



# 2019 Vision Zero Task Force

## Meeting #11 Summary

Tuesday, October 22, 2019 | 9:30 a.m. – noon

PCC Southeast Campus, Community Hall

Next meeting: TBD

## Task Force members in attendance:

Chris Warner, acting chair  
Jillian Detweiler, The Street Trust  
Jae P. Douglas, Multnomah County Health  
Jamey Duhamel, Office of Commissioner Chloe Eudaly  
Duncan Hwang, APANO  
Patricia Jewett, Pedestrian Advisory Committee  
Stephanie Lourenco, Portland Police Bureau  
Marlon Marion, Portland Police Bureau Equity  
Lake McTighe, Metro  
Grant O'Connell, TriMet  
Mandy Putney, ODOT  
Don Russ, Portland Fire & Rescue  
David Sale, Oregon and SW Washington Families for Safe Streets  
Kari Schlosshauer, Safe Routes to School National Partnership  
Jess Thompson, Oregon Walks

## City staff present:

Catherine Ciarlo  
Dana Dickman  
Matt Kelly  
Providance Nagy  
Irene Marion  
Anamaria Perez  
Leeor Schweitzer  
Shaina Hobbs

## Others present:

Robert Naylor

## Welcome and Introduction

Chris Warner begins the meeting and reads the names of people who have died in Portland's streets in 2019.

Chris: many other people have had their lives changed forever by serious injury beyond the people who died. We are dedicated to the work to make sure we don't have to read these names again

Jillian: One of the people who died was labeled as riding on a motorcycle but was actually riding a vespa scooter. Should those be categorized the same? Her family may object to that designation.

Chris: Anything over 49 cc is officially categorized as a motorcycle.

Anamaria: The movements of this type of street are similar for someone on a motorcycle and a scooter like this, so we categorized it the same. Scooters can't go on freeways, so they are different, but we don't have an in between category for now.

---

## Director Warner's Vision Zero Directive

Chris: Changes in response to the high death rates this year – a new directive that adds leading pedestrian intervals to give people more time to cross the street since so many deaths are at intersections; adding protected left turns; a left turn calming pilot - other cities have also been using this to make sure people aren't making such sharp turns, we're evaluating them to see if they are making a difference; and a new fatal crash protocol with variable message signs that let people know that someone has died on the street. We want to make sure people know that a crash happened and people remember it and are mindful in response.

Jae: With the signs it wasn't clear if the crash happened at that spot or if this was just to let people know that this is happening in the city.

Dana: We are limited with what the message can say because we only have three lines.

Jillian: Maybe saying "here" would be better than having the date.

Chris: We have longer term fixes, but these are some of our quick response strategies.

---

## Two-year strategy update

Catherine: We've been developing this strategy since late last year. The original plan had a few dozen action items. It was very focused on infrastructure changes. Crashes happen on

large streets with lots of lanes where traffic moves quickly, mostly in east Portland. We have focused projects on those streets and have been getting funding through Fixing Our Streets. Those projects take a long time, they are difficult, they require a lot of engagement. They are transformational. Can mean changing crossing distances, lanes, and speeds. Lots of change for the community. What we have realized is while we are making those big changes, we want to focus on more rapid response types of actions. Focuses on types of things Chris has talked about. Both two-year plan and directive focus on quick fix solution. Focus on lighting. Things we are moving on in a strategic way. Two-year strategy articulates more clearly a commitment to safe systems approach. The best way to describe it is prioritizing safety as top value over speed or moving quickly. That means looking at the system, changing from everyone looking out for themselves, and PBOT accepting responsibility as owner and operator of the roadway to protect people when people make mistakes. It talks about investment priorities. It's important to create a culture of shared responsibility. Speed is a huge factor in deadly and non-deadly crashes. We are trying to tackle speed from a cultural standpoint as well as infrastructure. Our culture really values autonomy and driving fast as basic human right, which is a challenging thing to try to change.

Jillian: Where is protecting bicycles in this approach?

Catherine: That is a critical piece of a safe systems approach. How do we create the safety for all forms of travel? Lots of the commitments consider how things fit into the bicycle network.

Jillian: I see a focus on pedestrians but I'm a cyclist and feel very vulnerable.

Dana: Pedestrian fatalities are on the rise in Portland and nationally so that's why we are prioritizing energy on pedestrians, but usually those changes also help people on bikes.

Catherine: Half our fatalities are pedestrians and that is a higher split than most of our peer cities.

Patricia: Has anyone considered car ads when considering the culture of speeding?

Catherine: I just watched a car commercial and was thinking about this problem.

Dana: We are also looking at safe vehicles. Is a vehicle with a speedometer that goes up to 130 safe? Not a thing for the city to tackle, but something we're thinking about.

Jae: Our vehicle fatalities are going down, which is part of why our pedestrian split is so high. Ped fatalities are increasing, but the data might be misleading. Are other cities seeing similar trends? Lots of people were cranky about 20 is plenty. I thought the campaign VZ ran that really asked people what's the hurry is important and really useful.

Catherine: We are doing a follow up to that campaign. The city is changing rapidly, more traffic, more people, displacement, longer trips to get places. Our message is against a

backdrop of a lot of change. It's difficult to get through to people. Jae gave a great change management talk. We're trying to orient around that and keep consistent messaging.

David: Do we have more specific information on pedestrian fatalities and reasons behind the fatalities? Is it jaywalking? Is it High Crash Corridors with no place to cross for a mile? What are the statistics? Because the educational part is really missed all the time. If you can educate to the specifics that can make more of a difference. With bicycle safety we have to keep working on that. Separating the modes so people don't get hurt.

Anamaria: Lots of pedestrian fatalities are on the High Crash Network. There are lots of issues with visibility because we are lacking lighting. Some are where people are crossing the freeway, or people crossing to the train tracks and we are not sure where they are going. Impairment is a contributing factor; some people are doing everything right but get hit by someone going too fast.

Catherine: This is a good frame of safer systems approach. We need to make the infrastructure as safe as possible but also use education, and also ask the question of how enforcement plays into this.

David: How have we been targeting those populations that are most involved? The homeless population for example. We can't design infrastructure if we don't know what we're dealing with.

Dana: We do have some more data on page 6 of the two-year strategy. 71% of crashes happened at intersections, which is part of why we are doing the left turn calming pilot. There are infrastructure changes we can make to help reduce the risks.

Jillian: I've heard about the number of drivers under time pressure because they are doing deliveries. What would it be like if Lyft were the pace car and never going above the speed limit? Lots of these vehicles are coming into our neighborhoods. What can we do without negatively impacting the income of those drivers?

Shaina: All regulatory drivers are required to complete testing and read materials within 30 days. VZ team created a driver safety videos with lots of focus on speed.

Dana: Those materials are not the same as a commitment from the company.

Jae: Campaigns targeting specific issues, peds should be safe and walk where they work. But we also need messaging saying it's dangerous out there and be careful when stepping into the intersection. Defensive walking is important, and people don't obey common sense rules sometimes.

Jess: It's an interesting idea, comes back to issue of culture for motorist going down the street, and the supremacy of a missile, the car. The culture is that walkers are always the most vulnerable, using mobility devices, and it's easy to try to target most vulnerable and tell them they have to be more careful. Tough sell to walkers who are dependent on their

feet or wheelchair. If we look at deaths, it's not pedestrian error. We were crossing on Division and I thought I'll have plenty of time to cross 82<sup>nd</sup>, but we were booking it and we barely made it across. I think we have to be careful about blaming, and I could tell you (Jae) were trying to be careful. I guess we could find a way to target pedestrians, but I can't imagine that. I think we need to focus on changing the culture and infrastructure. I could see offering sales or other ways to make reflective clothing more affordable. Those things I'm open to. But educating pedestrians is not helpful.

Robert Naylor: You gave a long list of fatalities in the city, very shocking, but they are not categorized. What caused that crash? Everything is mixed. Cause and effect always exist, is it 50 -50? Is it 100%? It's probably different from case to case. Pedestrians are not 100% innocent. So many pedestrians looking at smart phones without stopping and without looking start to cross the street. Is that the right thing? Is it acceptable? But they need to be protected. Are they? It seems to me too black and white. Except for Mr. Sale. What kind of scientific reviews are being done? That's what I'm interested in figuring out.

Catherine: Anamaria is the Vision Zero data analyst, and is looking through police reports, trying to categorize what happened. Also, we go back to the safe systems approach that says let's create a system that protects against human error, people make mistakes driving and walking, but let's protect them. It's frustrating and we wish they didn't. Our system tries to protect them against those mistakes. We will continue delivering ways to help people be seen. Our data doesn't show a lot of people dying while jaywalking. 70% of pedestrian fatalities are at intersections.

---

## Commissioner Eudaly's Vision Zero update

Jamey: The Commissioner's Office received PBOT a year ago. We quickly identified transportation justice values to use for work moving forward: climate, equity, and safety. We knew we need an immediate project to reassign right of way to get buses out of traffic in order to have a transit system this is rapid, reliable, and full. The Rose lane project is coming early next year to Council. But there is a whole lot about transportation which we don't know. We hadn't been working with people with experiences or had relationship (unlike housing which is our specialty). We convened a summit focused on racial equity to understand what our priorities should be. We wanted to create deep and authentic relationships with people with lived experience. We have three priorities. First is engaging on rose lane project and developing an internal advisory group to guide what that looks like and identify what community benefits are. Second is an anti-displacement strategy for transportation projects. Third is equitable enforcement. We're not dealing with enforcement in an equitable way. There are a wide variety of feelings about how enforcement should be. We need more information on the best strategy for how to alleviate these deaths. As a transit dependent mother of five children I feel this very closely.

The Commissioner feels we are not doing enough around enforcement. This body decided to pull back because of equity. But not doing enforcement is not helping us solve the problems like DUII and speeding. The Commissioner is pushing for traffic cameras as a more equitable option. But that doesn't answer questions of processing, placement, and DUIIs. This Task Force is a perfect body for these questions. We want PBOT to transform this body into a community facing/interfacing body to hear from community in listening session. We are directing staff for research and data needed. We want the Task Force to advise how do we increase enforcement in the right way? How do we do it without impacting most vulnerable communities?

---

## **Evolution of Vision Zero Task Force**

Shaina: PBOT and Vision Zero will be holding focus groups and hope the Task Force will help scoping questions. We are hiring facilitators to guide the focus groups with input from Task Force members. We hope that the Task Force with focus groups can provide feedback and we can use the model for other goals like education and outreach. We expect initial findings by next Task Force meeting February or March. Want to keep meeting in East Portland. We hope to get more people in the audience and more public comment.

Chris: The Commissioner is committed to doing what we can in the short term as we build toward a safer system.

---

## **Role of enforcement in Vision Zero**

Jillian: I would like a really great literature review. Some studies show citation does not change behavior, or it changes behavior for a month. Is that worth it? Others show evidence of increased enforcement and decreased fatalities, but I want that report. Does enforcement even work? I want to understand that.

Jess: I'm curious too about understanding what the causes are. If we are trying to solve a problem with one tool, what are the unintended consequences from using that tool? Tickets and money for folks living at the margins, these are public health issues.

Chris: Enforcement is not just one thing, it is a variety of tools. Catherine will say more. There are lots of answers to try to address the urgent issues we have today.

David: No one is above education. Peds need to be taught to get off the phone when crossing the street and not be as distracted, just like every other mode. Bicycles shouldn't push their luck on the yellow light every time. The only way to change culture is to separate

modes. Infrastructure is the number one way to fix this. This changes the environment and the attitude when arriving at intersections. Drivers like myself need to be reminded all the time. The means more enforcement, the best enforcement. Cameras are great because they take personnel out and are hammering people when they go too fast. Education: no one is above it.

Kari: I agree, teaching kids what the rules of the road is can be applied in many ways for every mode. The original action plan included a lot of things on state level changes, like the level of fines, issues in courts, and questions when getting a license. Speed limits also, so much is at the state level, but so much of our work is on the local level. State level changes should be a continued focus. Cameras are great but we can only put them on 8 streets.

Patricia: What if we just started having open conversations with drivers and talk about driving behavior and talk about their problems and look for common ground? Instead of enforcing and giving a ticket we could have a conversation.

Catherine: In response to Kari, there is lots of state level action, but we're restricted with what we can do at that level. We're focused on speed limits and automated enforcement at the state. We went to get local authority this last year and were not successful. We're working on new proposal this upcoming year with more partnership with ODOT, to get ODOT the ability to delegate authority. It's important because the approaches to speed setting is not the same.

Mandy: ODOT is also reevaluating how they set speed limits.

Lake: Clarification, have you looked at whether the cities get the ability to only lower speed limits? I'm worried that other cities will get the authority and raise speed limits.

Catherine: ODOT never hears from local jurisdictions wanting to raise speeds. Vision Zero is a multidisciplinary approach. We're talking about enforcement a lot but it's a small piece of Portland's strategy, not the only thing we're doing. Just a relatively small piece of the work. Education, we are planning the next meeting for the Task Force will focus on education. Jamey mentioned asking for a deep dive on education like the one we are doing on enforcement today. There are a number of initiatives talking about individual responsibility, but we want to do more. We want to frame up a little bit of history. Some here were around the table when the original plan was drafted. We want to talk a little about how we got where we got. In 2015, City Council made a commitment to Portland as Vision Zero city, a commitment to ending fatalities. In 2016 staff developed the action plan with active participation from the Task Force. The Task Force was chartered by Council. This slide shows the makeup of the Task Force. It includes agency partners, then organizations with a focus on transportation, and organizations focused on racial justice. This composition was intentional and strongly influenced how the plan evolved. In 2015-2016 there was a terrible string of police shootings. It was impossible to ignore that as the action plan was drafted. Lots of sentiments that it is not appropriate that an important component of VZ approach

would be increased enforcement of traffic violations. Lots of people felt strongly that enforcement is important and is an effective tool but also wanted a clear commitment to not increase the possibility of racial profiling and racial violence. Where we started from the commitments is that the crash data is important, but equity is equally important, and the commitments around data was that we would look at crash data and equity data. That meant we collected data on who was most affected and influenced and who lived in areas where our crash statistics happen. There is a clear overlay of Communities of Color where most crashes happen. There is more thinking and work to do on that, which is why we're here today. We agreed to make no actions to increase penalties or fines and to not increase enforcement by officers. We wished we could use that tool but did not feel certain we could use that tool without risking increased racial issues. That doesn't mean no enforcement, just no additional enforcement. The plan does talk about how to direct and focus the enforcement. That pointed us toward automated enforcement. Enforcement was put clearly in the context of other tools at our disposal. Improvement of infrastructure is critical. If we're not improving infrastructure we shouldn't be enforcing. There is a strong focus on education, for individuals and citywide. But the question is, if big project takes a long time, what can we do in the interim? Where we went in terms of the enforcement focus is on automated enforcement to address speed, a focus on access to classes instead of tickets, and focusing enforcement on dangerous behaviors. The enforcement is focused on the violations that cause serious crashes. We did some initial works and there is a lot more work to do. Anamaria, can you talk a bit about some of the data that we're collecting to try to inform this step.

Anamaria: The crash data we received doesn't include race data. We've been working on collecting race data from police reports, looking at fatal crashes. We don't have all of the police reports. We are also looking at where the crashes are happening, movements, and reasons. We are also looking into Uber and Lyft drivers. Was a driver working when they crashed? Driving a delivery vehicle changes how people were driving. For pedestrians and bicycles, were they going to transit? All of these pieces play a role in the equity question.

Audience member: The slide has names. One of the names in Cynthia. Is it at the airport? The airport is owned and operated by the Port of Portland. Does ODOT have any say over their operations? Also talking to a police officer 6 months ago about Spanish speaking drivers and that many of them are uninsured, so there is a situation with them, and they want to give you a phone number in Spanish...

Catherine: We won't address that question here.

Audience member: Who is familiar with PEDpdx.com? There is a whole new thing happening with crosswalk markings. With my knowledge, the traffic count is used to determine if the crossing should be marked.

Catherine: I will talk to you about that offline.

Jess: Thank you for the background. I see equitable and data driven approaches as working together, so I appreciate that. I am worried about quality of data. For example, on police reports the officer reports the race of the person. That's not reliable data, it's subjective. It's a start, but hopefully we can have the people who have a lived experience determine how they're identified.

Jillian: Similarly, on data quality, I've heard that traffic report filled out by officers in the Traffic Division are better than those filled out by precinct officers. I'm interested in demographics of the party who survived the crash. Are they people who were moving through the area? Are they the stereotype of young men? I hope as we go forward, we started with a racially diverse organization, folks have dropped out for lack of capacity, or they felt they accomplished what they came here to do, but it's important that moving forward the task force is more diverse.

Dana: That's why we want to be more outward facing.

Jillian: I don't want a white panel listening to more diverse community members.

Jamey: I would like us to fill our empty slots here with people with more lived experience, I've sent applications, but haven't gotten responses yet.

Anamaria: I hear you on race data being subjective, it's a problem. We're also trying to look at federal data on the county level. Once we get through a few years of fatal tracking we are trying to look at people who have survived and people who have been injured to get a more robust data set.

Lake: I have a question about the traffic laws handout. I see speeding and following too close. Why were these chosen?

Dana: This is what was coming up based on data or community conversations.

Lake: So these are more laws people might not know about?

Catherine: We'll look over this handout as an action.

Duncan: I think it's hard to have an equitable conversation about enforcement and only talk about traffic enforcement. Our community see government and enforcement all the same. There's immigration enforcement and Fish and Wildlife are raiding Asian grocery stores. We need to look more holistically at community interactions with police and not just in the context of traffic enforcement. The community wants to talk about other enforcement as well.

Irene: that's what we'll be talking about later today.

---

## Automated enforcement: methodology and implementation discussion

Dana: The current contract doesn't allow us to add new cameras, and we're at the end of the life of the current contract. The map shows fixed speed cameras and red-light cameras. The map shows the current distribution in the city. The contract is going through the procurement process and a competitive request for proposals. It should be decided by spring. The RFP is not out yet. We are trying to get procurement to move more swiftly. Today we want to have a conversation about how we use information to select where cameras will go. In the current framework we use information about vulnerable populations so they are not all in one area. Many of our high crash locations are also where we have more people of color and low-income people. Red light cameras are focused where we see signal disregard. The fixed speed cameras are on high crash corridors with a history of high speeds. We also look at roadway characteristics. Sometimes we can't place cameras because the engineering of the roadway can make it difficult. Marine Drive and the levy is an example. For red light cameras we are looking at high crash intersections and the type of crashes happening there. For fixed speed cameras we are looking at high crash corridors. There are ten that we identified are eligible from original legislation. We think more corridors are eligible now that we have done the analysis. We are looking where speeding is a crash factor. We are focusing where we can't use speed van or other mechanisms. That's some of what we're looking at for where we place cameras. Questions? Also, what are we missing? What else should we be thinking about when selecting locations? What concerns do you have with additional cameras?

Patricia: I'd like to see them along freight routes, like Columbia boulevard which splits my neighborhood.

Jillian: We want people not to speed, not citations. There must be swift and certain consequences. Traffic enforcement on episodic level isn't as good as cameras. I've heard there's a sign that says a camera is coming and tells them what their speed is.

Chris: Data has shown that speeds are reduced where we have cameras.

Dana: There is a lot ahead of cameras to let people know they are coming. There are other things we will do. Providence goes door to door to let people know the camera is coming. We use newspapers and social to let people know a camera is coming to the area. We want people to know the cameras are there.

Duncan: I think it's good that people know the cameras are there. I've heard and see folks cut across to the next street to speed. I think we need a better network so people don't use other streets.

Mandy: What about languages? Are there any signs in other languages?

Dana: The sign is an image. Roadway signs are in English only. The pre outreach is in other languages.

Lake: What about community concerns? People are calling in and complaining about speeding. WE can use input from the community.

Dana: We are always taking community input. We hear from people who have a lot of access. If we were considering community calls the cameras would go in Ladd's Addition. We are not hearing from people on High Crash Corridors in that way.

Lake: What about outreach to do interventions? Community support is important where it's needed.

Dana: Providence led a survey to understand sentiment about cameras. 70% support speed cameras. A lot of people would want more in their neighborhood. Duncan would you like to see one on each HCC in East Portland, recognizing the possible adverse impacts?

Duncan: Right now, they just cover one section.

Jae: I have a technical question. The system has a speed indicator first. Are the speed indicator units costly? Could we use them more broadly to give people information? I know how fast I'm going only when I'm really paying attention. Would it be possible to deploy more speed reader boards? They can also collect data.

Dana: Some data shows speed reader boards alone lose their effectiveness after a while.

Providence: The boards are about \$7,000.

Jae: And the cameras?

Providence: About \$80,000.

Grant: I think it's really valuable that if it's your fist citation you can waive your ticket by taking a class.

---

## **Community conversations around enforcement**

Irene: My role in Vision Zero work is to help teams to dig into concerns and grapple with complications to understand the problems and address them. With enforcement, there is a lot to unpack. We will be moving forward with community focus groups. Police will also be building out work and equity work at the Bureau level. One thing to introduce is the new three-year strategic plan. The plan has three goals: safety, moving people and good, and asset management. It also has a transportation justice focus: will it advance addressing equity and structural racism? And will it reduce carbon emissions? We're looking at stops data, specifically for traffic stops. We're also looking at census data. There are some

disparities. We're looking at the High Crash Network, and we always look at the network with communities of color and low-income people and multilingual people overlaid. We're getting out into the community to understand people's interests. There is conflicting information. We can look at these quotes from Walking While Black focus groups. The focus groups were in Black communities. They show that people want more enforcement for their safety but also are concerned about racial profiling. It's also important to understand the history of Portland and the unhealthy relationship that has developed with enforcement. There are a few questions we are trying to look at. PPB is also working to identify equity goals. At PBOT we are looking at making breakthroughs in communities of color to bring them with us as we make decisions and changes. We want to better understand communities' lived experience with enforcement. We want to have awareness of strategies tools and how people will receive them. We want to understand, what would a people centered enforcement approach look like? If we are trying to shift the culture, get behavior change, and get to a place where we don't need enforcement, what would that take? How do we shift the culture?

Patricia: To shift culture we need to promote walking and biking in a more friendly way. We need to understand what's creating the distance between people biking and walking and people driving. We need to explain that this is a mode of transportation that benefits everyone.

Irene: Coalition building among modes of transportation. Explaining that the modes are not just recreation.

Grant: This is new and far from my knowledge set. I'm in public affairs at TriMet. We are increasing fare enforcement but pairing it with customer advocates. I'm curious to understand that more to drive a more person-centered approach. I'm curious to see what they've learned.

Jess: A question I have, I'm curious, how do people perceive safety? What does safety mean? We experience it through our transportation lens, but how do other people experience it? How does it overlay with transportation?

Irene: That's a journey we're on, we've been defining it in a way that is limited to our expertise but doesn't extend to lived experience. Some other bureaus are grappling with that, with how the City approaches and solves things.

Marlon: I'm new at PPB, we have a hard time getting people of color to show up to community events to give input. I'm working on the racial equity report, a first for PPB. It might take two years because I might be switching roles. We're working to have community involved in every stage of the report. We're making sure people most likely to be impacted are in the room to make the decisions. I don't want them to speak for the whole community. But they can give us an idea of how the people who are most impacted feel. American Indian and Black drivers were much more likely to be searched. The Asian and

Pacific Islander population was stopped much more often. The numbers are from stops data. We're targeting those populations to discuss how to address that enforcement. It's in the development of the racial equity report.

Jamey: Other bureaus, including Civil Life, are asking what does safety mean to you? We should work together to not over ask the question. As they are doing neighborhood enforcement stuff they are asking. My specialty is in housing and tenant protection. People with lived experience are experts to solve their problems. That looks a little different in transportation because it's very technical and very counter intuitive. Widening freeways is a perfect example. So, I want PBOT to look to expertise of lived experience first, but people centered approach needs to identify the problem, but maybe not the solution, because people's suggested solution may not get to what they want. We should ask what the real problem is, the root cause of the problem they are trying to solve, and then provide a solution to that.

Lake: These are really good questions. I have some thoughts. Enforcement is embedded in a much larger context; however, we can highlight connections. There's a huge jail population, inequitable fines, and income-based fines. What happens if someone loses their driver's license because of a DUI? What options are there for people? People centered enforcement looks at all of that, including huge issues beyond PBOT's control, but we need to constantly be acknowledging them and seeing where addressing those issues can be brought into our work. It's hard to have equitable enforcement while those things exist. People experience fear with someone in an official capacity. We need to identify what types of enforcement in what situations are effective and target them. We need to do anything to take out bias. Cameras are good for that. I'm freaked out reading the news every day.

Irene: One piece in our transportation justice work is aiming to have more clarity around disparate impacts from our work, or disparities in our region, and looking for transportation solutions to address those. How do we partner to address them? This ties in with affordable housing. Someone was interested in tackling income based fine.

Mandy: How would the answer be different if question two was based on safety not enforcement? Similar to what Lake was saying, with lots of government systems, it's hard to understand how enforcement can be employed to create equitable solution unless we change other systems. If you do enforcement, what systems would have to change or how? Everything assumes there will be enforcement. Maybe our questions should put that into question. If we knew it had clear benefits that would help.

Irene: We have to address six things to do equity work.

Jae: Enforcement is a consequence to something, something more upstream is culture change. We need to call on people's better natures to stop them from being disconnected from the things they actually value. We need to focus on well-being and community well-being. There's a shift when people enter their missiles. What those things are is different

from community to community. What will help keep that connection when people get in their car? To find that maybe we need conversations within the community. We need to ask how did you get disconnected? We need campaigns that hold up images of community for pro social values. We need to keep people from getting disconnected. These things take a long time. We need to take the time to engage people in this experience.

Duncan: It's incumbent on us to think how we can help rebuild trust in civic institutions, especially for immigrant communities. Look at the life cycle for what happens after a traumatic experience. A police officer stop can be traumatic, losing family member more so. The level of support from the City is low or lumpy. One of our elders was killed on Division. Dana and I talked about how to deal with it. Bringing out a Cantonese speaking police officer to talk with that family was valuable. But that doesn't happen consistently. That's how you reestablish trust. If PBOT could step in to support families, that's how you build trust over the long-term. Police officers that speak your language help with that. That trust building is at the center of a community policing model. Those interactions resonate across the community. When we do that, people talk, and that builds trust even more.

Jillian: I want to raise the issue of how we use this as an opportunity to educate white people who are not in these conversations, don't understand disparate impacts, and are the loudest voices calling for enforcement. I have board members who don't get it. That could be part of the work.

Patricia: I'm thinking about the ADA community. Are we including elder voices, and younger voices? Teenagers? Children walking to school?

Lake: Last comment. A lot of what I was hearing today is that everyone in the public is grappling with why things are happening and wanting to understand the cause to effectively intervene. On equitable enforcement I think the question is, why is this happening? Why are there disproportionate searches? I'm trying to understand that. How is everything connected in terms of cause? For the work that PBOT is doing around the time of the crash, what changes can be made? What's happening on the street? But more broadly there are other issues: stagnation of transit ridership, rise in TNCs, price of gas, bigger and heavier cars that are more deadly even when they're slow. These are huge issue connected to the increase in fatalities. We need to draw those connections to see how interventions can address those things too. Otherwise, it just feels discouraging for people working on this every day.

Irene: It's hard to dig in to how these layers are interconnected and how to address them. There are demographic shifts into new neighborhoods. People are driving more after the MAX stabbing. So many things are happening at the same time. We are acknowledging how complicated it is and how many things we have to address, but it's daunting.

Jae: Thanks for including climate change. Our work includes mitigation and adaptation. One thing I'm aware of is climate threat for the Pacific Northwest is in-migration. We also have

some air quality effects and heat effects. We will be adding 50,000 to 100,000 people. We are experiencing in-migration as a climate impact. We are trying to see how to measure that. We're looking at density. Everything is going to back up in Oregon and Washington. Climate change includes population 2 to 3 times the size fifty years from now.

Catherine: This is such an important point from a change management stand point. It also ties in with Vision Zero statistics. Higher VMT is correlated with a higher fatality rate.

Irene: As we're growing, forecasts say we'll be more diverse. If we don't get ahead of current dynamics it will be a bigger problem later.

Jess: I'm still struggling with the questions. In my mind people centered and enforcement is a dichotomy. I'm thinking about SROs and the way students have been responding to those. Is it possible to do people centered enforcement in the way we have designed enforcement? What is the reason for the disparate outcomes looking at interactions with the police? It's 100% racism?

Lake: Right but what does that mean?

Jess: How do we have conversations? How do we have conversations about trust when the system is designed as it is? I'm curious to hear what people who have left this Task Force think.

---

## Public Comment

No public comment was given.

---

## Next steps

Shaina: Next steps. The Task Force members will help with scoping the focus groups, and we'll be sending requests to Task Force members for input on budget requests.

Irene: I can follow up on any of these issues and how we are moving through the work and talking to partners to help us navigate these questions.

Chris: This has been a really productive conversation. We keep peeling away at this onion, it's not going away, but we are making progress. Thanks, Jamey, for bringing the Commissioners words.

Catherine: We'll see you early next year to talk about education.

---

**Adjourn**