

Traffic Safety Culture Transportation Pooled-Fund (TSC-TPF) Program
February 18, 2015 Meeting Notes

Project Website: <http://mdt.mt.gov/research/projects/trafficsafety.shtml>

Resource Guide: <http://trafficsafetyculture.weebly.com/>

Pooled Fund Website: <http://pooledfund.org/Details/Study/558>

Attendees:

Sue Sillick/MT DOT	Chimai Ngo/FHWA-DC
Nic Ward/WTI, MSU	Wade Odell/TX DOT
Jay Otto/WTI, MSU	Joe Ouellette/CT DOT
Kelly Green/WTI, MSU	Kirk Zeringue/LA DOTD/LTRC,
Tim Harmon/ NH DOT	Skip Paul/LA DOTD
Jim Hollis/TX DOT	Jennene Ring/ WA DOT
Michael Holowaty/IN DOT	Marcee Allen/FHWA-MT
Robert Hull/ UT DOT	Steve Gent/IA DOT
Brent Jennings/ITD	Carole Guzzeta/ NHTSA DC
Gina Beretta/ USDOT NHTSA Region 10	Matt Hansen/ CA DOT
Angie Ward/ WA Traffic Safety Commission	Bayliss Camp/ California DMV R&D
Ned Parish/ITD	David Garrison/ IN
	Lynn Santo/ Audrey Alums / Kris C.- MDT

1. Housekeeping (10 minutes)

- A. Welcome and Introductions
- B. Please note we would like to record this webinar. Please let us know if anyone objections. No objections
- C. Additions to the Agenda- Nic Ward has asked the Board to attend and participate in the Traffic Safety Culture summit in Sweden June 9th-10th. Here is the link to the TSC conference in Sweden: <http://www.trafikverket.se/towardszero/> . The board has approved to fund 50% of Nic's fees to attend this conference. Nic thinks it will be a great opportunity to see firsthand what Europe is doing on traffic safety culture and share what the pooled fund hopes to do.
- D. Approval of November and January Meeting Notes- No comments, the notes are approved. These will be posted to the project website
 - a. Please note the Resource guide page noted above has been move to a new page www.trafficsafetyculture.wordpress.com, we will post the new link the project page. Post meeting note: We have been experiencing problems with this site.

2. TPF Funding Status – Commitments, Funding Transfers, Plans to Commit, and Board Members (5 minutes)

Sue stated that according to the website (<http://pooledfund.org/Details/Study/558>), 9 states have committed a total of \$975,000 over the next five years (federal fiscal years (FFY) 2015-2019): CT, IA, ID, LA, MT, NH, TX, UT, and WA. Sue stated that CA has been added as the 10th state since the January meeting however there are no commitments listed at this time. They were added because Caltrans is interested in participating.

Sue explained that to date funds have been received from MT, CT, ID, IA, LA. TX is checking in with funding folks regularly, and believes transfer in process. Sue reminded folks to let her know when forms were filled out. Post meeting note: Funds from TX and UT have been transferred.

Matt from Caltrans informed the group that there is a process before the process in order to get approval from Caltrans but they are planning on moving forward. He thinks they will be committing \$10k per year. Matt will be the board member for Caltrans.

Angie stated that the Washington State Traffic Safety Commission (the state highway safety office) is also considering contributing funding to bolster what our Washington State Department of Transportation has already contributed. Or is it too late for that? Sue stated they could contribute at any time.

3. Recap TRB Meeting and Events (30 min)

Relevant Information and Events- Nic explained that there were several events he participated ranging from TSC in different countries through work force development to participating as a facilitator for a session focused on TSC in commercial driving fleets (several companies were present) to discuss organizational safety culture. His main TSC activity was his attendance subcommittee for roadway safety culture in which he provided a brief update on pooled fund and participated in a discussion on the national summit in November in Washington D.C. The subcommittee finalized the theme of that summit, organizational safety culture- how to transform culture within organizations. Nic indicated that this may be a possible conference for the next face to face and a good opportunity to interface with roadway safety committee in person meeting. This opportunity would allow the TPF to share ideas on research with the subcommittee and attend a relevant conference on safety culture.

Sue asked if there are any questions for Nic or if anyone else had any updates. She asked if Nic had attended AB10 TSC meeting. He had not and unfortunately no one on the call did either. However, Nic was able to provide an overview of the agenda which was conversation around national TZD initiative and steps to move forward. It was mentioned that Robert is the co-chair of this committee so TPF can ask for an update if necessary.

Additional Project Ideas for Upcoming Years- None

4. Related Efforts (15 min)

Sue asked Jennene Ring from Washington State DOT to provide an update on the cannabis related research that is taking place in Washington. Jennene proceeded to discuss cannabis research efforts and encouraged Angie Ward from the WA traffic safety commission to join in as she is involved in much of the research. Jennene explained that PIRE has done roadside safety evaluations regarding impaired driving. The initial roadside surveys were conducted in June to correlate with the start of sales for recreational marijuana use in the state then a follow-up evaluation was conducted in Nov. and Dec. The evaluation looked for BAC levels, presence in drugs, changes in use and changes in perceptions of use. The results for the June PIRE survey are listed on the WA safety commission website, wtfc@wa.gov under the research and data tab and called the PIRE knowledge and awareness survey 2014. The study was completely voluntary and folks were paid for participating. Of all participants, 97% allowed a breath sample, 96% oral fluid sample, and 95% completed a marijuana questionnaire. This study was conducted across the state in five counties ranging from rural to urban. It was interesting to see the difference in counties. An interesting finding was that, when participants were asked when you used marijuana and drove how you think it affected your driving. 60% of participants stated it made no difference and 24% thought it made them better drivers. At this time, no results for Nov. and Dec. 2014 evaluations have been shared yet. Anything to add Angie? No nothing else.

Sue-Questions for WA? What was the date for the survey? June 2014

Jennene - The WA safety commission has also put together a list of cannabis research efforts that have been going on across the country. Jennene will share with Sue to share with the group.

Sue- Great thank you, any other questions or additions?

Audrey from MDT stated that the governor highway safety commission in MT is planning to conduct a research project about the effect of decriminalization on traffic safety. It is in the initial planning stages and will share information as it becomes available.

5. Discussion and Vote on Proposed First Year Project(s) (45 min)

Sue stated that more detailed information was provided on each of the proposed projects and sent out prior to call. She asked Nic for funding estimates on a monthly basis to determine when the TPF could start a second project. Based on estimates, the pooled fund is able to start both projects at the same time. The next step will be to have proposals written and approved by the board. Prior to moving to proposals, we would like to hear thoughts from the group on these two projects and any changes you would like to see.

Carol from NHTSA had a comment on the Engagement in Traffic Safety project. She thinks it is a great idea and was interested to know what the issues we would seek to look at. Specifically if the issue of children dying from vehicle heatstroke would be included. She stated that she was not sure if that is too far outside the current scope but think it would benefit from this concept as well. It also gets at the idea of citizenship.

Sue stated that it is a big issue and the project may need to remain focused to get the relevant information. Nic agreed with Sue. There a lot of relevant topics the project could cover, but there is a need to keep the list short. Jay stated that when we ask about behaviors this is definitely something we could consider or even a broader category of behaviors like it, bystander engagement for example. Are there other thoughts on this topic?

Sue thinks it is good idea to get both going on the same time if we can afford it. Right, she believes we are looking at two year timelines for these first two projects. The TPF should be just fine to start both in the March timeframe depending on when we get final proposals and receive a vote from the board. Sue will only contract for what we have in the bank and add to the contract as more funds are deposited in the bank.

Sue asked again, are we happy with the directions of the proposals?

Brent thinks if we are able to start both at the same time that would be great. He believes both projects are in the interest of all the pooled fund states and is supportive the idea of starting both together.

Audrey stated she would like to know how we determine who conducts the research. Sue suggested the Board has an offline conversation on this topic.

Any other comments on projects? Angie stated that before Dr. Hoff left she looked at the two projects and one idea she has was this marijuana study comes in the face of so many other measurement attempts. She noticed there was no mention of medical marijuana. This is a concern. If the only plan is to compare WA and CO with other states, we may need to include medical marijuana in this project.

Sue stated that this is kind of information that is good to provide when review in full blown proposal.

Jay stated he and WTI acknowledge the confounding effect of medical marijuana and intentional set up the projects so we were only comparing two groups, states with legalized marijuana and states for neither, no recreational or legalized marijuana. Do we attempt to have three groups in which we compare states that have neither, states that have legalized and states that have medical marijuana? Jay stated if we decide to move to three we will need to increase sample size ultimately increasing project costs.

Another confounding factor that was mentioned was that medical marijuana is cheaper than legalized marijuana in CO. It is something we will want to think about. Jay stated they will seek to understand amongst the user is how they classify themselves (medical user or rec user) when just looking at the two conditions (neither and WA/CO).

Other thoughts? Lynn at MDT asked for clarification this is not duplicative and it is complimenting other research efforts. Nic stated that the Center is aware of work from PIRE and the proposed cannabis study will not duplicate these efforts. It is focused much more on comprehensive measure of culture and actual use of marijuana and driving. These projects will help to move the research forward and complement the work currently being done.

Sue indicated this information should be included in the proposal (relationship to other work).

6. Preliminary Project Planning

Sue asked Nic if there was anything else WTI need for the preliminary project planning. Nic stated that the discussion had already covered some of the questions and providing confounding factors we need to address in the proposal template. If there are any other questions or thoughts about the samples, please let me us know.

Sue asked the group if there was anything missing? There was no response. Nic asked if WTI should move forward with these two projects by putting them into proposal form. Sue indicated that she would like to have an offline conversation with the board and will let WTI know if they should move forward.

7. Recurring Quarterly Meeting Schedule and Next Steps – (15 minutes)

In-Person Meeting - Location and Date

- Option 1- Roadway Safety Culture Summit in Washington D.C. on Nov. 5th and 6th, TRB subcommittee meeting on 4th
 - Ideally have our meeting on 4th as well
 - Works for NH, NHTSA local, WA,
 - Anyone against moving the in-person meeting to November?
 - Steve would like to review the Survey design in-person and fears that the November meeting may be too late in the process. Nic agreed that the board will have the opportunity to review the survey design. That is part of the process. WTI is planning on having conversations to review the survey design with all the board members even if that needed to happen over the phone. Steve indicating the timeline for the project puts the survey design phase month 3-5 (July- Sep). Since this is the most critical point in these types of projects need to make decision after discussion.

- Option 2- GHSA- meets in Nashville in Aug. 29th- Sep. 2nd- This idea was eliminated due to ASHTO conference following on the 3rd.

Sue stated that if we combine the face to face meeting with another conference, TPF would only pay for in-person meeting expenses for the duration of the TSC-TPF meeting.

Board will make this decision and let everyone know.

- Next Meeting: 5/20/15

Sue stated that Kelly will send out connection information. Anything else we need to discuss? Nic proposed the Board use the next hour to discuss whether or not WTI will put together proposals. Unfortunately, Brent is no longer on the call so the board will need to schedule a separate meeting to discuss this topic.