



WASHINGTON AREA BICYCLIST ASSOCIATION

2599 ONTARIO RD NW | WASHINGTON, DC 20009 | (202) 518-0524 | WABA.ORG

December 8, 2015

Council of the District of Columbia
Committee on Transportation and the Environment
John A. Wilson Building
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 108
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 724-8118
Attention: Ms. Aukima Benjamin

Re: B21-0335, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act of 2015; B21-0383, the Vision Zero Act of 2015; and B21-0021, the Enhanced Penalties for Distracted Driving Amendment Act of 2015

The Washington Area Bicyclist Association (“WABA”)¹ is pleased to submit this written statement in strong support of three important pieces of legislation being considered in the D.C. City Council:

1. B21-0335, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act of 2015;
2. B21-0383, the Vision Zero Act of 2015; and
3. B21-0021, the Enhanced Penalties for Distracted Driving Amendment Act of 2015

The adoption of these bills would represent a major step forward in the District of Columbia’s stated goal of eliminating traffic fatalities and serious injuries by the year 2024. These bills would make the streets of the District safer and friendlier for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers alike, enshrining the important principle that *streets are for people*. These bills would also enhance the quality of life for residents and visitors and improve the economy and environment of the District of Columbia.

At the same time, WABA believes these bills can be strengthened in certain respects to better achieve their intended goals. Part I of this statement addresses the major provisions of the three bills by subject matter, and makes specific recommendations for improvements to the proposed

¹ WABA’s mission is to create a healthy, more livable region by promoting bicycling for fun, fitness, and affordable transportation; advocating for better bicycling conditions and transportation choices for a healthier environment; and educating children, adults, and motorists about safe bicycling. WABA seeks to achieve this through advocacy, outreach, and education initiatives, as well as membership and development growth. WABA works for the D.C. metro area, which includes the following jurisdictions: Washington, D.C.; Montgomery County; Prince George’s County; Arlington County; Fairfax County; and the city of Alexandria.

text. Part II of this statement discusses three important safety gaps that the bills do not currently address – prohibiting right turns on red, increasing penalties for parking in bike lanes, and reducing speed limits on residential streets – and explains why the Council’s traffic safety bills should include these provisions.

I. Proposed Legislation

A. Complete Streets Policy

One of the most important sections of both the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act and the Vision Zero Act relates to complete streets policies. Both bills would require the District of Columbia Department of Transportation (“DDOT”) to implement a complete streets policy, but the bills differ in key respects. If these bills are reconciled into a single piece of legislation, we believe the most effective complete streets policy would result from a careful combination of each bill’s provisions with certain amendments discussed below.

1. Principles of Complete Streets Policies

Each bill lists the principles and purposes of the city’s complete streets policy. The Vision Zero Act would “ensure the safety and convenience of all users of the transportation system, including pedestrians, bicyclists, users of mass transit, people with disabilities, the elderly, motorists, freight providers, and emergency responders.” (p. 2, l. 19.) The Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act includes similar language. (p. 8, l. 183.) WABA supports the goal of ensuring the safety of all users, but we are concerned that these lists imply that the *convenience* of motorists and freight providers is a factor to be traded against the safety of others. For too long, our city’s roadways have been designed for the convenience of motor vehicles and trucks at the expense of the safety, attractiveness and livability of our streets. In order to actually change the status quo and create streets for people, the complete streets policy should elevate the safety and convenience of pedestrians, bicyclists, users of mass transit, people with disabilities, and the elderly over the convenience of motorists and freight providers.

The Vision Zero Act would prioritize accommodating all modes of travel, “while recognizing that individual corridors have modal priorities.” (p. 3, l. 2.) This language is somewhat vague and could also be used to justify maintaining the status quo on streets that already prioritize motor vehicle traffic. The very notion of complete streets is that most streets should accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit rather than continuing to prioritize motor vehicle traffic. Therefore, WABA recommends deleting this qualification. To the extent there are concerns about the costs or benefits of adopting a complete street, the conditions to the application of the policy, discussed below, should address those concerns.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act would have the goal of “Ensuring that the Department does not prioritize vehicle qualitative measurements above other measures.” (p. 8, l. 192.) We understand that the reference to “vehicle qualitative measurements” is intended to reference so-called “level of service” measurements of traffic flow. To make this provision more clear, we recommend that the sentence be amended as follows: “Ensuring that the Department does not

prioritize ~~vehicle qualitative~~ **level of service** measurements **for motor vehicle movement (as set forth in the most recent version of the Highway Capacity Manual)** above other measures.”

2. Street Redesigns

The Vision Zero Act would specifically require facilities for all users to be included in any construction, reconstruction, retrofit, repaving, and rehabilitation of a street. (p. 3, l. 16.) This means that DDOT would presumptively install bicycle lanes or separated bike lanes any time it repaved a street that did not previously have such facilities. WABA strongly supports this provision and recommends its inclusion in any transportation safety legislation that is adopted. We also recommend that the list of situations in which the complete streets policy would apply be *disjunctive* rather than *conjunctive*, to make clear that the policy would apply in any construction, reconstruction, retrofit, repaving *or* rehabilitation of a street. In addition, the complete streets policy should apply to the entire length of a street where there is construction, reconstruction, retrofit, repaving, or rehabilitation – not only the block(s) where the project has taken place – so that the city’s bike lanes will be well-connected and coherent without abruptly stopping where they are needed most. A well-connected network of bike lanes encourages people to ride bicycles as transportation. And, as bicycling rates grow, crashes decrease, making the roads safer for bicyclists, pedestrians, and drivers.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act would apply a complete streets policy to all construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads. (p. 9, l. 203.) While WABA supports this general goal, the legislation should be more specific to create the presumption that facilities for all users will be included in any construction, reconstruction, or road maintenance project – as the Vision Zero Act would do.

3. Conditions to Application of Policy

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act and the Vision Zero Act each contains conditions under which their complete streets policies would not apply to a particular roadway. WABA believes it is important that these conditions be drafted and construed narrowly so that they do not provide a statutory basis to maintain the status quo on the District’s deadliest streets.

Each bill includes as one such condition a situation where the costs would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use of the particular roadway. This condition is problematic because the need or probable use of a bike lane on a particular roadway is not equal to the *current* use of the roadway by bicyclists. Therefore, we recommend including a parenthetical in each bill that would make the following clarification to the condition:

“The costs would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use of the particular highway, road, street, or lane **(taking into account any changes in roadway use that DDOT reasonably believes may occur as a result of the change)**”
(Bicycling and Pedestrian Safety Act, p. 9, l. 209.)

“The cost of providing accommodation are excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use **(taking into account any changes in use that DDOT reasonably believes may occur as a result of providing the accommodation)**” (Vision Zero Act, p. 3, l. 23.)

These amendments would properly recognize that the installation of a protected bike lane *induces* demand, causing bicycling rates to increase substantially on the roadway.

The Vision Zero Act includes as another condition a situation where an affected roadway prohibits, by law, use by specified users, in which case a greater effort shall be made to accommodate those specified users elsewhere, including on roadways that “cross or otherwise intersect with” the affected roadway. (p. 3, l. 21.) The quoted text should be amended so that the specified users are accommodated on roadways that “run parallel to, or otherwise serve the same areas as” the affected roadway. In addition, this language, as amended, should be added to the similar condition that is included in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act. (p. 9, l. 206.)

Finally, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act should make a technical fix to clarify that the “Complete Streets policy shall not apply **to any particular highway, road, street or lane** if” one of the conditions applies. (p. 9, l. 205.)

B. Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Areas

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act would require DDOT to designate priority areas where the area is used heavily by bicyclists and pedestrians OR the area has a high number of collisions. DDOT would be required to make improvements to traffic patterns and infrastructure in priority areas to enhance bicyclist and pedestrian safety. WABA strongly supports this program and recommends its inclusion in any transportation safety legislation that is adopted.

WABA recommends that the first criterion for an area to be designated as a priority area should be disjunctive; the area should qualify if it is used heavily by bicyclists *or* pedestrians. In addition, the list of potential modifications to enhance safety in priority areas is somewhat narrow and should be expanded as follows:

“A description of modifications to traffic patterns and infrastructure that DDOT recommends occur within a Priority Area, including **(but not limited to)**:

- (A) Not allowing a right turn when a vehicle operator has a red light at a signalized intersection;
- (B) A reduction of the speed limit within the Priority Area;
- (C) The installation of protected bicycle infrastructure within the Priority Area; ~~and~~

(D) The increased use of traffic control officers and the automated traffic enforcement system in the Priority Area;

(E) Removing motor vehicle parking spots that immediately surround intersections in order to improve visibility;

(F) Reducing the number or width of motor vehicle lanes;

(G) Installation of leading pedestrian intervals;

(H) Designating lanes and/or signal phases exclusively for turns;

(I) Forbidding motor vehicles from making turns at any time at priority intersections;

(J) The installation of exclusive pedestrian and/or bicycle phases; and

(K) The installation of raised medians, crosswalks or pedestrian refuge islands.”

Finally, the bill should be revised to provide that DDOT shall actually implement, and not just recommend, safety changes to the priority areas.

C. Open Access to Data and Information

WABA is a strong supporter of open access to crash and road safety data. Accurate, complete, and accessible data will help the District accomplish many of the goals of its Vision Zero Initiative by:

- Identifying high priority streets, intersections and neighborhoods for safety improvements;
- Analyzing the effects of street design features;
- Creating more accurate benchmarks for measuring the District’s Vision Zero performance over time;
- Enabling public health practitioners to develop a greater understanding of the relationship between crash variables and medical outcomes; and
- Promoting transparency and ensuring the public’s ready access to important safety information.

WABA has encouraged the Mayor’s office, DDOT, the Metropolitan Police Department, the Department of Motor Vehicles and the City Council to modernize the District’s crash data collection, integration and disclosure policies in three ways:

1. Updating the crash intake form of the Metropolitan Police Department (“MPD”) to better align with national minimum standards so that the circumstances of a crash are captured accurately at the scene of the crash;
2. Integrating crash data with medical data so that the physical outcomes of people injured in a crash are reflected in the record of the crash; and
3. Disclosing crash data automatically, in a timely and intuitive manner.²

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act would take important steps to further these goals by mandating DDOT to publish on its website monthly collision data. One factor required to be disclosed for each crash is the “apparent human factor or factors that contributed to the collision, including intoxication, driver inattention or distraction, speeding, failure to yield, and use of cell phones or other mobile devices.” Unfortunately, it is WABA’s experience that crashes can also be caused by a driver’s intent, recklessness, or aggressive driving. Accordingly, this list should be expanded to include those potential contributing factors.

The bill would also require the MPD to publish on its website monthly moving infraction data. (p. 3, l. 69.) Since many infractions may be pleaded down or dismissed for reasons that do not relate to the underlying conduct, this section should be amended as follows to clarify that infractions should be disclosed as they are ticketed, not as they are finally determined:

“The Metropolitan Police Department shall publish on its website, at least once per month, the following information related to each moving infraction ~~occurring~~ **for which a citation was issued** in the preceding month . . .”

The bill should require MPD to disclose the number and location of tickets issued to motor vehicle drivers for parking, idling, or driving in a bike lane. Like moving violations and unlike most parking violations, parking, idling, or driving in a bike lane creates a safety hazard. Cars and trucks obstructing bike lanes cause bicyclists to merge into car traffic, sometimes abruptly, and sometimes directly into the path of a speeding driver. This is an all-too-common experience for bicyclists in the District, one that discourages inexperienced or apprehensive riders from riding their bikes. A requirement to disclose the number of tickets issued for parking, idling, or driving in bike lanes would send an important message that enforcement is needed in this area, and would allow the City Council and the public to monitor levels of enforcement.

² For more information on these issues, see our July 2015 policy paper, [Modernizing the Collection, Integration and Disclosure of Crash Data: Policy Recommendations for the District of Columbia](#).

Finally, DDOT and MPD crash data has often been released in static reports that do not enable the public to sort the underlying data to produce maps and charts. Therefore, all crash safety data subject to the disclosure provisions of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act should be disclosed in a format that is easy to read and should be downloadable by the public.

D. Bicyclists Must Stop

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act would permit a bicyclist approaching a stop sign or steady red light to cautiously make a turn or proceed through the intersection without stopping if there are no vehicles with the right of way in or approaching the intersection. The following chart compares what behavior is illegal or legal under current law and what would change if the proposed legislation were enacted.

Bicyclist action	Potential for endangering other road users?	Status under current traffic law	Status under proposed law
Riding through four-way stop without stopping or looking with a vehicle stopped at the cross street.	Yes	Illegal	Illegal
Riding through two-way stop without stopping or looking with a vehicle present or proceeding in the opposite direction.	Yes	Illegal	Illegal
Riding through a red traffic light without stopping.	Yes	Illegal	Illegal
Riding through a four-way or two-way stop without stopping when another vehicle is approaching at the same time.	Yes	Illegal	Illegal
Riding through a stop sign with a pedestrian crossing or preparing to cross the street.	Yes	Illegal	Illegal
Riding through a four-way stop without other vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians present.	No	Illegal	Legal

WABA supports this provision because it would focus scarce traffic enforcement resources on road user behaviors that pose real risks to others – including distracted driving, driving under the influence, and failing to yield the right of way to pedestrians.

E. Curbing Dangerous Driving

The three bills being considered would improve the safety of our streets by defining new moving violations, strengthening the enforcement of existing violations, and revising education programs. WABA supports these changes and has a number of recommendations to strengthen the bills, as discussed below.

1. Ignition Interlock Devices

The Vision Zero Act would require a person who has been convicted of certain drunk driving offenses to install an ignition interlock device. (p. 6, l. 15.) WABA supports this requirement, and believes it should be strengthened with an enforcement provision. Currently, the only consequence of failing to install a required ignition interlock device appears to be an extension of the mandatory term for which the device is required to be installed. (p. 7, l. 8.) However, there appears to be no penalty for a driver's *continued* failure to install a required ignition interlock device. These dangerous drivers should be seriously fined, removed from our roads, or even jailed for continuing to defy the law and endangering the public.

2. Drunk Driving Penalties

The Vision Zero Act would increase penalties for drunk driving offenses. (p. 7, l. 21.) WABA supports these provisions.

3. For-hire Vehicle Operator Training

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act would revise for-hire vehicle operating training and taxi operator training to add training in specific traffic concepts, including the rights and safety of pedestrians and bicyclists. (p. 12, l. 276.) WABA fully supports these revisions, which will help educate our city's most active and frequent drivers on the rights of the most vulnerable road users.

4. Remediation and Deferred Disposition Program

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act would mandate a study of whether the District should implement a remediation and deferred disposition program for individuals that commit moving or nonmoving infractions in the District. (p. 13, l. 306.) WABA supports a study of these programs. Any program that is adopted should be carefully structured to properly deter dangerous driving. For example, if penalties for a first offense are decreased upon the completion of a course or test, penalties for a second offense should be increased by the same amount or more. We would welcome the opportunity to participate in the design of a program, if one is adopted, including any education or testing that relates to the rights of bicyclists and pedestrians.

5. Repeat Offenders

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act would provide an escalating series of fines for repeat offenders of serious driving violations, including entering crosswalks, crossing through a red

light, failing to yield the right of way, or parking or idling on a sidewalk or bike lane. (p. 14, l. 322.) WABA supports this provision. However, the provision as it is drafted could be read to require a person to commit the *same* offense twice to be subject to the increased penalties. The language could benefit from clarification that separate violations of two different offenses on the list would also trigger increased penalties:

“A person that violates one **or more** of the following provisions of law ~~more than once~~ **after violating any of the following provisions of law** within a **the previous** 12-month period shall be subject to escalating fines as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section”

6. Distracted Driving

The Distracted Driving Safety Act of 2004, which bans the use of handheld devices by drivers, currently suffers from a number of weaknesses that undermine its effectiveness in stopping distracted driving:

- Fines for a violation are too low;
- No points are assessed on a violation unless it contributes to a crash;
- The purchase of a hands-free device suspends the fine.
- Repeat offenders are not subject to increasing penalties; and
- MPD interprets the language “moving vehicle” in the current law to exclude use of a device while stopped in traffic (such as at a stoplight);

While this law may have been appropriate for the time when it was adopted, a massive increase in distracted driving with the advent of the smartphone and other electronic devices, and new research undermining previous assumptions about the effectiveness of hands-free accessories, have proven that the law is no longer up to the task. The U.S. Department of Transportation has found that nationwide, distracted driving contributes to 10 percent of fatal crashes, 18 percent of injury crashes, and 16 percent of police-reported crashes.³ Research from the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety indicates that distraction “latency” lasts an average of 27 seconds, meaning that, even after drivers put down a mobile phone or stop fiddling with a navigation system,

³ U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, [Traffic Safety Facts Research Note: Distracted Driving 2013](#) (Apr. 2015).

drivers are not fully engaged with the task of driving.⁴ AAA research also shows that talking on a hands-free phone is almost as distracting to a driver as talking on a handheld phone.⁵

The three bills being considered would address some of the flaws of the Distracted Driving Safety Act. First, the Vision Zero Act would amend the law to increase the penalty for distracted driving from a \$100 fine with no points to a \$500 fine plus two traffic points. (p. 9, l. 1.) The fine and points would be suspended upon the purchase of a hands-free accessory.

Second, the Enhanced Penalties for Distracted Driving Amendment Act would amend the law by keeping the \$100 base fine, but providing an escalating series of fines for repeated violations within an 18 month period, including a suspension of the driver's license for the third violation. (p. 2, l. 41.) Points would not be assessed for a single violation that did not contribute to a crash, but may be assessed for a subsequent violation that occurs within an 18 month period, regardless of whether the violations contributed to a crash. (p. 2, l. 55.) There would be no suspension of a fine or points for the purchase of a hands-free accessory.

Third, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act would amend the law to further limit the situations in which a person could use a mobile telephone while operating a vehicle. (p. 15, l. 347.)

WABA supports adopting a combination of all three bills. A study by the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety showed that 27% of drivers surveyed *admitted* to driving distracted within the past 30 days. Department of Motor Vehicle records show that only 7,000 tickets were issued in 2014 for "driving using a cell phone or other device," and only 246 were issued to repeat offenders. With more than 650,000 daily motor vehicle trips within the District alone, it is clear that distracted driving laws are not being sufficiently enforced.

The base penalty for distracted driving should be increased to include higher fines and traffic points, because a \$100 fine is far too low to be a deterrent. Moreover, drivers should not be free of punishment for purchasing a hands-free device, since research now shows that hands-free phone use is nearly as distracting as handheld phone use. Rather, an increase in the penalties applicable to first offenses and repeat offenses should provide prospective and first-time violators with the incentive to comply with the law.

Furthermore, the time period between a first and second offense should be lengthened to increase the odds of a repeat offender being caught and penalized. Increasing the period for which a second violation can result in escalating penalties from the current 18 months to three years or longer would help address this problem.

Finally, the lingering cognitive impairment resulting from cell phone use in any degree creates inherently unsafe driving conditions and should be entirely banned. The scope of proscribed conduct should be expanded to include all situations where a driver is operating a motor vehicle

⁴ AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety, [Distracted Driving](#).

⁵ AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety, [Measuring Cognitive Distractions](#).

other than an emergency. MPD officers often interpret a stopped vehicle in traffic as “not moving” and fail to enforce the distracted driving laws. Accordingly, any final legislation should eliminate the “moving vehicle” language creating this loophole.

7. Aggressive Driving

WABA supports the creation of an aggressive driving offense for drivers who commit three or more specified dangerous offenses at the same time or during a continuous period of driving one mile. (Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Act, p. 15, l. 352.) Given the seriousness and number of offenses underlying an aggressive driving violation, we believe the proposed penalty of two traffic points and a \$200 fine is too low and should be increased.

II. Important Changes Missing from Proposed Bills

Unfortunately, none of the bills being considered would address three of the most dangerous behaviors on our city streets: speeding, blocking bike lanes, and making dangerous turns at red lights.

A. Lower Speed Limits on Local Streets

The bills should lower the speed limit on the city’s local (neighborhood) streets from 25 mph to 20 mph in recognition that speed is one of the most important determinants of traffic injuries and deaths.

The evidence is clear that lower speed limits save lives:

- A study by the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety found that the risk of severe injury for a pedestrian hit at 23 mph is 25 percent. At 31 mph, the risk of severe injury increases to 50 percent. At 39 mph, the rate of severe injury jumps to 75 percent.⁶
- According to AAA research, a person is **74 times** more likely to be killed if struck by a vehicle traveling at 30 mph than at 25 mph.⁷
- 20 mph zones in London reduced injuries by 42 percent and death and serious injuries by 46 percent, resulting in an economic benefit to the city of at least £20 million per year.⁸

Cities larger and more congested than the District of Columbia have adopted lower speed limits. Toronto lowered speed limits on hundreds of local streets from 40 km/h (25 mph) to 30 km/h (19

⁶ AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety, [Impact Speed and a Pedestrian’s Risk of Severe Injury or Death](#) (Sept. 2011).

⁷ [Why Lowering NYC’s Speed Limit by Just 5 Mph Can Save a Lot of Lives](#), Wired (Nov. 13, 2014).

⁸ London Assembly, [Braking Point: 20 mph Speed Limits in London](#) (Apr. 2009).

mph) in 2015.⁹ London has installed more than four hundred 20 mph zones in residential neighborhoods or near areas of high pedestrian activity since 2001.¹⁰

WABA urges the City Council to pass legislation lowering the speed limit on residential streets to 20 mph. District residents walk, bike, or take public transit more than in any other city in the United States other than New York. Our city should also be a leader in protecting its most vulnerable road users from preventable death or injury.

B. Increase Fines for Parking in Bike Lanes

Drivers who stop, stand, or park in bike lanes endanger bicyclists and other drivers. When a bike lane is blocked by a car or truck, even temporarily, bicyclists are forced to merge into a regular traffic lane. This sudden need to merge out of a bike lane and into motor vehicle traffic creates a safety hazard for drivers and bicyclists. The common and dangerous practice of blocking bike lanes completely negates the value of a bike lane and discourages people from using bicycles as transportation.

It is illegal under District law to stop, stand, or park in a bike lane.¹¹ The penalty is \$65 per violation. In 2013, the District issued 4,200 tickets for unlawful parking and standing in bike lanes.¹² The number of vehicles that continue to park in bike lanes demonstrates that this fine is clearly not a sufficient deterrent, especially for commercial delivery drivers and taxis. For many drivers, the small chance of receiving a \$65 fine is well worth using a conveniently car-free bicycle lane as temporary parking.

The District should raise the penalty for illegal stopping, standing, or parking in bike lanes. Comparable cities have significantly higher fines than the District (\$100 in San Francisco and New York; \$115 in Chicago).

C. Prohibit Right Turns on Red Lights

D.C. law generally permits drivers to make right turns at red lights, provided they make a full stop and yield the right of way to pedestrians and other vehicles.¹³ In practice, drivers often do not come to a full stop behind the stop bar or even slow down before making a right turn on red.

⁹ [Huge Swath of Toronto Will See Residential Speed Limit Decrease to 30 km/h](#), The Globe and Mail (June 22, 2015).

¹⁰ London Assembly, [Braking Point: 20 mph Speed Limits in London](#) (Apr. 2009).

¹¹ D.C. Muni. Reg. § 2405.1(g).

¹² [Are Drivers Still Parking in D.C. Bike Lanes? You Bet.](#) Washington Post (July 16, 2014).

¹³ D.C. Muni. Reg. § 4013. The law only forbids drivers from making right turns at red lights at a limited number of intersections and at certain times of the day, creating uncertainty for drivers that are used to turning red at right lights throughout the city.

Committee on Transportation and the Environment
District of Columbia City Council
December 8, 2015

Pedestrians are especially vulnerable to drivers making quick and dangerous right turns at red lights. Drivers are violating the pedestrians' right of way if they turn through an intersection with a pedestrian present, and the law encourages this dangerous practice. Drivers making unsafe turns at red lights also put any driver or bicyclist proceeding with the right of way on perpendicular streets at unacceptable risk. For these reasons, New York City has long prohibited drivers from making rights turns at red lights on *any* city street except a limited number of intersections marked with a sign or green arrow.

D.C. should follow this best practice and also forbid drivers from making right turns on red city-wide. Uniformity in the application of the law will create predictability and make the law easy to follow and enforce.

* * *

Thank you for your consideration of the comments set forth in this statement and for your continued engagement on street safety issues. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to reach out to me at (202) 518-0524 x205 or greg@waba.org, or Tamara Evans, Advocacy Director of WABA at (202) 518-0524 x212 or tamara.evans@waba.org.

Respectfully submitted,

Greg Billing
Executive Director
Washington Area Bicyclist Association