WHY THIS CASE STUDY?
Vision Zero – the goal of eliminating traffic deaths and severe injuries – is gaining momentum across the U.S. At its core, Vision Zero recognizes that all people have the right to move about their communities safely.

Two key questions are how do we ensure that the processes, strategies and outcomes of Vision Zero serve all, particularly vulnerable and traditionally underserved populations? And, how do we analyze for and then mitigate or ameliorate unintended consequences of Vision Zero that may exacerbate other challenges within those communities?

In light of these critical questions, this case study highlights context-sensitive equity strategies to achieve traffic safety.

Centering equity within Vision Zero efforts is vitally important and timely. Cities across the country are struggling with racial disparities as well as income inequity, including within the transportation realm.

Namely, low-income communities and communities of color carry a disproportionate burden of traffic-related injuries and fatalities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE KILLED WHILE WALKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW INCOME 2X AS LIKELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH INCOME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governing, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILDREN KILLED WHILE WALKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN AMERICAN 2X AS LIKELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATINO 40% MORE LIKELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dangerous by Design, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREETS WITH SIDEWALKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH INCOME COMMUNITIES 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW INCOME COMMUNITIES 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bridging the Gap, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANCE OF BEING STOPPED AND SEARCHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN AMERICAN DRIVERS 5X AS LIKELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE DRIVERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vision Zero’s data-driven, safe systems approach helps us recognize that the concentration of traffic safety problems are not accidental but rather the result of patterns of disinvestment and under-investment in certain communities, particularly historically black, brown and immigrant communities.

Now, not surprisingly, many of those neighborhoods are coming to the forefront, identified as Vision Zero priority areas because data and experience show they bear a disproportionate number of severe traffic crashes. Accordingly, they deserve more than “equal” attention and resources. This means moving past the default approach of using geographic equality in allocating transportation resources (i.e., each city council district gets “equal” treatment). The default approach is problematic because it does not address the reality that not all areas — and the people moving within them — are starting at the same place. Historically, many low-income communities and communities of color have been left out of transportation planning conversations, and their neighborhoods have seen chronic under-investment in creating safe environments, including such basic amenities as sidewalks, bikeways and sufficient crossing times for people walking.

We consider the centering of equity to hold great promise for Vision Zero to help create positive, sustainable change in our transportation systems and communities. Meanwhile, not centering equity within Vision Zero strategies could pose significant risks and unintended consequences, as detailed in this case study.

As Vision Zero brings greater attention and resources to problems areas, valuable and often difficult conversations surface about the intersectionality of transportation safety and other issues, many of which are tied to social justice concerns. This case study intends to encourage and support Vision Zero leaders to take on these critical conversations, to meaningfully engage the communities most affected, and to center equity within their Vision Zero work.

**RESOURCES**

- Reports on people most at risk from walking and the complexities of equitable transportation: [saferoutespartnership.org/resources/report/intersection-active-transportation-equity](saferoutespartnership.org/resources/report/intersection-active-transportation-equity)
- [smartgrowthamerica.org/dangerous-by-design](smartgrowthamerica.org/dangerous-by-design)
- [bridgingthegapresearch.org/_asset/02fpi3/btg_street_walkability_FINAL_03-09-12.pdf](bridgingthegapresearch.org/_asset/02fpi3/btg_street_walkability_FINAL_03-09-12.pdf)
- [www.governing.com/topics/urban/gov-black-pedestrians-research-smart-growth.html](www.governing.com/topics/urban/gov-black-pedestrians-research-smart-growth.html)
COMMIT TO THE WORK

An important first step is building a Vision Zero leadership team that is diverse and represents the broad swath of interests and communities involved in this complex issue. Another key step is agreement by the leadership team to recognize and prioritize equity issues within their work. A strong and explicit commitment, from the start, facilitates engagement amongst key city and community stakeholders. An example of centering equity within Vision Zero efforts comes from colleagues in Portland, Oregon.

Margi Bradway, Active Transportation and Safety Division Manager at the Portland Bureau of Transportation, has been working on safe streets for 12 years. She describes how Vision Zero brought together a diverse group of agency and community partners who engaged in honest conversations and shared serious concerns about the role of enforcement in Vision Zero stemming from awareness of real and perceived racial profiling.

Addressing those concerns, the leaders of the Portland Vision Zero Action Plan begin it with a statement that the plan will be equitable and “it will not result in racial profiling.”

Arriving at this guiding principle occurred because of the diversity of the participants in Portland’s Vision Zero Action Plan development process: 10 of 26 task force members represent organizations whose mission is focused wholly or partially on advancing equity. Many voices brought equity to the forefront at each of the early rounds of task force meetings. And having Police, Fire, the Courts and other agencies at the table to engage in those sometimes-challenging conversations was very powerful and led to joint agreement and understanding about how equity fit into Vision Zero efforts.

Portland explicitly aimed to develop a set of actions that would not lead to disproportionately negative outcomes for communities of color and low-income communities. For example, community partners representing equity interests were clear they would not support actions that:

- Increased penalties and fines for traffic violations
- Used checkpoints and saturation patrols to enforce DUIs

These actions are a notable part of Vision Zero enforcement, given that the data points to speed and impairment as top contributing factors to traffic deaths in Portland. As the concerns surfaced, PBOT reached out to specific community members with whom staff had spent the previous year developing relationships to better understand and address their concerns. For example, despite the downtown focus of the proposed DUI saturation patrols, the CEO of Black Parents Initiative...
made clear that regardless of where the saturation patrol is stationed the chance for racial profiling still exists given that people are moving throughout the city, not only in the neighborhood where they live. Because of these conversations and the voices at the table, Portland developed a more inclusive, equitable and impactful set of Vision Zero actions. Some plan additions include:

- Elevating street redesign to a high priority
- Securing funding to increase number of police officers trained as Drug Recognition Experts
- Revising the current Oregon distracted driving law to remove loopholes and clarify existing law
- Increase access and expanding referrals to driver diversion classes and the DUI Intensive Supervision Program

As Portland city staff listened to community members, they realized that they needed to address the issues of racial profiling and income disparity up front in their Vision Zero efforts. With leadership from diverse communities, the Portland Vision Zero Task Force engaged early and often in discussions around equity. This up-front investment of time and engagement was critical to the equity commitment within their efforts. These guiding principles highlight Portland’s approach to Vision Zero and can serve as examples to other communities working to center equity in their efforts.

**FACILITATE CONVERSATIONS, INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL**

Vision Zero calls for deep and meaningful collaboration and coordination across multiple city departments and amongst community stakeholders to reach a shared goal. From Los Angeles to Washington DC, Vision Zero teams are finding that when equity considerations are raised early and often within the city’s leadership committee and their respective staff teams, they can be more effectively integrated into regular, ongoing conversations and meaningful strategies.

These cities have found that “being on the same page” internally and communicating that message consistently can be challenging. Many cities have built a regular check-in process to build stronger connections between different city departments and efforts. “The internal culture shift was something we didn’t take seriously enough at first,” recalls Megan McClaire, who helped launch Boston’s Vision Zero program as part of the City’s Public Health Commission, reflecting on the common challenges of building rapport and buy-in across the many departments tasked with Vision Zero implementation. This Vision Zero Network Equity White Paper provides practical suggestions to help city staff align on internal communications, including how traffic impacts underserved communities and ways to build a shared language around these issues.
USING DATA TO FOCUS EFFORTS, ADVANCE EQUITY

While equity is not a new concern in transportation work, Vision Zero brings greater light to the issue, given its focus on data and stakeholder engagement. Let us first consider what cities are learning from data, and then turn to what that means for applying data to make meaningful improvements — including infrastructure investments and enforcement efforts.

It is important that cities collect and analyze their traffic safety data to identify and address high-injury areas and behaviors. In Vision Zero efforts, many cities overlay injury data with areas of economic hardship. In this step, cities use a socioeconomic lens to further define and prioritize areas for attention and limited resources.

Because quantitative data is often limited, qualitative data is also important. As described in the Meaningful Community Engagement section below, community-led observations, based on the experiences of people in the communities most affected by traffic crashes, should also be valued and incorporated into the process and guide strategies.

Following are examples of how cities are using both crash and equity data to make important decisions about how to use scarce resources.

**The Los Angeles High Injury Network (HIN)** spotlights streets with a high concentration of traffic collisions that result in severe injuries and deaths, highlighting those involving traditionally underserved and vulnerable communities. LA overlaid the HIN with data from Healthy Los Angeles using the Health and Equity Index, which combines demographic, socio-economic, health conditions, land use, transportation, food environment, crime, and pollution burden data into a single lens through which to compare health conditions citywide.

- **49%** of the HIN falls within our most vulnerable communities.

![Map of Los Angeles](image)

Community Health and Equity Index Areas in Top Quintile (2013)
As shown at right, nearly half of the High Injury Network streets are in communities burdened with the poorest health outcomes and economic conditions.

Because LA is so big, while the HIN represents only 6% of the city’s street network, at roughly 450 miles, LA needed to further prioritize, so the Vision Zero team developed a stakeholder survey to further prioritize.

LA is going beyond identifying the most dangerous corridors — they are applying the data to shift efforts from specific intersections to the 40 deadliest corridors. As LA Department of Transportation (LADOT) General Manager Seleta Reynolds described, “We’re taking 40 focus corridors and throwing everything we have at those corridors to see a reduction in injuries.”

LA’s work with community members and technical experts resulted in a more complex formula. In many models, all injuries are treated the same. The refined LA model includes Severity (number of severe or fatal injury collisions), Vulnerability (if the intersection has had fatal injury collisions that involve older adults or children), and Social Equity (if the intersection is in a community that has been traditionally under-invested in or underserved):

\[
\text{Fatality (x1.5)} + \text{Severe Injury} + \text{Child or Senior} + \text{Target Community} = \text{Intersection Score}
\]

That includes prioritizing intersections by schools. Traffic deaths are now the leading cause of death for children in LA. The LADOT Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan has identified the Top 50 schools with the most need, prioritized by number of vehicle-pedestrian/bike collisions, number of students who live within 1/4 mile from school, number of students eligible for Free-Reduced Price Meals, and lack of prior state/federal Safe Routes to School funding. All of the schools prioritized under the Strategic Plan are within a quarter mile of the HIN. Vision Zero builds from efforts like the Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan to continue focusing resources on areas of the City with the most demonstrated need.
Here’s how other cities are approaching work on data and health equity:

**IN CHICAGO,** Vision Zero practitioners reference the Chicago Department of Health “hardship index”, which uses indicators of crowded housing, poverty, education, per capita income, unemployment, and dependency. They are also working to add vacancy rates, gun-related crime and other social indicators that are often related to traffic fatalities. This data has helped to share equity-related insights and open up avenues for collaboration, including transportation department staff working more closely with their police partners and City Alderman to elevate equity considerations in citywide efforts.

**THE SAN FRANCISCO** Bay Area Metropolitan Planning Organization has defined “Communities of Concern” (CoC) to represent a diverse cross-section of populations and communities that could be considered disadvantaged or vulnerable in terms of both current conditions and potential impacts of future growth.

**AUSTIN** has clear data showing how black and Hispanic communities are disproportionately affected. Many of the corridors with high numbers of injuries and deaths are located in areas with higher poverty rates.

Using the Bay Area CoC definition, half of the San Francisco High Injury Network, the 12% of streets where over 70% of collisions occur, is located in neighborhoods defined as CoC. By prioritizing safety on these streets, Vision Zero work is addressing long-time under-investment in these neighborhoods.

Austin’s Vision Zero Plan describes the connection between development patterns, vulnerable populations, and disparities in safety, recognizing that: “these groups are increasingly priced out of Austin’s most urban neighborhoods, which often have shorter blocks, narrower street widths and trees, all of which contribute to slower and safer streets.” The City Council resolved that the Action Plan enforcement and education consider vulnerable populations that policy changes are evaluated using an equity lens.
Data shows the disparity in access to safe transportation options, under-investment in some communities, and inequities in enforcement (next section). Vision Zero cities are finding that deeper analysis brings inequities to light that may be uncomfortable but which are important to acknowledge and address. These findings offer internal teams opportunities to build a shared awareness of circumstances and a willingness to identify and improve. Findings also provide city leaders confidence in the importance of this work as they turn toward engaging the community.

While documenting disparities is a basis for focusing solutions, this alone will not advance equity. This health-equity analysis by the Prevention Institute describes three key recommendations for advancing health equity through Vision Zero:

- Develop and implement strategies to address the conditions that create traffic-safety inequities in the first place
- Engage the diverse range of partners within and outside government and start with community members in defining solutions that will create safer traffic conditions
- Get and use data that gets at equity that will create safer traffic conditions

Policy Link equitable development toolkit and equity atlas

Lesson learned in talking about health equity, racism and white privilege
[www.bmsg.org/blog/7-things-advocates-should-know-when-communicating-about-health-equity](http://www.bmsg.org/blog/7-things-advocates-should-know-when-communicating-about-health-equity)

**RESOURCES**

**DATA AND HEALTH EQUITY**

Los Angeles work on holistic portrayal of safety trends and resulting actions
Successful Vision Zero initiatives include enforcement strategies, but significant concerns are being raised about how increased use of enforcement would have an outsized impact on low-income communities and communities of color, including further exacerbating fragile police community relations in some cities. In addition to an alarming number of recent, highly publicized police-involved deaths of African-Americans that started with traffic enforcement stops, ample research and experience underscores troubling trends of racial biases within traffic enforcement and related growing distrust between communities of color and police.

The reality is that many of us in traditional transportation and planning realms don’t have experience working on — or even talking about — racial and income inequality. This section shares challenging conversations that are occurring, particularly about racial profiling and disproportionate burden related to enforcement. While Vision Zero presents challenges in these critical areas, it also provides opportunities to help transform broken systems into safe systems, improve diverse community engagement in transportation safety planning, and build greater trust between police and the communities they serve.

Safe Systems, not traffic stops

In the relatively short time in which U.S. communities have been developing Vision Zero commitments and strategies, one of the most urgent and troubling questions raised is:

How can Vision Zero promote appropriate and equitable traffic enforcement strategies without causing additional problems or exacerbating existing issues of biased enforcement?

Some answers are found at the core of Vision Zero, which is based on a Safe Systems approach. Vision Zero calls for a shift in attention from the traditional, primarily educational approach aimed at influencing individual behavior to an upstream “systems approach” focused on policies and roadway designs that most affect people’s behavioral choices. As we emphasize safe systems on the front-end, especially through street design proven to encourage safe behavior, we can reduce the need to correct for individual problems on the back-end via traffic stops, ticketing and fines. Admittedly, this requires long-term investment to shift our environment and our culture.

In the meantime, we must acknowledge and address today’s pressing problems related to equity in traffic enforcement and, by extension, to Vision Zero.

While Vision Zero’s data-driven approach can constructively shine light on inequities in a transportation system, it may also cause problems by seeming to justify increased enforcement in certain communities, which may be experiencing the greatest tensions with police.
So, as Vision Zero strives to increase public safety from a transportation perspective, we need to acknowledge that it also risks promoting over-policing, which can lead to biases and inequitable enforcement, further disintegrating trust between police and the community they serve.

It is well documented that traffic stops for minor violations such as driving too slowly or displaying expired tags involve the most blatant racial disparities, from before arrest or ticketing through adjudication and sentencing. As described in the 2014 *Pulled Over* report “virtually all of the wide racial disparity, is concentrated in one category of stops: discretionary stops for minor violations of the law.”

It is important that promoters of Vision Zero in U.S. communities acknowledge that officer-initiated traffic stops allow for higher-than-average levels of individual discretion and can be a slippery slope for racial bias and even aggressive police action. The broader Vision Zero community has a role and responsibility in improving, not exacerbating, these problems.

“We can’t talk about increasing enforcement without talking about a slew of other intersectional issues” describes Tamika Butler, Executive Director, of the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition in the “*Why Isn’t Anyone Talking About This?*” podcast. “So, to now increase the enforcement presence in those communities, we really have to go beyond transportation advocacy and look at other social issues that are impacting these communities.” This includes transportation professionals being willing to step out of their traditional work — and perhaps also out of their comfort zones — to recognize and see as valid other residents’ realities in a broader context.

### RESOURCES

- How to talk about race, multiple toolkits including “Race Matters” and [www.centerforsocialinclusion.org/talking-race-toolkit/](www.centerforsocialinclusion.org/talking-race-toolkit/)
- Campaign Zero integrates recommendations to end broken window policing [www.joincampaignzero.org/solutions](www.joincampaignzero.org/solutions)

### Engaging people rather than alienating them

Strategies to integrate equity considerations into traffic enforcement include:

- Community policing
- Ending the “broken windows” approach
- Additional officer training
- Careful use of automated enforcement over officer initiated enforcement
- Greater transparency of law enforcement’s traffic stop data
- Diversion programs that focus on education more than punishment
- Graduated/tiered fines for traffic violations, so that low-income people are not disproportionately burdened
The community policing approach is gaining increasing credibility and momentum and deserves serious attention from Vision Zero leaders. The U.S. Department of Justice, Community Relations Service presents 10 Principles of Community Policing including that police and the community share ownership, responsibility, and accountability for the prevention of crime; and that mutual trust between the police and the community is essential for effective policing.

We are seeing an increasing number of Vision Zero communities explore this approach and related strategies. One example is automated enforcement, a tool not only to reduce speeding and red light violations, but also to significantly reduce opportunities of bias in officer-initiated traffic stops.

Nations that have seen dramatic improvements in roadway safety over the past few decades credit this progress, in large part, to their use of automated enforcement, or safety cameras. While cameras can be back-end enforcement tools, they also encourage safe behavior on the front-end. There is widespread public support for safety camera use in Europe and evidence of their positive impact on safe behavior.

While cameras can lessen the risks of bias more likely in officer-initiated stops, equity-related concerns remain. As with tickets and arrests, there is still the potential for low-income people to shoulder a disproportionate burden. This should be addressed explicitly within Vision Zero programs, and many cities are starting to do so by considering equity in camera placement, and by examining possibilities to tier fines based on ability to pay.

Many Vision Zero cities are looking for opportunities to increase equity in a way that builds engagement in solutions instead of compounding poverty and marginalization. Examples include:

**IN CALIFORNIA,** this state bill would authorize an automated speed enforcement pilot in San Francisco and San Jose. Bill authors worked closely with social and economic justice advocates to acknowledge concerns about disproportionate impact and to incorporate new strategies, including a diversion program and tiered fines for low-income offenders.

**NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA** has a pilot program
to help low-income residents that are saddled with thousands of dollars in traffic-related fines that can’t afford to pay.

THE PORTLAND POLICE BUREAU teamed with Legacy Emanuel Medical Center and the court system on a Share the Road Safety Class, facilitated by a representative from the police bureau, court system and Trauma Nurses Talk Tough. The class is an option for people who violate some traffic safety laws, like failure to yield or unsafe passing.

RESOURCES


Racial disparities in policing: examination of race relations between the police and community in Oakland CA, with stop data and recommendations sparq.stanford.edu/opd-reports

Five Ways Vision Zero Should Address Race and Income Injustice bikeportland.org/2016/02/25/five-ways-vision-zero-must-should-address-race-and-income-176070
MEANINGFUL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The most effective Vision Zero programs work toward building and sustaining relationships with community groups. They are investing time to listen and demonstrating that they value the experiences of the people who are most affected by inequitable conditions. To avoid the perception of City Hall swooping in to diagnose problems and prescribe solutions from outside, Vision Zero cities need to invite input, listen to the experiences of people in the community, and work toward building trust and better results.

Meet people where they are

A best practice for outreach, and a growing theme echoed by Vision Zero practitioners, is to meet underrepresented communities where they are, literally. Rather than scheduling separate public meetings at City Hall, community involvement can be increased by meeting in the neighborhood, adjusting meeting times, joining another forum already in place, and/or coordinating with a local, trusted partner group, all to help create a safe and convenient forum for sharing input and opinions.

Many Vision Zero cities are working within existing local forums and taking small but impactful steps to help people feel safe sharing their experiences and suggestions for traffic safety.

WASHINGTON DC held 10 “pop-up” events in the community to engage residents early in the planning stage. The events were located at active public spaces, often outside of metro stations. The District Department of Transportation (DDOT) wanted to know residents’ traffic safety concerns, to share Vision Zero goals, and to introduce this crowd sourced safety map. The biggest concerns of the 2,700 survey respondents were: 1) speeding drivers, 2) distracted drivers, and 3) all travelers disobeying the rules of the road. DDOT used the survey results to inform and share community consensus about strategies in the action plan, especially those related to preventing dangerous driving and protecting vulnerable users.

Washington DC continues to use Advisory Neighborhood Commissions and works to hear the voices of residents throughout the District. As Jonathan Rogers of DDOT observes:

“For Vision Zero to succeed, we have to engage the community. Without the public’s support, achieving our goal will be very difficult, so engaging residents is a central piece of our approach.”
PORTLAND CHANGED THEIR VISION ZERO PLANNING PROCESS, adding time and meetings for deeper conversations about disproportionate impacts of certain proposed actions on communities of color and low-income communities. Changes made through these conversations resulted in a more inclusive and impactful plan. They also wanted to do a listening session on automated enforcement and engage potential partners, including the police department. But they recognized that there was a strong sense of distrust of police in some of the communities directly affected by the issues, and that people needed to have a welcoming location and feel safe in order to share their input.

To increase involvement, they worked with the local community partner to host the meeting in the neighborhood, rather than at a city-owned building, and asked that police officers attending come in plain clothes, rather than in uniform.

WHEN LOS ANGELES LOOKED FOR OPPORTUNITIES to spread the Vision Zero message, they worked to tie into existing forums, rather than stand-alone city-hosted public meetings. When they have a project ready for conceptual design, rather than create a separate public hearing forum, they look to plug into a local effort or neighborhood event.

SEATTLE HAS A DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOODS focused on community building and community development, and a specific program called Community Liaisons focused on outreach in underrepresented communities. The Community Liaisons are paid city contractors, oftentimes leaders in these communities, who serve as a bridge for city agencies.

Last year, the Seattle Department of Transportation obtained a Washington Traffic Safety Commission grant to test outreach approaches, including the Community Liaisons bringing attention to the issue of crashes. Pictured here is the Safe Streets table at the Rainer Valley Heritage Parade. Allison Schwarz of the Seattle DOT describes that “through this work, we’ve been able to build great relationships with our city colleagues in other departments, and community leaders and groups who can help us continue the safety dialogue. We see a big part of our outreach work as bringing attention to the issue of crashes — and that we don’t think our city should see 20 deaths and 150+ serious injuries a year.”

Giving people a chance to share provides cities a more complete picture of what is happening on their streets. Cities learn about concerns of residents, and residents learn about transportation engineering. This dialogue — along with
a genuine invitation to envision safe streets — can empower people to make a difference in their community. Listening to local community leaders in local forums builds trust and ownership of changes.

SUPPORT COMMUNITY MEMBERS’ CAPACITY TO ENGAGE

One of the reasons that even well-intentioned community outreach efforts fall short is that there is an expectation that people will invest time and energy without adequate support. Recognizing and valuing the expertise in the community is critical. Direct monetary support can build capacity as well as help sustain meaningful involvement in Vision Zero efforts.

Below are examples of programs intended to increase local participation and support local groups with direct funding:

THE SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH created two community grant programs targeting neighborhoods on the Vision Zero High Injury Network, of which almost 50% is in Communities of Concern. For example, in 2016, 43% of San Francisco’s traffic fatalities involved people over 65 years old. The Safe Streets for Seniors program provides funds to local non-profits serving individuals 65+ years of age to conduct outreach and education, especially to monolingual non-English speaking populations. And the Safe Speeds Campaign distributes funds to local non-profits to conduct education and outreach to reduce speeding behaviors in their neighborhoods, a top collision factor in traffic fatalities.

WASHINGTON, DC will utilize $500,000 in revenue from traffic cameras to provide grants to nonprofits and agencies partnering to advance Vision Zero. One recent grant went to support a local nonprofit to do bicycle education and provide free safety equipment to young people biking in the lower-income wards of the city.

LOS ANGELES AWARDED $300,000 IN GRANTS to community-based organizations to engage residents and educate them on traffic safety. Funding is prioritized to neighborhoods in priority corridors and for engagement that is culturally competent and linguistically appropriate.

LA’s program provides an example for Vision Zero community engagement. The city obtained $300,000 from the State of California’s Office of Traffic Safety to fund community groups’ projects on the City’s High-Injury Network. LADOT worked with the Department of Cultural Affairs on this Request for Qualifications for community-based outreach and education to support the City’s commitment to Vision Zero. LADOT made the application simple, requiring only 30 minutes to complete, so it was easy for small community organizations to apply.

In this way, LA developed a straightforward process to invest in the community organizers and influencers who are already doing on-the-ground work. They hope the focus on high injury network corridors (instead of intersections) broadens the network of stakeholders, including groups working in arts and culture, labor, public health, education and community development. The program honors that traffic violence is an incredibly personal and visceral experience and that community partners are
better suited to communicate Vision Zero’s core principles across diverse communities. Eight teams of community organizations were awarded up to $32,000 each for their proposed corridor-based traffic safety education campaigns.

MULTICULTURAL COMMUNITIES FOR MOBILITY (MCM) and their partners LA Commons and LA County Bicycle Coalition are working along Hoover Street, a high-speed, five-lane street with one of the highest rates of death and injuries for people walking and biking in South LA. The project connects to activities in place for the 25th Anniversary of the Uprising, to acknowledge the 1992 Rodney King riots that began after officers were acquitted of the use of excessive force. MCM’s work through the Vision Zero grant includes recruiting and training a street team to build on their community organizing skills to engage residents on transportation and traffic safety. Anisha Hingorani of MCM says that “through our ‘Rise Up Hoover’ project, we are engaging residents using community planning exercises that prioritize engineering improvements and building a shared vision of community safety outside the traditional policing framework.”

MULTI-LINGUAL AND MULTI-CULTURAL OUTREACH

Whether implemented by local community groups or city staff, it is important that safety education work be accessible.

On December 7, 2016 in Portland, two people were killed while trying to walk across Division Street in two separate crashes just hours apart. The tragedies sparked outrage and sadness. One day after the deaths, PBOT’s Margi Bradway called neighborhood leaders to talk about the city’s response, building on relationships she had established over time. She worked with them to think about ways that PBOT could help traffic safety outreach to reach the diverse communities. PBOT sought and received $300,000 in emergency funding to do multilingual outreach and education in adjacent neighborhoods, with significant populations of people whose native language is not English. The most common non-English languages are Chinese, Spanish, Russian, Somali, Vietnamese, Arabic and Burmese.

This was one of the first instances in which Portland dedicated specific funding for community-originated educational work. This work in the 4.5 mile high-injury corridor resulted in four multilingual capacity building workshops, 200 Chinese speaking participants in a safety walk and talk (discussing pedestrian rights and engineering solutions), local art along the corridor and train-the-trainer programs in four languages. The desire for capacity building to engage in transportation planning was clear.

Portland shared one lesson from their partnerships with local based groups: you have to be willing to listen. They described it as a “trust fall” for staff who have to give control to partners and trust that materials are presented in relevant ways. Sometimes that means combining the safety message with other issues important to the community. Practitioners also need to constantly remind themselves of the importance of using visuals and simple, clear, and concise language.
Transformation requires us all to think and do things differently

Vision Zero does not live in a vacuum. Equity is a complex topic in policymaking and governance. In issues ranging from infrastructure to enforcement, Vision Zero brings an opportunity and responsibility to consider how the world of transportation planning intersects with other important policies, many of which have social justice implications.

Ensuring that Vision Zero efforts result in equitable outcomes will not be fast or easy. It will require consciousness and effort, active engagement and coordination between diverse stakeholders, and an openness to change. One of Vision Zero’s greatest strengths — its cross-disciplinary nature — is well-suited to solving complex problems. This is the way we will reach the goal of safe mobility for all people, which is at the very core of Vision Zero.

RESOURCES

Resources are embedded in text and at the end of each section. A current list is at visionzeronetwork.org/resources/ To add resources, please email jenn@visionzeronetwork.org.

The Transportation Equity Caucus library aggregates and highlights resources from partners equitycaucus.org/FindResources

National Complete Streets Coalition webinar series “Implementation & Equity 201” smartgrowthamerica.org/tag/complete-streets-webinar-series/

Challenges & opportunities to elevating equity in vision zero communications visionzeronetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/VZ-Equity-White-Paper-FINAL.pdf
The Vision Zero Network is a nonprofit project committed to advancing Vision Zero in the U.S. We are proud to support the life-saving efforts of the dedicated policymakers, implementers, and community leaders on the ground who are working toward safe mobility for all.

MORE AT: VISIONZERONETWORK.ORG.

The case study primary authors are Jenn Fox and Leah Shahum.
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