

Cooper Jones Active Transportation Safety Council (ATSC)

Wednesday October 21, 2020

Participants: Wade Alonzo, Washington Traffic Safety Commission; Alexandria Alston, WA Bikes; Jennifer Arnold, Spokane Regional Health District; Barb Chamberlain, WSDOT; Dongho Chang, Seattle City Traffic Engineer; Charlotte Claybrooke, Safe Routes to Schools; Chris Comeau, Bellingham City Planner; Eric Edwards, Richland Police; Will Hitchcock, DOH; David Jones; Tony Gomez, King County Violence and Injury Prevention; Rep. Shelley Kloba; Katherine Miller, Spokane Capital Programs; Jon Pascal, Kirkland City Council; Dr. Amy Person, Benton-Franklin Health District; Lt. Dave Putnam, Washington State Patrol; Julia Reitan, Feet First; Eveline Roy, Region 12 Target Zero Manager; Portia Shields, Yakama Nation; Harold Taniguchi, Commission on Asian Pacific American Affairs; Scott Waller, WTSC; Kerri Wilson, Intercity Transit; Kirsten York, Community Action Council of Lewis, Mason, and Thurston Counties; Anna Zivarts, Rooted in Rights; Advisor: Ryan Peters, NHTSA.

Facilitator: ATSC Executive Committee members

AGENDA

I. Opening and Introductions

II. Action Team Updates

- **Automated Enforcement Action Team**

Scott reported that the Governor's Office asked some questions about the draft document submitted to them for review that required providing some additional information in the document. In addition to the questions, however, the Governor's Office reviewers also praised the work of the ATSC for developing the informative policy brief regarding the recommendation to expand authority for automated traffic enforcement systems to all roads within a school walk area.

- **Injury Minimization and Speed Policy Work Group**

Charlotte said the majority of the workgroup has approved final edits to the document and that the work group will meet on October 26 to discuss solutions to any problems identified during the review. Once developed, the policy will be...

- **Pedestrians in the Roadway Action Team – draft discussion paper (30 min)**

The full group reviewed the draft Pedestrians on the Roadway discussion paper and offered suggested changes/edits.

Based on input from the Pedestrians on the Roadway Action Team, the introduction section of the discussion paper was changed so that it highlighted the following reasons for the discussion paper being developed:

- There is currently an inequity in state law where drivers are held to a “due care” standard in RCW 46.61.245 while walkers/pedestrians have a lengthy set of instructions and responsibilities detailed in RCW 46.61.250.
- Six-foot “social distancing” requirements as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic often require walkers/pedestrians to leave sidewalks in order to protect themselves and others.
- Municipalities need the authority to close streets to increase safety for walkers/pedestrians. This can allow for creation of more walkable cities as well as spur economic development.
- To comply with current law, if a walker/pedestrian encountered a stretch of sidewalk that was impassable or unsafe, they would need to cross to the other side of the roadway in order to continue walking on a sidewalk.
- Individuals with disabilities and older adults – especially those who cannot or do not drive – are more reliant on infrastructure such as sidewalks so are disproportionately affected by requirements to stay on sidewalks even when those sidewalks are unsafe. Economic conditions...knowledge of what rules actually are
- In rural areas, where there is already limited access to sidewalks, leaving the roadway to avoid crashes as required by current law, is often impossible due to lack of shoulders, steep embankments, or bodies of water directly abutting the roadway.
- People are already leaving the sidewalk while walking – sometimes to avoid unsafe sidewalks, sometimes to avoid areas where overgrown vegetation obscures vision, sometimes to feel safer because the sidewalk is not well lighted. And the impact of the requirement to be on the sidewalk has a disproportionate effect in under-served communities that are least likely to have amenities such as sidewalks and bike paths.

- The potential exists for uneven enforcement of RCW 46.61.250 because it says that it is “unlawful” to be in the roadway if there is a sidewalk available.

Next steps. Scott will incorporate edits and suggestions into a new draft and bring the Action Team back together to review the updated information. If everything goes well, the ATSC could be looking at a final draft of the discussion paper at its November 18 meeting.

- **Communications Plan Action Plan; how does ATSC support the work? Standing committee? What does that mean? (30 min)**

Scott said that the problematic section of the draft plan regarding ATSC communication plan implementation duties has been removed. He said he has talked with the WTSC Communications Director, Shelly Baldwin, about ways to utilize their existing resources to help distribute communication messages and manage communication campaigns. One new resource that for sure will be available to ATSC is a newly created communications liaison between WTSC and the 17 regional Target Zero Managers. At a minimum, the TZMs will be involved with Pedestrian Safety Month and Bicyclist Safety Month messaging.

Scott also explained that there will be a need for ongoing work on the communication plan for the Automated Traffic Enforcement Systems communications plan, but that there will also be a need to develop a communication plan for other discussion papers and products as we develop them. He asked the group if there is support for developing a standing communications work group. The group was supportive of moving forward with establishment of a standing communications committee, with, perhaps, rotating membership. The need to be able to provide people outside ATSC with information about what we do was one element that a standing communications committee could consider. Also, individual action teams will need to identify the “key bullet points” about what needs to be emphasized in the communications plan about their product or discussion paper.

- **Safety Definition Action Plan (10 min)**

Harold Taniguchi presented to the group about work being done by the Safety Definition Action Team. He said that the action team has been approaching the work like there are multiple levels of safety:

Level 1- Immediate need to avoid getting hit by a car

Level 2 – What effects your ability to feel safe using the existing roadways, e.g., too dark at night, overgrown vegetation obscuring vision

Level 3 (and possibly 4) – the safety effects of traffic safety planning (e.g., pollution from emissions, noise, interrupted neighborhoods/cultures) including health problems such as obesity, diabetes, and whether people feel comfortable moving about outside of their homes.

Level 1 is pretty easy to describe and relatively easy to come up with actionable items. Level 3 is more esoteric and will need additional work to identify actionable steps to take. Even though it is more conceptual, the group thought the discussion about Levels 3 or 4 was important and could serve as a template for how to address both the current built environment and new development, when it occurs.

Harold also presented an idea to have the full ATSC participate in a group exercise to increase the group's already-existing capacity for open communication so that conversations about addressing the levels of safety would be less inhibited by individual member's personal belief systems. T

The specific proposal would be to have Pat Hughes facilitate the group through a Gracious Space exercise that could take part of the November 2020 meeting and part of the January 2021 meeting. Gracious Space involves four central concepts: Spirit (what is the "wake" that I leave), Setting (what does the space feel like?, who can I see?), Inviting the Stranger (being open to other ideas and inviting in people who don't necessarily agree with you), and, Learning in Public.

In beginning the group discussion, Harold asked, "Are we as open to see things differently as we can be?" The group expressed ambivalence about whether the training was needed. Several members observed that there was already pretty open conversation and that Pat, as facilitator, was clearly leading the group using concepts from Gracious Space. There was also concern about the amount of time needed for the group exercise as several members spoke about the need to address many topics within the time that we have together. After extending the discussion time in hopes that the group could come to a consensus about implementing the training, Scott moved the group to the next agenda item and said that the November meeting would not include Gracious Space training.

III. Executive Summary Draft

A. Executive Summary – proposed content outline

- Preamble/Intro – need better graphic for first page of report
- *Suggestion to add a description of the group's purpose and an Appendix*

with the group membership

- How ATSC reorganized this year
 - Action Team Scope and Process
 - Action Team: Automated Speed Enforcement
 - Action Team: Peds in Roadway
 - Action Team: Safety Definition – Provide the four levels and a brief discussion
 - Action Team: Communications
 - Work Group: Injury Minimization and Speed Management Policy Committee
 - New document submission process
 - Discussions through the year
- B. Core documents: To be followed by Action Team White Papers and Core Documents (Critical Criteria, Selection Process, Equity Lens) developed by ATSC, and ATSC membership

The group was very supportive of the proposed organization for the annual report. Charlotte stated that the product developed by the Injury Minimization and Speed Policy Work Group should definitely be included as one of the appendices.

Timeline: Submit draft to ATSC in October, finalize in Nov, submit to Gov's office first week of Dec

IV. Bike, Walk, and Roll Summit Discussion and Debrief and applications to ATSC Work

Several people indicated they had participated in workshops or presentations. Some of the highlights for people included:

Dongho – seeing a broader view of speed management, speed limit-setting, and self-enforcing streets. He said Anna Zivarts' keynote presentation made him wonder who had been left behind or not heard in projects that he has been involved in

Kerri – enforcement has been removed as one of the six "E's" for Safe Route3s to Schools and replaced with Engagement. She wondered what that would mean in Washington State, especially as it relates to the ATSC proposal to expand use of automated enforcement in school walk areas.

Chris – implications of our work regarding social equity in planning and law enforcement

Eveline – differences in needs for people using bike paths. She said she was also surprised by the critical tone that many presenters had toward law enforcement.

Jenny – community engagement ideas, especially running the age range from “littles” to “elders”

Barb – really impressed with the format of the online conference – three sessions each day for five days but not one right after another. Very hard to maintain attention and engagement online when there is one session after another. Arrested Mobility presentation from Charles Brown and the follow-up panel on Monday afternoon – very different perspectives about equity, engagement, and inclusiveness than we usually are³ exposed to.

David – “Safety for who?” from Anna’s keynote and Arrested Mobility. Redefines our challenge to finding out what we need to do to make our environment safe for everyone.

Will – reinforced the importance of the work ATSC is doing. Felt like we were “right there in the middle of everything going on.”

V. Adjourn