



TRANSPORTATION SAFETY ACTION PLAN

Advisory Committee Meeting #3 Summary

January 27, 2025

Attendees

- Sgt. Howard Dorner, Troop K Traffic Supervisor, NYS Police
- Stephen Gill, Traffic Engineer, Dutchess County Dept. of Public Works
- Hisieni Sacasa, Biostatistician, Dutchess County Dept of Health
- Bill Johnson, Dutchess County Traffic Safety Administrator
- Sgt. Todd Kara, Troop K, NYS Police
- Dr. Dwight Bonk, Superintendent, Wappingers Central School District
- Melkorka Kjarval, Deputy Mayor, Village of Red Hook
- Jeffery Smith, Director of Transportation Services, Bard College
- Mohammed Islam, Pedestrian/Bicycle Coordinator, NYSDOT Region 8
- Emily Dozier, Senior Planner (Project Manager), DCTC
- Mark Debald, Transportation Program Administrator, DCTC
- Tara Grogan, Senior Planner, DCTC
- Nina Leonard, Planner, DCTC
- Cory Hopwood, Cambridge Systematics (CS)
- Ryan Klitzsch, Cambridge Systematics (CS)
- Russ Martin, Cambridge Systematics (CS)
- Dave Rettig, TYLin
- Kaylee Moon, TYLin
- Mikala Sherman-Kortright, Weston & Sampson

Welcome, Introductions, and Status Update

Cory Hopwood launched the meeting, facilitated brief introductions of attendees, and reviewed the agenda.

Cory described the status of the plan: Task 1-Project Management and Public Outreach activities are ongoing; Task 2-Dutchess County Context and Document Review is complete; Task 3-Data Collection is complete; and Task 4-Data Analysis is underway. Task 5-Countermeasures Selection has just begun. He also briefly reviewed upcoming activities in Task 6 through 8.

Action Item: CS has provided the PowerPoint presentation to the DCTC to send to the Advisory Committee so they can reference it and provide feedback if appropriate.

Task 1 Public Outreach

Mikala Sherman-Kortright reviewed the outcomes of major public outreach activities to date. The DCTC has two online resources for gathering community input including the Interactive Safety Mapping Tool and Transportation Safety Survey.

The Interactive Safety Mapping Tool has received numerous locations pinned by public respondents, mostly in the western corridor of the County. The top concern (20%) is stop sign/red light running.

The Transportation Safety Survey has received 283 responses. Respondents feel most unsafe while walking, bicycling, or riding a motorcycle. The top three recommended improvements that would make respondents feel safer include improved intersections, enforcement, and roadway design. The survey received a significant influx of input this weekend after recent survey promotion.

Action Item: Emily noted that DCTC will send a blurb and graphic that can be used by stakeholders to further promote the survey and map.

Mikala summarized the outcome of Public Meeting #1, which was held December 19. Primary safety concerns included speeding, roadways designed primarily for vehicles, vulnerable road users (VRUs), and distracted/impaired driving. The participants mostly favored key engineering countermeasures like improved lighting and signage, roundabouts, roadway reconfiguration, and crosswalk improvements. They also highlighted several specific locations of concern.

David Rettig summarized interviews with a wide range of stakeholder groups, including county agencies, highway superintendents, municipalities, school districts, and representatives of the most vulnerable road users.

- Key concerns focused on the safety risks of unsafe driving behaviors: speeding, distracted driving, and aggressive driving. At the same time, enforcement is limited by lack of equipment and staffing resources, as well as inability to apply for certain kinds of grants (for instance, the need for individual agencies - not the County - to apply for grants from the NY GTSC). There was some interest in automated enforcement.
- Participants were concerned about infrastructure shortcomings for VRUs and lack of ADA-compliant designs. Many locations lack basic features like crosswalks and sidewalks.

Emily Dozier mentioned that the DCTC is planning future pop-up events and asked the group to let her know if they have any upcoming events where the DCTC could set up a booth.

Action Item: Dr. Dwight Bonk noted that he had a specific location of concern near Myers Corners Elementary School in Wappinger and volunteered to partner on community outreach.

Task 4 Data Analysis

Cory presented on and explained the recommended emphasis areas for the SAP. Cory suggested potentially adding Roadway Departures back in under “Safer Roads”, as this would be a fruitful area of systemic investment for rural areas of the county.

Dutchess County SAP Draft Emphasis Areas

Safer Roads	Intersections		
Safer Speeds	Speeding		
Safer People	Vulnerable Road Users Older Drivers	Distracted Driving Impaired Driving	Aggressive Driving
Safer Vehicles	Large Trucks		
Post Crash Care			

Emily commented that EMS access is priority for County Executive Sue Serino.

Cory explained the plan’s approach to network screening, which is meant to identify specific locations of interest and fulfill an SS4A requirement. The goal of reactive screening is to narrow down a list of final locations by comparing roadways with a ranking on various performance metrics. The Plan will aim to identify 30 locally-owned locations, one state-owned location, and one County-owned location, in addition to a longer list of candidate locations. The analysis had to use slightly different criteria for local roads due to fewer crashes and less traffic than more major roadways.

State highways have a higher frequency of crashes due to volume, however Emily commented that the analysis examines local roads specifically because a goal of the plan is to enable each municipality to be able to apply for federal funding to implement improvements.

The Plan will also consider locations identified by the Advisory Committee, the public, and other stakeholders to seek potentially overlooked problem areas.

Cory described the data source (NYSDOT CLEAR), timeframe (the past five years), and various metrics and criteria used in the network screening. CS established a system of scoring that prioritizes fatal and serious injury crashes, as well as Vulnerable Road User (VRU) risk.

Cory presented the network screening map and explained the two analyses. A November 2024 analysis, which included all roads, resulted in more urban areas and State routes selected. A January 2025 analysis, in which local roads were prioritized, resulted in more locations balanced throughout the county. CS will add road ownership and some other contextual information to the lists of results. Cory asked the Committee members to review the list over the next week and consider potential priorities and other feedback.

The process would benefit from Committee input on how to narrow down locations, or any additional hotspots that were not captured.

Action Item: Emily stated that DCTC will send out follow-up instructions for the Committee to provide input on the network hotspot screening.

Cory explained the systemic screening analysis in progress. This analysis has identified where there are the most over-represented crash types in the last 10 years: intersections, pedestrians,

roadway departure, and speeding. Analysts are using data to narrow down which roadway facilities are over-represented for each of these crash types. Cory noted that for roadway departure, the DCTC is seeking data on roadway curves to better identify high-risk locations.

The analysis will then dive deeper to identify key risk factors for each facility that are relevant for the focus crash types. Cory described the variable quality of data that facilitates this analysis. From this systemic screening, we can identify key countermeasures that can be applied in a targeted way system-wide to help reduce these risks and address severe crashes.

Task 5 Countermeasure Toolkit and Stakeholder Meeting

David presented on the Countermeasure Toolkit under development. He showed a template for how countermeasures might be presented in this resource and the accompanying information, such as what emphasis area it pertains to, safety background, design guidance, implementation cost, and timeframe. The toolkit will also include references to national guidelines.

The countermeasures included will be ones that apply the most to Dutchess County and especially for locations on the expanded list of safety hotspots. The consultant team is determining exactly which countermeasures to include and asked the Committee to recommend any “must have’s”.

David described the upcoming in-person Stakeholder Workshop in March. Scheduling is in progress but DCTC is planning to invite the full Committee and representatives from all municipalities. At the meeting, the team will summarize key findings to date and have a “workshop” format with “stations” to gather feedback on potential priority locations and candidate countermeasures.

Post Crash Care

Dutchess County is already looking to expand EMS access, but EMS needs are not necessarily identified in crash data. Nor did post-crash care come up as a key concern in stakeholder meetings. David mentioned that signal prioritization is one countermeasure that can help facilitate EMS response – a feature already installed on some State roads.

Action Item: Emily asked Moe Islam from NYSDOT to investigate how many State Road locations in Dutchess County have signal prioritization for EMS.

Cory asked if Post-Crash Care should be an SAP Emphasis Area, how important is it, and what action items can be pursued? Current Dutchess County EMS actions could be included as an action item. Representatives from the County Department of Emergency Response are on the Committee but have not been able to attend. EMS needs may include new ambulances, equipment for ambulances, traffic incident management training and equipment, and EMS data improvement projects.

Action Item: Emily suggested having a meeting with the Emergency Response staff to discuss this issue and how we can more clearly connect needs to traffic safety outcomes.

Many countermeasures, like signal prioritization, would require extra funding. Post-Crash Care may not need to be its own emphasis area, and could be mentioned as a smaller-scale, separate action, so there’s not a need for a lengthy list of investments.

Drug Impaired Driving

With increased drugged driving due to cannabis legalization and the challenge of lagging data, the group discussed drugged driving needs in the context of the SAP.

Currently, police in Dutchess County generally use the normal Standardized Field Sobriety Tests (SFSTs) for drugged driving cases, though these tests not necessarily optimized for cannabis.

The County has some coverage for drug recognition training (ARIDE - Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement certification and Drug Recognition Expert - DRE certification). Dutchess County and State Police Troop K have a limited number of DREs. All State Troopers in Dutchess County benefit from ARIDE training, but may not have on-the-road experience with what they're learning and it can be difficult to build confidence because there isn't a high volume of cases over time.

Local municipalities also don't have funding to send officers for ARIDE or DRE training. DRE training in particular is a long, high-intensity training course (three weeks). The state has a push to increase the numbers of DREs statewide, but certification and maintenance is very tedious. DRE training is held regionally around the state and may or may not take place close to Dutchess County. Law enforcement agencies have to budget to send officers to training and once a DRE is certified, pay for DRE call-outs to conduct case evaluations and testify in court. There are no strong incentives to encourage more DRE participation; DRE training itself is very selective and merit-based.

The state does not offer a lot of funding earmarked specifically for drugged driving enforcement. State police are responsible for 75 percent of impaired driving arrests in the county and support focused enforcement campaigns leveraging lots of staff. Local law enforcement agencies lack enough manpower to focus effectively on impaired driving. Additionally, many drugged driving cases are now multi-substance with cannabis and alcohol, or with prescription medication, which is much more difficult for DREs to evaluate.

County prosecutors are sometimes hesitant to prosecute drugged driving cases due to case inexperience and evidentiary challenges. Dutchess County does not have a DWI or other specialty court that can offer unique services to impaired driving offenders (the County only recently established centralized arraignment). Impaired driving cases are mostly managed in municipal courts, leading to inconsistency. Defense attorneys not familiar with drug recognition training and tend to aggressively attack DRE qualifications, making it hard for DREs to defend themselves and the program on the stand.

Ultimately, drugged driving faces a number of legislative barriers on the state level, though there is an effort to redefine "drugged driving" to be more expansive. The Committee agreed that this was a problematic area where risk is increasing and training is not keeping up.

Action Item: Though there was consensus to include drugged driving in the plan, further discussion will be needed to identify countermeasure strategies.

Next Steps

Cory briefly summarized next steps, including Data Analysis, developing the Countermeasure Toolkit, developing an SAP outline, Stakeholder Workshop #1, Public Event #2, and beginning Task 6. The DCTC aims to host the 4th Advisory Committee in late March.