



## **Vision Zero Task Force Meeting #3 Summary**

**February 8, 2017, 12:30 - 3:00 pm**

Next meeting: Wednesday, April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2017, 12:30 - 3:00 pm, Woolworth Building, 940 Willamette Street, Chinook Conference Room (2<sup>nd</sup> Floor)

---

---

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Larisa Varela welcomed Task Force members to the meeting. A new Task Force member attended the meeting, Rick Hamilton, he introduced himself to the Task Force. Rick will be serving as the social equity representative on the Task Force and also has years of experience working as a Trooper for the Oregon State Police. Larisa told the Task Force that Aria Seligmann, a member of the City of Eugene Human Rights Commission has also been recruited to serve on the Task Force. She is not in attendance today due to a work conflict, but has agreed to share information and be a liaison between the two committees.

---

---

### **Agenda Review**

During the agenda review, Task Force member, Rob Zako, asked to add a couple items to the agenda. One was to allow time to review and provide comments on the summary from the second Task Force meeting and the other was to add an agenda item around funding, both of which were added.

---

---

### **Data Analysis**

Rebecca Sanders provided an overview of the data analysis that has been conducted since the last Task Force meeting.

Several comments and concerns arose around sample size. Due to the smaller number of fatal and severe injury traffic crashes in Eugene over the past 8 years, the sample size is not large enough to provide statistical significance.

Throughout the data presentation, several comments or questions arose, which were:

Question: Does data take into consideration construction and street work?

No: This data does not look at time of year and connect it with construction. The maps would get us closer to that, but we would have to do some additional analysis if we wanted to look into the possibility of construction as a cause of crashes.

Slide: *Injury Crash Outcomes: Day of Week*

Correlated thought: The level of stress is higher during the week when everyone is rushing around to get somewhere.

Question: Did you look at changes over time?

Answer: No, we need to look at multiple years at a time.

Question: Are motorcycles included in this data set?

---

---

Answer: Yes, when not broken out into their own category, they are included with motorist because analysis results were not appreciably different between the two modes.

Question: Are our findings consistent with what Toole is seeing across the country and nationally when working with other Vision Zero clients?

Answer: The best we can compare Eugene to is Portland and Eugene is definitely not Portland. It would be helpful to be able to compare Eugene to other similar sized cities, or other Oregon cities with Universities such as Corvallis. Not a lot of small cities have pursued Vision Zero, so this is a challenge. The patterns aren't too different than what we're seeing in other Vision Zero cities. Arterials are a problem everywhere. In Portland, downtown was deemphasized and the outskirts were more of a focus where exposure is low and numbers are high. In Eugene, downtown has more fatalities and serious injuries. Downtown in Eugene will probably be more of a focus. The patterns in Eugene are somewhat different than in Lane County, so it has been valuable to do this City-focused analysis and not only rely upon existing regional analysis. In the rural parts of the county, there are more roadway departures and speed related fatalities.

### **High Injury Network**

Rebecca introduced the high crash maps.

Question: The classification map shows interstates as major arterials. How are we looking at those?

Answer: We have pulled out I-5 and I-105 because the City doesn't have the power to influence changes on the interstate system. However, the tabular data presented in the first part of this meeting did include Interstate crashes, but they only represent 2 percent of all fatal and severe injury crashes in our data set.

Question: Are the crashes that were near schools students that were hit?

Answer: We are not able to determine that with the data set we are working with. We can add schools to the maps.

Question to Task Force: What does non-motorist illegally in roadway mean when listed as a crash cause?

Answer from State Police: The person was definitely not supposed to be in the road. For example, when someone jumps into traffic on a highway in attempt to commit suicide.

The project team needs to continue to look at what non-motorist illegally in roadway means from the different police departments.

Task Force Members then broke into groups to look at the high crash maps. They were asked to think about if they see things on the maps that are surprising or if they are not seeing highlighted streets on the maps that they would expect to see. Feedback from this exercise will inform further edits to the maps. Task Force feedback will be combined with Technical Advisory Committee feedback and Project Team input to make clarifying edits to maps before Task Force meeting #4.

High-level feedback included:

Maps need to be easier to read.

General agreement that side streets that intersect with major streets do not need to be included on the maps if the problem is intersection only.

Add more contextual information, such as schools.

---

---

## **Public Works Funding**

Kurt Corey, Public Works Executive Director, provided an overview of local transportation infrastructure funding. The City Council is familiar with what Kurt calls three-legged stool functions of Public Works: 1) Build new infrastructure, 2) maintain the infrastructure and 3) periodically upgrade. The three legs of the stool have different funding sources.

New infrastructure: We don't have a budget to build new streets or transportation infrastructure. That is built with transportation system development charges (SDCs), generated through development projects and/or the PEPI process where infrastructure can become a condition of development.

Maintenance: The maintenance and operating budget is around \$12 Million, which is the City's share of the State Highway Trust Fund. This goes to pay for median maintenance, pothole repair, signals, transportation options, and urban forestry. Capital preservation is funded through our local \$.05/gallon gas tax supplemented with money from the road bond. This pays for overlay and street reconstruction programs.

The Street Repair Review Panel (SRRP) recently received an estimate of backlog work, which is around \$90 million. The SRRP examines recently completed street repair projects, learns more about plans for future repair projects and reviews expenditures of bond funds to fix streets.

Public Works had successful bond measures in 2008 and 2012. The Department will be recommending to City Council to renew the bond measure. Kurt feels we need to renew the bond measure this year to have continuity. Public Works feels we should be investing \$14-15 million per year on an ongoing basis to reduce the backlog and ensure we don't have streets that need to be completely reconstructed. We are a few million dollars short.

The SRRP is having a meeting today to review the report and assure that money collected from the bond measure is being spent according to the resolution. The next meeting will be to craft the renewal measure. The SRRP report for 2016 projects will likely go to City Council next month. If City Council agrees that it is a good year to renew the measure, the SRRP will meet to discuss the measure and it will likely go back to Council before their summer break. Input to help guide allocation of bond funds will likely be necessary by July.

Upgrade: Periodic upgrades to the system are made through the five year Capital Improvement Program.

Rob Zako is curious about how to pay for infrastructure design changes in problem areas where traffic fatalities are occurring. What funding source does the City have to pay for safety improvements to the high crash network that we are identifying through this Vision Zero process?

## **Public Comment**

No audience members signed up for public comment.

## **Public Involvement Plan and Schedule Discussion**

Larisa Varela provided an overview of the Vision Zero Public Involvement Plan which was developed based on the discussion and input from the last Task Force and Technical Advisory Committee meetings.

Erycka Organ asked to add the disability community to the list. Larisa explained that they are included in the public involvement plan as vulnerable users, they were just not specially listed on the handout.

---

The business community is listed as one of the stakeholders to reach out to. Rob Zako brought up that the business community is represented on the Task Force. Matt Roberts is a member of the Eugene Chamber committee and Steve Wildish is the freight representative.

Larisa asked the Task Force if we should expand the project timeline by a couple months to allow for more public involvement over the summer.

Rob Zako understands the value of moving the timeline into early fall to allow for tabling at community events over the summer. However, funding opportunities should not be missed. Public involvement could be extended into early fall, but actions could be brought to City Council sooner, perhaps in May.

Brian Johnson agreed with Zako. There is value in pushing ourselves to get a product.

The project team can push pieces forward faster, such as the high crash network.

Greg Gill asked if the project team could identify by next meeting what we are going to keep on track.

At the end of the public involvement discussion, it was decided that we are going to stay on schedule with plan development. Once the plan is drafted, then we may choose to extend the timeline to allow for more public involvement on the draft plan.

### **Next Steps**

After reviewing topics to cover at the next Task Force meeting, Larisa mentioned that there may be a need to add an additional meeting due to the amount of information that needs to be covered before the plan is drafted.

### **Task Force Meeting #3 Attendance:**

#### **Task Force Members Present:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Alternate for:</b>	<b>Stakeholder</b>
Marina Hajek	Advocate	N/A	parent of traffic victim
Pat McGillivray	Community Relations Director	N/A	Bethel School District
Rob Zako	Executive Director	N/A	Better Eugene-Springfield Transit (BEST)
Kelsey Moore	Member	N/A	City of Eugene, Active Transportation Committee
JoAnna Kamppi	EMS Chief	Chief Joe Zaludek	City of Eugene, Fire & Emergency Medical Services
Greg Gill	Assistant Judge	N/A	City of Eugene, Municipal Court

Capt. Sherri Meisel	Police Chief	Chief Pete Kerns	City of Eugene, Police Department (EPD)
Kurt Corey	Executive Director	N/A	City of Eugene, Public Works Department
Chris Ellison	Transportation Manager	N/A	Eugene 4J School District
Brian Johnson	Epidemiologist	N/A	Lane County, Public Health
David Reesor	Transportation Planning Supervisor	N/A	Lane County, Public Works
Erycka Organ		Eugene Organ	Lane Independent Living Alliance (LILA)
Carl Yeh	Board Member	N/A	Lane Transit District (LTD)
Rick Hamilton	Senior Trooper	N/A	Oregon Department of State Police
Bill Johnston	Transportation Planner	N/A	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Matt Roberts	Senior Director for Community Relations	N/A	University of Oregon
Steve Wildish	Vice President	N/A	Wildish Companies/freight

**Task Force Members Absent (no alternate):** Carmel Snyder, AARP and Aria Seligmann, City of Eugene Human Rights Commission

**Members of the Public Present:** Michele O'Leary

**Project Staff Present:**

Name	Title	Agency
Bill Clingman	Senior GIS Analyst	Lane Council of Governments
Ellen Currier	Transportation Planner	Lane Council of Governments
Rob Inerfeld	Transportation Planning Mgr	City of Eugene
Matt Rodrigues	Interim Traffic Engineer	City of Eugene
Larisa Varela	Transportation Planner	City of Eugene

**Project Team Consultant Present:** Rebecca Sanders and Jessica Zdeb from Toole Design Group