

**NYSAMPO Association**  
**Safety Working Group Teleconference**  
**May 7, 2014**  
**MEETING NOTES**

**1. Participating**

- A/GFTC – Kate Mance
- CDTC – Sandy Misiewicz
- ECTC – Mike Perry
- GBNRTC – Hector Boggio
- GTC – Bob Torzynski
- NYMTC – Chris Hardej
- PDCTC – Emily Dozier
- SMTC – Mike Alexander
- UCTC – Brian Slack
- NYSDOT – Regina Doyle, Jackie Berlant, Andrew Sattinger
- FHWA – Emmett McDevitt

**2. Meeting Notes – April 2, 2014 (attached)**

The meeting notes were approved.

**3. Federal Register Review**

- Safety Performance Measure Rulemaking Comments  
Misiewicz reported. Comments were received from CDTC, PDCTC.  
McDevitt – Encourage comments to focus on impact on safety, working relationships. Some may think they are not affected, but all MPOs are affected.  
Misiewicz: NYSAMPO will submit comments; NYMTC and other MPOs will submit on their own if they choose to do so.

Gayle reviewed the summary of NYSDOT concerns that Rob Limoges reported to the MAP-21 Working Group on Monday.

- There are 4 performance measures: # and rate of fatalities, and # and rate of serious injuries. Covers all public roads. Because New York is MMUCC compliant, we conform to the serious injury definition (A on the KABCO scale). These measures are consistent with SHSP and GTSC's HSSP.
- Concerned about target setting, and FHWA proposed methodology for demonstrating "significant progress" on target achievement. Note that If state does not achieve at least significant progress on 50% of targets, they must program HSIP funds based entirely on a remediation plan.
- Concern about applying VMT-based measures to non-motorized modes.
- Performance measures apply to "all public roads", but traffic count/AADT data is generally lacking on local roads not on the Federal Aid system.
- Discussed the "5 year rolling average" methodology for determining significant progress. Notes that there will be a narrow prediction interval band. Point raised that driver behavioral issues like cell phone/texting use can cause spikes in rates. In this sense, 5 year average smooths the trend line.
- NYSDOT may consider proposing a simpler methodology, like achieving at least a stated % of each target. This is easy to calculate, and transparent to the public.

SWG members made the following comments:

Hardej: New York City uses a population based method for pedestrian crashes. This makes more sense than VMT, but does not account for changes in pedestrian volume and therefore exposure. Exposure would be better, but difficult to calculate.

McDevitt: Per capita is a poor surrogate. Agrees exposure is a better basis for pedestrian and bike crash rates. FHWA should come up with an exposure rate. Combining pedestrians and bikes for performance planning is poor practice.

Torzynski: Agrees that you cannot compare pedestrian and bicycle crash metrics. Causation is entirely different.

Misiewicz: NYC influences number of crashes in state; they are the only area that can move the number. Is there a way to measure % fatal and serious injury by mode? And use that as a basis.

Gayle: Responded to a question about reporting, noting that it is only the state that reports to FHWA. But MPOs "report" on use of performance measures and target achievement through their certification review.

Hardej: USDOT, through its modal agencies, requires 7 different safety plans and reports. Can they be consolidated? This is worth a comment.

Misiewicz: MPO is not the facility owner or operator, so it becomes difficult to define progress. [Gayle: the focus is on the outcomes of TIP investments, regardless of whose project it is.]

Consolidation makes sense; targets differ between SHSP and HSSP

Hardej: TSBs are a key opportunity for input.

Misiewicz asked for a response to the idea of breaking out modes. CDTC planning does that, looking at more vulnerable roadway users.

Torzynski: Agree in Rochester that separate methodology and reporting by mode would be helpful. Per capita may not be that bad if you use the right geography.

Gayle notes that the MAP-21 metrics are intentionally high level so all states and MPOs can use them without significant new data collection. All states have fatalities and serious injuries from crash records (although some may need to work on data bases), and sample VMT from HPMS. Exposure data from pedestrian or bicycle counts could be resource intensive.

Dozier: Per capita is a good compromise, census data available, there could be guidance on establishing geographic basis. Does not skew like VMT change. Particularly useful for non-motorized modes. Perhaps an interim that would transition to exposure basis.

Is there support for defining "significant progress" on target achievement as achieving at least a pre-determined % of the target? This seems to be a reasonable approach.

Transparency to the public is important.

Dozier: There would be an incentive to go low with the targets, but that could apply with any methodology.

Gayle proposes that States be required to use the 5 rolling average to set their targets, then use the simplified method to measure progress.

Interest was expressed in supporting that idea.

Misiewicz raised a concern about misalignment of target setting with LRP. Safety PM is an annual exercise, other measures are not.

Gayle suggests waiting to see what Planning NPRM says.

- HSIP rulemaking (attached)

Gayle reported on MAP-21 WG meeting. Notes that this NPRM is straightforward. Does a clean-up with respect to SAFETEA-LU programs that were eliminated in MAP-21. Establishes a 5 year

update cycle for SHSP.

Biggest concern from NYSDOT is Model Inventory Roadway Elements (MIRE).

Doyle report on MIRE. It breaks data elements at 400 AADT, with fewer requirements for low volume roads. Includes all public roads. NYSDOT has inventory, but missing some data elements for local roads. The hurdles are creating a representative AADT on non-FA local roads; and intersection data (location, type, traffic control). It is not clear if there is a requirement for actual AADT on every road, or whether a statistical sample is ok.

Hardej: How does that affect MPO? Is there an expectation that data collection for local roads will be imposed on MPOs or members?

Doyle: Highway Data Services Bureau is taking the lead, has issued a contract for traffic counts. May solicit input from MPOs for representative locations. For other data elements, not yet decided.

Sattinger: MPOs may be affected in NYSDOT changes methodology for PILs for example.

Misiewicz: Concern on gap between State and local system. State must do network screening, but then municipal project sponsors need analysts to do the work on local roadways. They often do not have staff, nor resources for consultant support.

Is there a way to use HSIP funds for planning?

Gayle proposed and McDevitt agreed that HSIP eligibility and data collection could be limited to FA system. This would include off-system local roads that are at least collectors; McDevitt points out that 60% of HSIP is spent off-system. There is little if any likelihood that HSIP money will be spent on roads/streets functionally classified as local, but the proposed rule creates a large data burden for those facilities.

- Planning rule

Gayle reported that the NPRM on Statewide and Metropolitan Planning is due out next week. The MPO Directors would like all Working Groups to review it from their own perspective.

#### **4. NYSDOT/Crash Record Coordination**

- Traffic Records Coordinating Council: Strategic Plan Adopted (attached)

- Misiewicz reported that the Council met last week, adopted plan as referenced. Executive Summary with project list was distributed. Contact Misiewicz for full report if interested.

Dozier: How does ALIS data get into FARS?

Misiewicz: ITSMR takes raw data, cleans it, and reports to FARS.

Perry: Do we analyze FARS data when we analyze ALIS data?

Misiewicz: The variation between the two datasets is small. She will send link to FARS website.

#### **5. Partnerships/Coordination**

- NYSDOT: HSIP Solicitation Status

Doyle reported that the SSO Team met and reviewed all applications. They are now reaching out to Regions for more information where it is needed. Notification of project selection should be close to end of May target.

- NYSATSB (meeting notes attached)

Engineering Committee

Misiewicz attended this week. VanSlyke cannot, so she will continue to represent NYSAMPO for 2014.

Dozier inquired about law enforcement bike/ped training? Was this similar to what was done in Capital region?

Torzynski: The training was held Mar 17-18 in Monroe County, with the same trainer as in the Capital District. There was good local participation.

- GTSC

DeWeese unable to be present. No report.

## 6. Training/Conferences

- ALIS Training: May 13<sup>th</sup> from 10 AM to 3 PM
  - NYSDOT Region 3 (Syracuse)  
Gayle reported 11 seats are filled.
- Walk/Bike NY Symposium: May 21-22, 2014, Suffern, NY
- FHWA Intersection Safety Courses
  - Tentative Dates:  
June 17<sup>th</sup> (Albany), June 18<sup>th</sup> (Utica), June 19<sup>th</sup> (Rochester)
- Highway Safety Conference Session Proposal ACCEPTED Dozier
  - October 19-22, Lake Placid, NY  
Cyndi Paddick, Emily Dozier, Sandy Misiewicz on the panel
  
- Additional Training? Designing Pedestrian Safe Streets (Upstate Locations?)

## 7. Other Topics

Dozier asked if PDCTC comments on rumble strip policy had been submitted to NYSDOT. [Gayle determined they had not been submitted, PDCTC will submit directly.]

Perry asked about the hospital records issue raised in the Safety Performance Measure NPRM. Gayle responded that this had been discussed at the MAP-21 WG meeting. NYSDOT had met with NYS Dept of Health to discuss. There are many issues of patient privacy. Hardej stated that since we are a CODES state there is a framework for doing this, but must find funding to continue CODES. Gayle notes that this is not expressed as a requirement in the NPRM, but an encouragement with a forward looking 2020 implementation.

**Next Meeting Date:** Wednesday, June 4<sup>th</sup> at 1 PM