



**Legislative BPAC Subcommittee Meeting
March 14, 10:45am to 12:15pm
Rutgers University
33 Livingston Avenue, New Brunswick, NJ**

Attendees: Janna Chernetz (Chair), Dana Dobson, Jim Hunt, Lisa Cintron, Cyndi Steiner, Leigh Ann von Hagen, John Boyle, Olivia Glenn, Cyndi Steiner

First Order:

Discussion of bike/pedestrian white paper 'asks' as a standalone resolution

Second Order:

Language for cities & state adoption of Vision Zero (VZ) / Towards Zero Deaths (TZD)

Long Form Notes:

First Order: Discussion of bike/pedestrian white paper 'asks' as a standalone resolution

Leigh Ann spoke about how funding works internally for NJDOT projects, covering funding vs. goals. If goals aren't met, there is no option for NJDOT to flex funds (flex work for up to 50% of funding allocation for projects).

HSIP money out of DOT programs. But, it's hard to get that money spent in the first place and if not spent, the funding is lost.

How the safety funds are designated/grouped is not known. If there is a 15% increase in portion of pedestrian fatalities, additional funding is unlocked to apply towards road safety improvements.

It is beneficial for the state of NJ to be able to flex money out of other allocations to help cover deficits in other areas. Funds are not necessarily flexed to similar safety related programs. This make it easier to use/reallocate funds.

Goals are tied to Federal funding as well. If safety goals aren't met, then the Fed mandates all funds should go towards safety.

John: there's a general confusion as to difference between VZ and TZD.

Leigh Ann: In order to maximize federal funding, the flex mechanism (described above) was created.

"Systematic safety improvements" that can be implemented without engineering studies that can go towards promoting safety goals.



Second Order: Language for cities & state adoption of Vision Zero (VZ) or Towards Zero Deaths (TZD)

Broadening of language is needed.

Example given: 'pedestrian islands.' Is this legislative? bike/pedestrian initiatives might be a way to spend aforementioned HSIP funding.

Jim: VZ vs. TVZ. With the legislative place, we need to pick phrasing that best allows legislators to package and market the agenda. Discussion of what we can recommend as a subcommittee which policy makers and leaders can then use to pitch to the larger community.

Matt: With the new (Murphy) administration coming in, is there an opportunity to talk about Complete Streets and tie initiatives to funding streams?

Mandating Complete Streets to state or we will give bonus consideration to have Complete Streets/Vision Zero to foster implementation at county and municipal levels.

Big projects are sought after to spend the money and to increase state and local aid. This presents an opportunity. There is funding and it is available. Is there a way to tie this funding to the policy goal?

Cyndi: County and municipality aid and TAP. Bike and pedestrian safety initiatives were also allocated to municipal and county aide.

Cyndi: started discussing economic value and safety value of Complete Streets.

Leigh Ann: we can use other states as context, mirroring existing policies

Leigh Ann: VZ network resolution presents to group. Thoughts towards building a VZ Action Plan. It is embedded in safety/law, health, education at state, county, local levels and with multi disciplines (edu., enforcement, law engineering, CD, health).

Jersey City VZ Task Force Resolution language can be used. (EO)

Matt: State-like pilot programs might be good resources to draw upon too. Narrowing down to city and county level programs that have been implemented.

Anna: major cities to collaborate in adopting a joint action plan regionally (Jersey City, NB, Trenton, Elizabeth, Camden, Vineland, Atlantic City, Patterson). Alternative list of early adopters: Hoboken, Asbury Park.

Jim: Elise is meeting with Assistant Commissioner; can we formulate some talking points to send along with her as to why state should go towards VZ and not TZD. Meeting is next week: we need to deliver points to her to pass on to Assistant Commissioner. The point of the task force is to address why the state should address VZ (and, ultimately, move towards forming a task force).



Anna: coming up with a sample Exec Order for task force might be a good deliverable?

Jim: we might need more of an announcement – an easy ask and easy thing to do- since it aligns with Murphy’s existing initiatives.

John: a multidisciplinary leadership component of a ‘strong vision zero commitment’, such as an infographic, should be a part of the task force component.

Leigh Ann: clear enforcement strategy still needs to be developed.

DEP, EJ advocates, State Chiefs of Police, NJPTO, MVC, DOE, folks and Education folks and community stakeholders all need to be added to list of possible/appointable taskforce members.

Jim: we need to make this list easier to read. 4 big ‘buckets’ to give the general idea, because individual components might be unclear/scattered. A guide for municipalities. NACO.

Cyndi: Recommendation with Elise: arm her with an argument before she meets with Assistant Commissioner next week.

Leigh: TZD is possibly an ideal approach, labeling it as a comprehensive task force.

Jim: And adding ‘why not’s’ (i.e. what is missing from TZD) is also needed.

Leigh: one of the key tenants of VZ is that crashes are preventable. TZD doesn’t capture that in the messaging. VZ is better equipped to change the culture (with family victim messages).

Cyndi: change away from driver convenience. That time of travel is not more important than people’s lives.

Matt: Shifting dialogue and personalization (much like the gun debate) to show people how families and communities are impacted by crashes and hazard.

Jim: VZ is a more effective way to package this: ‘X amount of things are helping it reduce deaths.’

John: national trends, vs. state and city comparison. ‘NY up, Jersey down. National up. NY down.’ changing perceptions changes results.

*Same thing as NACTO. Similar pushback with vision zero. So we should use same strategies as NACTO to counter naysayers.

John: get messaging from victim’s family (victim advocacy)

Blow it off as normalized. Car centric feature

John: Or we use placards. Memorials. For every site of a pedestrian death.

Leigh Ann: the prevailing question asked is ‘what did the pedestrian do wrong?’ Street-smart doesn’t address this directly all the time, but if we focus too much on pedestrian deaths, it gets trivialized and message is lost.



Camden outreach approach might be more of a sensitive approach. Less aggressive in certain areas.

Leigh Ann: Jim's marketing phrases (aforementioned as 'buckets' above) are good enough to deliver to Elise.

Jim's 3 talking points:

- Changes perception
- Produces results
- Involves multiple stakeholders in meeting the goal

Jim: 9/11 ride. Any updates on getting the governor to meet us in Trenton? It might be a wonderful time to announce the EO April 26th we get to West Windsor. 27th Trenton. May is bike month. 9/11 memorial trail is the main act of the 9/11 ride, so May is bike month is probably a better platform.

Matt: NJ Corporate business tax funding so green coalition is already looking to carve up the funding. Trails was not offered a 'slice' of the increased funding last round. Should Legislative Committee look at the issue and advocate for diversion of funds for trail funding? DEP might not favor allocation towards trail.

John: A hybrid funding recipient model might increase trail funding. Like in PA. Can't advocate but can make recommendations to DOT.

Jim: people for bikes legislation. Regulations can potentially create dangerous situations in bike lanes.

Next EBike legislation meeting: next meeting is in June.

End at 12:15pm

Next Legislative Meeting: TBD