Agenda

1. Welcome & Introductions

2. Vision Zero Update

3. Intersection Safety Improvement Program

4. TTI Research Report

5. Best Practices in Addressing Alcohol-related Crashes

6. Discussion and Announcements
Vision Zero Update

- Current crash statistics for the year
- Texas Municipal Courts Education Center Webinar
- Vision Zero in Action Initiative
- Street Team Pilot Program
- Grant applications for CAMPO’s 2019-2022 call
- Pedestrian Safety Action Plan
- APD’s special enforcement initiatives
Austin traffic deaths

Traffic Deaths

Year


Traffic Deaths

3-year rolling avg.

73 61 64 60 59 62 49 54 78 75 62 102 79 76
2017 traffic deaths by mode

- Pedestrians: 23
- Motorcycles: 11
- Cars: 36
- Bicycles: 4

Source: Austin Police Department
Action 16: Educate Judicial Professionals

Texas Municipal Court Education Center Webinar Feb 8th, 2018

Educational Opportunities for Traffic Crimes

Vehicular Crime
- Transportation Code Class C, e.g.
  - Speeding
  - Failing to Obey Signs/Signals
  - Illegal Turn

Ticket
- Include brochure on Vision Zero

Municipal Court
- Plead Guilty or No Contest
- Plead Not Guilty
  - Not Guilty
    - Prosecutor can educate defendant & jury
  - Guilty
    - Judge can educate through sentence

Pay Ticket
- Include brochure on Vision Zero

Driver Safety Class
- Deferred Deposition
Vision Zero in Action Initiative

CITATIONS AND WARNINGS - 2018

- OTHER: 26
- NO SEAT BELT: 41
- DISREGARDING POSTED SIGN: 91
- DRIVING IN BICYCLE LANE OR RESTRICTED LANE: 19
- RAN RED LIGHT OR STOP SIGN: 81
- FAILED TO SIGNAL INTENT: 18
- FAILED TO YIELD: 36
- SPEEDING - OTHER: 229
- SPEEDING - SCHOOL ZONE: 67
- HANDS-FREE: 134
Street Teams Pilot Program

The Street Teams Pilot Program is a partnership with Austin Pathways, part of the Housing Authority of Central Austin (HACA). HACA residents provide traffic safety education at events and near intersections.

Future Planning

• Grant was submitted to TxDOT for an intersection safety program.

• Asked for $75,000 to conduct outreach and enforcement efforts at 10 locations throughout the city.
CAMPO Call for Projects 2019-2022

• Projects Recommended for Funding
• Highlights on safety projects for the region
• Supports Action 8 & 27
City of Austin
Pedestrian Safety Action Plan
2018
Special Projects/Initiatives
Hands Free Initiatives
BUS OPERATIONS:
2016 – 753 CITATIONS/ 83 WARNINGS
2017 – 561 CITATIONS/ 78 WARNINGS
2018 – 90 CITATIONS/ 100 WARNINGS

DOWNTOWN OPERATIONS:
2017 – 2,783 CITATIONS/ 530 WARNINGS
2018 – 426 CITATIONS/ 116 WARNINGS

2017 TOTAL HANDS FREE CITATIONS – 9,713
APD Conducts Sting Operation to Enforce Move-Over Law on I-35 | KEYE

Move Over Operations

2017 – 299 Citations/ 13 Warnings
2018 – 31 Citations/ 152 Warnings
DWI NO REFUSAL

41 Nights YTD
RED LIGHT CAMERA PROGRAM

• Originally started with City of Austin & Red Flex in 2008
• Renewed contract with Red Flex in March 2013 & 2018 for additional 5 years
• Expanding from 10 intersections to 15 intersections
• New technology with renewal:
  • Better resolution
  • Ability to see multiple violators
  • Lower cost per unit
  • Red Light Hold safety feature
## 2018 Traffic Fatalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fatal Crashes</th>
<th>Fatal Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intersection Safety Improvements Program
Transportation Safety Engineering Program Updates
Vision Zero Task Force

Upal Barua, M.Sc., P.Eng., P.E.
Austin Transportation Department
Safety Engineering Initiatives Under Vision Zero

• High Priority Intersection Safety Improvement Projects
• 2016 Mobility Bond Intersection Safety Projects: Dedicated $15 million at Top Crash Locations
• Fatality Review Board
• Speed Management Program (Revamping Underway)
Intersection Safety Program - Update

- Patterns of Crashes
- Crash Severity
- Traffic Volume
- Crash Frequency
- Crash Rates
- B/C Ratio

Weighted Score & Rank
Lamar Blvd / Parmer Lane

Before:
Lamar Blvd / Parmer Lane

After:
Lamar Blvd / Parmer Lane

43% Reduction

Before:

Lamar Blvd / Parmer Lane

After:
Lamar Blvd / Rundberg Lane

22% Reduction

Before: After:
PHB installed at Rutland in Lamar Blvd / Rundberg Lane Project
SH 183 Service Rd / Cameron Rd

57% Reduction

Before:

After:

Pedestrian Refuge & Crosswalk at 183/Cameron
IH 35 Service Rd / MLK Blvd

Before:

61% Reduction

After:
Before - After Comparison

Before and After Comparison of Total Crashes @ Lamar/Parmer Intersection (2012-2017)

- Before: 33
- After: 19

Average Annual Crashes

43% Reduction

Before and After Comparison of Total Crashes on Lamar between Rutland and Rundberg (2012-2017)

- Before: 54
- After: 42

Average Annual Crashes

22% Reduction
Before and After Comparison of Total Crashes @ US 183/Cameron Intersection (2012-2017)

- Before: 9
- After: 4

57% Reduction

Before and After Comparison of Total Crashes @ I-35/MLK Intersection (2012-2017)

- Before: 33
- After: 13

61% Reduction
# INTERSECTION SAFETY PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSECTION</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport Blvd / MLK</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Blvd / 12 St</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Blvd. / Oak Springs Dr.</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH 35 SR (NB) / 7 Street</td>
<td>1, 3, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-35 Service Rd. (NB) / Braker Ln</td>
<td>1,4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Street/IH35</td>
<td>1,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter Ln. / Cullen Ln.</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter Ln/ South 1st Street (early out)</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Creek Dr./Riverside Dr.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Dr. / Wickersham Ln.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Riverside / Tinnin Ford Rd</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Valley/ Elmont (early out)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB Riverside Dr. / Pleasant Valley Rd.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Oltorf/Parker Ln</td>
<td>3,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Congress Ave. / Oltorf St (early out)</td>
<td>3,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-35 Service Rd. (NB) / Cesar Chavez St.</td>
<td>3,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-35 Service Rd. (NB) / Rundberg Ln.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Blvd. / Payton Gin Rd.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Blvd. / RM 2222 (Koenig Ln)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Blvd. (Loop 275) / RM 2222 (Koenig Ln.)</td>
<td>4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Lamar Blvd/W St Johns Ave</td>
<td>4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Lamar Blvd / Manchaca Rd</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 183 SR (NB) / Lakeline Blvd</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braker Ln. / Stonelake Blvd.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Bud Trail / 3400 Block - W of River Crossing</td>
<td>8,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter Ln/Brodie Ln</td>
<td>8,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45th St. / Red River St.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Springs Rd / S 1st St</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERSECTION SAFETY PROJECTS

• Funding allocation: $15 million
• Appropriation to-date: $8.5 million
• First 8 intersection Safety Projects are underway (various phases)
  ➢ Pleasant Valley Rd./Elmont Dr. (in Construction since Sep. 2017)
  ➢ Slaughter Ln./South First St. (1st phase of Construction completed Sep. 2017; in Detailed Design)
  ➢ South Congress Ave./Oltorf St. (in Construction since Feb. 2018
  ➢ Slaughter Ln./Cullen Ave. (in Final Design)
  ➢ I-35 Service Rd./Braker Ln. (in Final Design)
  ➢ E. 45th St./Red River St. (in Final Design)
  ➢ E. Oltorf/Parker Ln. (in Preliminary Engineering)
  ➢ Braker Ln./Stonelake BLvd. (in Preliminary Engineering)
Pleasant Valley Rd/Elmont Dr

Before:

During Construction:

After Construction:
Pleasant Valley Rd/Elmont Dr

Before:

After:
Questions ?
City of Austin Vision Zero Gap and Opportunity Analysis

- Survey of Regional Safety Programs
- Best Practices Assessment of Peer Cities Programs
- Analysis of Program Effectiveness & Performance Measures
- Interviews with Regional Transportation Policy Makers
- Final Report & Summit
Strategic Guidance Report

- Tenets for Successful Transportation Safety Education Program
- Steps to Design Effective Transportation Safety Education Campaigns
- Framework for Performance Measurement
- Recommendations
  - Prioritize Dangerous Behaviors and Coordinate Messaging
  - Collaborate on Funding Opportunities
  - Identify Data Sharing and Data Gathering Opportunities
  - Collaborate with Non-Traditional Partners
SAVE THE DATE!

CENTRAL TEXAS’ SAFETY CULTURE: WHERE ARE WE AND WHAT’S NEXT?
BREKFAST PROVIDED!

APRIL 20, 2018 • 7:30 - 11:30 a.m.
OMNI AUSTIN HOTEL AT SOUTHPARK
4140 GOVERNORS ROW
AUSTIN, TX 78744

Texas A&M Transportation Institute
Vision Zero & Austin Public Health
Policy Research

SARAH SEIDEL, DRPH

OFFICE OF THE MEDICAL DIRECTOR, AUSTIN PUBLIC HEALTH
Outline

- Policy Review of Actions 46, 54, 55 and 60
  - 54 & 55 & 60 – Alcohol-related policies
  - 46 – Motor vehicle crash-related policy

- Quick background on policy actions and definitions
- Quick summary of conclusions for studies under each policy action

Note: Details of research studies can be obtained from final non-abridged versions of these separate policy presentations on the website.
Model for Reducing Alcohol-Related Crashes

- Availability of Alcohol
- Consumption of Alcohol
- Alcohol-related health and social problems
Definition: Excessive Alcohol Use

Excessive alcohol use
- Third leading lifestyle-related cause of preventable death in the United States
- Health and social problems among adult and underage drinkers
  - E.g. liver disease and motor vehicle crashes

Around 9% of Travis County adults are heavy drinkers and about 21% had a binge drinking episode in the past month (BRFSS 2016), defined as:
- **Heavy Drinking** – 2+ drinks per day for men or 1+ drink per day for women
- **Binge Drinking** – During a single occasion, drinking 5+ drinks for men or 4+ drinks for women.
2016 DUI FACTS — Travis County

WHAT IS A DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE (DUI) CRASH?
A crash where the driver has a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) result of ≥ 0.08, or had a positive alcohol test, or had a positive drug test, or had a contributing factor of had been drinking, or under the influence – drugs, or taking medication.

TRAVIS COUNTY IS RANKED FIFTH IN TEXAS FOR FATAL DUI CRASHES

FATAL DUI CRASHES

DUI CRASHES AND OTHER ROAD USERS
In 2016, there were 14 DUI crashes that involved vehicles colliding with pedestrians, 10 that involved bicyclists, and 53 that involved vehicles colliding with motorcyclists.

DUI FATALITIES

34 DUI FATALITIES

33% FROM 2015

31 & 39 YEARS OLD most common ages of a person killed in a DUI crash

In 2016, Travis County experienced the fewest number of fatal DUI crashes since 2011.

PORTRAIT OF A DUI DRIVER

2% had a positive drug result
CNS depressants were most common

Average BAC: 0.17
Twice the legal limit

White Male
23-years-old
Action 54

Impact of limiting the number or density of alcohol-serving establishments in certain areas
**Alcohol outlet density** - the number of alcohol outlets in a given area; often divided by the population in that area to give a ratio

- On premises- restaurants, bars, clubs
- Off premises- grocery, liquor, convenience stores
Analytic Framework

More availability (lower prices and more accessible)

→ More drinking

→ More alcohol-related health and social problems

Figure 1. Analytic framework showing the hypothesized effects of changes in outlet density on excessive alcohol consumption and related harms
The Community Preventive Services Task Force (Task Force) has released the following findings on what works in public health to prevent excessive alcohol consumption and related harms. These findings are compiled in The Guide to Community Preventive Services (The Community Guide) and listed in the table below. Use the findings to identify intervention strategies you could use for your community.

Legend for Task Force Findings: **Recommended** | **Insufficient Evidence** | **Recommended Against** (See reverse for detailed descriptions.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Task Force Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions Directed to the General Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing alcohol taxes</td>
<td><strong>Recommended</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of alcohol outlet density</td>
<td><strong>Recommended</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dram shop liability</td>
<td><strong>Recommended</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining limits on days of sale</td>
<td><strong>Recommended</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining limits on hours of sale</td>
<td><strong>Recommended</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic screening and brief interventions (e-SBI)</td>
<td><strong>Recommended</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overservice law enforcement initiatives</td>
<td><strong>Insufficient Evidence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible beverage service training</td>
<td><strong>Recommended Against</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privatization of retail alcohol sales</td>
<td><strong>Recommended Against</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions Directed to Underage Drinkers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced enforcement of laws prohibiting sales to minors</td>
<td><strong>Recommended</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alcohol Outlet Density, Consumption & Injury

• An increase in alcohol outlet density (on or off-premises) results in an increase in alcohol consumption.

• An increase in alcohol outlet density (on or off-premise) results in an increase in alcohol-related crashes.

• High impact in urban areas:
  • 73% of crashes occur in urban areas (nationally)
  • Case Study: In NYC, the presence of at least one alcohol outlet in a census tract increased the risk of a pedestrian or bicyclist being struck by a car by 47%.
Conclusions

- **On-premise alcohol retailer density** is associated with
  - An increase in alcohol consumption
  - An increase in alcohol-related crashes

- **Increased off–premise alcohol retailer density** may contribute to increased crashes:
  - Driving after drinking and distance from origin to destination are not necessarily related to where the alcohol was purchased
  - Chain outlets may contribute more than independent retailers because of cheaper prices, more sales promotion
Limiting or Reducing Alcohol Outlet Density - Vision Zero

**Early adopters of Vision Zero** (Minnesota, Utah, West Virginia, Washington) with a decrease in traffic incidents have not used Action 54

- Used other types of interventions – e.g. ignition interlock program for DUI convictions; promotion of ride sharing

**Policy changes outside of Vision Zero:**

- **Vallejo, California** - Adoption of new land use and nuisance abatement policies, 18% decline in total number of alcohol outlets over 10 year period.

- **Omaha, Nebraska** - “Let Omaha Control its Alcohol Landscape” supported the adoption of nuisance standard.

**More information:**

- **Johns Hopkins SPH Strategizer 55** on reducing alcohol outlet density:  
Alcohol Retailer Sites in City of Austin Census Tracts (through 2017)

Count and Rate per 100,000 population aged 21 and older
Recommendations

- Reduce or limit the density of on-premises alcohol serving establishments to decrease alcohol consumption and alcohol-related crashes
  - Nuisance Ordinance
  - Land development code revisions
Recommendations

- **Nuisance Ordinances**
  - Can take the form of **aesthetic requirements** for off-premises establishments – e.g. no advertising, no signs blocking windows
  - Can include alcohol sale limitations for off-premises (e.g. volume restrictions)
  - **Responsible beverage training** for on-premises establishments
- **Community Engagement**: Complaint response team, including representatives from development services department, police department, and a citizens’ community coalition; alcohol outlet advisory board that must include at least two business owners.
- **Funding**: Charge every alcohol-selling or alcohol-serving establishment a yearly fee to fund the nuisance prevention taskforce and work
- **Land development code revisions (CodeNEXT)**
  - May require setting a limit for an area only for new alcohol-serving establishments
Action 55

To consider the effect of increasing the liquor tax (in order to decrease the amount of alcohol consumption)

VISION ZERO

any traffic death is too many
Alcohol Tax Policy Interventions

**DEFINITIONS**

- **Excise tax** – levied at point of manufacture
- **Sales tax** – levied at point of sale

- Texas has mixed beverage gross receipts and mixed beverage sales tax, AND beer, alcohol and wine excise taxes (all three are very low in US rankings)
- Texas alcohol excise tax is 45th in the nation

**OUTCOME MEASURES OF INTEREST**

- Excessive alcohol consumption
- Harmful consequences of alcohol consumption: e.g. alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes
The Community Preventive Services Task Force (Task Force) has released the following findings on what works in public health to prevent excessive alcohol consumption and related harms. These findings are compiled in The Guide to Community Preventive Services (The Community Guide) and listed in the table below. Use the findings to identify intervention strategies you could use for your community.

Legend for Task Force Findings:
- Green circle = Recommended
- Yellow diamond = Insufficient Evidence
- Red triangle = Recommended Against
- See reverse for detailed descriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Task Force Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions Directed to the General Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing alcohol taxes</td>
<td>![Green Circle]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of alcohol outlet density</td>
<td>![Green Circle]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dram shop liability</td>
<td>![Green Circle]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining limits on days of sale</td>
<td>![Green Circle]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining limits on hours of sale</td>
<td>![Green Circle]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic screening and brief interventions (e-SBI)</td>
<td>![Green Circle]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overservice law enforcement initiatives</td>
<td>![Yellow Diamond]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible beverage service training</td>
<td>![Yellow Diamond]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privatization of retail alcohol sales</td>
<td>![Red Triangle]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions Directed to Underage Drinkers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced enforcement of laws prohibiting sales to minors</td>
<td>![Green Circle]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effect of Price on Alcohol Consumption & Alcohol-Related Mortality

The effect of price on alcohol consumption is expressed as "price elasticity" (or the expected percentage change in alcohol consumption when the price is increased by 10%).

- **Total alcohol (ethanol) consumption**: -0.77
  - Total alcohol consumption decreases 7.7% for every 10% increase in price

Findings from Systematic Reviews & Meta Analyses:

- 10% increase in alcohol taxes resulted in 5% reduction in alcohol consumption
- Doubling the alcohol tax could result in 35% reduction in alcohol-related mortality
- 11% decrease in traffic deaths due to an alcohol-tax increase
Conclusions

- **Increasing alcohol prices** is an effective means of reducing excessive drinking and fewer motor vehicle crashes and fatalities and less alcohol-impaired driving.

- The *Guide to Community Preventive Services* (Community Guide) recommends increasing alcohol price (including taxes) as a strategy.

- Alcohol taxes can meet opposition from industry (e.g. bars, small and large retailers selling alcohol) – need to build a strong public health and injury prevention case for increasing alcohol taxes.

- **Next Steps:**
  - Consider excise taxes or sales taxes
  - Consider limits on increasing sales or excise tax locally
  - Review previous state legislation regarding increasing the tax on alcohol
  - Review successful tax increases and public media campaigns surrounding them
Action 46

Part I
- Explore shortening driver’s license renewal from 6 to 4 years

Part II
- Requiring defensive driving or driver’s education for all top contributing factors
Conclusions & Recommendations

Action 46 – Part I: Shortening renewal cycles does not have a significant reduction in automobile injuries or crashes with the elderly.

- However, implementation of either vision tests OR in-person renewals, and shorter renewal cycles could reduce fatal crashes in the elderly.
  
  Note: Shortening the DL renewal from 6 years to 4 years for entire population will bring undue burden upon the Texas DMV by increasing the amount of traffic into their offices and increasing the cost.

- Requiring drivers 75 and older to renew in-person every 2 years OR to send a physician-signed vision test every 2 years should be sufficient for the older population

  Note: Need to consider possibility of age discrimination if not using a standard procedure for determining eligibility for renewal
Conclusions & Recommendations

Action 46 – Part II: More research is needed to test the quality and type of driver’s education (defensive driving or post-license education) for the general population, since the evidence did not prove a significant decrease in traffic crashes.

- A **pilot study combining safety and skills training** into courses might show promise for reducing not only traffic violations but also crashes.
- Most important question to ask is: **What content should be included?**
Action 60

Community-based prevention practices to identify and intervene with at-risk populations.

At-risk populations in Austin/Travis County (based on binge drinking behaviors and DWI crashes and arrests):

- ~ 21-30 years old
- Male (74% of DWI arrests)
- Prevention focus: DWI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Binge Drinking in the Past Month by Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travis County 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 44</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>DWI Arrests - APD 2013-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 49</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions & Recommendations

Action 60: Implementing a multicomponent intervention along with community coalitions and media advocacy will reduce alcohol-related crashes.

Effective programs include:

- Sobriety checkpoints – (Note: can’t be implemented in Texas)
- Responsible beverage service training
- Efforts to limit access to alcohol (focused on young people)
- Public education campaigns
- Media advocacy
- Combination of effective program strategies and innovative aspects tailored to Vision Zero Austin will bring success

- Well-funded and multi-year programs along with technical assistance and evaluators helped make these programs effective.
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Discussion & Announcements
Thank you!

The next Task Force meeting is tentatively scheduled for June 28th, 2018. An invite will be sent once confirmed.