

Meeting Summary

Salem-Keizer Area Transportation Study (SKATS)
Metropolitan Transportation Safety Action Plan (MTSAP)

Steering Committee

MWVCOG Hybrid Meeting
100 High St. SE, Suite 200
Salem, OR 97301
Thursday, July 13, 2023

Steering Committee Members Present

Virginia Stapleton, Salem City Councilor
Trevor Phillips, Salem City Council & SKATS MPO Policy Committee – via Zoom
Sadie Carney, Cherriots Board & SKATS MPO Policy Committee
Nick Fortey, FHWA & West Salem Neighborhood Association-Transportation Chair

Steering Committee Members Absent

Nicole Charlson, ODOT Region 2-Public Safety
Ryan Crowther, Marion County Public Works-Capital Projects Manager
Tammy Kunz, Northeast Keizer Neighborhood Association-President
Kevin Cameron, Marion County Board of Commissioners & SKATS MPO Policy Committee

Others Present

Lacy Brown, DKS-Consultant
Mike Jaffe, MWVCOG-SKATS
Kindra Martinenko, MWVCOG-SKATS – via Zoom
Theresa Whisenhunt, MWVCOG-SKATS

Agenda Item 1. Call to Order – Introductions

Mike Jaffe called the hybrid meeting to order at 3:37p.m. This is the second Steering Committee (SC) meeting.

Agenda Item 2. Project Update

Lacy Brown, DKS presented.

Progress since last meeting: Detailed review of public feedback. PMT developed final emphasis areas. Screened network for high-crash locations.

Open House #1

- Survey ended in April. Initial “High-level take-aways” of the responses presented at Steering Committee meeting #1 in April.

- Draft report is being edited and will be shared when completed. Staff are doing a deeper dive to summarize the open-ended comments and “stories” from the public.
- The “Anything Else to Add” open-ended question¹ generally reflected these two categories:
 1. **Asking for infrastructure improvements:** more sidewalks, safe/enhanced crossings, protected and maintained bike lanes, more time for pedestrians to cross streets.
 2. **Calling for behavior changes, education, and enforcement:** reduced speeding, law enforcement, driver/bicycle/pedestrian education on safety.
- On the “Sharing Your Story”, we provided a small sample of the 252 stories at the April Steering Committee meeting. They are categorized as follows:

Aggressive drivers	11
Almost hit	3
Crash reported	7
Distracted driving	9
Dangerous location	21
Drivers disregarding traffic signs/light, not yielding to bikes/peds	54
Education & enforcement needed	9
General comment – increased safety	11
Need bike lanes/paths, sidewalks, signal, stop sign, maintenance, etc.	70
Speeding comment	39
Not a safety issue	18

There was a discussion about how crosswalk signal timings are programmed. (Question: How can we get a longer “walk time”?) The question is based on the concern of the aging population of Salem is not being considered. Ms. Brown explained that when using the formula to program the lights, an “older” person’s walking speed considered. The sequence is designed to accommodate someone in their sixties crossing the street or someone using an electric mobile device or wheelchair. Keeping that in mind, a local city jurisdiction may elect to program the lights with a longer walk time for their area; ODOT has control of what the programming is for the state highway system. Ms. Brown also clarified how the “walk signals” function and cycle. Ms. Stapleton noted that she has seen two variations on walk signal cycles. One has the “walk” signal, a countdown timer that goes to 0 when the traffic signal turns to yellow, then shows the “stop” signal; the other cycle is showing a “walk” signal then shows the “stop” signal after a period while the traffic signal is still green. The second scenario has a “green extension”. Currently how the technology works: the traffic signal has a set time limit for the green, but if the sensor shows more traffic arriving at the intersection it will extend the time for the green

¹ 293 responses were given to the open-ended question “Anything Else to Add?”.

signal, but the system does not trigger until the middle of the “green time”. The walk signal will not necessarily restart the time for the walk signal.

The committee is at **Task 4** in the schedule: **Safety Analysis – Emphasis Areas & High Crash Locations**. The next task is **Safety Analysis – Solutions** scheduled for completion in September/October. After that is the **Strategic Framework**. When those tasks are completed will be a second Public Engagement (#2 Open House.)

Agenda Item 3. Emphasis Areas

Emphasis areas and strategies previously discussed by the Steering Committee (SC) included safety at intersections, speeding, safety while driving a motorcycle or vehicle, safety while riding a bicycle, safety while walking/rolling, impairment, safety of aging adults, and distraction. After getting input from the community, SC, and the Project Management Team (PMT), a final list of emphasis areas has been developed:

- Intersections
- Pedestrians
- Bicyclists
- Speeding
- Impairment/Distracted*²
- Road User Age*³

Agenda Item 4. MTSAP Vision and Goals

Ms. Brown started her presentation about how setting the goal is important for forming a shared vision, establishing a safety culture, and to assist with funding requirements (e.g., the *Safe Streets for All* federal program).

Example of goals used in other Safety Action Plan:

- Eliminate fatal and serious injury crashes.
- Reduce fatal and serious injury crashes.
- Reduce all crashes, regardless of severity.

Ms. Brown shared with the committee a *Vision Zero* video⁴ (developed by Seattle Dept of Transportation) asking people on the street about the Vision Zero goal. This was shown to the PMT⁵ and there was a similar discussion of support for a Zero overall goal. Councilor Stapleton has seen similar videos in Europe and would like to see a local version.

² *First four areas are used to screen for high-crash locations; last two will be emphasis areas of the plan, but not used in screening locations.

³ Road user is defined as anyone who is “traveling” within the road network. That includes “walk, roll, and pedal”.

⁴ [Vision Zero People on the Street - YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XFo60aDOGSc) (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XFo60aDOGSc)

⁵ City of Keizer, Marion County, and the City of Salem staff were present at the PMT meeting.

Councilor Phillips stated the City of Salem has already voted and adopted a *Vision Zero* goal. He is very supportive of a *Vision Zero* goal for this MTSAP, and he is hopeful that other members are also supportive of this goal despite skepticism by others of achieving the goal. He posed the question to staff: Does it decrease or increase our accessibility to funding for the next couple of years, having the aspirational goal of zero? Ms. Brown said expects that having a Zero goal would increase the accessibility of funding. Councilor Phillips went on to state that argument will be very compelling across a diverse political spectrum. Staff did point out that several SC members were absent for this meeting and we may want to discuss the goal at the next Steering Committee meeting. Councilor Stapleton said it will be interesting to see how Marion County feel about the zero goals. It was pointed out that Marion County is developing their own TSAP, making the possibly of overlaps in areas on the east side of the region.

Continuing her presentation, Ms. Brown suggested overall plan goals might be:

- City of Salem supports a *Vision Zero* goal (zero fatalities), or
- Oregon statewide TSAP goal is “no deaths or life-changing injuries by 2035”.

As discussed with the PMT, the plan could also include interim goals:

- Smaller quantitative goals, or sub-goals, with examples being:
 - By 2030, reduce fatal and serious injury crashes by 30%
 - By 2035, reduce fatalities involving pedestrians by 50%

Ms. Stapleton said that she struggles with plans that sit on shelves without being put into action; she asked if a goal could it be “X percent of our plan by Year X should be put into action?” Ms. Brown replied that transportation safety action plans usually contain performance measures, which track how actions are being implemented (e.g. “putting in a number of LPI (leading pedestrian intervals) by a certain date”). Mr. Jaffe noted Seattle has a Vision Zero plan (adopted in 2015) and 2023 report from the Seattle DOT defined five priority strategies⁶ that they are focusing on in the near term in order to make better progress toward their Vision Zero goal.

Councilor Phillips asked about the history of Seattle moving toward their Vision Zero work and concept. After a quick internet search by Sadie Carney, it was discovered that the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) adopted the goal of ending traffic deaths and serious injuries in 2012 through the Road Safety Summit Action Plan and formally launched its Vision Zero program in 2015 to organize and strengthen the effort.⁷

⁶ 1. Phase-in No Turn on Red signs downtown; 2. accelerate Leading Pedestrian Interval (LPI) rollout where existing systems can support; 3. improving Martin Luther King Jr Way; 4. engage public on automated enforcement; 5. Elevate City Traffic Engineer to a Chief Safety Officer role. Source: Seattle DOT Vision Zero Top-to-Bottom review: Momentum-Building Actions and Recommendations. February 2023

⁷ Seattle DOT, Vision Zero Top to Bottom Review Draft Full Report, February 23, 2023

Discussion continued about using performance measures and interim goals to demonstrate progress towards the main vision and goal. “How can we set steps to make sure the process is on track to make the goals.?” Ms. Brown continued in her presentation to talk about example interim goals (by emphasis area) and how the SC could set an overall goal as well as interim goals with strategies to meet those goals.

An example interim goals and associated strategies by emphasis areas is shown below (these are from a different California city’s Safety Action Plan that DKS is the consultant):

EMPHASIS AREA	GOALS	STRATEGIES by Safe System Approach
PEDESTRIANS	Reduce the proportion of fatal and serious injury crashes involving pedestrians by 17% by 2035.	Safe Roads
		Install engineering counter- measures focused on increasing driver awareness of pedestrians and reducing conflict zones between vehicles and pedestrians.
		Develop and implement a Construction Accessibility Policy to maintain accessibility during construction and maintenance projects.
PEDESTRIANS	Eliminate fatal and serious injury crashes involving pedestrians by 2040	Safe Road Users
		Improve infrastructure connectivity for pedestrians, especially along safe routes to school, and gap closure within the sidewalk and trail network.
		Expand safe routes to school program.
		Pair education with key engineering and enforcement countermeasures.

EMPHASIS AREA	GOALS	STRATEGIES
BICYCLISTS	Reduce the proportion of fatal and serious injury crashes involving Bicyclists equivalent to the current proportion (13%) by 2035.	Safe Roads
		Install engineering counter- measures focused on increasing driver awareness of bicyclists and reducing conflict zones between vehicles and bicyclists.
		Develop and implement a Construction Accessibility Policy to maintain accessibility during construction and maintenance projects.
	Eliminate fatal and serious injury crashes	Safe Road Users
		Improve infrastructure connectivity for bicyclists, especially along safe routes to school

BICYCLISTS	involving bicyclists by 2040.	Expand safe routes to school program.
		Pair education with key engineering and enforcement countermeasures.
		Develop a Vision Zero policy to modify LOS standards and parking along preferred bicycle corridors.

Mr. Jaffe noted whatever is adopted in the MTSAP, it will take coordination and implementation by the local jurisdictions. He noted that the local jurisdictions and the MPO have made substantial investments in safety projects over the last 30 years. ODOT adopted their Blueprint for Urban Designs (BUDs) which describes the appropriate design of state facilities that act like main streets and recognizes that the land use along those streets need to be considered. A current example is the planning work by ODOT for the Commercial/Liberty NE couplet. Councilor Stapleton shared a recent experience: she recently attended an urban design conference and the presenter said the three goals of roads should be “connectivity”, “they should support the land use around it” and “joy.” She noted that historically it’s been mainly just the road that we think about and not necessarily the supporting land use around it.

WHAT SHOULD BE THE SKATS MTSAP GOAL?

Ms. Brown said we don’t need to finalize a goal(s) today, we could do that at a later meeting or at the end of the planning work before developing the draft MTSAP; she asked if there’s additional information that SC members would like to have to support a specific goal.

Councilor Phillips wants to advocate for “Zero” goal and noted that Vision Zero is the position of the city of Salem, which he and Councilor Stapleton represent. Councilor Phillips asked a question to the group: “Is there any reason you can think of why we wouldn’t support a Vision Zero goal?” The answer was a unanimous “no”. Most members are supportive of a *Vision Zero* style goal. Council Phillips said he’s most interested “in maximizing both the dollars we have and our time, to get more people as safe as possible as quickly as possible.” Staff noted that additional discussion on a goal statement for the plan - or creation of interim goals, if any -- should be discussed again when more local jurisdictions steering committee members attend a future meeting.

Councilor Phillips asked if it’s correct that if SKATS adopts a Vision Zero plan, will that change the prioritization of projects? Mr. Jaffe answered that the Policy Committee always has the choice to determine its preference for projects and how project selection criteria are determined or weighted, but it also depends on which projects the local jurisdictions choose to put in the long-range plan or propose for the TIP (transportation improvement program). Also, there are other types of projects (e.g. replacing buses, replacing a bridge that is past its useful life) that also apply for the federal funds allocated to SKATS. There’s also the choice of funding large projects costly big-ticket projects or fund lower cost projects lower-cost projects --(e.g., adding leading pedestrian intervals at signals, or building enhanced crossings.)

Councilor Stapleton asked about creating safety strategies for both the built environment and people's behaviors, and wondered about creating interim goals for both of these separately. She also thinks the goals should prioritize the most vulnerable users first.

Nick Fortay asked "how can the average person understand the connection between the Vision Zero goal and actual projects or actions that solve safety projects", using Wallace Road as an example. Sadie Carney related her experience biking to places along Wallace Road, which she said is very auto oriented. Council Phillips mentioned that some drivers seem to have increased animosity to other drivers, noted the problem of pedestrians dangerously crossing Mission Street at locations where they shouldn't cross, and the need to "dial down the temperature" and to get us to care about each other for safety reasons. Councilor Stapleton would like to know what other areas are trying to affect behaviors. Mr. Jaffe mentioned a few examples of behavioral strategies, such as the "Every intersection is a Pedestrian Crossing" campaign, and the Safe Route to School program to teach kids to walk, bike, and roll safely. Mr. Jaffe mentioned that a few years before the COVID pandemic, ODOT had pedestrian safety messages on the sides of Cherriots' buses. Sadie Carney said they have no issues with messages that support the transit districts overall mission, and there's no reason to not have a bus wrap about transportation safety.

Agenda Item 5. Top Crash Locations by EPDO scores

Ms. Brown described the process for Identifying High-Crash Locations:

- Created a heat map of the crash data (for the four emphasis areas) in GIS to visually identify locations with concentrations of crashes. This was weighted by crash frequency and severity.
- Selected "hottest" segments and intersections with at least one Fatal or Serious Injury crash.
- Conducted this process for five sets of crash data and layered them onto the map – four emphasis areas (intersections, pedestrians, bicyclists, and speeding) and the fifth set was all crashes combined. Ms. Brown shared the GIS map of the results.

At the beginning of this task, the consultant identified 29 locations; this will be narrowed down to ten locations selected as "case studies" for the project memo/deliverable. Picking an initial 29 locations was done to ensure that each emphasis area (intersections, pedestrians, bicyclists, and speeding) is reflected in at least one of the final ten locations examined, plus we would like the locations to be geographically balanced across the SKATS area, if possible. Mr. Jaffe reminded the committee that the objective of this exercise is not to develop the recommended solutions/fixes for the 10 selected case study locations⁸. Instead, it is to provide a demonstration of safety treatment options for each location. These treatments may be

⁸ Specific recommendations at any of these locations or corridor would take much more time and analysis than being done by this limited examination of options.

applicable at locations with similar characteristics within the SKATS area beyond each case study's location⁹.

Ms. Brown showed a table¹⁰ of the 29 initial locations by their Emphasis Areas (shown at end of the minutes), showing for each location the number of crashes (in 2017 – 2021), the EPDO score¹¹ and EPCO score per mile (for corridor locations). In the table, the locations are grouped by the four Emphasis Areas, plus an All-Crash group.

Selecting ten locations from the list was discussed by the committee members. Councilor Phillips supported choosing the Lancaster corridor segment, the Commercial @ Marion intersection, and the south Commercial St segment. The committee discussed adding River Road NE in Keizer, Silverton Road, and a location in west Salem. The consultant and staff suggested that we take the input from today's discussion to the next Project Management Team meeting to finalize the list of case study locations.

Agenda Item 6. Next Steps

The committee and staff discuss the timing of the next steering committee

The meeting was adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

⁹ This will be more evident when the deliverable is presented (DKS memo "Safety Analysis and Solutions Memo").

¹⁰ See table at end of these minutes.

¹¹ EPDO – Equivalent Property Damage Only. A procedural analysis that combines the number of crashes and the severity of each crash to develop a score for a location (intersection or road segment). Fatal and serious injury crashes (weight=100); other injury crash (weight = 10), property damage only crashes (weight=1).

High Risk Locations per Emphasis Area

[Map of High Risk Locations](#)

	INTERSECTION OR SEGMENT	NUMBER OF CRASHES (2017-2021)	F+A Crashes	EPDO	SEGMENT LENGTH (miles)	EPDO PER MILE (Segments only)
EMPHASIS AREA: BIKE						
Lancaster from Wolverine to Market St	Segment	11	1	200	0.56	357
Lancaster from D Street to Amber Street	Segment	7	1	160	0.84	190
River Road from Chemawa Road to Glynbrook St	Segment	11	1	200	1.29	155
Commercial St from D Street to Bellevue Street (City Hall)	Segment	12	1	120	0.94	128
State Street at Kettle Court	Intersection	2	1	110	-	-
Center Street at Hawthorne Ave	Intersection	2	1	110	-	-
EMPHASIS AREA: PEDESTRIAN						
Commercial St from Hilfiker to Fabry	Segment	23	6	770	1.24	621
River Road from Claggett to Apple Blossom	Segment	28	5	730	1.75	417
Lancaster from Sunnyview to Mahrt Ave	Segment	31	5	760	1.96	388
High St from Division to Ferry Street	Segment	12	1	210	0.56	375
Commercial St from D Street to Bellevue Street (City Hall)	Segment	14	2	320	0.94	340
Lancaster at D Street	Intersection	4	1	130	-	-
High at Center	Intersection	4	1	130	-	-
Liberty at Ferry	Intersection	7	0	70	-	-
EMPHASIS AREA: SPEEDING						
Mission Street from 17th to I-5	Segment	19	4	487	1.77	275
Marion and Center Street Bridges from W Salem to Front St	Segment	18	1	198	0.77	257
EMPHASIS AREA: INTERSECTIONS						
Commercial at Marion	Intersection	100	3	820	-	-
Silverton at Hawthorne	Intersection	65	4	767	-	-
Lancaster at Sunnyview	Intersection	94	1	742	-	-
Lancaster at Market	Intersection	92	1	695	-	-
Liberty at Center	Intersection	99	1	549	-	-
Commercial at Kuebler	Intersection	75	1	543	-	-
ALL CRASHES						
Lancaster from Sunnyview to Market	Segment	245	5	2144	0.26	8246
Commercial from Hilfiker to Kuebler	Segment	266	7	2651	0.60	4418
Liberty from Mission to Miller	Segment	103	3	850	0.27	3148
Silverton from Portland Road to I-5	Segment	326	11	3206	1.36	2357
Commercial at Marion	Intersection	100	3	820	-	-
Liberty at Center	Intersection	99	1	549	-	-
Kuebler at Commercial	Intersection	75	1	543	-	543