**Pedestrian Safety Advisory Council**

## Meeting #25 Summary

## September 26, 2018, 10:00 am – 2:30 pm

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Attending:** | Marc Anderson, Charlotte Claybrooke, Aimee D’Avignon, Joshua Diekmann, Mike Dornfeld, Tony Gomez, Darrin Grondel, Will Hitchcock, John Nisbet, Julia Reitan, Paul Taylor, Ida Van Schalkwyk, Karen Wigen, Scott Waller, Heidi Keller |

1. **Announcements and Updates**

The proposal to establish an Active Transportation Safety Advisory Council has gone to the Governor’s office in Z Bill form. The Governor’s Office will decide if it will submit the legislation or whether the bill needs to be introduced by a legislator. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Councils are set to expire in June 2019. This bill will merge the two groups into one council and continue their work.

1. **WSDOT Funding Package**

Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) has submitted a funding package to the Governor that includes recommendations that this Council has proposed. It includes a broad range of complementary strategies to address safety and mobility, including funding for 1) active transportation (walkable bike-able Washington), 2) traffic safety systems, and 3) transit.

The Council discussed sending a letter of support once they have had time to review. It will be on the agenda for the October 24 meeting.

## Review 2018 First Draft Annual Report

Overall comments:

* Still too long
* Separate the actionable from the aspirational – what can be acted on now
* Info graphics would help condense and explain some of the dense material

Specific suggestions begin on Page 2.

**Next meetings:**

10/24/18, 10 am – 2:30 pm, WTSC, Olympia

12/12/18, 10 am – 3:00 pm, WTSC, Olympia, Joint meeting with the Cooper Jones Bicyclist Safety Advisory Council

**PEDESTRIAN SAFETY ADVISORY COUNCIL**

DRAFT 2018 Annual Report and Recommendations

Specific comments appear in blue.

Two ideas that got bumped to next year:

Charlotte Action item: new for next year: Automated cameras help to bring down speeds where other infrastructure cannot be applied; temporarily lower speeds to give opportunity to

Next year Marc’s idea about providing sufficient funding to maintain streetlights (replace bulbs, etc.)

**Changing the Status Quo - A New Vision for Safety**

Suggestion: Frame as access: how can people get places

How do we get the legislature’s attention at the beginning of the document, make it a priority so they can help to change the traffic safety culture

Tony: words that resonate: public safety and public health emergency, Elected officials get that. Kicks it up a notch. Includes public safety and law enforcement. Resonates with both sides of the aisle.

Darrin: what’s not there: there’s no urgency. Adding data will help emphasize the urgency.

Urgency a better word than emergency.

John Nisbet: Intro seems like an overarching recommendation. Data piece can add to it. Missing the core recommendation. Right now, it says we need to change our approach. This is a big deal, it’s not getting better. Not just one thing or two that can change it. And here’s our recommended approach.

Julia: building a constituency, help identify the pedestrians we are trying to serve. If it’s everybody as reads now then it’s nobody. Who are these pedestrians who are part of the transportation system? School kids; elderly who aren’t driving, don’t own cars. Where are these communities where car ownership is low? How do you talk about the transit users as pedestrians? ID who are we trying to serve. We put a face on those who were being killed but who is out there on their feet, using the transportation system. Pedestrian-transit commuter.

Charlotte: It is something like 85% of transit users walk to get to their connection. (she can verify)

Marc: likes the ads, woman on street, can we build that in here? How many fatalities should occur in a year…how about in your family…? Perhaps insert this message into report

Darrin: Highlight the big issues, set that hook, and then recommendations to address

Nisbet: understanding the data, limitations of the data, it’s bigger than infrastructure.

Nisbet: there is an ability to walk; system is dependent on pedestrians being able to walk. Multi-modal isn’t possible because of the inability to do it safely. System depends on people being able to safely walk.

Scott: the system doesn’t work if people can’t safely walk.

This report focuses on how to change the status quo for pedestrians and other roadway users in Washington State. In each of the past five years, there has been an increase in the number of pedestrians being killed on our roadways, more than doubling since 2013 (49 in 2013, 108 in 2017). The number of pedestrians seriously injured as a result of collisions with vehicles increased in four of those five years.

If there a disease were killing increasing numbers of people each year we would declare a public health emergency. And that would mean isolating the causes of the disease and establishing effective treatments.

The Pedestrian Safety Advisory Council (PSAC) has examined the common factors for pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries. This report utilizes five internationally-recognized principles of systematic safety to detail the Council’s findings and recommended treatments to reduce pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries in Washington State.

The principles of systematic safety are the core of a very successful safety approach called Vision Zero. Vision Zero starts with the conviction that everyone has the right to move safely in their communities, and that system designers and policy makers share the responsibility to ensure safe systems for travel. The Vision Zero approach recognizes that people will sometimes make mistakes, so the road system and related policies should be designed to ensure those inevitable mistakes do not result in severe injuries or fatalities. This means that system designers and policymakers are expected to improve the roadway environment, policies (such as speed management), and other related systems to lessen the severity of crashes. Vision Zero Network, 2018, <https://visionzeronetwork.org/about/what-is-vision-zero>.

**Would be great to have input about how to make this introductory section more impactful and direct. HK Note: this is a good start; but what else?**

Charlotte: could be made friendlier but let us keep POSS in parentheses: The five principles of systematic safety are**:**

Darrin: like the suggestion of putting some of these in graphics. Picture that shows speed reduction, showing vehicle separated from people.

**Addressing speed and separating cars from people in high density, multi-use corridors (**Speed control and separation)

Charlotte will submit wording to this effect: Where people are walking and driving the speed should be low. In [other settings], there should be separation. (Needs one or 2 sentence explanation here. Could also be handled in info graphic.)

**Roadways are designed to reduce conflicts between users** (Functional harmony)

Discussion about always using the word “roadways.”

Josh: Change this sentence to “All transportation facilities are…”

Charlotte: intended to get you to your destination. Saying “transportation facilities” does not cover retail, and other destinations.

M**aking it easier for all roadway users to recognize and follow the rules for safety (**Predictability and Simplicity)

Julia: not all about roads. Streets and sidewalks

Will: transportation pathways…

Darrin: is it an active transportation – reflective of the whole system

Shelly advises: active transportation doesn’t work with elected officials. It’s a non-starter.

Nisbet: RCW has some definitions, public right of way

Darrin: can say some refer to it as roadways, others [insert other words], but here we say active transportation – something that highlights that it’s not just about cars or motor vehicles…

S**imple mistakes are predicted and prevented** (Forgivingness and Restrictiveness)

**Addressing behaviors that contribute to crashes (**State awareness)

Charlotte: this is an oversimplification. I like the ways this is explained later in the document but this does not work as a standalone statement. Needs a one or two sentence explanation in reader friendly language.

**Findings (Obviously to be fleshed out more – perhaps we can “workshop” this with the group on 9/10)**

Ida: Could these be a sidebar? Going for a more graphic approach.

**A.** Words matter: reframing the language of safety to promote safe passage for all road users

Throughout this document we will be using:

Accident vs. crash

Non-motorist vs. roadway user

**B.** Safe Mobility is a Civil Right

Discussion of how to phrase this.

Nisbet: Cite the source so that it lends credibility to the statement (not just us saying this). Others are making these statements. Reflective of a movement. Perhaps in sidebar…per the United Nations, ADA, …civil right (ability to move safely)

Darrin: mobility is a right. Driving is not. It’s a privilege. Cite the source so it doesn’t look like this committee made it up.

Ida: human right instead?

Julia: is the system disabling any user? Wheelchair is moving until it hits a step. Don’t want our society to disable some users.

**C.** The road system owner is responsible for ensuring road safety - If our road system were treated like any other industry, it would be shut down immediately for gross safety violations

Discussion about rewording – Ensuring transportation system safety is a shared responsibility. the owner of the road is responsible for the roadway. The user of the infrastructure and roadway is responsible for their use of the roadway but the two are interrelated. The roadway design must be self-explaining to users about how to use the system properly.

Charlotte: not important to say who is responsible. Main point: This is the shift that will help us get closer to where we want to be.

Ida: different pieces of the system that need to come together. This is too limiting by putting the infrastructure owner in the hot seat.

Mike: got hung up on the like other industry. It’s not like other industries.

Charlotte: acknowledge that there is a price for making the shift [to safety]. Besides the infrastructure price, there is an impact on the system in general… (Referring to narrowing of lanes, etc.)

Charlotte: Somewhere in this opening section – change the status quo is focusing on a roadway design that is more self-enforcing and the reduces the potential impact for serious crashes for vulnerable users.

**D.** Traffic safety programs must be proactive, eliminating safety risks before they cause serious injury or death - Reacting to historic crashes is necessary, but not sufficient; Data collection and analysis is valuable, but no excuse to delay action

Systematic Safety: The Principles Behind Europe’s Vision Zero, Peter G Furth Policy Briefing to Boston City Council’s Committee on Parks, Recreation, and Transportation January 5, 2017, <http://www.northeastern.edu/peter.furth/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Systematic-Safety-Action-Plan-for-Boston.pdf>

Scott: separate the above declarations from these more factual statements.

**E.** Changes have been made in recent years to start making roadways safer, but they are coming far too slowly and are not universal

Marc: concept: infrastructure improvements are not keeping pace with growth. We are fastest growing and infrastructure hasn’t kept up with growth, little thought about pedestrians. Infrastructure for pedestrians has not kept pace with growth

Scott: also rural

Charlotte: we have made it safer – fewer total fatalities – but this is about safer for people who are walking. Increase the emphasis on making the roadway safer for people who walk.

Julia: general comment that we are not emphasizing the pedestrian aspect. Talk generally and about all users which is good but we need to be clear that pedestrians are the most vulnerable. They are not wearing a helmet, slowest – what makes it particularly important for pedestrians, what’s unique for them.

**F.** Where you live effects your ability to move about safely. Lower income neighborhoods often require more investment to bring them up to the safety level of higher income neighborhoods within their cities. Pedestrian safety issues tend to affect a higher percent of people living in poverty, which includes an overrepresentation of people of color, the elderly, and people with disabilities. These neighborhoods are under resourced and historically underfunded.

Nisbet: Be more specific. It’s very specific around lack of infrastructure – sidewalks and other treatments.

Ida: historic. Red lining. Need to recognize historic under investment. Amy Shuman could give a good graphic depiction.

**G.** Scarcity of “user” data impacts ability to effectively plan

Aimee: explain what user we are talking about

Ida: lack of (suggested wording submitted)

Julia: need to find out how many pedestrians there are. Gross/blunt estimates here: e.g. 85% of transit users, school kids, # of people living in census districts with low car ownership

Ida: potentially link to obesity, alternative modes for congestion, all ties into this…

**H.** Need to work on speed of vehicles as number one variable – roadway control is one strategy, building Positive Community Norm around going speed limit and being aware of other roadway users is another

Scott: Different phrasing from last year

See Ida’s suggested wording. She read aloud and Marc endorsed.

Julia: one other finding we have seen is darkness as a factor, winter months, and evening commute. Darkness and rain a particular hazard. Electeds: this is partly why we have high numbers it adds one more layer to challenge and urgency.

Charlotte: darkness is why headlights do not pick up what you need to see.

**Transition to be inserted – need to have a couple stories, perhaps, or, at a minimum, some data regarding pedes**

**Recommendations**

1. **Addressing speed and separating cars from people in high density, multi-use corridors** (Speed control and separation)

Where concentrations of pedestrians are present, strategies like narrowing the travel lanes and raised intersections and crosswalks make roads self-enforcing. *Separation* refers to the process of separating vehicles from other road users (pedestrians, bicyclists), especially on thoroughfares with higher posted speeds and several lanes of traffic.

* 1. Work with local jurisdictions and other state agencies to develop a target speed policy and guidelines that emphasize lower speeds on state routes, city streets, county and tribal roads compatible with the needs of all users. Local jurisdictions and state agencies should add “high-risk demographics” (e.g., high density of older adults, transit users, pedestrians, etc.) as a contextual factor to consider in setting speeds. If necessary, changes should be recommended to the legislation regarding statutory speed based on the target speed policy.”

Julia: could this be more definite or actionable; e.g. move from 85th percentile to target speed. E.g. tie state funding to target speed to force that shift

NIsbet: have to be careful. RCW as a laundry list that you can use. "A" fits very nicely, not using all the flexibility that we have. It’s probably an educational strategy. Have to take how people are driving into the broad calculation. Say vehicle speed instead of 85th percentile

Josh: evaluate whether we can diverge from the 85th percentile to use more factors; consider in future

Scott: is there a way that we can give guidance differently. E.g. Study alternatives to 85th percentile.

Scott: need to understand target speed (Ida),

Mike: we have a lot of flexibility in WA, ahead of MUTCD 10 years or more. Have a law that local agencies can lower to 20 mph or more without a study if they so choose. Not using it, maybe next step is to find out why are they not using it? Do you take advantage of it? If they are not using it, why not? Get more data behind the decisions that are being made.

Julia: As is it is featured at the top of the list. Even though this is not in descending order it gives it outsized prominence. Can we drop 85th percentile down the list and put newer concepts higher.

Operational and posted speed, connected to the features that are self-explaining and self-enforcing

Action Items:

1. Provide continuing education credits and/or disseminate more broadly the up-to-date options for speed setting options, options that current reflect research. (Many older Professional Engineers did not learn about this during college and have not received more current guidance)
2. Change the culture around speed setting to frame it as “injury prevention and minimization.”
3. Charlotte add an action item…specific infrastructure (will turn in to Scott)

Authorizing legislation should stipulate that revenues generated from operation of the automated enforcement cameras be used only for support for the following six purposes: (2017)

Will: We should note progress if any on 2017 recommendations, as in “This was recommended last year and still needs to be done” or whatever

Charlotte: is creating a spreadsheet to document progress. Will provide to Scott.

Action Items:

* 1. Development and operation of school safety patrols;
	2. enforcement costs associated with reviewing automated enforcement citations;
	3. funding of law enforcement to emphasize increasing safety in school zones and in elementary school walk areas ((including allocation of FTEs to school zone enforcement, where appropriate);
	4. maintenance of the automated enforcement equipment;
	5. providing infrastructure improvements that will reduce the risk of pedestrian and bicycle fatality or injury; and,
	6. public education and outreach to encourage more parents/guardians to have their children walk or bicycle to school.
	7. Change RCW 46.63.170 to allow placement of automated speed enforcement cameras on any road identified in an elementary school’s walk area (RCW 28A.160.160). (2017)

Charlotte Action item:- new for next year

Automated cameras help to bring down speeds where other infrastructure can’t be applied; temporarily lower speeds to give opportunity to

* 1. Drop: ~~Develop a new category of citation allowed for automated enforcement called “Failure to Yield to Pedestrians at a Designated School Crossing.” Allow automated enforcement within any marked school crossing during times when students are walking and when flashing signs are lit or a sign is posted to notify drivers. (2017)~~ Reconsider next year

Mike: not an option to use cameras to issue citation for this?

Nisbet: city of Bellevue is developing but not ready

Karen/Paul: Spokane is citing for this, but this is getting pretty far out. Rather have things that can pass

1. **Roadways are designed to reduce conflicts between users** (Functional harmony)

This is achieved when road characteristics are in agreement with expected user groups and adjacent land use context. For example,roads that are shared by people driving, walking and bicycling to businesses and residences should feature frequent opportunities crossing the road, and road characteristics that signal drivers to maintain lower speeds.

Aimee: acronyms are confusing

Julia: is there a real concrete action about how you increase the pedestrian amenities that need to be provided that is tied to level of service in the GMA. “encouraging” and “enhancing” not specific action.

2.1 Improve Coordination of Transportation and Land Use Planning (2018)

*Action Items:*

* 1. Encourage RTPOs & MPOs to offer more incentives for jurisdictions to integrate safety, multi-modal options, and equity into Comprehensive Plans.
	2. Encourage more widespread adoption of LOS metrics that account for safe travel by all modes
	3. Enhance coordination of transportation and land use elements to ensure the roadway is built or improved to support the land use.
	4. Adhere to density goals in GMA. Examples: Rethink acreage requirements for school siting by co-locating with parks and community centers; locate large projects – such as schools, housing, and bus bases – within growth boundaries instead of opting for cheap land outside the population centers that result in more car dependence.
	5. Consider mismatch between historical road classifications and current use, e.g. number of crossings, lanes, and speed in areas that feature pedestrian generators like residences, shopping, and clinics.

Scott: to be more meaningful it would be better to pull out some action steps that we want to have happen. Scott will rewrite.

2.2. Make an action item under 2.3. Local agencies adopt pedestrian scale illumination design standards/guidelines. (2018)

*Action Items:*

* 1. Update current illumination guidelines to focus on pedestrian safety. Keep reference to pedestrian scale to distinguish from street lighting. Incorporate into training. Potential mechanisms: WSDOT Design Manual, L.A.G. Manual. (scott reworded on board)
	2. Disseminate an “illumination best practices” at marked crosswalks guidance document. Note: SDOT standards are ready for dissemination.

2.3. Develop guidelines and make investments for an iterative approach to transition from vehicle-dominated corridors toward “complete streets,” with spot treatment leading to holistic corridor improvements. (2018)

*Action Items:*

* 1. Include identification of thresholds where growth and traffic trigger changes that promote safe movement for all – vehicles, pedestrians, and non-motorized vehicles (e.g. bicycles, wheelchairs).
	2. Provide a toolbox to aid cities and counties in developing access management plans and designing routes for vehicles and people to move safely.
	3. Provide examples, similar to Seattle’s “Streets Illustrated,” that make it easier to identify and design needed improvements.

2.4. Establish funding for small and under resourced jurisdictions to devote to developing Comprehensive Plans. (2018)

2.5. Create guidelines for pedestrian crossing frequencies based on land use and context. (Some research may be needed. (2018)

2.6. Require coordination of transportation and land use elements of Comprehensive Plans to ensure the roadway is built or improved to support the land use. (2018)

2.7. Develop minimum requirements for bicycle, pedestrian, and complete streets elements. (2018)

2.8. Determine what WSDOT needs to do to continue their work on context classification and associated modal priorities and infrastructure needs. (2018)

*Action Items:*

* 1. Assure curb cuts are available in both directions so people with wheelchairs do not have to enter the road in order to cross the street in the direction they are traveling, and transition points for transit re: wheelchair.

2.9 Update Growth Management Act to Address Transportation Health and Transportation Safety: (2018)

*Action Items:*

* 1. Add health and safety to the list of required elements in Comprehensive Plans.
	2. Add health as transportation policy goal in statute.

2.10. ~~Address autonomous vehicle impacts, car sharing. (2018)~~ Charlotte: not consistent with complete streets.

Julia add: principle that is missing: create conditions where drivers can better see pedestrians and pedestrians can better see drivers. Dongho has a long list of things that we could identify

Darrin: NTSB three-pronged recommendation

1. **Making it easier for all roadway users to recognize and follow the rules for safety** (Predictability and Simplicity)

People make fewer mistakes when they know what to expect and when decisions are simple. For example, median islands allow a pedestrian to cross in stages and check for traffic one direction at a time. Intersections that feature protected left turn phases make it simpler for a driver to know when to turn without having to judge gaps in oncoming traffic.

Move illumination recommendations here

3.1. Move. Will be in Charlotte’s progress spreadsheet. Provide funding incentives to jurisdictions to develop effective pedestrian walkway and safety plans and/or include a section dedicated to the elimination of pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries as part of local and regional transportation plans or safety planning. (2017)

Action Items

* 1. Using a multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional process, WSDOT should develop, adapt or adopt a template for effective local pedestrian walkway plans that includes criteria for prioritizing future investments to proactively reduce/eliminate pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries and other considerations such as increasing general access to pedestrian facilities like trails or sidewalks and/or connecting existing facilities to create continuous pedestrian routes.
	2. Continue and expand training for local traffic safety planners and engineers on using the template and other tools for prioritizing future safety investments.

3.2. *(Still needs more work)* Based on ridership, traffic, and behavior (passenger) data, ensure bus stops are located no further than \_\_\_ feet from crosswalk. Each bus stop should have appropriate signage, warning lights, and lighting. *(2018)*

*Scott and Marc rewrite*

*Julia: these are ped/transit commuters. This effects a lot of people and is important.*

1. **Simple mistakes are predicted and prevented** (Forgivingness and Restrictiveness)

*Forgivingness* means that if someone makes a simple mistake it will not result in serious injury. *Restrictiveness* means preventing people from making the mistakes they might want to make, discouraging passing, encouraging roadside parking as a buffer between vehicle traffic and pedestrians, and other methods that separate motorists from other road users.

4.1. Provide funding to WSDOT to support a multi-agency, multi-disciplinary work group to identify appropriate levels of increased funding to support installation and maintenance of pedestrian friendly infrastructure (e.g., roundabouts, accessibility features, curb extensions, and crosswalk median islands) in contexts where people walk. Use increased funding to establish focused efforts on pedestrian safety infrastructure, operations, and maintenance programs. (2017)

4.2. Develop stakeholder group regarding changes to funding strategies to proactively identify historically under resourced areas for improvement investments.

*Action Items:*

* 1. Conduct an asset analysis of census tracts with 1) lower income, and 2) racial and ethnic minority populations for use by multiple organizations to prioritize investments.
	2. In order to be accurate and useful, data collection should include both roadway and societal factors and impacts.

4.3. Encourage and support pedestrian safety oriented infrastructure and technology, such as (2018)

Action Items

* 1. Widespread use of leading pedestrian interval – 3 seconds. (Make it a requirement except in the case of older signals that are not sophisticated enough to accept such a change.)
	2. Provide pedestrian-only walk time (no vehicle movement); automatic walk signal without pedestrian activation; protected left turns – green arrow only.

4.4. Update the Local Agency Guidelines Manual to be consistent with the WSDOT Design Manual and national design standards specific to pedestrian safety, including flexibility for traffic calming, separated facilities and the *5* *Principles of Systematic Safety* from Vision Zero. (2017)

1. **Addressing behaviors that contribute to crashes** (State awareness)

**State Awareness** refers to things outside the realm of road design, such as drunk driving, texting, and inexperienced operators.

* 1. The Washington State Legislature provides funding to the Washington Traffic Safety Commission to coordinate as statewide Active Transportation Safety Advisory Council (ATSAC) to continue to make recommendations for improving pedestrian safety in Washington State. (2018)
	2. *Note – Revisit this potential recommendation* Develop a statewide estimate of pedestrian and bicycle exposure. (2018)
	3. Fund and evaluate a 5-year pedestrian fatality review pilot in two sites, one in Western Washington and one in Eastern Washington, to demonstrate the efficacy of the process to identify and address modifiable contributing factors. (2017)
	4. State of Washington inventory State data systems related to traffic safety, centralize governance of those systems, and examine and make continuous improvements to the systems. (2018)

*Action Items:*

* 1. Look at the National Violent Death Reporting Systems as a model for how to combine a variety of data sources to create a more complete and accurate picture for use in determining improvement investments. (2)
	2. Expand the sources – and increase the confidence in – the data we use. Conduct a pilot to dig deeper into Electronic Medical Records (EMR) and hospital records to describe the incident, not just the injury. Expanded knowledge will aid in making better recommendations to the legislature. (4)
	3. The Washington State Legislature allocates sufficient funding to WSDOT to develop an enterprise GIS network for all public roads that can be used by any agency in the state for data collection and management.
	4. The Washington State Legislature allocates sufficient funding to WSDOT to proceed with mobile LIDAR data collection on state highways for inventorying of pedestrian, bicyclist, ADA, and other asset management. Make this data available to WSP and any other state agency for their use. (Note: Louisiana success story)
	5. The Washington State Legislature allocates sufficient funding to WSDOT to Participate and act on findings of the FHWA Roadway Data Improvement Program assessment and the NHTSA Crash Data Improvement Program assessment that will be complete by November 2018.
	6. The Washington State Legislature allocates sufficient funding to WSDOT to coordinate on a plan for a centralized management of roadway, asset, socio demographic, and health data for use by all agencies and advocacy/community groups. with Office of the Chief Financial Officer, State of Washington, OFM, DOL, HCA, WTSC, and DOH (Data integration).
	7. Continue efforts to provide summaries of crash, injury, and related event data to community advocacy groups from the WSDOT Public Crash Data Portal, and the DOH Washington Tracking Network (WTN)
	8. Provide funding to develop and implement methodology to determine reliable estimates of the number of pedestrians in the state, number of trips made by pedestrians, number of miles travelled by walking, and level of service measures for pedestrians. (2017).
	9. Provide funding to implement comprehensive inventory of pedestrian infrastructure in the state, e.g., number and type of signals and types of pedestrian facilities in place (for example, sidewalks, roundabouts, curb extensions, etc.). (2017)
	10. Create requirement for law enforcement, prosecutors and judges to be trained about Washington State’s Vulnerable User law, RCW 46.61.526 (Negligent driving—Second degree—Vulnerable user victim), and how to apply it to instances where pedestrians and bicyclists are killed or seriously injured. For law enforcement, the training should be conducted as part of the Washington State Law Enforcement Academy curriculum, Washington State Patrol Academy, roll call and other in-service training opportunities. Training should be provided as well to prosecutors and judges as part of their continuing legal education requirements. (2017)
	11. Change Washington State law to double penalties for drivers who are cited for any traffic offense associated with a crash in which a pedestrian is killed or seriously injured. (2017)
	12. Evaluate driver-training curriculum relating to left turns. Require more frequent driver education/continuing education reflecting new knowledge. Update ASAP: side pillar blocking vision during left turns, especially for Commercial Driver License training. (2018)
	13. Provide funding to improve the capabilities of, and accessibility to, WSDOT’s Crash Data Portal to support the development of local pedestrian walkway and bicycle plans. (2017)
	14. Continue to provide public policy changes, education, and enforcement about the state’s new distracted driving law. (2017)

Action Items

* 1. Fund the development and implementation of a targeted statewide public education campaign aimed at drivers who do not yet comply with Washington’s distracted driving law.
	2. Fund public education efforts to promote greater awareness of and care for all road users, targeted to drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists.
	3. Continue to provide public policy changes, education, and enforcement about the state’s new distracted driving law. (2017)
	4. Expand funding for the WSDOT Safe Routes to School Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Program administered in partnership with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2017)
	5. Remove barriers for obtaining a warrant for a timely blood draw from drivers involved in pedestrian crashes involving suspected pedestrian injury. (2017)

Action Items

* 1. Provide funding support to Washington Technology Solutions (WaTech) to develop a statewide electronic warrant system that would allow a judge to authorize a timely blood warrant based on a review of documents received electronically.
	2. Change Washington State law to require public hospitals and emergency rooms to prioritize blood draws related to criminal investigations (e.g. DUI) over non-emergent cases, and to bill the blood drawee’s health insurance for associated costs.
	3. Provide funding support for implementation of an effective law enforcement phlebotomy program where law enforcement officers draw blood from suspects in crimes.
	4. Using research based, effective strategies implement traffic safety culture change. (2018)

*Action Items*:

* 1. Implement recommendations from Montana State University.
	2. Potential exists for using positive norms change campaigns that have been successful; could be used across all issues.
	3. Develop and implement a statewide education/awareness campaign on impaired walking. When going out, have a plan for getting home. (2018)

*Action Items:*

1. Conduct outreach to:
	* Pedestrians
	* Bars/servers
	* Public transit
	* Rideshare apps
	* Bystanders/buddy system, “designated walker”
	1. Conduct more research on the combined effects of alcohol and marijuana.(2018)
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**Exhibit A – Pedestrian data for the state**

**Exhibit B – PSC Sponsors and Members**

**PSC Chair**

Darrin Grondel, Director, WTSC

**Executive Sponsors**

Captain Monica Alexander, Government and Media Relations, Washington State Patrol

Dolly Fernandes, Section Manager, Washington State Department of Health

Darrin Grondel, Director, Washington Traffic Safety Commission

John Nisbet, P.E., State Traffic Engineer, Washington State Department of Transportation

**Project Manager**

Scott Waller, Program Manager, Washington Traffic Safety Commission
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**Facilitator**
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**PSC Members**
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Dongho Chang, P.E., PTOE, City of Seattle
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Aimee D’Avignon, MPH, Washington State Department of Health

David Delgado, King County Medical Examiner Office

Josh Diekmann, P.E., PTOE, Tacoma Public Works Department
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Officer Eric Edwards, Richland Police Department

Will Hitchcock, Ph.D., Washington State Department of Health

Sergeant Bill Judd, Renton Police Department Patrol Services Division
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Lieutenant Kurt Schwan, Federal Way Police Department Traffic Division

Janet Shull, AICP, CUD, Senior Planner, City of Seattle

Officer Paul Taylor, Spokane Police Department Traffic Unit

Ida Van Schalkwyk, Ph.D, Washington State Department of Transportation Traffic Office
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**Exhibit C - PSC Purpose and Scope**

SSB 5957 established the PSC to “review and analyze data points at which the transportation system can be improved, and to identify patterns in pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries.”

The WTSC convened the PSC in March 2016. Members include experts from multiple disciplines including law enforcement, traffic engineering, traffic safety, transportation planning, public transit, injury prevention, cities, counties, tribes, and the King County coroner. The PSC met monthly to review data on pedestrian safety and begin to compile evidence on actions that Washington can take to prevent pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries.

The PSC’s purpose is to decrease pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries. To accomplish this, the PSC is directed to:

* + Review and analyze crash data
	+ Identify points at which the transportation system can be improved
	+ Identify patterns in pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries
	+ Recommend changes in statutes, ordinances, rules, and policies to improve pedestrian safety

The PSC’s recommendations are addressed to the WTSC, other state agencies, the Governor’s Office, and the Transportation Committees of the Washington State Legislature.

The PSC’s work plan is organized around eight focus areas. Each focus area is supported by actions for improving pedestrian safety. A complete list with action items and a timeline for the PSC’s work is shown in *Exhibit A – PSC Recommendations and Timeline.*

* 1. Explore laws, rules, and ordinances that support pedestrian safety
	2. Promote positive pedestrian culture
	3. Prioritize infrastructure investments to reduce pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries
	4. Improve pedestrian data
	5. Invest in the development and implementation of local pedestrian walkway plans that support pedestrian safety.
	6. Implement proven enforcement strategies
	7. Include diverse stakeholders
	8. Encourage emerging technology that supports pedestrian safety

**Exhibit D – Description of recommendation-development process and listing of all recommendations considered prior to selection of those that would be included in report**

In gathering and compiling information in this report, participating organizations and agencies do not waive the limitations on this information’s discoverability or admissibility under 23 U.S.C SS 409.