**Cooper Jones Bicyclist Safety Advisory Council**

**Draft Meeting #13 Summary**

**May 13, 2019, 11 AM – 3 PM**

**Tukwila Community Center, 12424 42nd Ave S, Tukwila, WA 98168**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Attending:** | Chris Comeau, Jenny Arnold, Barb Chamberlain, Dong Ho Chang, Doug Dahl, Josh Diekmann, Steve Durrant, Marla Emde, David Jones, Steve Durrant, Liz Kaster, Rep. Shelly Kloba, Nancy Lillquist, Amy Person, Evelyn Roy, Paul Taylor, Kerri Wilson, Scott Waller. Heidi Keller, Facilitator |

1. **Announcements – Scott Waller**

Our June 10 BSAC meeting is cancelled, as we will be meeting jointly with the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Council on June 26 at the Washington Traffic Safety Commission in Olympia.

Legislative Update:

The Active Transportation Safety Advisory Council bill is approved. Funding takes effect in late July. The first meeting of the joint council is likely to be held in early September.

Updates to the Vulnerable User Law were approved. It includes doubling the fines for violating seven different traffic related RCWs when a vulnerable user is involved.

Several other traffic safety bills were also approved. As requested, Scott will send a summary.

1. **Target Zero Draft Review**

This year’s Target Zero Update, Washington’s State Strategic Highway Safety Plan, features a chapter that combines pedestrians and bicyclists. The Council reviewed the draft chapter and provided the following feedback.

Page 106

Chart – Separate out pedestrian and bicyclist data within the chart

Clarify: applies to all roadways, not just state roads

Not clear why some of the diamonds are not filled in and others are. If it is rolling, it should not be different. Is the data different?

* If kept as is, add hollow diamond to the key and define

2nd paragraph, “…risk has grown due to other factors.” Add examples of other factors, “…such as…”

What happened in 2013? A very good year. Why such a disparity in that year?

* Possibly due to driving reduced in the recession – should you overlay total VMT? Increasing VMT does increase exposure

Page 107

Chart – Separate out pedestrian and bicyclist data within the chart

Chart – In the key, reorient orange bar from horizontal to vertical to match chart

Under “Key Countermeasures,” bullet points need to be more descriptive, e.g.

* Designing *roadways* to reduce speed
* *Appropriate* speed limits
* Reducing *behaviors that result* in impaired and *distracted* crashes

Graph shows we are not on a path to zero. Would be interesting to know what was going on from 2005 to 2010.

Page 108

Overall comment: this page too busy. Information is crammed together and hard to digest. “Hard to know where to start.”

Separate infographic, move to separate page. Data in infographic does not compute.

First blue box: change “other factors” to “multiple factors”

Pie charts

* Do not add up to the same totals as in the info graphic.
* Do not match the text on Page 110.
* Move pie charts to pg. 112 or somewhere near the infrastructure discussion.
* “Using the roadway.” Does it show what we want to show when many of those folks are trying to cross the street? Break out which of these were trying to cross the street.

What are we trying to communicate with the pie charts? Do the pie charts really help?

* Change to “walker or pedestrian” was *doing?* Bicyclist was *doing. E.g. crossing marked, unmarked, etc.*
* What were they doing vs. what were they using
* Pull out critical information; make a box out of the impactful conclusions
* Hate to give the impression that crosswalks are shown to be dangerous so let’s not have them…

Headline says “fatalities and serious injuries” but the data presented is only fatalities. Add serious injuries on all of the following factors.

* They are presented separately on previous pages

Important to know the category of “roadways;” what is included.

Bike chart: same kind of question.

Page 109

Answer key: you have a category (>50%) that is not being used. Can you change the key to include 10-20%?

In the map: unclear what the percentages and numbers represent. Need to more clearly label.

WSDOT has good data on who manages each roadway. Would be more helpful to break this data down to differentiate between crashes on state vs. local roadways.

* Barb note: there is a table in safe systems chapter. Could be replicated here with just bike and ped.

Page 110

Overall recommendations:

1. Text and graphic speeds should match
2. Talk about how speeds below a certain speed are safer
3. Relating where the numbers of crashes are occurring by speed (refer to wording in pedestrian Council report)

This chart shows 20 mph and 30 mph. Our other reports use 25 mph and 35 mph. Should we be consistent across reports?

* Should use 25 mph since the majority are on city streets they can be 25 mph.

In the ped report, a graph shows the percentage of posted speed limit…shows how it is broken out. Message: more fatalities occur at higher speeds.

* Speed between 30-40 mph are where most fatalities are happening.

There is a similar paragraph on page 179. Move the graph. Frequency of occurrence of crashes at different speeds

Recommended add: All crashes, serious injuries and fatalities. Stacked chart.

Under headline “Crossings:” The first sentence makes it sound like pedestrians are at fault.

3rd bullet:

In about 71% of bicyclist and pedestrian fatal and serious injury crashes where the pedestrian or bicyclist was crossing the road, there were no stop signs or traffic signals ~~requiring~~ *alerting* motorists to stop. ~~This requires pedestrians and bicyclists to find a gap in the flow of passing drivers in order to cross.~~

Health equity – can we add racial and ethnic data on crashes? Such as “Drivers twice as likely to yield to white pedestrians.” Liz Kaster can provide additional statements and sources.

Page 111

Can you combine the fatalities and injuries into side-by-side bars rather than separate? I would say a lot more, a lot more quickly.

* If you do two bars for each year, it would get small so you need to cut down on the number of years or stack.

Begs the question of causation. What factors may have contributed to changes from year to year? Why are they different for pedestrians and bicyclists?

Q. Bike injuries are going down but fatalities up. Same number of crashes?

A. Not all crashes; just fatal and serious injuries.

Go back to stacked chart.

Play around with Graphs; need to communicate more effectively. These do not point us to a conclusion.

You can see that the rate for serious injury is gradually trending down while others are trending up. Useful to know, in that they are trending the wrong way.

A title would help, e.g. *these are trends*. Need a better intro or be linked to other graphs

Page 112

Remove side bar on bus crashes. Does not belong here.

* Buses are the safest way to get around – needs context. Not clear who is being hit. Occupants? Walkers?

Impairment section:

This wording reads as if whenever impairment is involved it is the responsibility of the bicyclist/pedestrian, not the driver.

Put impairment into the context of other contributing factors. Perhaps it should not be portrayed as a stand-alone section.

Last paragraph, last sentence: “under reported” is an unsubstantiated statement.

Impairment figures do not seem right. Does not seem statistically possible without some explanation.

* Example: In X% of crashes we have no information because the motorists were not tested. Of the percent where they were tested this is the figure…
* See ped report language

Impairment: using the same standards for driving does not seem right. It is not illegal to walk.

We do not know how much equals impairment for cannabis. There is no research regarding its impairment potential for walking and bicycling.

Side note: would like to see more public education, similar to drinking and driving: if you are too drunk to drive, you may also be too drunk to walk.

Page 113 – 114

This section is missing explanatory headlines. The Council will review in more detail during the next draft. Some observations:

Not consistent with other graphs. What am I looking at?

Bottom of 113 –Move posted speed limit graphs to that part of the chapter.

Reconsider the term “improper crossing.” There are no proper ways to cross if there is no crosswalk. It is not illegal to cross. Victim blaming and confusing and needs to be changed.

Page 115

89/95% - are we talking about all crashes or just ped/bike? Should be clear it is ped/bike.

Destinations: is transit included in that? If so, specify.

Really like the Rainier Ave before/after crash data. Add other, similar examples if possible.

While four members voted to keep the phrase “road diet,” the Council suggests avoiding the term because it has a negative connotation. It implies that the road belongs to vehicles and you are taking something away from motorists.

Pages 115 -116

Repetition of the word “speed” in headlines gets a bit confusing. Consider rewording.

* Design is one; speed limits is another topic. Make separate sub headings.

There was a discussion about countermeasures falling under the umbrella of “Policy,” which can be a succession of actions you take to appropriately slow vehicle speed, e.g. adopt citywide design, change posted speed…

* Is there a best practices section? There you can talk about speed management, posted speed, actions other than expecting people to obey the sign. On a spectrum. You can change the speed limit but if you combine it with other things people will slow down.

Page 116

Protected/separated bicycle lanes – should it just be “protected”?

Add under “crossings” sub head: educate drivers that all intersections are crosswalks

Call attention to countermeasures by converting to a bulleted list. Use a hierarchy, starting with land use planning. Add:

* Count down timers
* Pedestrian interval crossing
* Signal timing optimized to accommodate ped crossing.

WSDOT is studying crossing on state highways. To ensure it is clear that the recommendations are applicable outside of the current study, the following wording is suggested:

 “It is anticipated that this study will make recommendations which draw from current best practices for improving crossing safety, including: ~~Once the locations are identified, specific recommended countermeasures include:~~ pedestrian hybrid beacons, road reconfiguration, rectangular rapid flashing beacons, pedestrian refuge islands, curb extensions, reduced curb radii, in-street pedestrian crossing signs ~~signals~~, curb cuts/ramps and other ADA accessibility measures, high visibility crosswalks with illumination, and gateway treatments. Improvements at signalized crossing locations should consider accessible pedestrian signals, bicycle detection, implementation of leading pedestrian interval or exclusive pedestrian phasing, and updated signal timing to ensure appropriate crossing time for all users.”

Page 117

Current wording can be interpreted that we are changing infrastructure to accommodate drunk pedestrians.

Pictures do not mesh with what is being said here,

Recommended edits:

Reducing the risk of impaired crashes

~~Strategies specific to crashes involving impaired pedestrians and bicyclists should focus on providing infrastructure that reduces the likelihood of a crash occurring, and the severity of a crash if one does occur.~~

The strategies described on the preceding pages provide benefits for all users, including those who are impaired. This includes lowering vehicle speeds, providing crossing opportunities, and developing separated and complete infrastructure for people who walk and bicycle.

~~Another approach is to identify locations and corridors with the presence of places where people buy liquor or cannabis, which suggests the potential for a higher number of people who will be using the roadway while impaired. These locations can then be evaluated for appropriate engineering, education, and enforcement countermeasures.~~

In addition, the Impairment chapter on page 30, and the WIDAC strategic plan, go into depth about reducing driving under the influence of drugs and alcohol.

Page 118

Highlight the vulnerable road use law changes.

Maybe highlight changes throughout since last report

Thinking about the audience: are they advocating for policy? If so, it would be good to have it here.

Page 119

Many questions about the infographic, which came from FHWA. It does not communicate clearly.

Trying to say that with more traffic and higher speeds you should have more protection. Should be able to present more clearly than this does here.

* General point: menu of options with a variety of tradeoffs…how do you engineer to the right solution.

If you are going to attempt an infographic to show level of traffic stress, it should also include pedestrians.

Bike infographic does not belong on same page as Pedestrian Laws – the two do not relate.

We have a place earlier about context. If we keep this infographic, it needs to move under a “context sensitive solutions” section.

Random conclusions:

Is there a section on the cost of safety? Value of life? Yes, in the introduction

Send readers to list of recommended design guides; provide a resources list – use FHWA list on their website

**Next meeting:**

June 26, Joint meeting with Cooper Jones Bicyclist Safety Advisory Council, 9 AM – 2:30 PM, WTSC, Olympia