Montgomery County Vision Zero Equity Task Force Meeting #5 Summary

July 30, 2019

Purpose of the Meeting

This was the fifth Equity Task Force Meeting for the Montgomery County Vision Zero Plan. Montgomery County developed an Equity Task Force as part of the implementation in a two-year Vision Zero Action Plan. The Task Force was comprised of County staff, members of the *Pedestrian, Bicycle, Traffic Safety Advisory Committee* (PBTSAC), residents, and other organizations. The goal of the Task Force is to define what equity means within the context of Vision Zero. Based on that definition the task force determined what action items should be developed in the areas of engineering, education, and enforcement. The fifth meeting consisted of a short recap of the goals and data presented in the prior meetings and finalizing the recommendations for engineering, education, and enforcement.

Meeting Information

The meeting was held on Tuesday, July 30, 2019 from 7pm – 9pm at the BCC Regional Service Center Room West A 4805 Edgemoor Ln, Bethesda, MD 20814.

Attendance

Approximately 11 members of the Equity Task Force attended the fifth meeting with 2 members attending through the livestream. These attendees included residents, members of PBTSAC, staff of MCDOT, SVHS PTSA, ACLU, Community Vision for Takoma, and Greater Shady Grove Area TMD Advisory Committee.

Format

1. Introduction

During the introduction, Wade Holland from Montgomery County, introduced the members of the project team, Mei Fang, Jazmin Kimble and Cipriana Eckford. Wade introduced the meeting agenda and the purpose of the Task Force explaining the four parts of the prior meetings: Defining Equity, Engineering, Education and Enforcement.

Wade gave a recap of the first four meetings. He shared the goals for this meeting:

1. Review data and practices for traffic law enforcement from meeting #4.
2. Revise draft equity statement developed from meeting #3.
3. Discuss equity framework considerations and scorecard for engineering and education.

2. County's Presentation

Wade began the presentation with an overview of the Vision Zero Equity Task Force project and recapping data presented at previous meetings. Wade showed the Vision Zero operating and capital budget, followed by 2013 to 2018 Montgomery County injury and traffic stop data. Attendees asked questions during the presentation.

Q. What's the injury related data the County will collect?
A. John Hoobler from MCDOT answered that the injury data included fatality number, vehicle speed and high injury network data.
Q. The data you show on the map, is there data from Georgia Ave?
A. John replied yes.

Comments: What are we really focusing on at high injury network? Location, type of crashes, demographic?

Q. Should we prioritize the high injury network location?
A. Wade explained that some of the high injury location overlap with vulnerable group areas as identified with the Equity Emphasis Areas.

After a brief presentation and short questions and answers, all the attendees were separated into two groups: Engineering group and Education and Enforcement group. Wade introduced the rules for the group discussion.

3. Activity

Engineering Group (Cipriana, John and Mei)

The group went through each category of the Engineering Equity Framework.

In the **Data** category, delete the first consideration; Maintain the 2nd consideration but made some change of the sentence so it read:
Prioritize funding, resources and type of projects based on need (within high injury network) coupled with equity emphasis areas such as communities with higher rates of poverty, and persons of color **rather than locations that have political influence**.
Rephrase the last bold part of the sentence to make it clearer.

In the **Existence of Physical Infrastructure** category, we added lighting into the consideration, so it goes: Determine if the community has adequate sidewalks, bike infrastructure, bus stops, lighting and other physical infrastructure that would increase safety

In the **Existence of vulnerable population** category, we considered cleaning the sentence and make it clearer. This item seems like based on prioritize age group, like children and senior, the equity area included senior housing and school which might overlapping each other.

In the **History of funding** category, we all agree on this consideration but made minor edits: Review the prior engineering projects and maintenance the community had to improve safety noting the type of project and date of project. The team also discussed that this consideration is of lower priority.

In the **Economic opportunity** category, the team decided to delete this consideration because this related to funding category in some way.
Q. Will this provide the funding to public transportation vs. road construction?
Comment: How about prioritize funding resources and type of project?
John: The County Councilor the Department of Transportation will decide what project to be funded depending on the project size.

In the **Modal Priority and Crashes** category, the team agree the first sentence is of more priority; The second sentence got deleted because there are projects that look at issues for the fatal crashes, such as Blue Ribbon; The team suggested the third sentence to use the highest percentage instead the highest number,

2 considerations from **Strategy Priority** got deleted because the redundancy.

Land Use and **Audience** Category got deleted by the team because it overlaps with the previous categories or it might cause confusion in the framework.

Framework after discussion:

1. Prioritize funding, resources and type of projects based on need (within high injury network) coupled with equity emphasis areas such as communities with higher rates of poverty, and persons of color rather than locations that have political influence.
2. Determine if the community has adequate sidewalks, bike infrastructure, bus stops, lighting and other physical infrastructure that would increase safety.
3. Prioritize vulnerable transportation modes (walking, bicycling, scooting, and persons using mobility assistive equipment) over driving because protection for vulnerable roadway users can also improve safety for motorists.
4. Prioritize projects based on location such as: neighborhood in an equity emphasis area based on the census tract; within the walkshed of a school; area within a quarter mile of a

senior or recreation center; neighborhood (census tract) has a high vulnerability senior population as identified by the [Senior Vulnerability Study.](#) (Clean up wording)

5. Allocate resources to modes with the most fatalities and then to injuries to meet the goal of zero traffic related deaths and injuries. (Use percentage instead number)
6. Review the prior engineering projects and maintenance the community had to improve safety noting the type of project and date of project.

Education and Enforcement Group (Wade and Jazmin lead)

Education
- The county should focus on its cultural competence to effectively reach diverse groups of people such as rather than solely focusing on youth:

  - Prioritize all vulnerable groups:
    - Youth
    - Seniors
    - Minorities
    - Disabled Persons
    - Shift workers

- Cultural Competence
  - Universal messaging
  - Non-Verbal translation
  - Meeting where target population lives
  - Different modes: transit, drivers, pedestrian, bicyclists.

- Conduct educational campaigns to vulnerable populations and equity emphasis areas.
- Data Driven decisions. What are the indicators?
  - Walking/bike audits
  - Encouraging passengers to report ride share drivers (e.g. uber, lyft)
  - Data on how likely vulnerable population is contacting the County.
  - Data system of prioritization requests
- Community sponsoring advocacy programs.
- Educating residents on how to actively engage with County.
- Creating a metric to prioritize vulnerable populations.
- Identifying the local influencers (schools, churches, other community organizations). Form partnerships with these local influencers.

Enforcement (Jazmin and Wade led)
- Developing levels of enforcement (explain)
  - Groups of low-income wouldn't be disproportionately affected.

- Providing people with alternatives to pay fines.
    - Community Service
    - Educational Class
        - Prioritizing bicycle and pedestrian education over driver's education.
- Using funding to train officers.
- Consistency with how we decide warnings vs. citations.
    - Collecting that data
- Creating an app to report other drivers (ex. Safe Schools Maryland)

Next Step

The activity went a little over scheduled time. Wade ended the discussion and asked both groups to share the discussion result. The team gave out attendees some project examples to test out if the framework would actually work and mentioned that they can send us feedback if they have it. Wade stated that this is the last equity focus group meeting.

The project team will improve the statements from the feedback we got at this meeting and highlight what is a priority. We will discuss and summarize the points. Wade will post online and notify Task Force members when a final draft is ready for their review.