington’s “dooring” law.
* Work with the Municipal Research Service Center (MRSC) to update model ordinances, specifically what they say about bikes
* Washington is in the process of rewriting the driver education laws
* Look at policy recommendations put forth by the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Council and look for policies that we can jointly endorse.

*Sources for model laws and ordinances:*

League of American Bicyclists *Bike Law University,* a resource series created by the League to present state traffic laws related to bicyclists in a reader-friendly, layperson format.

<http://bikeleague.org/content/bike-law-university>

National Conference of State Legislatures’ *State Traffic Safety Legislation Database,* up to date, real-time information about traffic safety bills that have been introduced in the 50 states and the District of Columbia, <http://www.ncsl.org/research/transportation/state-traffic-safety-legislation-database.aspx>

1. **Potential Recommendations**

Based on the day’s presentations and discussions, the Council noted the following potential recommendations.

* Requests for improvement funds should be tied to larger plans that are coordinated between multiple agencies (e.g. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), transit, WSDOT Regions, local jurisdictions). Funding criteria should reward a systematic, multi-agency approach.
* TIB mobility standard should be revised to address all modes—not just vehicles.
* State and local jurisdictions should not adopt a single design guide, but rather maintain design flexibility and utilize the guides that are most relevant, up to date, and adhere to accepted design practices.
* The Council should develop clear recommendations to the Legislature for increasing funding for active transportation. These recommendations should clearly describe the *need*, be accompanied by a broad dollar figure, and suggest sources or “pots” of money where funding can be increased or placed. (Suggestion by Rep. Kloba: Legislature is more likely to act if the need is quantified and the recommendation is accompanied by specifics; it is a helpful starting point.)
* Similar to the Complete Streets ordinance requirement, incentivize the development of Active Transportation plans. Applicants won’t be considered for higher funding level without one.
* Incentivize the 5 Principles of Systematic Safety, and add a requirement to address equity.

**Next meetings:**

June 11, 11 am – 3 pm, Joint Meeting with Pedestrian Safety Advisory Council, Seattle Municipal Tower

July 9, 11 am – 3 pm, Tacoma

August 13, 11 am – 3 pm, Ellensburg

September 10, 11 am – 3 pm, SeaTac

October 8, 9 am – 4 pm, SeaTac

December 10, 11 am – 3 pm, SeaTac

**Potential Recommendations Running List**

*Autonomous Vehicles (February meeting)*

In order to be certified to operate an autonomous vehicle (AV) in Washington State, AVs must be capable of:

* Recognizing bicyclists, no matter what they are wearing or what they are doing
* Recognizing all vulnerable road users regardless of color of skin or mode of travel, e.g. wheelchairs
* Recognizing other road hazards, e.g. construction sites
* Interacting safely with human drivers during the transition
* Using required software that selects routes to avoid streets where bicycling and walking are prioritized.

The State of Washington should be able to designate specific routes where bicycling and walking are prioritized.

The Governor’s AV Workgroup should consider bicycle and pedestrian safety as core to their deliberations.

Recommend a national framework for bicycle and pedestrian interaction that puts the onus on AV manufacturers.

The State of Washington should:

* Create an ethical framework that recognizes the greater vulnerability of bicycles and pedestrians
* Develop the liability framework
* Advocate for bicyclists and pedestrians in experimental research (see policy developed by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute)
* Consider the health impact of AVs (e.g. Health Impact Assessments)
* Consider growth management issues and the potential contribution to sprawl.
* Require data transparency before allowing the research, piloting, and operation of AVs in Washington State (data available on failures as well as successes).

The Washington State Legislature should:

* Adopt legislation that describes and requires AVs to follow the rules of the road, including any rules identified by this Council as important for bicycle safety (e.g. following speed limits and stopping at signals for bicyclists and pedestrians)
* Adopt state law establishing safe passing distance that considers speed
* Protect and expand the investment in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

*Case Reviews (March Meeting)*

* Failure to Yield needs more attention/infractions
* Need to emphasize Vision Zero principles
* Vehicles permitted to cross double yellow line to avoid bikes if no oncoming traffic
* Infrastructure investments called for – traffic calming, road design, slower speeds, accommodations for all users, protected bike lanes and other separated facilities
* Emphasize “Transit-oriented development” instead of “Development-oriented transit”
* Strengthen vulnerable user law
* Study of ticket costs to see if it’s possible to set fines based on potential for injury, e.g. failure to yield is a very common reason for fatal/serious injury crashes but we don’t know how many tickets are issued or what the fines are.
* Using turn signals before the turn
* More aggressive treatment by licensing and court systems of repeat offenders – especially regarding CDL
* Driver’s Education – emphasize mobility education by teaching driving biking and walking
* Require “Sideguards” on panel and box trucks operating in urban areas to keep people from being swept underneath the trucks
* Design for speed management – design slows movement
* Comprehensive evaluation of bicycling on state routes or crossing state routes
* More funding for infrastructure development and improvements for all ages and abilities
* Organize recommendations as short-, medium-, and long-term
* Design and implement alternatives to fines/infractions, diversion programs from traffic fines, especially in high poverty areas
* Extend implied consent law to cover distracted driving, e.g., you agree to turn over your phone for inspection or license suspension (would need to address concerns about other confidential information that may be on the phone like medical records, pictures, etc.)

*Funding, Design Guides, Systematic Safety (May Meeting)*

* Requests for improvement funds should be tied to larger plans that are coordinated between multiple agencies (e.g. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), transit, WSDOT Regions, local jurisdictions). Funding criteria should reward a systematic, multi-agency approach.
* TIB mobility standard should be revised to address all modes—not just vehicles.
* State and local jurisdictions should not adopt a single design guide, but rather maintain design flexibility and utilize the guides that are most relevant, up to date, and adhere to accepted design practices.
* The Council should develop clear recommendations to the Legislature for increasing funding for active transportation. These recommendations should clearly describe the *need*, be accompanied by a broad dollar figure, and suggest sources or “pots” of money where funding can be increased or placed. (Suggestion by Rep. Kloba: Legislature is more likely to act if the need is quantified and the recommendation is accompanied by specifics; it is a helpful starting point.)
* Similar to the Complete Streets ordinance requirement, incentivize the development of Active Transportation plans. Applicants won’t be considered for higher funding level without one.
* Incentivize the 5 Principles of Systematic Safety, and add a requirement to address equity.