

**CITY OF PHOENIX VISION ZERO COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
August 21, 2024**

Street Transportation Department
In-person and WebEx
<https://www.phoenix.gov/streets/roadsafety>

Committee Members Present

Ed Hermes, Chair
Jamie Trufin, Vice Chair
Steve Burns*
Tom Callow
Amanda McGowan*
Catherine Mulkerin
Dan Penton*
Joe Yuhas*
Julian Zepeda

Student Committee Members Present

Abigail Tomich
Lavender Walsh
Kullen Wirkkala

City Staff Present

Inger Erickson*
Joe Brown
Briana Velez
Jorge Riveros
Carl Langford
Reed Henry
Laura Farrell
Heather Murphy
Gregg Bach*
RoseMarie Horvath*

Others Present

Alyssa Ryan, University of Arizona

*Attended virtually

1. Call to Order

Chair Hermes called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. with a quorum present.

Chair Hermes welcomed new student members Lavender Walsh and Kullen Wirkkala.

2. Approval of the Minutes from the June 20, 2024, Meeting

Committee Member Zepeda motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Vice Chair Trufin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Director's Updates

Director Brown welcomed the new student members.

Director Brown stated that automated enforcement will be discussed at the October meeting.

Director Brown stated that the micromobility age requirement recommendation will be presented to City Council in the fall.

Chair Hermes asked if the leading pedestrian interval study will be ready for the October meeting. Langford stated that it should be. Chair Hermes also asked if the sidewalk work for the 27th Avenue corridor project will be moved up. Director Brown

replied that staff is looking into separating some portions of the project out to include safety improvements, including doing the sidewalk work earlier.

4. Approval of the Revised 2024 Meeting Schedule

Vice Chair Trufin motioned to approve the 2024 meeting schedule. Committee Member Zepeda seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Approval of the 2025 Meeting Schedule

Vice Chair Trufin motioned to approve the 2024 meeting schedule. Committee Member Zepeda seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Red-Light-Running Study

Alyssa Ryan presented information on the red-light-running study conducted by the University of Arizona.

Student Member Tomich asked if the committee is supposed to discuss bringing red-light-running cameras back. Langford replied that staff reached out to the University of Arizona to study what effect red-light cameras had in Phoenix when they were installed in the past.

Committee Member Yuhas mentioned that he thought there were vendor conduct issues with the red-light cameras in Phoenix. Ryan stated that she did not know of any in Phoenix. Committee Member Yuhas commented that he hopes if Phoenix moves forward with red-light cameras again that the procurement process is iron clad to avoid any issues.

Committee Member Yuhas asked if the pedestrian and vehicular data was separated. Ryan replied that it was not. Yuhas stated that the safety factor needs to be looked at, not just in terms of vehicles but also pedestrians.

Committee Member Penton asked if there are any alternative technologies that could further enhance the safety benefits of red-light cameras, like crash detection. He also commented that he is supportive of bringing back red-light cameras and thinks higher fines will be a deterrent. Ryan is not aware of any technology that could detect a crash.

Committee Member Zepeda asked about the data regarding right-angle and rear-end crashes. Ryan replied that they do have that data, but she does not know it off the top of her head. She stated that, generally, there are typically more rear-end crashes when there are red-light cameras at some locations.

Committee Member Mulkerin stated that there is a software company that is developing real-life crash analysis and does detect about 100 feet from the intersection. They are working on the ability to connect to 911 operators to avoid response time delays.

Committee Member Yuhas asked what the findings were about Phoenix versus other cities. Ryan replied that driver behavior is different in every city. One thing that is happening across the nation is drivers' acceptance of risk after the pandemic.

Committee Member Yuhas asked what decisions in other cities were based on statistics and science versus more political concerns. Ryan stated that she cannot speak to why other cities removed the cameras, but they did not find any data that indicated the cameras made safety worse.

Committee Member Penton asked how any potential biases in the empirical analysis were addressed. Ryan stated that they compared red-light-running cameras to similar locations without cameras, and their results were statistically significant with what they reported.

Student Member Tomich asked what other projects the University of Arizona is doing for Phoenix. Ryan stated that she is not aware of any others other than a signal study. Langford replied that Phoenix has worked with several universities on different projects. Student Member Tomich asked what the specific signal study was. Ryan replied that it was a study regarding red-light timing for traffic signals related to red light running.

Student Member Tomich noted that she looked at the map of the addresses provided in the study, and it appears there were few to little red-light-running cameras in Council Districts 1 and 6. She asked what determined the locations to install the cameras. Ryan replied that the University of Arizona only studied the history of the cameras after they were removed, so she does not know how the locations were determined. Committee Member Callow replied that he was the Street Transportation Department Director when the cameras were installed, and they had funding for ten locations. He recalls that a camera was installed at a location in each council district. The additional two were installed at the most hazardous locations. Langford added that staff did look at collision data specifically.

Vice Chair Trufin asked if there have been any studies regarding combining red-light-running cameras with leading pedestrian intervals. Ryan replied that she does not know of any studies like this.

Student Member Tomich asked if the fees will be based off income. Director Brown replied that this is to be determined.

A member of the public, Nicole Rodriguez, addressed the committee. She stated that it is unclear why this item was brought to the agenda. She mentioned that infrastructure can be implemented to save lives and should be discussed. She also mentioned she noticed cameras were installed disproportionately in the west valley and the south side. She hopes the city will look at potential conflicts of interest with vendors when considering red-light cameras in the future.

7. Neighborhood Traffic Mitigation Program

Carl Langford presented information on the city's neighborhood traffic mitigation program.

Vice Chair Trufin asked if renters are included in the petition process. Langford replied that renters are allowed to sign the petitions.

Student Member Wirkkala asked if there are studies conducted for compliance regarding the signs that have time-of-day restrictions. Langford replied that staff works closely with police before installing the signs but acknowledged that compliance is an issue.

Student Member Tomich asked if staff has a list of all locations that have signs with time-of-day restrictions. Langford replied there is no existing list.

Student Member Walsh asked about the retired traffic calming programs and if they can be done again. Langford replied that those were in place with 2006 GO (general obligation) Bond funding, which has been depleted. The programs will not be reinstated unless additional funding can be identified.

Committee Member Zepeda asked how the information is being delivered to the public. Langford replied that there is a website with the information, and information is also being shared at neighborhood meetings.

Committee Member Zepeda asked how the committee can advocate for more funding for these programs. Chair Hermes stated that there is \$10 million annual budget for Vision Zero, and this committee can recommend how that funding is used. Riveros mentioned that the community can attend the city's budget meetings to advocate for funding for these programs.

Committee Member Penton stated that his neighborhood has petitioned for speed humps and no parking signs, and they are great programs when they work. He mentioned that the process can be tedious, and his community has not had as much success as some other communities. He also mentioned that traffic calming devices are not available for arterial streets, and he would like to see that changed in the future.

Chair Hermes read a statement from Committee Member McGowan regarding her experience with the processes to request traffic calming and speed limit reductions. The statement included the opinion that the processes felt like a battle, and Committee Member McGowan wondered if there was a way to be more proactive about pedestrian safety. Langford replied that the traffic calming program does require a lot of neighborhood input, and some residents are for them, and some are against them. The city tries to keep a balanced program to meet the needs of residents.

Student Member Tomich asked if the petitions are available in Spanish and on the city's website. Langford replied that they are.

Chair Hermes commented that the process does feel inequitable, and he would like to see it be more equitable in terms of the cost. He mentioned he would like to see a different model for the cost that includes financial ability and a more robust tool chest. He asked if the requirement for support of 70 percent of the affected residents

is set by City Council or the Street Transportation Department. Langford replied that the program requirements are consistent with what other cities have.

Student Member Tomich asked if every resident of an apartment complex would have to agree on the petition. Langford replied that an apartment manager would need to sign. If they are condos, the front-facing residents would need to sign.

A member of the public, Nicole Rodriguez, addressed the committee. She mentioned that the 70 percent requirement should be compared to the 50 percent requirement needed for gated alleys. She recommended the committee look at the NACTO Urban Street Design Guide, which includes traffic mitigation devices like chicanes. She also mentioned that the process is too arduous, and it needs to be made simpler. She agrees with the committee in that it needs to be made more accessible and easier.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items

Vice Chair Trufin requested more discussion about the traffic mitigation program.

Committee Member Penton requested a discussion about citizen reporting for hazardous obstructions in the bike lanes.

Chair Hermes requested information on crash analysis practices, including the contributing factor from a design perspective.

9. Public Comment

A member of the public, Haley Ritter, addressed the committee. She stated she has collected a lot of feedback from the community about traffic mitigation. She mentioned there are a lot of affordable visual projects to narrow traffic through intersections, like widening the sidewalks, and she would like to see these discussed.

A member of the public, Timothy Jiang, addressed the committee. He suggested shortening the traffic signal cycle times by about 30 seconds because he thinks it would make traffic more efficient and safer.

A member of the public, Michelle Turner, addressed the committee. She stated she spoke to the speed hump program coordinator recently, and she was told there were no options since speed humps were not an option for the locations she requested. She would like to see the program expanded to include other options.

A member of the public, Gavin Lewis, addressed the committee. He mentioned he would like to see lowering the requirement to 50 percent for traffic calming and thinks residents should have more power to decide what their neighborhoods need.

A member of the public, Sarah Monje, addressed the committee. She mentioned that preventing deaths and injuries is a public health issue and wonders if the monitoring is done by the police and how that is affecting the monitoring when some people do not feel comfortable calling the police. She also mentioned that the costs are discussed and wondered if the costs of people dying are discussed. She asked what the public health approaches are and those costs.

A member of the public, Nicole Rodriguez, addressed the committee. She commented that she is excited about the public comments and hopes the public engagement continues. She mentioned that infrastructure can have an impact on saving lives. She also commented on the traffic calming process and would like to see the program streamlined to make it easier overall.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.