



Bob Fifer, Chair John Diak, Vice Chair Ashley Stolzmann, Secretary Kevin Flynn, Treasurer Herb Atchison, Immediate Past Chair Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director

MEETING SUMMARY REGIONAL VISION ZERO STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE – Mtg. 4

Tuesday December 3rd, 2:00 PM – 3:30 PM

DRCOG, 1001 17th St., 7th Floor, Red Rocks Conference Room, Denver, CO

In-person Participants	Organization
Mo McCanna	Bicycle Colorado
Amy Saxton	Clear Creek County
David DiGiacomo	City and County of Denver
Beth Doliboa	DRCOG
Jerry Stigall	DRCOG
Jacob Riger	DRCOG
Lisa Houde	DRCOG
Steve Cook	DRCOG
Charlie Alexander	Fehr & Peers
Melissa Balding	Fehr & Peers
Patrick Picard	Fehr & Peers
Lindsey Alarcon	RTD
Charlie Stanfield	RTD
Jill Locantore	Walk Denver, Denver Streets Partnership

Remote Participants Organization

Long NguyenAdams CountyKarl PackerArapahoe CountySarah GrantBroomfieldDanny HermannCDOTPhil GreenwaldCity of LongmontDarrell AlstonCity of ThorntonEmily LindseyDRCOG

1. Introductions

Kristina Evanoff

Beth Doliboa called meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. and overviewed items listed on the agenda. Participants did a brief introduction.

Westminster

2. Survey and web map results

Lisa Houde, DRCOG, presented a summary of the virtual engagement and regional Vision Zero survey results. The survey closed was available to the public August 2019 thru October 2019, it generated over 3,200 responses. The Facebook ad platform was successful in generating survey responses. The web map generated almost 1,100 comments. Those comments will be available for review on the regional Vision Zero website during plan development.

3. Local agency meeting feedback

Beth Doliboa, DRCOG, presented on the local agency meetings that took place in the beginning of November. During these meetings, participants were asked to provide feedback on the draft High Injury Network, draft strategic initiatives, and crash profiles and countermeasures. The top countermeasures per area type were called out. Further discussion on the crash profiles and countermeasures ensued as part of the more detailed review.



4. Proposed crash profiles and countermeasures

Patrick Picard, Fehr & Peers, reviewed the crash landscape analysis, which investigates one dimension of the crash data. He introduced the crash profiles which encompass multiple aspects of crash types in order to identify countermeasures. The top three to four crash profiles per area type were identified, with key statistics and potential countermeasures. In addition to area type crash profiles, there are behaviors that were identified as present in a high percentage of KSI crashes including distracted driving, careless or reckless driving, alcohol and drug involved, and aggressive driving.

Discussion involved how speed relates to the likelihood of a fatality. Reducing speed can be called out as an overarching countermeasure, pointing out that arterial streets are often higher speed streets and have disproportionately more KSI crashes. For the departing from travel lane and rear end crash profiles in rural and limited access area types, additional potential countermeasures of variable speed limit and variable message signs to communicate messages upstream were discussed. Other overarching themes included advanced warning of changes to traffic flow and where there are stop or signal controls, and maintenance of pavement and road facilities. An overarching theme is that providing non-auto modes, and reducing vehicles on the road, is a viable way to reduce KSI crashes. Additionally, when it comes to drunk/ impaired driving, mode shift is particularly important, including TNCs as an option. The conversation will continue with the project team and stakeholders for how mode shift and TDM fit into regional Vision Zero.

There was a request to explore the data in more detail for crashes involving motorcyclists, with the City of Denver identifying a quarter of fatalities involving motorcyclists. Incident management and vehicle technology were identified as potential countermeasures to rear end and stopped or slowing vehicle involved KSI crashes. There is an ongoing question about where vehicle type fit in, and the consideration of safety for people outside of the vehicle in vehicle vs. non-vehicle crashes and in crashes with vehicles of differing size.

5. Draft supporting objectives

Jerry Stigall, DRCOG, provided an overview of the Metro Vision Planning Framework, which guides the organization of this planning effort. The terminology of supporting objectives and strategic initiatives is directly from Metro Vision and will be included in the written report. Objectives are intended to map the plan towards outcomes.

Charlie Alexander, Fehr & Peers, introduced the draft supporting objectives and facilitated conversation around the objectives. The conversation on advocacy as a countermeasure fit into the conversation on objectives in the conversation of collaboration between allied agencies.

6. Draft strategic initiatives

Charlie Alexander, Fehr & Peers, introduced the draft strategic initiatives and facilitated conversation around the initiatives.

In Denver, there is a Technical Advisory Committee for Vision Zero that assists in directing enforcement. This raised the question of having enforcement having their own group as well. Valuing time of working group members is a priority. In the report, the role and authority of the working group should be clarified with details on the range of potentially involved parties including public health, those representing aging populations, those representing people with disabilities, non-profit, modal advocacy, and enforcement. The I-70 mountain corridor group was discussed as potential model group.

Discussion involved hands free and distracted driving legislation as part of the list of potential legislative actions that align with Vision Zero options. Conversation on legislation also ensued around remote enforcement and the clarifying language of safety cameras, though there is variance in the level of support for this initiative. Education on the importance of particular violations could be important for



legislators and enforcement. When discussing the initiatives related to funding, it was discussed that the state has limited funds and that tolls and violations should be explored as additional funding sources for safety projects, but accountability for funding that claims to be for safety improvements could be enhanced. Additionally, it was discussed that TIP funding criteria could prioritize vulnerable users.

In the toolkit, some stated it would be helpful to provide guidance on how to work with locally owned and maintained vs. CDOT owned and maintained roads. There was also a request for the toolkit to include guidance on how to do quick build projects. CDOT's course on Pedestrian and Bicycle design course was cited as a valuable resource for training. There was a request for DRCOG to assist in detailed crash analysis for some jurisdictions that don't have the capacity to perform detailed analysis on their own. A regional response team that investigates KSI crashes could be important, especially for smaller communities. The tracking of exemplary Vision Zero safety improvement projects with details on effectiveness, cost, and implementation could be of value to some member jurisdictions. Data collection on latent demand for other modes would be useful to some member jurisdictions. Additional guidance on how to set speed limits was also identified as a potential toolkit item, providing a model for how to adjust instead of leaving this as a purely legislative action.

7. Next steps

Beth Doliboa, DRCOG, discussed the next steps. These include finalizing the High Injury Network based on the previous stakeholder meeting, the local agency meetings and the interactive web map comments. Additionally, the strategic initiative and supporting objectives will be finalized based on the local agency meetings and the conversation during the stakeholder meeting. Finally, the draft report will be presented at the next regional Vision Zero stakeholder committee meeting.