CCTA Vision Zero Working Group Meeting 3

VISION

ZERG

Fehr / Peers

10-06-2020



contra costa transportation authority

Agenda

- 1. Introductions
- 2. Project Overview
- 3. Overview of Vision Zero "How To" Implementation Guide
- 4. Present Countywide Collision Analysis & Collision Profiles
- 5. Breakout Group Discussion on Collision Profiles
- 6. Breakout Group Report Back
- 7. Discuss Next Steps





Proposed Meeting Outcomes

- Introduce "How-To" Guide for review
- Discuss & gather feedback/recommendations on collision profiles



Project Overview

Project Goals

- Advocate Vision Zero as standard practice
- Collect & analyze traffic safety data
- Develop "How To" guide for local jurisdictions







TRADITIONAL APPROACH TO SAFETY

VISION ZERO APPROACH TO SAFETY



relies on multi-disciplinary collaboration and is data-driven and equity-centered. For more information refer to the Vision Zero Core Elements at <u>https://visionzeronetwork.org/resources/vision-zero-core-elements/</u>.

VCCTA ROLES SHARED ROLES LOCAL ROLES





Project Status

<u>Complete</u>

- Best practice review
- Local plan review
- Mapping high concentrations of injuries

In-progress

- Collision profiles/typologies
- Vision Zero "How To" Implementation Guide
- Vision Zero database

Future actions

- RTPC Presentations/"Roadshow"
- Typical pedestrian improvement projects & pedestrian needs assessment







Vision Zero "How To" Implementation Guide

- Inspired by ITE Core Elements for
 Vision Zero Communities
- Highlights best practices for each Core Element
- Indicates role of CCTA & local jurisdictions
- Summarizes data analysis and resources developed to-date
- Refers to external resources to stay up-to-date





How to Develop Vision Zero Leadership & Commitment

- Public High-Level, and Ongoing Commitment
- Authentic Engagement
- Strategic Planning



How to Take a Data-Driven Approach

- Equity-Focused Analysis and Programs
- Responsive, Hot Spot Planning
- Proactive, Systemic Planning
- Comprehensive Evaluation and Adjustments



How to Build Safe Roadways & Ensure Safe Speeds

- Complete Streets for All
- Context Appropriate Speeds
- Project Delivery



Public, High-Level & Ongoing Commitment

- Example Vision Zero
 policies
- Education materials & approaches
- Inter-departmental & agency collaboration



Source: City of Richmond





Equity-Focused Analysis & Programs

- External resources on defining, analyzing, and programming for equity
- Understanding historical context of segregation and disinvestment
- Project prioritization using equity metric(s) (e.g., project located in MTC "Community of Concern")

People Killed While Walking:

African Americans	2 x as Likely
Latino	2 x as Likely
White	
Governing, 2014	

People Killed While Walking:

Low Income 2x as Likely High Income Governing, 2014

Communities With Sidewalks:

High Income	90%
Low Income	49 %
ridging the Gap, 2012	

Chance of Being Stopped and Searched:

African Americans 5x as Likely White

Source: Vision Zero Network



Proactive, Systemic Planning

- Underlying collision risk factors: the who, where, how, and why collisions happen
- Using travel behavior, roadway design, built environment factors to ID profiles
- Resources on countywide collision profiles and how to develop local profiles

Draft Countywide Collision Profiles



Speeding

DUIs

Channelized right turns



Skewed intersections



Left turns at signals

Red light violation

Complete Streets for All

- Integrate Complete Streets
 concepts
- Leverage CCTA pedestrian
 & bicycle design guidelines
- Select & apply safety countermeasures to make streets safer for all users



Figure D-8 Buffered Bicycle Lanes Preferred Width



Complete Streets for All



Countywide Collision Analysis Summary & Collison Profiles

Collisions by Mode

Countywide 2008-2017

2,048 collisionsinvolved bicyclistsbetween 2008 and2017

2,101 collisionsinvolved pedestriansbetween 2008 and2017

Collisions that involve:

pedestrians

bicycles

vehicles only

Increasing KSIs

Countywide 2008-2017

Primary Violation

100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10% 0% All Collisions **KSI** Collisions Bicycle **Bicycle KSI** Pedestrian **Pedestrian KSI** Collisions Collisions Collisions Collisions Driving Under Influence Unsafe Speed Wrong Side of Road Automobile Right of Way Traffic Signs and Signals Improper Turning Ped Right-of-Way Violation Pedestrian Violation Other

Countywide

2008-2017

VISION ZERC Countywide **Roadway Type** * 🚍 🚘 🖈 2008-2017 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30%

20% 10% 0% All Collisions KSI Collisions Bicycle Bicycle KSI Pedestrian Pedestrian Contra Costa Collisions Collisions Collisions **KSI** Collisions Roadway Miles Collisions on: major arterials minor arterials local roadways collectors

Existing Bike Facilities

Countywide 2008-2017

shared facilities

no bike facilities present

bike paths bike lanes

Communities of Concern

100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10% 0% County **Population** All Collisions KSI Collisions Bicycle **Bicycle KSI** Pedestrian Pedestrian Average Collisions Collisions Collisions **KSI** Collisions

collisions in Communities of Concern

collisions not in Communities of Concern

Countywide

2008-2017

Communities of Concern are defined by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission as census tracts having concentrations of both lowincome and non-white populations; Contra Costa population average estimated using 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Pedestrian Priority Areas (PPAs)

CCTA's 2018 Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update identifies Priority Pedestrian Areas (PPAs), which include areas within walking distance of schools and major transit stops and locations with the greatest concentrations of pedestrian collisions.

Location & Control Type

100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10% 0% All Pedestrian Collisions KSI Pedestrian Collisions All Bike Collisions KSI Bike Collisions

Collisions at: unsignalized intersections

midblock

PPAs

2008-2017

Location & Marked Crosswalks

PPAs

2008-2017

Contra Costa Common Collision Profiles

Common Collision Profiles

Speeding

Channelized right turns

Skewed intersections

Highway interchanges

Trail crossings

Contraflow bike riding

Transit priority areas

Vulnerable populations – Seniors

Vulnerable populations – Youth

Profile 1 Speeding

Unsafe speeds is a common collision profile and key systemic safety issue across Contra Costa. Vehicles often travel faster than the posted speed limit. Since victim injuries and deaths increase exponentially with vehicle speeds, especially for people walking and biking, reducing speeds is the most critical way to improve safety. Potential countermeasures for this profile include traffic calming, speed warning signs, increased enforcement (including automated once allowed in California), and driver education.

collisions with unsafe speed listed as the primary collision factor

7% of pedestrian KSI collisions

9% of bicycle KSI collisions

YProfile 2DUIs

Driving under the influence (DUI) of alcohol, drugs, or medication is a common collision profile in Contra Costa – and has a strong influence on KSI collisions. The proportion of collisions where DUI is considered the primary collision factor (PCF) more than doubles from 8% of all collisions to 18% of all KSI collisions. Potential strategies to address this collision profile include enforcement activities (e.g., sobriety checkpoints), marketing campaigns, and education. In areas where DUI is especially prevalent, design redundancy, such as center medians and rumble strips, may also be effective.

collisions with DUI listed as the primary collision factor

3% of pedestrian KSI collisions

7% of bicycle KSI collisions

Profile 3 Channelized Right Turns

About one-third of collisions at signalized intersections in Priority Pedestrian Areas (PPAs) that involve a right-turning vehicle occur at intersections with channelized right-turn lanes (i.e., slip lanes). Slip lanes facilitate fast moving vehicles through the conflict point with a pedestrian crossing. Potential countermeasures to address this collision profile include improvements that slow speeds and improve visibility such as closing slip lanes and reducing curb radii. Redesigning slip lanes to slow approach angles (similar to a roundabout entry) and provide a raised crossing area also potential countermeasures.

2% of pedestrian KSI collisions in PPA

Many intersections across Contra Costa are not orthogonal and have skewed or offset approaches. About one-quarter of all collisions occurred at skewed intersections. These intersections may have longer or less intuitive pedestrian crossings. Motorists may have limited visibility of pedestrians and vehicles on the intersecting roadway. Potential counter-measures include "tightening up" approaches, crosswalk daylighting (i.e., prohibiting parking for at least 20' adjacent to a crosswalk), or channelizing turns to improve sight lines and encourage slower speeds.

8% of pedestrian KSI collisions in PPA

Profile 5 Left Turns at Signals

About one-quarter of collisions at signalized intersections in PPAs involve a left-turning vehicle. This could be related to permitted rather than protected left turn phases at signalized intersections. Potential approaches to addressing this collision profile include providing a Leading Pedestrian Interval, installing protected left turn phases (where feasible), or using split signal phasing. In some cases prohibiting left turns in a grid network may also be an option to address this collision type. Finally, a road diet may allow for left turn pockets to be provided if current right of way does not allow for this.

1% of pedestrian KSI collisions in PPA

Red light violations occur when either a motorist, bicyclist, or pedestrian enters an intersection against the signal. Approximately 20% of all collisions at signalized intersections in PPAs had 'signals & signs' listed at the primary collision factors, which is how red light violations are typically categorized in collision databases. Potential countermeasure to address this collision profile could include signal timing adjustments to allow for longer clearance intervals or shorter cycle lengths, or green paint for increased bicyclist visibility. Enforcement and red light cameras may also be considered.

3% of pedestrian KSI collisions in PPA

4%

Profile 7 Highway Interchanges

Interchanges tend to be difficult to navigate for pedestrians and bicyclists due to high volume of fast-moving vehicles and land use and roadway designs that do not signal for the presence of multi-modal users. This challenge was highlighted as part of community and stakeholder outreach during the development of the 2018 CBPP Update. Although this profile represents a smaller number of collisions, this may reflect lower levels of walking and biking near interchanges. Potential countermeasures include reducing curb radii at ramps and providing single lane ramps, where possible, to minimize conflict points.

2% of pedestrian KSI collisions

1% of bicycle KSI collisions

collisions near interchanges

Profile 8 Trail Crossings

Contra Costa has a well-developed system of trails, such as the Iron Horse Trail, that provide separated connections for people walking and biking. However, trail crossings of major roadways can present stressful experiences and significant conflict points. Potential improvements at trail crossings include enhanced crossings (e.g., rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs) or pedestrian hybrid beacons (PHBs)) or gradeseparated crossings (e.g., pedestrian/bicycle bridge).

FR

"||a

4% of bicycle KSI collisions

Profile 9 Contraflow Bike Riding

Wrong way riding collisions denote a collision that occurs when a bicyclist travels in the opposite direction of vehicular traffic. This can occur when existing facilities do not exist or when existing facilities do not meet bicyclists' desire lines. For example, if an adequate crossing does not exist where a bicyclist wants to cross the street, they may ride in the wrong direction to access a signalized crossing. Potential solutions include installing bicycling facilities or bicycle crossings at key desire lines. Bicyclist education is also important to address risky behaviors when appropriate facilities are in place.

collisions involving wrong-way bike riding

15% of bicycle KSI collisions

Profile 10 Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)

CCTA defines Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) as areas within a half-mile walk of transit stations with 15-minute headways or better during peak periods, such as BART stations. Improving access for people walking and biking can make transit more convenient, which is a key goal of the 2018 CBPP Update. Therefore, improving safety for people walking and biking to/from transit is key, considering that 11% of pedestrian KSI collisions countywide occur within TPAs.

11% of pedestrian KSI collisions

5% of bicycle KSI collisions

Profile 11Seniors

Seniors (65 years old and older) are involved in 11% of pedestrian-involved collisions. Incorporating senior-friendly design, such as slower crossing times at signals, or focusing pedestrian improvements near senior centers are some potential countermeasures to consider for this profile.

11% of countywide pedestrian collisions

5%

of countywide

bicycle collisions

Youth (less than 15 years old) are involved in a disproportionate share of pedestrian-involved collisions. Opportunities for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects and programs are numerous and can include education, encouragement, and engineering strategies.

18% of countywide pedestrian collisions

17% of countywide bicycle collisions

BREAKOUT GROUP DISCUSSION

NEXT STEPS

Next Steps

- Finalize "How To" Guide
- Finalize Collision Profiles
- Vision Zero RTPC "Roadshow" & TAC Input
- Countywide Pedestrian Needs Assessment
- Countywide Micromobility Policy

