



**Safety BPAC Subcommittee Meeting
June 15th, 2017, 9:30 – 10:30am
Rutgers University
33 Livingston Avenue, New Brunswick, NJ**

Attendees:

Alan Huff – SJTPO
Leigh Ann Van Hagen – Rutgers – VTC
Ruchi Shrivastava – WSP
Andrew Lappitt – Michael Baker International

Summary:

Alan Huff opened the meeting by summarizing the meeting agenda: 1) best practices and data sources – where are communities getting their study information on near miss data from regarding signals/lighting studies? How complete is the tracking of this data? Next item is high visibility ‘zig zag’ crosswalks. Alan brought a 20 page report to share with the committee, a report which summarized the findings of a recent Virginia DOT pilot study which implemented warning signals to drivers approaching pedestrian crossings. Final topic is to discuss how to boost membership and activity within the Safety Subcommittee in order to draw people in who are interested in both bicycle/pedestrian safety issues on an ongoing basis as well as people who are interested in specific issues (on a less involved ‘friends of committee’ status). Also discussed, a ‘call in’ option during BPAC subcommittee meetings. Midterm meeting is tentatively scheduled by Alan for the end of July.

Long Notes

Alan Huff opened by sharing a conversation he had with Lance Devos at Virginia DOT. Lance is in charge of a ‘zig zag’ trial marking project, where high visibility crosswalks were placed at rail crossings on two high volume roads.

- a) Alan noted that though these counter measures will likely get edged out with the addition of overcrossing bridges and blinking signage (additions which vie for the limited focus of drivers), Lance’s team generally observed favorable results through this ‘pilot’ implementation effort.
- b) Lance is in test / experimentation status with his project, and the study area includes 2 intersections along two different state road corridors.
- c) Alan obtained the 20 page report from Lance and brought it to the committee to share. Since the rest of the committee members were not familiar with the report, Alan said he would send out a copy via email for the committee to review.



Alan is also working on reaching out to Hawaii county. He has not made contact yet.

- a) Leigh mentioned a pertinent contact she has in Hawaii: Michael Mole (former APBP Exec and a former Councilmember) who is currently a transportation consultant in Hawaii who specializes in bike/ped safety.
- b) Alan has heard from his conversation with Lance that the Hawaii study is focused on school crosswalks and unique crosswalks (criteria which are specified and applied to a narrow application, not universal). This second hand information is what has Alan interested in contacting the Hawaii study team directly.

Leigh and Alan agree that safety addition projects should be directed towards problem areas.

- a) Leigh mentioned that Washington state has done zig-zag pilots down the center of lanes and how Passaic county has engaged in pedestrian safety-related data collection efforts.
- b) Leigh asked the group if there are any additional contacts people know of to reach out to in Washington state in hopes of obtaining sharable data from other agencies.
- c) Leigh suggests asking Michael for insight and tips on the outreach process.
- d) Leigh suggests reaching out to Mike Tossy at NJ DOT as well.
- e) Leigh asks if there are any other jersey counties doing similar work.
- f) Andrew Lappitt recommends Michael Listacato of Bergen county as a good person to reach out to for more information about pedestrian safety projects.
- g) To conclude, Leigh will pull up Michael's contact information.

Alan poses the question to the group: does DOT have to sign off on these county safety projects?

- a) Leigh responds that it depends on the jurisdiction of the roadway (township/city/county/state) but not generally.
- b) Leigh mentions how Route 130 in City of Burlington is one of the most dangerous pedestrian coordinators in the state and is getting addressed since the 3rd death of a student in 2016 along this roadway.
- c) Leigh expands on this by stating that student action motivated public interest and NJDOT to take action for roadway improvements, after multiple student-led candlelight vigils were held at the fatality sites.



- d) Ruchi Shrivastava recommended that a charrette session with high school students could be a valuable source of public input. Leigh shared restriping efforts as a strategy for road calming (basically changing roadways from three lanes down to two).
- e) Leigh proposes putting together a memo as a committee with background of issue, a summary of the subcommittee's objectives (what we want to try to test), and a synopsis of existing studies. The memo would be sent to DOT Virginia. Sending the memo from a formal BPAC subcommittee is agreed to be a compelling method of outreach.

Leigh finds it worthwhile to check to see if this type of study would fall under the DOT's Research Division, pointing out that clarification is needed before moving forward, on how NJDOT will classify a pedestrian safety study.

- a) Alan proposes starting a Google doc shared with the subcommittee, with an outline so the group can start crafting a draft.
- b) It is agreed that coordinating with the design subcommittee would be a valuable collaboration.
- c) Alan concludes by announcing that he will send everyone in the subcommittee the Virginia DOT report.

Alan calls to skip the 'lighting component' today, in lieu of focusing more on boosting support for the committee.

Alan opens discussion by asking what he, as subcommittee Chair, can do to make the committee more flexible and marketable to an outside audience, in hopes of drawing more involvement.

- a) It is mentioned that a 'call in' option might be good – to draw the interest of people who cannot travel to BPAC but who have capabilities to teleconference remotely.
- b) Leigh mentions platforms like GoToMeeting and Live Edit Documents to ease the flow of the meetings. Alan asks if WebX would be a feasible web conference option.
- c) Leigh mentions the need to make a schedule available well in advance so as to reduce confusion.
- d) In terms of revising the format of subcommittee meetings, Leigh suggests organizing meetings by topic in order to boost participation, so people can select the meetings they want to tune in to, based on the topic(s) advertised.

Ruchi asks what towns would be interested in listening in to BPAC's safety subcommittee meetings? Leigh answers that statewide administrators are a possible target audience.

Leigh suggests that setting up a 'friends of the committee' genre is a way to bring more people in without the expectation of a long term/ involved commitment. 'Friends of the committee' would not have to be members, but people who have more of a regional influence.



- a) Adam would like to incorporate Friends of committee and call in option.
- b) Safety subcommittee would like to invite NJTPA to the committee – due to their work with Street Smart.
- c) Alan will send a Doodle poll towards the end of July to assess interest in a ‘call in’ teleconference option for future meetings.
- d) Leigh mentions she will reach out to a Traffic Safety Officer she knows and Alan mentions reaching out to Michael Tozzy and the Hawaii research team.

At 10:30 AM, the meeting ends so members can attend the BPAC general meeting