

SAFETY CRITERION CHANGES – Draft Staff Proposal

Safety is currently one component of the mobility / circulation section of the policy criteria. Point values in the regional competition range from 3 to 8 depending on the category and funding source; point values in the countywide competitions vary from 2 points and above.

The current criteria language = “Describe how the project addresses safety and security.”

Per the Task Force direction, safety will now be separated into a stand-alone criterion with a distinct point value. In consultation with the RPEC and Countywide Chairs, the staff proposal for the point value for the regional competition = 8 points, and the minimum point value for the countywide competitions = 5 points.

In addition, the criterion language will be expanded:

- Describe how the project addresses safety and security. *(4 points)*
 - *Note: this bullet addresses the full spectrum of safety improvements across projects, including elements of conflict reduction and elements specific to the various project types and locations.*
- Describe how the project helps protect vulnerable users of the transportation system, by improving pedestrian safety and addressing existing risks or conditions for pedestrian injuries and fatalities and/or adding or improving facilities for pedestrian and bicycle safety and comfort. *(2 points)*
- Describe how the project reduces reliance on enforcement and/or designs for decreased speeds. *(1 point)*
- Does your agency have an adopted safety policy (e.g., Vision Zero, Target Zero, etc.)? How did these policies inform the development of the project? *(1 point)*

Guidance will also be updated to include additional resources and definitions, being more explicit on the expectations for high scoring responses. Specific improvements:

- Information on FHWA’s Safe System Approach will be provided
- Specific expanded guidance language:
 - "Applicants shall describe how their project improves pedestrian, bicycle, public transit and private vehicle safety by addressing an existing injury and/or fatality disparity, known safety issue or accident location, or by describing how the design of the project will help to prevent future safety issues, e.g., by the inclusion of specific features, by retrofitting an outdated facility, or by reducing speeds."
- Definitions of “disparity,” “harm,” and the distinction between safety and security will be provided. Examples of effective solutions to achieve the outcomes identified above will also be provided; staff will work with RPEC and the CW forums on these examples.