

INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes a peer review of five (5) Vision Zero action plans from across the country. It was developed in support of Hoboken’s Vision Zero Action Plan to provide benchmarks and ideas from comparable cities. The purpose of this peer review was to learn from other cities what aspects of their programs are applicable to Hoboken based on similar demographic contexts, land use patterns, street types, and transit dependency.

A list of questions for review were compiled based on input from the project team and Hoboken’s Vision Zero Task Force. The topics of review are organized thematically, and the question list (with direct answers) is included in **Appendix A**. The five peer cities selected for review consisted of the following:

- Cambridge, MA
- Jersey City, NJ
- Los Angeles, CA
- New York City, NY
- Philadelphia, PA

THEMATIC RESPONSES

The four themes used for this review were the following (along with a definition of the theme):

- **Data Analysis and Countermeasure Development** – This forms the core of each plan; it describes the data used to measure traffic safety and the actions developed to mitigate unfavorable measurements.
- **Community Engagement** – The methods and activities used to interact with the public, whether through explanation of the plan or education as an action.
- **Performance Documentation** – How a jurisdiction measures its success against the Vision Zero actions and how that information is conveyed to the public.
- **Task Force Participation** – What key individuals or groups contributed to the Vision Zero plan, as well as their overall responsibilities to the public and one another.

Each is described in detail in the following sections along with examples extracted from the text of the respective peer Vision Zero plan.

Data Analysis and Countermeasure Development

Data Analysis

All Vision Zero action plans begin with a review of traffic and crash data, whether it be existing historical data or a new effort for data collection. For example, Los Angeles completed a full “Vision Zero Safety Study and Technical Analysis” prior to the plan in order to inform the existing conditions and context of Vision Zero. This data provided a basis for initial action items and set benchmarks to track progress against goals.

An important aspect of any Vision Zero plan highlights the relationship of traffic fatalities and pedestrian involvement. Pedestrians which are older, younger, or disabled are given heightened status and attention, with particular importance for young children. In turn, schools are given heightened status in analysis and countermeasure implementation. This also included action

items for engagement in most cases where schools and/or retirement communities were prioritized for education efforts.

Only certain cities highlighted which pedestrians are disproportionately impacted based on cultural bias or social standing. The only city which focused on communities of color and those not born within the United States was Jersey City, which used the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA) *Together North Jersey* definition of its Communities of Concern. Jersey City's action plan overlaid its High Injury Network and crash data on a map of socio-economically disadvantaged communities to extract meaningful trends from the data.

Most cities pursued some level of supplemental data collection beyond crash reporting, but it was almost exclusively limited to vehicles speeds, related to automated enforcement of speeds along a "high injury network." Again, Jersey City differed from the others in that they also wanted to investigate the use of near miss detection at signalized intersections to proactively reduce crashes.

Scooters or other kinds of smaller motorized vehicles were not mentioned. This is primarily attributed to the recent advent of these modes as transportation options, and the lack of reporting to date. Note that the transportation industry as a whole is now starting to recognize the importance and potential impact of this mode, particularly scooters, and its relationship to safety. However, most jurisdictions or enforcement agencies have no means of tracking scooter crashes separate from bicycle or pedestrian crashes.

Countermeasure Development

The relationship of parking to the Vision Zero plans was primarily limited to enforcement of parking within bicycles lanes, and an overall desire for cities to enact more stringent fines on parking violators. In general, the legislative actions presented as action items related to transfer of enforcement to local jurisdictions or the increase in penalty for infractions. Other cities also included the transfer of speed limit control from the state level to the local level. Philadelphia added a unique action item to determine the potential for and effectiveness of a pilot program that offers traffic safety classes for first-time moving violation offenders in lieu of fines related to traffic safety infractions.

The only cities which focus on bike lanes were Jersey City and Los Angeles; however, most cities recognized the impact bike lanes have on improving safety and as an element in the traffic safety toolbox. Los Angeles took a more unique approach to this point, emphasizing and prioritizing the most impactful measures such as protected bike lanes, leading pedestrian intervals, and high visibility crosswalks were critical to the success of the plan.

Overall, the peer Vision Zero plans did not mention emergency vehicles and response time, and only referenced city fleet vehicles in the context of better driver training, citizen awareness of large vehicle blind spots, or the installation of guards between large-base vehicle wheels to prevent pedestrians from being caught under larger vehicles (mostly those operated by the cities themselves).

Community Engagement

Most of the peer cities (with the exception of Cambridge) initiated the Vision Zero process after an executive order, with a public pledge from the mayor and Vision Zero task force members. Philadelphia's roll out even provided an opportunity for every citizen to sign the pledge and become active in the process. Each of the plans was accompanied by some level of public

Vision Zero Action Plan – Peer Review

City of Hoboken NJ

campaign, which was related to the acute needs of each city. In New York City’s case, their campaign focused on the messages of speeding and drunk driving since their data analysis determined these were key factors in fatal and serious injury crashes.

The action plans reviewed did not describe in-person outreach but mention that communities such as school populations were targeted with pedestrian education programs. For the in-person events, Jersey City found that participants reacted to charts and graphs well, and requested they be more prominent during engagement. Jersey City also held four information sessions to discuss the plan, three of which focused on equity issues, this being pertinent to their plan’s focus on Communities of Concern. Several of the plans included high-level summaries of what participants communicated during any events.

“Quick builds” (traffic calming devices or other strategies which may be rapidly deployed, for example in response to a crash) were a minor portion of the peer Vision Zero action plans in the sense that each one included immediate and near-term actionable items. Only Jersey City identified the need for a “Rapid Response Team” to conduct rapid response review for every fatal crash. Other plans focused on improved data collection and aggregation in the near term in order to establish a stronger understanding of safety issues.

Communicating the long-term trends in the data analysis was not a strong point for most of the peer action plans. Most included some sort of line chart with a comparison of year and fatality count, but implied that over the coming years there would be a sharp decline in fatality rates. This implication proved to be challenging for Philadelphia in their update report, as it cited little to no progress being made over the span of two years. However, despite this apparent challenge, the city used the statistic as an impetus for increased effort and urgency in achieving its Vision Zero goals.

Cities also developed action plan items to engage their communities directly for either rollout of the action plans or implementation of education campaigns. Techniques included typical strategies such as workshops and social media campaigns, but also included more impactful strategies such as partnerships with community and governmental organizations, or development of specific education/media campaigns. An example of this strategies is found in Jersey City’s action plan, which included a targeted campaign that will “focus on specific behaviors in locations known to have a crash record.”

Lastly, the action plans reviewed seldomly included a complete “tool kit” – a documented set of traffic calming and crash prevention techniques, each related to the types of crashes which they are designed to prevent. More often, the cited documents were stand-alone from Vision Zero, and did not include the relationship between the Vision Zero tenants and the anticipated impact of the countermeasures described. The use of this terminology varied from Philadelphia citing the Federal Traffic Calming Toolbox to Jersey City referencing its own street Design Guide which included traffic calming measures. Cambridge referenced a toolbox online; however, the page had not been updated and only listed one measure for application.

Performance Documentation

Although the over-arching goal of Vision Zero is apparent in each of the peer cities’ Vision Zero plans (zero traffic fatalities or serious injuries by a certain year), the action plans for the peer cities reflect primarily the output of this process. At a high level, outcomes are discussed as the reflection of data output. Few of the action plans cited hard figures beyond an overall

Vision Zero Action Plan – Peer Review

City of Hoboken NJ

fatality/serious injury reduction, and as a whole, the action item performance outcomes were broad or vague.

One example of the type of benchmarks described in the action plans offering a bit more detail than the whole of the documents may be cited from the City of Los Angeles. Under their plan's "Create Safe Streets for All – Safe Routes to School (SRTS)," there are three time-constrained outputs, each describing how many crosswalks or plans may be completed by said year. While these are proactive elements, they do not focus on the reason behind the actions and the anticipated goal of reducing pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries. A theoretical example of an outcome-based action may be something like "reduce traffic fatalities for children under the age of 14 by 25%, 50%, and 100% through implementation of crosswalks, safe routes to school, etc." This action plan statement may be accompanied in plan updates by a record of effectiveness, describing how impactful each of the deployed countermeasures are and what number may be required in order to meet future targets.

Since the action plans reviewed were published at the onset of each process, they are not fully inclusive of the process. This means that lessons learned from data analysis is unavailable. Both the City of Los Angeles and New York City published updates 1 and 2 years after the initial roll-out of the plans, which do provide some indication of change and progress toward the plan goals.

One key area of note is that typical vehicle performance measures are not mentioned in relationship to Vision Zero. Vehicle performance outcomes (Level of Service, travel time, congestion) are often counter to the goals of the plans; as such, they are ignored when considering actions. The only relationship described in the plans is to speed, and only in the context that reducing vehicles speeds reduces the severity of crashes.

Task Force Participation

In general, the task forces of each city provided a positive opportunity for cross-departmental coordination and the discussion of high-level goals. While most every task force member (or department) was delegated specific responsibilities based on their areas of expertise, the plans do not elaborate on accountability past a pledge and signature. In the case of Jersey City and New York City, the tasks forces are stated to be permanent; the other cities do not elaborate on the long-term commitments of their members.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON PEER REVIEW

Peer Review Summary

While each Vision Zero action plan had merits, each had gaps or omissions from a truly broad-based plan to eliminate severe injury and fatal crashes. This being the case, some of the more nuanced and specific actions are implied underneath broader actions or are included at the operational level of the task force members.

Similarities across the action plans reviewed included a breakdown of responsibilities across all members of the Vision Zero task forces. These task forces also included nearly every department of a city government, with the key members being the executive branch (including law enforcement) and departments of transportation, education, and public works. Each plan had a focus on youth populations, citing their disproportionate share of traffic fatalities. Another similarity was the provision of separated bicycle facilities, although each plan differed as to the level of focus they received.

Vision Zero Action Plan – Peer Review

City of Hoboken NJ

Of the five peer reviewed cities, Jersey City appeared to have the most comprehensive plan. This plan was specific, thorough, and included an appropriate amount of background to support the actions listed. The Jersey City plan also had the most significant connection to communities of concern, citing the diverse population as integral for understanding crash information and taking action to eliminate fatalities. These elements appeared to be the hallmark of a high-quality action plan and should be considered in the development of the Hoboken Vision Zero Action Plan.

Recommendations Based on Peer Review

Based on the above review and summary, the project team developed a set of high-level recommendations to help form Hoboken's Vision Zero Action Plan:

- Use accurate and direct language to phrase Vision Zero documentation and discussion: crashes and deaths are serious; as such, the language used to describe and address them should match.
- Create a sense of urgency within the document, action items, and during community engagement. Additionally, develop action items that are rapid-deployment to demonstrate to communities that Vision Zero is an immediate priority.
- Use data to establish and analyze priority locations, such as the identification of a “High Injury Network,” high crash locations, or communities of concern.
- Continue to use (and improve) data collection to track progress against desired outcomes and update the plan to either correct shortcomings or build on successes.
- Relate trends in data analysis to the impact on (and relationship to) specific communities in Hoboken such as youth, non-native-born citizens, minorities, and elderly residents.
- Create specific, outcome-driven and time-constrained actions. Additionally, relate actions back to the core principal of Vision Zero: to eliminate fatalities and serious injuries on the transportation network.
- Highlight and prioritize countermeasures that will have the greatest immediate impact on Hoboken's transportation network.
- Break down the plan action items by responsible parties, ensuring that each is empowered to complete the action. Develop measures for the task force to be accountable for actions and progress.
- Utilize technology where possible to improve upon data collection, enforcement, and engagement.

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONS AND NOTES

The following questions were defined by the Hoboken Vision Zero Action Plan Task Force to consistently extract information from peer agencies. Where relevant information was available pertaining to each question for a particular peer city, it is mentioned specifically. The absence of a city being mentioned following a question indicates that relevant information could not be identified in the document being reviewed.

Data Analysis and Countermeasure Development

1. How have cities identified their communities of concern, have they used a standard definition, or is it specific to the city's demographics?
 - a. Cambridge: Generally, the city identifies a standard vulnerable population including older population, recently arrived residents, individuals with disabilities, families, or youth (page 38). The city has also identified the city's "Squares" as a priority based on the notion that they represent the centers of social and economic life in the city.
 - b. Jersey City: Definitions for Communities of Concern are pulled from NJTPA's *Together North Jersey* (page 16). However, the Action Plan states that more than 80% of the City falls within this official designation.
 - a. Los Angeles: Uses a broader identification for these communities but is generally tied to groups that were disproportionately affected by crashes. However, analysis for specific locations does take into account the *Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles's* Community Health and Equity Index.
 - b. New York City: Data analysis indicates that the most vulnerable populations are middle school youth and elderly populations.
 - c. Philadelphia: "In Philadelphia, neighborhoods with higher proportions of residents living in poverty are subjected to a disproportionate number of traffic crashes. More traffic deaths and severe injuries occur in neighborhoods where most residents live below the poverty line."
2. How have cities viewed the relationship between communities of concern and vulnerable road users?
 - a. Cambridge: The city has identified the need for "20 MPH Speed Zones" based on the application of future criteria. Considerations for criteria may include proximity to land-uses serving vulnerable populations such as senior centers and senior housing, parks, hospitals, and schools (page 20).
 - b. Jersey City: The City sees the relationship of Communities of Concern and vulnerable road users as intrinsically tied to one another: "Traffic crashes within the City correlate most closely with census blocks with elevated levels of poverty, and to densely populated, non-white neighborhoods. These areas also have lower levels of drive-alone commuting and higher transit use." There is also mention within the action plan as to ways for reducing impact to communities of concern without decreasing effectiveness of the countermeasures (page 35).
 - c. Los Angeles: Equity is a key theme throughout the action plan. Persons of color are disproportionately affected by traffic incidents and are more likely to be transit users or pedestrians.

Vision Zero Action Plan – Peer Review

City of Hoboken NJ

- d. New York City: The action plan identifies a stronger focus on education for the communities of concern compared to others.
 - e. Philadelphia: No mention of communities of concerns, or minorities of any kind.
3. How are communities of concern integrated into crash reporting (i.e., are the impacts to communities of concern apparent from analyzing crash reports?)?
 - a. Jersey City: Crash mapping is overlaid with a map of communities of concern, but specific analysis with respect to crash details is not present and the relationship of pedestrian crashes and communities of concerns is discussed in general terms.
4. What supplemental collision data has been key to understanding and acting on collision patterns? How was it possible to procure that data?
 - a. Jersey City: Action item for a pilot project to use advanced technology to identify near misses at signalized intersections.
 - b. General: speeds along each city’s “high injury network” were also used as a predictor of severe crashes (note that speed is a general concern across the board for reducing the fatality rate of crashes).
5. What special considerations are provided regarding schools or parks?
 - a. Cambridge: Schools are given priority for the special low speed zones.
 - b. Los Angeles: In 2018, Los Angeles added safe access to parks and recreation to its Vision Zero plan.
6. How are scooters integrated in data analysis and countermeasure development?
 - a. General: motorized scooters are not mentioned in any action plan since they are a recent development in the industry. Generally, there are two schools of thought: treat them as bicyclists (must use dedicated lanes and share vehicular right-of-way) and treat them as pedestrians (operate on sidewalks and follow pedestrian laws). Either way, the tenets of Vision Zero recommend separating them from vehicular traffic. For more information regarding scooters, see Transportation for America’s *Shared Micromobility Playbook* at playbook.t4america.org.
7. How is parking enforcement integrated?
 - a. Los Angeles: Increase fines for parking in bicycle lanes and for repeat offenders.
 - b. Philadelphia: Increase traffic safety enforcement and penalties for illegal sidewalk closures and obstructions as well as Increase traffic safety enforcement against illegal parking.
8. Is legislation/ordinance language included/recommended?
 - a. Jersey City: Action item for Law enforcement to maximize the effectiveness of state laws, such as cumulative penalties for repeat traffic violations and removing barriers (e.g., evidence needed or paperwork required to issue a citation) for certain violations such as blocking a bike lane.
 - b. New York City: The action plan states that many laws are controlled by the state. However, there are several ‘ideas’ to provide greater control back to the city council, including control of red light cameras, lowering the city speed limit, and strengthen laws that impact pedestrians and bicyclists, trainings, and other increased penalties for violations. Note that New York City is the only jurisdiction discussed in this document which has implemented City control of

Vision Zero Action Plan – Peer Review

City of Hoboken NJ

- statutory speed limits (note that other jurisdictions may still implement signs with lower speed limits).
- c. Los Angeles: The 2018 plan mentions current legislation in the State of California that would enable the use of automated speed enforcement. Los Angeles also mentions revising the strategy for determining posted speed.
 - d. Philadelphia: Similar to other cities, Philadelphia aims to take control of automated enforcement and local speed limits. One unique element was to explore a pilot program that offers traffic safety classes for first-time moving violation offenders in lieu of fines.
9. What countermeasures have been particularly effective in transit hubs and on small neighborhood streets?
- a. Los Angeles: The Action Plan specifically focuses on measures that are proven to reduce fatalities such as high visibility crosswalks, leading pedestrian intervals, and separated bike lanes.
10. Are protected bike lanes a key element of the program?
- a. Jersey City: Yes; The plan indicates the City will “Prepare concept development studies for 2 miles of protected bike lanes per year.”
 - b. Los Angeles: Yes; the major action item is the identification of network bike lane gaps.
 - c. Philadelphia: no particular focus; the city currently has minimal facilities.
11. How have cities engaged or overcome conflicts with fire departments, especially with respect to large vehicles?
- a. Jersey City: No mention of this concern specifically. However, action plans include the introduction of more innovative traffic calming devices and improved emergency response driver training.

Community Engagement

1. How was Vision Zero rolled out? Initial pledge?
 - a. Cambridge: No pledge. A video was developed to introduce and describe it for public consumption.
 - b. Jersey City: Yes, a pledge was signed by the heads of each city division. Initial engagement was focused on introducing the Vision Zero concept and included presence at two public festivals and a social media campaign.
 - c. Los Angeles: a launch document outlining the purpose and process as a whole was initiated prior to the analysis and action plan. This included a mayor’s pledge. In this respect, pieces were released over time.
 - d. New York City: Two specific advertisement campaigns were developed for public consumption based on two key areas of concern: speeding and drunk driving. The city is also maintaining a website for all information.
 - e. Philadelphia: Yes, the plan included a pledge. Citizens may also sign a pledge online.
 - f. Generally, it appears any Vision Zero plan has come from an executive order, led by the city’s mayor. This is usually related to a campaign promise of improved safety and transportation.
2. What engagement activities have been particularly useful around schools and parks?
 - a. Los Angeles: For schools, biking and pedestrian education programs are able to reach the youth population. Also focus on Top 50 schools of Highest Need.

Vision Zero Action Plan – Peer Review

City of Hoboken NJ

- b. Philadelphia: Not specific to schools, Philadelphia hosted an interactive website where individuals could report specific locations of unsafe behavior.
3. What materials are provided at public events (possibly include what materials are provided in advance?)
 - a. Jersey City: public feedback suggested that materials include charts and graphs that help to make information, particularly data-intensive information, more easily understood.
4. How are Action Plan materials presented to the public (is it an interactive website, delivered in paper/PDF report format, presented in sections, etc.)
 - a. Cambridge: A Vision Zero portal is on the city's website with the action plan, tool box, Advisory Committee, and list of projects. However, it appears that the information is not maintained regularly. There is an option to enroll in a Vision Zero newsletter. Community engagement is also discussed generally, such as entering the community in person to have conversations around Vision Zero and engaging using "variety of materials, web content, and social media."
 - b. Jersey City: The plan indicates that a Vision Zero progress report should be published annually. Community engagement efforts mentioned typical engagement efforts, but also mentioned a targeted campaign that will "focus on specific behaviors in locations known to have a crash record."
 - c. Los Angeles: Hosted on city website. Strategies for engagement, specifically with regards to developing a culture of safety, include partnering within communities, partnering with other government organizations, education campaigns, or social media campaigns.
 - d. New York City: Information, data, and plans are shown on a website. Other efforts include workshops that "bring neighborhoods together to discuss their needs and identify engineering, education and enforcement needs at particular locations."
 - e. Philadelphia: Hosted on city website. A unique aspect of the city's engagement plan includes an action to "Research which additional communications messages are most needed through surveys, focus groups, and working with behavioral scientists."
5. What has been the role of quick builds (traffic calming devices or other strategies which may be rapidly deployed, for example in response to a crash) in the Vision Zero program and what metrics are tracked?
 - a. Jersey City: Establish a Rapid Response Team to conduct rapid response review for every fatal crash.
 - b. Los Angeles: As part of the Vision Zero team, Safe Routes to School is utilizing quick builds to bridge the time between plan development and capital project design and construction, thereby soliciting additional community input and leveraging local funding sources.
6. What aspects of the program are particularly important in dense, diverse communities?
 - a. Jersey City: During the second round of outreach, four info sessions were held to discuss the plan, three of which focused on equity issues. The plan included a reduced reliance on police presence and enforcement as a result of the dense communities of concern. Rather, the focus is on 24/7 permanent solutions.
7. How do cities discuss tragic crashes with residents?

Vision Zero Action Plan – Peer Review

City of Hoboken NJ

- a. Jersey City: The action plan actually included several ‘tragic crashes’ with pictures of the deceased as footnotes throughout the document, highlighting the importance of the plan throughout.
8. How do cities deal with trolls? (PHILLY discussed this at the NACTO conference)
 - a. Philadelphia’s Vision Zero action plan did not specifically mention the challenges of public involvement or the interactions of specific communities with respect to Vision Zero.
9. How do cities communicate progress and the importance of taking a long-term view amidst fluctuating statistics?
 - a. Los Angeles: An update was communicated out in 2018, however no new ones have been sent. This update tracked the action items, fatality and crash rate over 1 year, and reported if actions were on track or not.
 - b. New York City: They have changed the NYPD TrafficStat meeting (safety review) from past 28 days to past 2 years of review in order to identify longer-term trends and overall improvement.
 - c. Philadelphia: The annual update indicated the crash and fatality rate. However, this did not highlight progress particularly well, since metrics did not show an improvement. This could be both subjectively positive or negative. There was little mention of ‘overall’ progress.
10. Do other cities have tool kits? If so, what do they include?
 - a. Cambridge: Toolbox is listed online, but only includes RRFBs.
 - b. Jersey City: Action plan identifies an update to the street design guide which includes a countermeasure selection tool.
 - c. Philadelphia: Only cited the federal Traffic Calming Toolbox. However, key elements from the toolbox were referenced alongside relevant action items.

Performance documentation

1. What data are tracked, in general – what is the balance of output as opposed to outcome?
 - a. Cambridge: At this time, only tracking of data and crash-related metrics appears evident. Standard metrics such as count/location of crashes, calls for service (police dispatched), crashes by type, and crashes by injury are used.
 - b. Philadelphia: The Vision Zero plan identifies 16 benchmarks for improvements but doesn’t have specific values (only increase/decrease). Examples of benchmarks include a decrease of speeds on Philadelphia streets, an increase of policy changes to advance Vision Zero, or an increase in the number of people walking and biking.
 - c. Generally, typical crash values are tracked – count, location, severity, type, and involvement of pedestrians/bicyclists. Most action plans and updates don’t focus on outcomes (yet) as the short-term duration of their programs (1-3 years) are not yet through a full cycle of engineering improvements. Los Angeles’ Vision Zero update reported metrics on the number of fatalities, count of corridor and signage improvements, speeding tickets issued, and how much of the High Injury Network had been speed-surveyed.
2. What have been the trends in outcomes?
 - a. Philadelphia: the two-year report highlights that the trend in traffic deaths has not changed, and that current action is insufficient.

Vision Zero Action Plan – Peer Review

City of Hoboken NJ

3. How is performance tracked on the backside; have there been any key changes or lessons learned on performance monitoring?
 - a. Jersey City: Action 5.6 states the City will collect before and after traffic data for each calming device installation
 - b. New York City: DOT Traffic Division and NYPD Transportation Bureau meet monthly to review safety performance and set strategy for improvement.
 - c. In General: the cities that had updates did not highlight/publish any lessons learned from tracking; the focus was mostly on the data and outcomes.
4. How are public updates provided?
 - a. Cambridge: While not currently active, an action item from the Vision Zero Plan was to launch a data dashboard for the Vision Zero webpage.
 - b. Los Angeles: an update was distributed online on their Vision Zero site after 1 year.
 - c. Philadelphia: an update was distributed online on their Vision Zero site after 2 years.
5. What data are tracked for pilot projects?
 - a. Jersey City: none stated; simply to collect more data surrounding them and implement a before and after collection effort.
 - b. Los Angeles: The SRTS program tracks metrics related to the goals of the install. For example, if slowing vehicle speeds is a goal, before and after speed surveys are conducted.
6. To what extent is impact on vehicle operations tracked and what has been the messaging around the potential tradeoff between safety and vehicle LOS?
 - a. General: Operations are seldom discussed, and most strategies are irrelevant of operational considerations at the planning level.

Task Force Participation

1. What have been the most valuable elements of the task force?
 - a. General: it appears that having multiple city departments coordinate specifically has helped each department understand the others' efforts.
2. How are task force members held accountable post-plan adoption?
 - a. General: nothing specific; likely only as a result of reporting to the mayor.
3. Are task forces continued beyond the creation of the Action Plan?
 - a. Jersey City: it appears as such.
 - b. New York City: Vision Zero task force is permanent.

Overall Action Plan Review

- a. Cambridge: The plan is somewhat specific but lacks a richness of detail stating how certain actions will get accomplished.
- b. Jersey City: This is a very specific and action-oriented plan. It is well-organized and thorough. Agency responsibilities are noted by action item. Very good example of an action plan.
- c. Los Angeles: The plan includes specific and time-constrained goals but omits the details of implementation from the document. The action items and goals also seem very aggressive considering the size of the city but are supported with matching levels of urgency. Note that an initial "Vision Zero Safety Study and Technical Analysis" was conducted prior to the plan.

Vision Zero Action Plan – Peer Review

City of Hoboken NJ

- d. New York City: There is a significant focus on the for hire/delivery services as well as the deployment of automated enforcement (both wayside and on-board controlled fleet vehicles). The city has also created a plan in which boroughs are engaged with by DOT and NYPD to develop local Vision Zero plans. Since the city is generally more progressive with street design, the focus is more on the driver behavior side of mitigation.
- e. Philadelphia: The plan has a lot of action items; however, the delivery of them is confusing and the sheer number decreases the weight of the most impactful ones.