



**PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COUNCIL
MINUTES**

**REGULAR MEETING
November 3, 2014**

The Pedestrian Advisory convened in a regular meeting on November 3, 2014 at Willie Mae Kirk Brach Library, 3101 Oak Springs Drive.

Elected Members in Attendance

Joe Almazan
Peter Baird
Janet Beinke
Ken Craig
Nancy Crowther
Valerie Fruge

Girard Kinney
Ramah Leith
Nic Moe
Carmen de la Morena-Chu
Marva Overton
Emily Risinger

Kathy Rock
Mike Sledge
Luke Urie
Heyden Walker
Virginia Wilkinson

Guests in Attendance

E. Nicole Thompson Beavers
Hatty Bogucki
Sam Day-Woodruff
Sharon Ellerby

Pamela Larson
Nevena Pilipovic-Wengler
Daniela Radpay
Patricia Schaub

Lenore Shefman
Jeremy Siltala
John Woodley

Staff in Attendance:

Robert Anderson
Caitlin D'Alton

Stephen Ratke

Francis Reilly

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 6:06.

- 1. INTRODUCTIONS (6:00 to 6:05)**
- 2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION: GENERAL (6:05 to 6:08)**
No citizen communication.
- 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (6:08 to 6:10)**
Valerie moved to approve minutes, Emily seconded.
- 4. STAFF AND COMMISSION BRIEFINGS (6:10 to 6:15)**
 - A. Bicycle Advisory Council / Urban Transportation Commission**
No staff present.
 - B. Surgeon General's Call to Action on Walking**

Electronic update provided. Call to action delayed until spring 2015.

5. PROJECT SUBCOMMITTEE (6:15 to 7:05)

A. Vision Zero Recommendations to Council – Discussion and Possible Action

Presentation by: Nic Moe, Project Subcommittee Chair

Nic Presents: The group has been working on Vision Zero. Vision Zero is idea that no deaths or serious injuries should occur. The subcommittee has been working to make recommendations to Council to create diverse stakeholder Task Force.

Multiple members of the project subcommittee are doing research and writing the memorandum.

Council will be receiving this memorandum. Our reason for the need behind the Task Force is that there have been a lot of different issues that have addressed separate elements of traffic safety, but they have not all explicitly looked at safety as their primary concern. Vision Zero is an umbrella framework to address safety within Austin. The reason it's important, in the last decade over 600 have been killed in traffic. Of those, one-third have been pedestrians.

Vision Zero is not unique. Sweden adopted Vision Zero in 1997 and they have been very successful. Other countries within Europe have adopted similar policies. Now in the US, other cities are adopting Vision Zero policies, including New York and San Francisco. Cities have been adopting to local context to try to deal with issues. We want to make that happen in Austin.

Austin is a dangerous city, and particularly dangerous for pedestrians. It was the seventh most dangerous city for pedestrians for cities over 500,000.

The initiative has received support from thirteen groups, departments and agencies thus far. The PAC is the last group to receive the presentation, and asking for PAC to support to move to City Council.

Nic asked for questions and discussion.

Staff clarified that the goal is for Council to create a Task Force to look more into the issue.

Nancy motioned to advance recommendations to City Council. Girard seconded.

Emily had wording changes. Page 2 last paragraph, the meaning of “how to more effectively enforce dangerous behavior” should be clarified. Top paragraph, need to soften “rampage” to “incident”.

Janet wishes to change the fatality rate, listed as 2.97, and round it to 3. Nancy wishes to leave as a formula.

Steve verified it needs to be more specific, with more decimal places.

Valerie wished to move “create a task force” from page 3 to Description of Recommendation to Council on page one.

Girard asked about whether Council sponsors have been lined up. Staff clarified that, yes, there are Council sponsors, and probable Council dates are November 20 or December 11.

Francis asked if we can do grammatical points off line. Nic said yes.

Heyden asked for opposition. None received.

6. TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE (7:05 to 7:30)

A. Construction Barriers – Briefing

Presentation by: Peter Baird, Technical Subcommittee Chair

Peter presents: There are two points: 1. Construction barriers; 2. How we are able to report issues.

Last meeting we had conversation on the 311 app. We are looking to help ATD Right of Way Management Division.

Had meeting on Oct. 15 with Jason Redfern, from the Right of Way Division of the Transportation Department, and he explained a couple key points for right of way diversion of projects. While there is a process, sometimes the qualified individual has sub-consultants aren't doing as good of a job. So, there is an issue of communication between individuals responsible.

Jason Redfern is looking to develop an accreditation system that will address this issue. If the system is implemented, all individuals performing work in the right of way will go through training to ensure access issues aren't created through the work. The work we are doing is to assist that by capturing photos where issues are occurring, or where there are really good examples of proper detours and accessibility provisions being provided. We are still looking for those photos to be distributed to Peter at pbaird@broaddusplanning.com or Robert at robert.anderson2@austintexas.gov. We will then pass along those photos to the Right of Way management team. Jason said it's good to have positive examples to show contractors how work should be done.

Another aspect of the work the PAC is doing with the right of way team is to look at the policy itself. We are using examples from the federal level and other best practices. Zakcq provided great user-friendly documents at a previous Technical Subcommittee meeting. This helps us to be more educated and for us to update or improve our policy. We will probably put forward recommendations to Jason.

Then we need to address reporting. We met with 311 to discuss reporting issues. Jason didn't have clarity on whether 311 issues were being transmitted to his staff. We met with 311 staff to point out we need clear method for reporting issues and need clarity for how those incidents are processed. A primary issue is there are multiple computer systems within the city so sometimes a reported issue lists the status as "closed" when it is simply transferred between systems and/or routed to different staff in other departments. They are going to send us diagram of how calls are routed.

"Obstruction in the Right of Way" is the phrase to use and should be entered using the "other" category in the APP. The phone version often requires much more time to be spent with the operator. But they have more detailed reporting categories. The APP has the advantage of being quick and able to submit photos.

Technical subcommittee meeting will be in the third week of November to address. See Peter if you'd like to be involved.

Girard asked about the Thursday meeting. His concern is that Tuesday meeting is same as BAC. Suggests we coordinate with BAC. Staff says he'll coordinate.

Valerie has question about whether is issue is closed. Staff clarified that 311 is working with Motorola to resolve issue so the field only closes when issue is resolved.

Virginia asked does 311 have a way to capture typos. Staff clarified that requests are manually sorted.

Peter mentioned that it is technically possible to add categories to the 311 APP, but 311 wants to coordinate with the respective departments and divisions.

Peter indicated we have been doing some test cases to make sure that 311 triage is actually getting cases to the right staff.

Attendee said there is a need to address the liability issue for construction companies in order to ensure compliance. This relates back to Vision Zero. Peter clarified that ROW management division can shut down project if in repeat violation, but they are a small team so it is difficult to monitor all construction projects across the city. The point of certification would be to pre-empt violations through better education.

Peter said we could provide advice regarding lawsuit to Jason for certification.

Girard said shutting a project down is effective. But, more effective potentially is hearing from city lawyer directly. Carmen agreed this might be a more authoritative voice.

Nancy cited project example. Corner of Manchaca and Lamar no way to get to bus stop on the #3 northbound. Contractor had been spoken to from citizens and they weren't making a route. Nancy said it was an inexcusable safety risk. Peter said that is exactly the kind of issue we are trying to capture. That sort of real-time reporting to Jason is vital. The Technical Subcommittee will draft some language of support for a certification system.

Staff clarified Jason wants our support in providing examples in order to demonstrate the need for a business proposal.

Carmen asked what are criteria for protected pedestrian paths. Peter said it is the proximity of building and potential for debris falling from project.

Peter said he found good example at UT where printout of area and map of clear route for ADA detours.

Carmen said that suggests the UT community is thinking of liability.

Girard, last week, called in an issue for the E 6th Street Post Office. There was an error in site planning because they reversed traffic flow. The entrances are now more dangerous. There is a question for how to address a design issue, not construction re-routing problem.

John Woodley asked if we are able to actually fine construction contractors.

Carmen said we have proactive legal arm, incident-based reporting, and fines. There is a set of options and penalties.

Heyden reaffirmed the need to send photographs of good and bad examples to Peter and Robert.

Joe confirmed traffic control plans are part of the construction plans. If how re-routing doesn't match what was in the approved plans, that is another way to put pressure on contractors.

Nic said it is great that these conversations are occurring. Besides different tactics, what else needs to happen? Do we need critical mass of examples? Peter says, moving forward we need to present something to Jason. There is no magic number of cases.

Peter says ultimately, language will be drafted and brought before full PAC.

B. Sidewalk Master Plan – Briefing

Presentation by: Peter Baird, Technical Subcommittee Chair

Meeting on October 15, John Eastman discussed Sidewalk Master Plan update.

Project hasn't commenced yet. We will be on board and John is very enthusiastic to work with Technical Subcommittee to get good input and help provide updates to the Sidewalk Master Plan.

Confusion potentially occurred through ask to provide recommendations for sidewalk priorities. 311 is option for reporting missing sidewalk. Neighborhood Plans have already identified their priorities and those will continue to be influential for priorities within SMP.

Girard says that is in contrast to John. He heard that NP were not contributing to Sidewalk Master Plan because not every area of the city has NP. Girard says faulty reasoning. Peter says not his understanding. Reading current Sidewalk Priority Matrix. Neighborhood Plan score is in there. So, not in the base score. His understanding is that system will continue. 311 calls will also contribute to additional score. Peter confirms that they are not changing the priority matrix. What he hopes to see, which is more comprehensive than updating maps, that update will more accurately reflect neighborhood plan.

Key parts is update aligns work with Imagine Austin and wider city vision. Second, PAC's involvement is to take citywide view on sidewalk updates. Lastly, provide input from neighborhood's perspective.

Girard says John is great. He recommends working through Neighborhood Planning Program (Margaret Valenti). Should Neighborhood Associations be continuing to make recommendations or should they hold off. Recommends John's group connects with neighborhood groups.

Staff said John Eastman is interested in PAC to help with financial recommendations.

Mike is interested in timeline and ability to provide iterative review of sidewalk priorities.

Nancy said ADA Task Force has been involved since the 1990s. The city keeps shifting so there is always an opportunity to work with John Eastman to coordinate with matrix. She underscores this is a continuous process.

John Woodley, his understanding is spending about \$5 million per year to fix billion dollar problem. He'd like to see a lot more aggressive spending. Girard says it does bring up a longer term goal for a

bond program. We might want to think about what that process would be. Peter says the funding issue is specific ask to look into other funding models around the country. Heyden said also tie to Vision Zero, if speeds are reduced, not every street needs a sidewalk. So solutions other than building a sidewalk. Carmen also said agrees with John's point regarding to funding, can be transformative. In Spain, Sevilla 87 miles around the city, pedestrians and bike paths in very short period of time.

John said he'd like to see Sidewalk Plan to coordinate with TXDOT on state roads for accommodation.

Girard said another emerging program are parking districts like Mueller. That is the model for a city ordinance for parking management districts. Funds from meters become available for improvements in that district, including residential parking permit enforcement.

7. OTHER BUSINESS (7:30 to 7:50)

A. Bylaws

Staff discussed proposed changes to the bylaws

Nic asked if page five should read 'two consecutive terms'.

Girard said he is fundamentally opposed to term limits. He said it is an insult to electorate. If someone is doing good job, he wants them to stay in office.

Hattie said it's a relatively small electorate, so it's not a bad idea. She also mentioned the language clearly mentions the term limits are only a recommendation.

Girard said it might be good to reconsider how elections are done rather than allowing only full and alternate members to vote. Nic asked if that means whoever shows up to the meeting on election day gets to determine who the elected members are?

Girard said a nominating committee is another way of dealing with term limits.

Heyden agreed that 'consecutive terms' is good additional language.

Nancy had issue with word 'walking'. She recommended replacing 'walking' with 'pedestrian mobility' throughout the document. There was unanimous consent for that idea.

Girard had question about the 75% attendance requirement. He said it affords the opportunity to attend and then not show up for a series of meetings. He said the attendance requirement is also a high bar. And, it has been issue for other groups when individuals who hadn't been attending for a period of time show up to vote on issues they knew nothing about.

Virginia had issue with the date of a subcommittee meeting. She said the regular meeting is scheduled and occurs the same date and time but subcommittees are irregular. She suggested maybe lowering the attendance requirement for subcommittees.

Staff said the excused absences are given for individuals unable to attend meetings scheduled with short notice. The scheduling of regularly occurring subcommittees is also an issue that has been put on hold until the group has had a chance to discuss a bylaw requiring full and alternate members to participate in the subcommittees because then the members' availabilities would be used to inform meeting days and times.

Peter said generally the Project Subcommittee meets the second week of the month, and the Technical Subcommittee meets the third.

Nic offered the flexibility of scheduling Subcommittee meetings is good to ensure attendance because individuals may be available some days one month but not the same day another.

Nancy asked how long the subcommittee meetings are. Peter said about one hour.

Valerie asked about alternative participation such as participating at Council. Virginia said she agrees, and was able to present at external community meetings for the Vision Zero project.

Nancy wondered about back to back meetings. Hattie says it's a more difficult schedule because then everyone has to be present.

Peter said he prefers separate days because he does work to prepare for each.

Nic said the different days afford more opportunities for people to participate that have conflicts on a given day.

Lawrence asked what if the attendance requirement was a percentage of total meetings.

Mike suggested retaining the requirement for full meetings.

Staff said the record keeping needs to be simple, that the goal is to have a quick reference so we can see members are participating.

Nic asked if there should be a requirement for members to be part of a subcommittee. So far subcommittees have had great attendance. The role of subcommittee chair is to find and inspire people to show up. This is more important than strict attendance requirement. Nic said maybe not good to have strict percentage attendance requirement for full members on subcommittee.

Consensus on this point.

Girard said that the Chair could ask certain members to be liaisons or to present at Council. Leave it to Chairs to control attendance and participation for subcommittees.

Virginia suggested including language in the bylaws regarding two full term consecutive terms.

8. FUTURE BUSINESS (7:50 to 7:55)

Girard to take up topic of shared streets. Staff clarified interest in making that as part of Sidewalk Master Plan update.

Peter said we should still include as presentation.

9. ANNOUNCEMENTS / UPDATES (7:55 to 8:00)

- **Bicycle Master Plan**

City Council will consider an ordinance to amend the Bicycle Master Plan on Thursday, November 6. More information, including the draft Plan, can be found [here](#).

- [Urban Transportation Commission](#) meets on November 11. Location to be determined.
- **Vision Zero Workshop**
At the first-ever Vision Zero for Cities Symposium (VZCS) in New York City (November 13-15, 2014) leading advocates and elected officials will join professionals in engineering, education and law enforcement, as well as families impacted by traffic violence to discuss how to achieve Vision Zero in cities around the world. Details and registration [here](#).
- [Bicycle Advisory Council](#) meets November 18, 6pm. Location to be determined.
- Technical subcommittee meeting for Nov. 18 or 20
- **[Strong Towns Workshop](#)**: *Transportation in the Next American City* November 20th, 8:30 am to noon at St. David's Episcopal Church. Strong Towns President, Charles Marohn, will give a 3 hour workshop covering a range of topics in transportation including the impact of transportation infrastructure on land use, strategies for making high ROI incremental investments, how to retrofit roads, creating more walkable communities, and a better approach to transit projects.
Brief overview video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uFXrJhE8-ZE>
Facebook Event and more information: <https://www.facebook.com/events/600397576752702/>
Early Bird Tickets are just \$20, until November 6th: www.strongtowns.us/austin-transportation

Steve said there is a webinar on designing streets for older user. He'll send out the link to the list serve.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn at 8:00

Pedestrian Advisory Council - 2014 Regular Meeting Attendance

	Name	Oct 6	Nov 3	Dec 1	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept
F	Joe Almazan	○	•										
F	Peter Baird	•	•										
F	Nancy Crowther	•	•										
F	Valerie Fruge	•	•										
F	Girard Kinney	•	•										
F	Ramah Leith	•	•										
F	Nic Moe	•	•										
F	Emily Risinger (Vice-Chair)	•	•										
F	Heyden Walker (Chair)	•	•										
A	Janet Beinke	•	•										
A	Ken Craig	•	•										
A	Dan Keshet	✓	✓										
A	Jessica Lemann	✓	✓										
A	Nathan Lynch	✓	✓										
A	Joel Meyer	✓	✓										
A	Carmen de la Morena-Chu	•	•										
A	Marva Overton	✓	•										
A	Kathy Rock	•	•										
A	Mike Sledge	○	•										
A	Luke Urie	✓	•										
A	Virginia Wilkinson	•	•										
F = Full Member, A = Alternate Member • Present ○ Excused Absence ✓ Unexcused Absence													

Pedestrian Advisory Council – 2014 Technical Subcommittee Attendance

	Name	Oct 15	Nov 20	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept
F	Peter Baird (Chair	•	•										
F	Girard Kinney	•	•										
F	Nic Moe	•	•										
F	Emily Risinger (Vice-Chair)	•	•										
A	Carmen de la Morena-Chu	•	✓										
A	Kathy Rock	•	•										
A	Luke Urie	✓	✓										
		•											
C	Gwen Jewiss	•	✓										
C	Alix Scarborough	•	✓										
F = Full Member, A = Alternate Member, C = Community Member • Present ○ Excused Absence ✓ Unexcused Absence													

Pedestrian Advisory Council – 2014 Project Subcommittee Attendance

	Name	Oct 6	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept
F	Ramah Leith	•	NA										
F	Nic Moe (Chair)	•	NA										
			NA										
A	Janet Beinke	•	NA										
A	Virginia Wilkinson	•	NA										
		•											
C	Hatty Bogucki	•	NA										
C	Capital Metro (Lawrence Deeter or Caitlin D’Alton)	•	NA										
C	Christian Malanka	•	NA										
F = Full Member, A = Alternate Member • Present ○ Excused Absence ✓ Unexcused Absence													