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AB 2363 Report Topics

1) The existing process for establishing speed limits, including a detailed discussion on where speed limits are allowed to deviate from the 85th percentile.

2) Existing policies on how to reduce speeds on local streets and roads.

3) A recommendation as to whether an alternative to the use of the 85th percentile as a method for determining speed limits should be considered, and if so, what alternatives should be looked at.

4) Engineering recommendations on how to increase vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle safety.

5) Additional steps that can be taken to eliminate vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle fatalities on the road.

6) Existing reports and analyses on calculating the 85th percentile at the local, state, national, and international levels.

7) Usage of the 85th percentile in urban and rural settings.

8) How local bicycle and pedestrian plans affect the 85th percentile.
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## Advisory Group Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe your expertise as it relates to multimodal traffic safety and speed management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What unique perspective(s) do you bring to the Advisory Group?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What should be the State's top three priorities to reduce traffic fatalities to zero?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any documentation or material you would advise the Task Force to review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Shruti Hari, Metropolitan Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sean Co, Streetlight Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ribeka Toda, Fehr &amp; Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jodie Medeiros, Walk San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rachel Zack, Remix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gus Pivetti, City of Santa Clarita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Henry Coles, Retired Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jean Armbruster, LAC Dept. of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Megan Wier, SF Dept. of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Megan Gee, Arup (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Matthew Dubiel, LAC Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Luke Klipp, City of Long Beach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results

What should be the State’s top three priorities to reduce traffic fatalities to zero?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th># Of Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revision to speed-limit-setting process/local authority for context-sensitive speed control</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometric Design</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data (Quality/Timeliness/Collection/Sharing)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy on Impaired/Distracted Driving</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Safety Programs/Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected/Autonomous Vehicle (CAV) Technologies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Purpose of the Research Synthesis

Documenting:
• Existing practices
• Best practices
• Viable alternatives to setting speed limits in California
• Other traffic safety considerations
## Synthesis Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>UC Davis</th>
<th>UC Berkeley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Brian Taylor</td>
<td>• Dillon Fitch</td>
<td>• Offer Grembek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Yu Hong Hwang</td>
<td>• Graduate Student</td>
<td>• Katherine Chen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This effort is coordinated by UC ITS Assistant Director, Laura Podolsky and supported by SB1 funds.*
1. Current process for establishing speed limits in California

a. Existing practices
b. Historical perspective. Where did the 85th percentile come from and how it evolved over time
c. Speed surveys and calculation of the 85th percentile. How is it used and applied?
d. Where are speed limits allowed to deviate from the 85th percentile. 
   i. Highways
   ii. Local roads
e. Limitations of the 85th percentile for highways and local streets.
   i. Highways
   ii. Local roads
2. Potential alternatives to setting speed limits

a. Impact of speed on safety.

b. Synthesis of different approaches to setting speed limits (optimization approach, engineering approach, etc.)

c. What is being done to set speed limits in other countries. List of attributes and considerations.

d. Promising alternatives to consider for CA.
   i. Highways
   ii. Local roads
3. Engineering recommendations on how to increase vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle safety

a. Road design and operations based primarily on FHWA’s CMF clearinghouse.

b. Vehicle-based road-user protection for vehicle occupants and vulnerable street users.

c. Emerging technological opportunities to provide road-user warning and emergency braking.
4. Existing policies on how to reduce speeds on local streets and roads

a. Evidence of the connection between absolute value of car speeds and safety
b. Policies in other countries that reduce speeds on local streets / roads
c. Safe System approach considerations
   i. Road design and operations
   ii. Vehicle design
   iii. Road-user behavior (enforcement, education)
Next Steps

✓ **Market Research Webinar**
   September 4, 2019 at 1-2 pm  
   Postponed. Details to be provided soon.

✓ **Advisory Group Webinar**
   September 12, 2019 at 1-2:30 pm

✓ **Upcoming Task Force Meetings**
   - October 22, 2019 at 10 am to 4 pm (Sacramento)
   - December 10, 2019 (via webinar)