Pedestrian Safety Advisory Council

Meeting 10 Summary

March 22, 2017, 10 am – 2:30 pm

**Attending:** Mike Dornfeld, Ida Van Schalkwyk, Joshua Diekmann, Dongho Chang, Julia Reitan, David Delgado, Officer Paul Taylor, Karen Wigen, Charlotte Claybrooke, Greg Fredrickson (NHTSA guest observer), Darrin Grondel, Scott Waller, Staci Hoff, Heidi Keller (facilitator)

This meeting visited two focus areas from the Council work plan

1) Focus Area 1: Explore laws, rules and ordinances that support pedestrian safety

1.2. Expand photo speed/red light enforcement within and beyond school zones as a means to prevent pedestrian crashes

6.1. Photo red/school zone speed enforcement with funding dedicated to safety

2) Revisit Focus Area 4: Improve pedestrian data

1. **Focus Area 1**

The Council heard presentations on photo speed/red light enforcement experiences from Staci Hoff (national overview), Dongho Chang (Seattle experience), and Joshua Dieklmann (Tacoma experience.

**Summary of presentations**

The public and elected officials are more understanding and accepting of this technology when

1. Revenue is designated for safety improvements
2. Data shows a reduction in collisions

*Seattle experience in school zones:* steep decrease in collisions, resulting in an increase in public support

* Seattle school zone revenue model: proceeds distributed equitably throughout the city to benefit children’s safety
* Locations selected based on safety data
* Revenue from current locations invested in improvements like safety bumps, striping, and other engineering fixes. Able to remove the photo enforcement from these locations move to new ones.

*Experience in Tacoma with photo speed enforcement* has shown a decrease in collisions and the severity of collisions.

* Tacoma has the only automated speed enforcement location outside of a school zone. This location is on Bay Street (SR-167) near the Emerald Queen Casino. This camera was originally approved as a pilot project, and the changes made in 2015 established this location as a long-term installation.
* Photo enforcement is used conservatively. Tickets only issued for going significantly over the speed limit, e.g. 45 mph in a 25 mph zone.
* The location was selected based on the number and frequency of severe collisions, and also on the inability to use other tools to address the problem.
* Locations selected based on where safety can be increased but also based on locations where the number of violations is high. This helps ensure the cameras can be affordable tools, and will not divert finances from other activities.
* Result: drop in collisions and severity of collisions.

**Conclusions**

* Red light enforcement gains more public acceptance when revenues are designated for safety improvements, and when data shows a reduction in collisions.
* Public acceptance is low when the revenue is put into a general fund; seen as a money maker for government and vendor
* Provides warning to drivers that speed is photo enforced and you will get a ticket. The lead car slows down and the rest follow. As a tool it’s very effective in changing behavior in the short term until you can make longer term engineering changes.

**Messages when communicating with the public and elected officials**

* Reduces collisions.
* Privacy is a huge concern. Expect public debate. Need to position this as a safety measure that gets us to Target Zero.
* Spokane example: communicated to elected officials as a violator-funded program. Message: saving our children.

**Potential Recommendations**

* Change current budget proviso language that limits expansion to previously authorized pilot sites. The pilot has been successful. Authority should be extended to other sites.
* Propose legislation that revenue from these technologies shall be dedicated to the improvement of walking environment, e.g. better count down signals, curb cuts, pop up enforcement locations, better information for the driver.
* Propose legislation for a statewide program that requires revenue to be used for safety. Roll it out as a new safety tool. Split revenue between local jurisdiction and statewide grant program to provide startup funding for additional sites, prioritized based on collision data and financial need.

**2) Revisit Focus Area 4: Improve pedestrian data**

Council members reflected on last month’s pedestrian death case review exercise and concluded:

* Case review is a good tool for understanding the underlying factors that contribute to pedestrian fatalities (human factors, roadway factors, availability of pedestrian amenities).
* Want to use case review format in future meetings, but suggest it will be more helpful if it is paired with a roll up of quantitative data that is also available from other sources.
* Staci Hoff agreed to revisit the content and format of future data presentations and come to the April meeting with a proposal for Council consideration.