



## CSET Action Items

(revised December 22, 2017)

Number	Action	Assignee	Status
CSET-2017-01	Develop year 2 RFP	Nathan Belz	
CSET-2017-02	Provide Nathan with ITD 2-page proposal template	Kevin Chang	Not Needed due to changes to proposal submission plan
CSET-2017-03	Provide Nathan with 2-page proposal template from Hawaii	Panos Prevedouros	Not Needed due to changes to proposal submission plan
CSET-2017-04	Develop the CSET definition for Rural	Nathan Belz and Kevin Chang	
CSET-2017-05	Develop the CSET definition for Isolated	Panos Prevedouros and Guohui Zhang	
CSET-2017-06	Include the definitions for the 4 RITI terms on the website	UAF staff	Dependent on CSET-2017-04 and -05 being completed
CSET-2017-07	Identify potential conferences that the Advisory Board meeting could be linked to in the May to October 2018 time period	All	
CSET-2017-08	Revise CSET mission statement to incorporate feedback from the AB	Nathan Belz	
CSET-2017-09	Website improvements and fixes	UAF staff	Ongoing
CSET-2017-10	Identify complimentary groups/activities and include on the CSET website	All	
CSET-2017-11	Revise slides presented at the meeting and send to Vicky Wolf for use on the website and other outreach activities	Panos Prevedouros and Ziqiang Zeng	
CSET-2017-12	Develop pre-proposal template for proposers to use that includes an extended abstract, timeline, and budget.	Nathan Belz	Not Needed due to changes to proposal submission plan
CSET-2017-13	Send out doodle poll to determine a time that will work for the most people to meet at the TRB conference	Nathan Belz	
CSET-2017-14	Verify funding sent to consortium Universities for year 1 projects	Kathy Petersen	Complete



# Center for Safety Equity in Transportation

If you have a right to get there, you have a right to get there safely.

University of Alaska Fairbanks 245 Duckering 907-474-5552 cset.utc@alaska.edu

CSET-2017-15	Add "and indigenous populations" to paragraph 3 of the mission statement	Vicky Wolf	Complete
CSET-2017-16	Add more information on cultural considerations to the final paragraph of the mission statement	Nathan Belz	
CSET-2017-17	Future Advisory and Executive Board meetings should include agenda item for reporting out on results from funded projects	Nathan Belz	
CSET-2017-18	YR2 project approval notifications need to be sent out by May 1, 2018	Billy Connor	



## YR2 RFP TIMELINE

RFP 1<sup>st</sup> Draft: January 7, 2018

RFP Approved: January, 31 2018

RFP Full Proposal Solicitation: February 1, 2018

*(executive summary, literature review, research need, deliverables, tasks and prelim timeline/budget, identified source of match)*

Full Proposal Submission: April 1, 2018

*with full match commitment letter*

Executive Board Review Due: April 16, 2018

Summary of EB Results Sent to Advisory Board: April 19, 2018

AB Comments Due: April 29, 2018

EB/AB Conference Call: April 30, 2018

Full Proposal Approval Announced: May 1, 2018

Project Award: July 2, 2018

### **Notes:**

Timeline was revised by CSET Director Billy Connor to provide more time to develop more meaningful and substantive proposals if the May 1, 2018 deadline is to remain our target.

# CSET UTC Advisory Board Meeting Agenda

Cape Fox Lodge – Ketchikan, AK

Updated: December 22, 2017

Meeting Attendees: Nathan Belz, Kathy Peterson, Vicky Wolf, Guohui Zhang, Ziqiang Zeng, John Tomlinson, Kevin Chang, Panos Prevedouros, Hilary Strayer, Darrin Grondel, and Anna Bosin (via telecon).

Friday, December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017

Cape Fox Lodge - Naa Kaani Room

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/359018429>, Access Code: 359-018-429

- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| <b>8:30am – 9:30am</b>   | Breakfast   |
| <b>10:00am – 10:30am</b> | Working Breakfast – Welcome and Introductions / CSET Mission Summary and Q&A  |
| <b>10:30am – 10:50am</b> | Washington – Discussion of YR1 Projects<br><br>Develop a Regional Multi-Source Database System for Safety Data Management and Analysis in RITI Communities in Washington State – <a href="#">Yinhai Wang</a><br><br>Promoting CSET Outreach Activities through Safety Data Management and Analysis in RITI Communities – <a href="#">Ziqiang Zeng</a>   |
| <b>10:50am – 11:10am</b> | Idaho – Discussion of YR1 Projects<br><br>Transportation Equity for RITI Communities in Autonomous and Connected Vehicle Environment: Opportunities and Barriers – <a href="#">Sameh Sorour</a><br><br>Documenting the Characteristics of Traffic Crashes for RITI Communities in Idaho – <a href="#">Ahmed Abdel-Rahim</a><br><br>Safety Equity and Transportation in Tribal Communities – Navigating Collaborative Approaches and Indigenous Partnerships – <a href="#">Rula Awwad-Rafferty</a> |
| <b>11:10am – 11:30am</b> | Hawaii – Discussion of YR1 Projects<br><br>Initial Assessment of Transportation Safety Equity for Hawaiians, part-Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders in RITI Communities - <a href="#">Panos Prevedouros</a><br><br>Develop an Interactive Baseline Data Platform for Visualizing and Analyzing Rural Crash Characteristics in RITI Communities – <a href="#">Guohui Zhang</a>   |
| <b>11:30am – 12:00pm</b> | Alaska – Discussion of YR1 Projects<br><br>Rural Outreach and Baseline Data Collection – <a href="#">Billy Connor</a>   |

12:00pm – 1:00pm	Lunch
1:00pm – 1:30pm	Rural Safety Research Needs – Pt. 1 (Washington) Darrin Grondel, Washington Traffic Safety Commission
1:30pm – 2:00pm	Rural Safety Research Needs – Pt. 2 (Idaho) John Tomlinson, Idaho Department of Transportation
2:00pm – 2:30pm	Rural Safety Research Needs – Pt. 3 (Hawaii) Dr. Josh Green, Hawaii Senate District 3 Dr. Brennon Morioka, Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation
2:30pm – 3:00pm	Rural Safety Research Needs – Pt. 4 (Alaska) Hillary Strayer, ANTHC Anna Bosin, AKDOT&PF
3:00pm – 4:00pm	Center Goals (i.e., where do we want to be in 5 years?)
4:00pm – 5:30pm	Project Brainstorm and Prioritization
5:30pm – 6:00pm	Break
6:00pm – 7:30pm	Dinner ( <a href="#">Annabelle's Famous Keg and Chowder House</a> )

Saturday, December 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017 (optional for Advisory Board members)

Cape Fox Lodge - Naa Kaani Room

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/273421045>, Access Code: 273-421-045

8:30am – 9:00am	Breakfast
9:00am – 10:00am	YR2 Research Projects – Education & Outreach
10:00am – 11:00am	YR2 Research Projects – Coordination & Context Sensitive Solutions
11:00am – 12:00pm	YR2 Research Projects – Changing Social & Environmental Climates
12:00am – 1:00pm	Lunch
1:00pm – 1:15pm	CSET TRB Activities
1:15pm – 2:30pm	CSET Timeline / Task Assignments
2:30pm – 4:30pm	Break ( <a href="#">Self-Guided Walking Tour of Downtown Ketchikan</a> )
4:30pm – 5:15pm	Field Trip ( <a href="#">Tongass Historical Museum</a> )
5:30pm – 6:00pm	Break
6:00pm – 7:30pm	Dinner ( <a href="#">New York Cafe</a> )

## Center Goals

(What is our IMPACT at the end of YR5)

1. Tangible products that we can offer to specific “groups” that has a lasting impact
  - a. Driver’s education app that insurance recognizes since driver’s ed is not required in Alaska
  - b. Products that are sensitive to heritage, culture, and traditional ways of knowing; letting the residents see/develop what is going to work
  - c. Reporting findings, delivering products of value communities can use
  - d. LTAP style tools, training, etc.
  - e. Outreach to younger demographics (e.g, kids and teens)
    - i. Snowmachine and ATV training
    - ii. Portable safety trainings; incorporate cultural context
  - f. Low-cost data collection systems; crowdsourcing certain types of information/data that can be verified and doesn’t introduce “incentive bias”
2. Policy changes that improve state of safety culture
  - a. DMV required drivers education (would require working with the state, legislature, etc.)
3. Questions to answer
  - a. What works for tribal/rural “male” traveler? How do you get them to transform their behavior?
  - b. What tools are most effective for specific demographics? Talk to them directly and ask how to reach them? What resonates with this community?
4. Establish long-term relationships and partnerships
  - a. Outreach that is not superficial; effective enough to address deep, engrained, “unsafe” behaviors
  - b. Our center/universities are seen as a key resource with established trust
  - c. Instill partnerships where the community becomes their own advocates **BGC – We want them to have ownership; it’s theirs, not ours. We want to be enablers.**
  - d. Co-authorships with local partners or involvement of local partners
  - e. Engagement of tribal partners and approval/feedback from elders; contact may need to happen through tribal councils or other previously established “research” or organizational (e.g., ANTHC) relationships
  - f. Building trust and bridging the “gap” so that data sources can be shared
5. Solutions that support community longevity/sustainability (akin to “living and aging in place”)
6. Integration of data sources (coding, consistency, etc.)

- a. Crash
  - b. Hospitalizations
  - c. Injuries/traumas/Health Facility Reporting System
  - d. Fatalities (FARS, Vital Stats, etc.) e.g., an event won't show up in FARS data if the person died 30 days after the initial event
  - e. DMV/DOL data on licensed drivers, driving history, vehicle registrations
  - f. EMS
  - g. Newspapers
7. Defining rural/isolated for our Center's use and publications
    - a. By state?
    - b. Regional?
  8. Redefining "modes" of transportation
  9. Continuation/succession plan; maintain UTC status or viability of some sort; center sustainability
    - a. Are there key players in RITI communities (legislators, congressional representatives, etc.) that we can involve that would increase our likelihood of being refunded if the opportunities arise
    - b. Develop long-term private and other public match sources
  10. In line with USDOT performance metrics
    - a. How many grad students funded? How many students from RITI areas that we can support with intent to go back and help their communities? Leverage existing groups like Department of Alaska Native Studies and Rural Development (DANSRD) at UAF to recruit.
    - b. How many publications? How many of those include "local" co-authors?
  11. There is value to having people in communities who can carry on this work. We are trying to identify ways to improve transportation safety. Who is the person who can be "boots on the ground" and carry on our "legacy?" How can we support people like Byron Bluehorse?
  12. How are people going to use our products? Are they effective? Are they simple? Are they plug and play? Can RITI communities pick them up and use them immediately without feeling overwhelmed or lost. Ensure that our products have longevity and shelf-life and won't be obsolete when we close out the center.
  13. The work that we are doing is relevant today and will be in the future.



14. Reduction in RITI transportation related fatalities, injuries, and crashes in our consortium states
15. We want to be relevant in RITI transportation research; we want to be the “go-to” group when someone wants to know about safety research, safety data, and safety initiatives (e.g., best practice guides, tool kits, etc.) for and in RITI communities. This work would be complementary to other centers, organizations, products and services, while avoiding conflicts.

## Project Brainstorm

1. Identify and characterize which communities are actually RITI
  - a. Better definitions of RITI
  - b. Lack of literature and definitions of “isolated” communities
  - c. Refine definitions so that we are all using standardized language (SHSP has a “remote road” definition; ANTHC used access to care/hospitals to define remote e.g., 100 road miles, 100 miles by air, more than 100 air/road miles, etc. to an acute care facility)
  - d. Incorporation of time domain and weather; routes - one-way in one-way out (ingress/egress)
2. Complete the data component by developing products based on our YR1 data explorations
3. Identification of best practices from each state; once we identify those, what do we do with them? Assess current application and utility in a community. Get community feedback on which would be most accepted.
4. Continue to foster the relationships in our RITI communities (looking forward to implementing “hard” projects in YR3)
5. Focus on community outliers identified from YR1 data analysis
6. Continue to engage and speak at summits, workshops, and partnerships
7. Conduct cultural assessments; build a foundation of understanding amongst qualitative and quantitative data between relevant groups
8. Develop surveys (like Behavioral Risk Factors Surveillance System, Youth Risk Behavioral Survey, or NHTS add-on) to obtain ground-level data
  - a. May cost a nominal fee to have questions added
  - b. Get access to the existing data from the BRFUS and YRBS surveys
  - c. Booth at AFN

9. How do you collect data that isn't being collected? How do you get better data?
  - a. Collision reporting systems
  - b. "Exposure data"
  - c. Model minimum uniform crash criteria as an example MMUCC Fifth Edition
  
10. Distillation/accumulation of ATV/Snowmachine/(musher?) policies across communities in consortium states
  - a. Overlay safety data with policies and cultural assessments
  - b. How does the community change their transportation culture to make it safer?
  
11. Winter travel and "road" maintenance
  - a. Ice roads
  - b. Park and forest roads
  - c. Unmaintained in winter
  
12. Travel choice – a person could use a motor vehicle but they opt to use other modes
  
13. What kind of enforcement is done in RITI communities? Are they trained? Are they trained in collision investigation and analysis? If we get the data, is it good data? Can we even get the right data? Do they have the capacity and the right documentation?
  
14. How many communities have traffic safety coordinators?
  
15. EMS data and EMS response time???
  - a. Individual state Departments of Health
  
16. What is the proportion of crashes involving older drivers and what are the characteristics of those drivers and crashes? Ergonomic factors? Cognitive, physical and chemical impairment?
  
17. Media and communications
  - a. What forms and means are most effective?
  - b. Messaging types and platforms
  - c. Appropriateness
  - d. Idaho has seen a lot of push back on DMS if used for non-emergency messages; but public is supportive
  
18. Vulnerability of isolated communities
  - a. Weather/forces of nature
  - b. Access to resources
  - c. Medical evacuations
  - d. Food security

## YR2 RFP/Project Development

### Outcomes

1. Best practices document (could be folded into some of the other projects that we are doing)
2. We are obtaining the data that we haven't had before
3. People are willing to talk and invite us in
4. Center representatives have an invited presence at tribal conferences or community forums, etc.
5. How do we know we are doing a good job or the right thing? Send out an evaluation document about how people perceive CSET: What aspects are we doing well? Where should we be focusing more of our energy?
6. What methods of communications do they use? Facebook, newspaper, email, online forums. Issues related to data limits and internet speed, finding people's contact information.

### Research, Education and Outreach

#### *Establish long-term relationships and partnerships*

1. Outreach that is not superficial; effective enough to address deep, engrained, "unsafe" behaviors; teasing out the anecdotal behaviors that may not be represented in current safety data because the "environment" is forgiving enough that the "problem" is not captured or there is no system or process in place to capture data
2. Which communities do we select and which communities need/want our help? Who is going to listen to us? Use FARS/Vital Statistics/Traumas as a starting point.
3. Our center/universities becomes seen as a resource which has established trust
  - a. Present, boots on the ground, champion
  - b. Have links between websites (tribal, indigenous, etc.)
  - c. Transportation feedback online form
  - d. Provide them with our data analysis results
4. Instill partnerships where the community becomes their own advocates
5. Co-authorships with local partners or involvement of local partners (tied to partnerships)
  - a. The person in the community that everyone relates to, respects, or trusts
  - b. Involvement of students
  - c. Utilize traffic safety coordinators to develop a peer-to-peer program/relationship. If no TSC, is there an enforcement liaison (e.g., VPSO)? Is there a local champion or a mentor? School counselor, FCCLA, etc.

6. Engagement of tribal partners and approval/feedback from elders; contact may need to happen through tribal councils or other previously established “research” or organizational (e.g., ANTHC) relationships
7. Building trust and bridging the “gap” so that data sources can be shared
  - a. Data that may have already been collected but not shared
  - b. Data that has yet to be collected; having them become comfortable enough to allow us to come in to collect that data

### *Local Partner and/or “Persona” Involvement*

There is value to having people in communities who can carry on our work. We are trying to identify ways to improve transportation safety. Who is the person who can be “boots on the ground” and carry on our “legacy?” How can we support people like Byron Bluehorse (Alaska TTAP Program Manager)?

### *Identification of best practices from each state*

1. How do we identify those? We need to start by asking them what their transportation “issues” area. Transportation safety may not be a problem for them and we may have to “ignore” some places of interest because they are more concerned with other issues like dust storms, which is more of a health issue.
2. The isolated communities should be a separate part of the discussion where the knowledge and data related to those will be quite different. Of particular concern, is the public health type of safety when it comes to access to EMS response data. Do we focus our efforts here? There is very little research on isolated communities. Do we provide resources on our website where people can find tools and information related to safety best practices.
3. Once we identify those, what do we do with them?
4. Get community feedback on which would be most accepted and implementable
5. Is CSET a resource to provide consultative services for communities? Incident response or mutual agreements? Do they have transportation contingency plans? Can we work with the communities on a variety of engineering plans, designs, and services? We can evaluate perspectives on work with other communities and help them find a “best fit” from the toolbox. We can bring to them a lot more than what they think was out there. Can we help them write grants? Can we help them collect data? Can we help train them to do things? Instrument or data collection loan program that involves training them to use this equipment. Are they aware that grants exist to help them out? Are there grants that are regionally beneficial and don’t just help one community.

### *Continue to engage in summits, workshops, and partnerships*

1. Coordinate efforts to cover these within region, cross representation
2. Booth, presentation, round table, etc.

*Media and communications* (small survey to find out how people prefer to get info from us)

1. What forms and means are most effective
2. Messaging types and platforms
3. Appropriateness
4. Idaho has seen a lot of push back on DMS if used for non-emergency messages; but public is supportive

*Develop surveys to obtain ground-level data*

1. Like Behavioral Risk Factors Surveillance System, Youth Risk Behavioral Survey, or NHTS add-on
2. May cost a nominal fee to have questions added
3. Booth at AFN with a one-question survey

*Continue to foster the relationships*

in our RITI communities (looking forward to implementing “hard” projects in YR3)

## Coordination and Context Sensitive Solutions

**Identify and characterize which communities are actually RITI. This is our primary action item!**

1. Better definitions of RITI; specifically better and more appropriate definitions of rural as it pertains to CSET. How did we decide on 200 people per square mile?
2. Lack of literature and definitions of isolated
  - a. What is isolated?
  - b. How “big” can isolated be? Do we need to consider other variable for this definition?
3. Refine definitions so that we are all using standardized language (SHSP has a “remote road” definition; ANTHC used access to care/hospitals to define remote e.g., 100 road miles, 100 miles by air, more than 100 air/road miles, etc. to an acute care facility)
4. Incorporation of time domain and weather; routes one-way in one-way out (ingress and egress)

*Focus on community outliers identified from YR1 data analysis*

Are there cases where tribes don’t get along? Will they be willing to share best practices? As we share best practices, we may want to anonymize the “source” to avoid issues related to conflict of interest or “hostile” relationships between levels of governance.

*Conduct cultural safety assessments*

Build a foundation to help understand communities, cultural values, beliefs, attitudes, norms

Make sure to avoid over-surveying. Do we have a strategic survey/outreach plan? Do not approach them and say, “We’re here to solve your problems.” It needs to highlight their tradition and culture but tries to tease out any underlying safety issues. Which questions will get to the cases where they may not know they have a problem? How do we ask people about “safety shaming?” How comfortable is a person with telling their friend not to drive drunk? Or to ask someone to give them a ride if they have had too much to drink? What role does our changing culture, emerging tech (Uber) play in things like this?

*How do you collect data this isn’t being collected? How do you get better data?*

1. Collision reporting systems
2. Websites, feedback forms
3. “exposure data”
4. Model minimum uniform crash criteria (an example?)
5. DMV/DOL Data – licensing and registrations
6. More data doesn’t mean its good data
7. YouTube or other sources? Videos or photos of self-declared bad behaviors. Or access to “How’s My Driving” database?
8. Online repository or hashtags for hared safety content
9. Adding variable to Trauma Registry to identify driver vs. passenger

*Distillation/accumulation of ATV/Snowmachine policies across communities in consortium states*

1. Small project for each university
  - a. Registration required
  - b. Allowed on roads?
  - c. If they can cross roads, where?
  - d. Do they require lights, horns, flags?
  - e. Other modes?
    - a. Golf carts
    - b. Horses / horse and buggy
    - c. Cows
    - d. Tractors and ag vehicles
    - e. Construction vehicles / oversized & overweight
2. Overlay safety data with policies and cultural assessments

3. How does the community change their transportation culture to make it safer?

*What kind of enforcement is done in RITI communities?*

Are they trained? Are they trained in collision investigation and analysis? If we get the data is it good? Can we even get the right data? Do they have the capacity and the right documentation? How many communities have traffic safety coordinators? **This could be part of the cultural assessment.** There are definitely going to be different between RI (county sheriff, municipal police state, etc.) and TI (VPSO or tribal police who may be more concerned with domestic abuse).

*EMS data and EMS response time*

1. Data availability
  - a. Idaho has been trying to gain access but has not been able to get it; they have seen a few coroners' reports. We get docked (the event record is rated on a scale of five related to "accuracy") significantly if we do not report the time of arrival at the hospital.
  - b. Bureau of Emergency Services, Department of Health and Welfare, Division of Public Health and Safety
  - c. HIPA issues
2. Data integration/compatibility
  - a. Does anyone know what the format of the data are? Does it look like FARS? Or DMV?

*Solutions that support community longevity/sustainability*

(akin to "living and aging in place")

If a persons' license is suspended/revoked do they retain the option to live where they are or do they have to move to a more urbanized area. Repeat offenders versus getting to an age where it is taken away? Creating elements that do not change the nature of the community.

### **Changing Social and Environmental Climates**

*Resiliency and sustainability plan/analysis for communities*

1. Do they have one? If they do not, can we help them prepare one?
2. Significance of transportation in the plan; if it's not, it wouldn't be appropriate for us to be involved
3. How robust is the network? Are there other options? How long does that option take? Other modes? Medi-Vac reliability?
4. Map of response times
  - a. Normal conditions
  - b. After a landslide/earthquake/eruption/avalanche/wildfires etc.
5. This does not necessarily map directly to evacuation research, but here we are talking about one person (probably) after a crash or significant event

*State of GPS/cell technology and coverage and its use for communication after a crash?*

*Vulnerability of isolated communities*

1. Weather/forces of nature
2. Access to resources
3. Medical evacuations
4. Food security

*Winter travel and “road” maintenance*

1. Ice roads
2. Park and forest roads
3. Unmaintained in winter

*Travel choices*

A person could use a motor vehicle but they opt to use something else. Is the only way to get there by their own car? Are there other options such as transit or walking? Informal taxi services? How do we define areas where it is appropriate to provide safe features for all transportation alternatives?

Hawaii has had issues with increased biking on highways that do not have bike “facilities.” Is the stenciled “share the road” a good or effective option? We are creating band-aids and death traps. There is definitely an educational component to this. There is a political component to this (being forced by legislature of local government). Paint and signs don’t solve the problem. It created a higher liability for the trucker that may hit a bicyclist. The trucker is contributing to the economy but the biker is contributing to health and well-being?

*What is the proportion of crashes involving: 1) older drivers, and 2) younger drivers.*

1. What are the characteristics of those drivers and crashes? Ergonomic factors? Cognitive, physical and chemical impairment? Human factors? This may be well researched and need to be careful not to duplicate efforts. Whether or not there were local policies or state policies for testing and licensing. This could tie in well with younger driver education and licensing; Who does the training and testing? Where is it conducted? How often? Is the person applying the driver’s education they have been trained in?
2. Differences in modal injuries and fatalities (e.g., elderly pedestrians)
3. Issues related to crossing times for pedestrians and getting stranded in the middle