



MID-AMERICA TRANSPORTATION CENTER

Report # MATC-MU: 185

Final Report

25-1121-0003-185

UNIVERSITY OF
Nebraska
Lincoln

K-STATE
Kansas State University

KU
THE UNIVERSITY OF
KANSAS

MISSOURI
S&T
University of
Science & Technology

U LINCOLN
University

 University of Missouri

IOWA STATE
UNIVERSITY


THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

New Highway Accident Location Manual for Missouri

Carlos Sun, Ph.D., P.E., JD

Associate Professor

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Missouri-Columbia

Praveen Edara, Ph.D., P.E., PTOE

Associate Professor

Henry Brown M.S., P.E.

Research Engineer

 **Mizzou**
University of Missouri

2013

A Cooperative Research Project sponsored by
U.S. Department of Transportation-Research, Innovation and
Technology Innovation Administration

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the information presented herein. This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation University Transportation Centers Program, in the interest of information exchange.
The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the contents or use thereof.

New Highway Accident Location Manual for Missouri

Carlos Sun, Ph.D., P.E., JD
Associate Professor
Department of Civil Engineering
University of Missouri-Columbia

Praveen Edara, Ph.D., P.E., PTOE
Associate Professor
Department of Civil Engineering
University of Missouri-Columbia

Henry Brown, M.S., P.E.
Research Engineer
Department of Civil Engineering
University of Missouri-Columbia

A Report on Research Sponsored by

Mid-America Transportation Center

University of Nebraska–Lincoln

December 2013

Technical Report Documentation Page

| | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------|
| 1. Report No. 25-1121-0003-185 | 2. Government Accession No. | 3. Recipient's Catalog No. | |
| 4. Title and Subtitle New Highway Accident Location Manual for Missouri | | 5. Report Date December, 2013 | |
| | | 6. Performing Organization Code | |
| 7. Author(s) Sun, C., Edara, P. and Brown, H. | | 8. Performing Organization Report No. 25-1121-0003-185 | |
| 9. Performing Organization Name and Address University of Missouri-Columbia E 2509 Lafferre Hall Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering Columbia, MO 65211 | | 10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS) | |
| | | 11. Contract or Grant No. | |
| 12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Research and Innovative Technology Administration 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE Washington, D.C. 20590 | | 13. Type of Report and Period Covered June 2012 to December 2013 | |
| | | 14. Sponsoring Agency Code MATC TRB RiP No. 1250769 | |
| 15. Supplementary Notes | | | |
| 16. Abstract The Missouri HAL manual is used to identify, analyze, and correct high crash locations, and has not been updated since 1999. This new edition brings the manual up to date, while incorporating the methodology of the national Highway Safety Manual (HSM). This 4 th edition represents a complete re-working of all existing chapters of the manual. The changes are both stylistic and substantive. A contemporary book-style stylesheet was used to improve the appearance of figures, tables, headings, and labels. Even the title of the manual was changed from HAL (Identification, Analysis, and Correction of High-Crash Locations) to S-HAL (Safety Handbook for Locals) in order to reflect current trends in highway safety. The section on countermeasures has been improved significantly through the incorporation of the HSM approach to analyzing countermeasure effectiveness. Further, the manual now incorporates a partnership-based approach to safety. This edition takes full advantage of the availability of safety information, becoming the gateway for many additional sources. | | | |
| 17. Key Words safety, local community, manual | | 18. Distribution Statement | |
| 19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified | 20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified | 21. No. of Pages 5 | 22. Price |

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------|------|
| Acknowledgments..... | vi |
| Disclaimer | vii |
| Abstract | viii |
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| References | 4 |
| Appendix..... | 5 |

List of Figures

No figures to report.

List of Tables

No tables to report.

Acknowledgments

The authors are thankful for the guidance and direction provided by MoDOT staff Michael Curtit, John Miller, and Ashley Reinkemeyer. The authors acknowledge the assistance of Britt Smith, David Bange, and Tia Griffiths from the Public Works department of Jefferson City, and Richard Stone and Rose Wibbenmeyer from the City of Columbia. The authors also acknowledge David Engstrom and F.E. (Gene) Amparano from the FHWA Resource Center for sharing their “Safety Analysis for Local Agencies” course material.

Disclaimer

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the information presented herein. This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation's University Transportation Centers Program, in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the contents or use thereof.

Abstract

The Missouri HAL manual is used to identify, analyze, and correct high crash locations, and has not been updated since 1999. This new edition brings the manual up to date, while incorporating the methodology of the national Highway Safety Manual (HSM). This 4th edition represents a complete re-working of all existing chapters of the manual. The changes are both stylistic and substantive. A contemporary book-style stylesheet was used to improve the appearance of figures, tables, headings, and labels. Even the title of the manual was changed from HAL (Identification, Analysis, and Correction of High-Crash Locations) to S-HAL (Safety Handbook for Locals) in order to reflect current trends in highway safety. The section on countermeasures has been improved significantly through the incorporation of the HSM approach to analyzing countermeasure effectiveness. Further, the manual now incorporates a partnership-based approach to safety. This edition takes full advantage of the availability of safety information, becoming the gateway for many additional sources.

Executive Summary

This 4th edition of the Safety Handbook for Locals (S-HAL) contains both stylistic and content changes from the 3rd edition. In terms of style, a primary goal was to make the manual more reader-friendly to local communities. A more contemporary stylesheet was used in this new edition, and improvements were made in the appearance of figures, tables, headings, and labels. Where numerical examples are presented, numerical analysis was utilized so that the reader can follow the units of each variable for a better understanding of the computations. When advanced techniques are presented, the effort required is presented graphically so that the reader can quickly ignore techniques that are beyond their resources.

Since the 3rd edition was published in 1999, significant substantive advances have been achieved in terms of highway safety. These advances are reflected in the contents of this new edition. One main advance is a redirection of focus from blackspot identification to system-wide analysis. In other words, the national safety approach has moved beyond simply chasing after high-crash locations. The modern approach is proactive, rather than reactive. Traffic crashes are rare, because many circumstances must occur simultaneously in order to cause a crash; the possibility that the same set of circumstances will recur exactly has only a tiny probability. This is not to say, however, that it is unimportant to examine the circumstances that contribute to a crash. Circumstances are typically divided into three categories: human factors, vehicle factors, and roadway (including environmental) factors. Therefore, the title of this manual was changed from HAL (Identification, Analysis and Correction of High-Crash Locations) to S-HAL (Safety Handbook for Locals). Another reason for this new title was to relate the S-HAL to a recently published national safety handbook, the Highway Safety Manual (AASHTO, 2010). The HSM is expected to significantly influence local policy and engineering practice, in the same way that

the Highway Capacity Manual has transformed traffic impact analysis for planning and site development. It is important that the S-HAL be consistent with the principles and techniques that are promoted in the HSM. The HSM was developed from a wealth of national knowledge and experience surrounding highway safety. The S-HAL takes advantage of this same wellspring.

The S-HAL chapter on countermeasures has been improved significantly through incorporation of the HSM approach of analyzing countermeasure effectiveness. By using the HSM approach, problems such as regression-to-the-mean and data randomness are increasingly being reduced. A wealth of countermeasure evaluations that have been performed over the past 20 years; the local community can now benefit from the experiences of other communities, which have been translated into user-friendly quantitative measures—most notably, the Crash Modification Factor (CMF). The economic analysis procedure for countermeasures has also been completely rewritten and expanded. For example, three different methods—net present value, benefit/cost ratio, and cost effectiveness—are now presented.

Though this manual is targeted toward individuals who are involved in public works and transportation engineering, the current trend in safety is moving toward a partnership-based approach, in contrast to the primarily engineering approach of yesteryears. This new edition encourages the formation of partnerships and coalitions for improving safety. Local traffic enforcement is an indispensable partner, since local police collect vital crash data and enforce traffic laws; in some communities, the local police, not engineers, are in charge of traffic safety. Another important “partner” is education. Education can refer to formal ways of improving driver education, especially among higher-risk younger drivers. It can also refer to general public outreach via the media and news releases; for example, the success of new engineering techniques such as roundabouts and the flashing yellow arrow indication relies heavily upon the

public's understanding and acceptance of these techniques. Education can also refer to changing individuals' behaviors and attitudes about risky behaviors such as driving while intoxicated, not using seatbelts, or the improper use of child restraints. Emergency medical services are another important class of partners. How quickly the injured are transported and treated following a crash can have a significant impact on injury severity and the prognosis for recovery. Many additional partners have a vested interest in safety, including public schools, neighborhood associations, and pedestrian coalitions, just to name a few.

One major change occurring in the last decade is that technology has made electronic sources and documents easily accessible. Instead of having to request and then wait for paper documents to arrive, electronic information can be accessed instantaneously. This new edition of the S-HAL takes full advantage of the availability of safety information, becoming a gateway for many additional sources. Many of these sources, such as publications and websites, are fully documented throughout this new edition.

Many new tools have also recently been developed. A brand new chapter has been devoted to the new "Road Safety Audits or Assessments (RSA)" tool, which incorporates new and varied perspectives that were previously unaccounted for. The RSA tool reflects the new attitude towards community partnerships for achieving safety goals.

References

AASHTO (2010) *Highway Safety Manual*. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. Washington, D.C.

Appendix

Please see the attached electronic file that includes the complete new edition of the S-HAL manual.



MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Produced by the University of Missouri

SHAL

MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

S-HAL: Safety Handbook for Locals

Produced by the University of Missouri
Transportation Engineering Program
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
E2509 Lafferre Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65211-2200
Phone 573.882.6269 • Fax 573.882.4784

Copyright 2013

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the support provided by the Mid-America Transportation Center under the auspices of the USDOT University Transportation Centers Program. The authors are thankful for the guidance and direction provided by MoDOT traffic safety staff Michael Curtit, John Miller, and Ashley Reinkemeyer. The authors acknowledge the assistance of Britt Smith, David Bange, and Tia Griffiths from the Public Works department of Jefferson City, and Richard Stone and Rose Wibbenmeyer from the City of Columbia. The authors also recognize David Engstrom and F.E. (Gene) Amparano from the FHWA Resource Center for sharing their “Safety Analysis for Local Agencies” course material.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO S-HAL | 1 |
| Changes from Previous Editions | 3 |
| How to Use the S-HAL System | 4 |
| Evolution of Substantive Safety | 7 |
| S-HAL Organization | 8 |
| Chapter 1 Bibliography | 10 |
| CHAPTER 2: TRAFFIC RECORDS SYSTEM | 11 |
| Crash Data | 11 |
| Crash Data Interfaces | 17 |
| Local Crash Database | 21 |
| Spreadsheets | 21 |
| Database Software | 22 |
| GIS Databases | 24 |
| Chapter 2 Bibliography | 25 |
| CHAPTER 3: NETWORK SCREENING | 26 |
| Annual Average Daily Traffic | 27 |
| Safety Performance Measures | 28 |
| Average Crash Frequency ☹ | 29 |
| Crash Rate ☹ | 30 |
| Equivalent Property Damage Only ☹ | 31 |
| Relative Severity Index ☹☹ | 33 |
| Critical Crash Rate ☹☹ | 35 |
| Method of Moments Adjustment ☹☹ | 37 |
| Introduction to HSM-Based Service Performance Measures | 38 |
| Level of Service of Safety ☹☹☹☹ | 39 |
| Excess Safety Performance Function Crash Frequency ☹☹☹☹ | 41 |
| Specific Crash Type Proportion Threshold ☹☹☹☹ | 42 |
| Empirical Bayes Adjustments ☹☹☹☹☹ | 42 |
| Chapter 3 Bibliography | 44 |
| CHAPTER 4: SAFETY ANALYSIS TOOLS | 45 |
| Tools for Analyzing Individual Locations | 45 |
| Collision Diagram ☹ ☹ | 45 |
| On-Site Observation Report ☹ ☹ | 48 |
| Condition Diagram ☹ ☹ | 52 |
| Traffic Data Collection ☹ ☹ | 55 |
| Spot Speed Studies ☹ ☹ ☹ | 55 |
| Traffic Conflicts Studies ☹ ☹ ☹ ☹ | 55 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Sight Distance Evaluations | 55 |
| Location Analysis Worksheet | 55 |
| Tools for Analyzing Multiple Locations | 59 |
| MoDOT Crash Statistics | 59 |
| MSHP Traffic Crashes Online Mapping Tool | 61 |
| LETS | 63 |
| Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) Mapping Tool | 63 |
| Pedestrian and Bicycle GIS Safety Analysis Tools (FHWA) | 66 |
| Pedestrian and Bicycle Crash Analysis Tool (PBCAT) | 66 |
| Highway Safety Manual (HSM) Spreadsheets | 67 |
| Interactive Highway Safety Design Model (IHSDM) Software | 76 |
| SafetyAnalyst | 79 |
| Surrogate Safety Assessment Module (SSAM) | 81 |
| Chapter 4 Bibliography | 83 |
| CHAPTER 5: SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS | 85 |
| Selection of Countermeasures to Address Contributing Factors | 90 |
| Example Problem 1: Countermeasure Identification | 92 |
| Economic Evaluation of Countermeasures | 93 |
| Example 2: Economic Analysis | 97 |
| Chapter 5 Bibliography | 101 |
| CHAPTER 6: ROAD SAFETY AUDITS | 102 |
| Introduction | 102 |
| Overview of RSAs | 102 |
| When to Conduct RSAs | 103 |
| Benefits of RSAs | 104 |
| RSA Process | 105 |
| Step 1: Identify Project | 105 |
| Step 2: Select RSA Team | 105 |
| Step 3: Conduct Start-Up Meeting | 105 |
| Step 4: Perform Field Reviews | 106 |
| Step 5: Conduct RSA Analysis | 106 |
| Step 6: Present RSA Findings to Owner and Design Team | 106 |
| Step 7: Prepare Formal Response | 106 |
| Step 8: Incorporate Findings | 107 |
| RSA Field Examples | 107 |
| Example RSA | 111 |
| Step 1: Identify Project | 111 |
| Step 2: Select RSA Team | 112 |
| Step 3: Conduct Start-Up Meeting | 112 |
| Step 4: Perform Field Reviews | 113 |
| Step 5: Conduct RSA Analysis | 115 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Step 6: Present RSA Findings to Owner and Design Team | 117 |
| Step 7: Prepare Formal Response..... | 117 |
| Step 8: Incorporate Findings | 117 |
| RSA Case Studies | 118 |
| Case Study 1: Arizona Bullhead Parkway..... | 119 |
| Case Study 2: Bicycle Road Safety Audit (BRSA) in Grant Teton National Park | 119 |
| Case Study 3: Design Visualization for Conceptual Corridor in Rhode Island | 120 |
| Case Study 4: Safe Routes to School in Albany, Georgia | 121 |
| RSA Resources..... | 121 |
| Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) RSA Website | 121 |
| RSA Newsletters | 121 |
| Transportation Safety Resource Center..... | 121 |
| Chapter 6 Bibliography..... | 122 |
| CHAPTER 7: ADDITIONAL RESOURCES | 123 |
| Agencies and Organizations | 124 |
| American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) | 124 |
| American Public Works Association (APWA)..... | 124 |
| American Traffic Safety Services Association (ATSSA) | 124 |
| Center for Excellence in Rural Safety (CERS)..... | 124 |
| Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA) | 125 |
| Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) | 125 |
| Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) | 126 |
| Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) | 126 |
| Missouri Coalition for Highway Safety..... | 126 |
| National Association of Counties (NACo) | 127 |
| National Association of County Engineers (NACE)..... | 127 |
| National Association of Development Organizations (NADO) | 127 |
| National Association of Towns and Townships (NATaT) | 128 |
| National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) | 128 |
| Roadway Safety Foundation (RSF) | 128 |
| Transportation Research Board (TRB) | 128 |
| Publications..... | 129 |
| Roadway Safety Information Analysis: A Manual for Local Rural Road Owners..... | 129 |
| Intersection Safety: A Manual for Local Rural Road Owners..... | 129 |
| Roadway Safety Departure: A Manual for Local Rural Road Owners | 129 |
| Low-Cost Treatments for Horizontal Curve Safety..... | 129 |
| Noteworthy Practices: Addressing Safety on Locally Owned and Maintained Roads | 130 |
| Guidance Memorandum on Consideration and Implementation of Proven Safety Countermeasures | 130 |
| Funding Resources | 130 |
| Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)..... | 130 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)..... | 130 |
| High Risk Rural Road Program (HRRRP)..... | 131 |
| State and Community Highway Safety Grant Program (Section 402) | 131 |
| Hazards Elimination Fund (HEF)..... | 131 |
| Railroad-Highway Crossings | 132 |
| Highway Lighting | 132 |
| Sign Retroreflectivity and Replacement | 132 |
| Chapter 7 Bibliography..... | 134 |

Table of Figures and Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1.1 MoDOT districts and contact information..... | 2 |
| Figure 1.2 The Core S-HAL System. | 6 |
| Figure 1.3 Substantive versus nominal safety. | 8 |
| Figure 2.1 MUAR page 1, general information, location. | 13 |
| Figure 2.2 MUAR page 2, collision diagram. | 14 |
| Figure 2.3 MUAR page 3, drivers, vehicles, owners, and occupants..... | 15 |
| Figure 2.4 MUAR page 4, codes and narrative..... | 16 |
| Figure 2.5 Example of an accident browser selection | 19 |
| Figure 2.6 Example of a listing of crashes..... | 19 |
| Figure 2.7 Example of the MSHP online traffic crash report interface..... | 20 |
| Figure 2.8 Example of a MSHP traffic crash report output..... | 21 |
| Table 2.1 Example of a spreadsheet crash database..... | 22 |
| Figure 2.9 Example of a graphical query | 23 |
| Table 2.2 Example of an SQL query..... | 23 |
| Figure 3.1 Example of daily traffic variations on a rural highway | 27 |
| Figure 3.2 Example of monthly/seasonal traffic variations on a rural highway..... | 28 |
| Table 3.1 Crash frequency characteristics | 30 |
| Table 3.2 Crash rate characteristics | 30 |
| Table 3.3 EPDO characteristics..... | 33 |
| Table 3.4 Example of crash cost by crash type | 34 |
| Table 3.5 RSI characteristics | 35 |
| Table 3.6 Common values for confidence level constant..... | 36 |
| Table 3.7 Critical crash rate characteristics | 36 |
| Table 3.8 MEM characteristics..... | 38 |
| Table 3.9 LOSS characteristics..... | 40 |
| Table 3.10 Excess SFP characteristics | 41 |
| Table 3.11 Specific crash type proportion threshold characteristics | 42 |
| Figure 4.1 Collision diagram..... | 47 |
| Figure 4.2 On-site observation report – Page 1 | 50 |
| Figure 4.2 On-site observation report – Page 2 | 51 |
| Figure 4.3 Condition diagram. | 54 |
| Figure 4.4 Location analysis worksheet – Page 1..... | 57 |
| Figure 4.4 Location analysis worksheet – Page 2..... | 58 |
| Table 4.1 Crash report for Jefferson City (MoDOT) | 60 |
| Table 4.2 Crash Report for fatalities involving inattentive drivers (MoDOT) | 61 |
| Figure 4.5 Crashes in 2013 in Columbia, Missouri from MSHP traffic crashes online mapping tool (MSHP) | 62 |
| Figure 4.6 LETS graphical map interface (REJIS, 2012). | 63 |
| Table 4.3 FARS crash data for alcohol related crashes in 2011 (NHTSA) | 64 |
| Figure 4.7 Example map from SafeRoadMaps showing location of fatal crashes in Columbia, Missouri in 2010 (SafeRoadMaps). | 65 |
| Figure 4.8 High pedestrian crash zone view (FHWA) | 66 |
| Table 4.4 General project input data for HSM spreadsheet example | 69 |
| Table 4.5 Input data for segment 1 in HSM spreadsheet example..... | 70 |
| Table 4.6 Input data for segment 2 in HSM spreadsheet example..... | 71 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 4.7 Input data for intersection 1 in HSM spreadsheet example..... | 72 |
| Table 4.8 Input data for intersection 2 in HSM spreadsheet example..... | 73 |
| Table 4.9 Input data for intersection 3 in HSM spreadsheet example..... | 74 |
| Table 4.10 Results report for HSM spreadsheet example..... | 75 |
| Figure 4.9 Sample input screen from IHSDM software (FHWA) | 76 |
| Figure 4.10 Sample graphic output from IHSDM (FHWA) | 78 |
| Table 4.11 Sample tabular output from IHSDM (FHWA) | 79 |
| Table 4.12 Example countermeasures report from SafetyAnalyst (FHWA, 2006) | 81 |
| Figure 4.11 Conflict between two vehicles (FHWA)..... | 82 |
| Table 5.1 Haddon matrix of contributing factors for a right-angle crash at a signalized intersection..... | 86 |
| Figure 5.1 Contributing factors to roadway segment crashes | 87 |
| Figure 5.2 Contributing factors to crashes at signalized intersections | 88 |
| Figure 5.3 Contributing factors to crashes at unsignalized intersections..... | 89 |
| Figure 5.4 Contributing factors to pedestrian and bicyclist crashes | 90 |
| Table 5.2 Countermeasures for reducing roadway segment crashes (based on chapter 13 of HSM)..... | 91 |
| Table 5.3 Countermeasures for intersections (based on chapter 14 of HSM)..... | 91 |
| Table 5.4 Countermeasures for intersections | 94 |
| Table 5.5 Societal costs of crashes by severity..... | 94 |
| Figure 6.1 Safety implementation cost versus stage of project life..... | 104 |
| Figure 6.2 Intersection sight distance obstructed by hill..... | 108 |
| Figure 6.3 Utility poles and trees on inside of horizontal curve | 109 |
| Figure 6.4 Tree adjacent to roadside | 109 |
| Figure 6.5 Stop sign obscured by foliage..... | 110 |
| Figure 6.6 Overlapping sets of pavement markings | 110 |
| Figure 6.7 Truck in median blocking highway..... | 111 |
| Figure 6.8 Study area for RSA example (Rossey et al., 2009)..... | 112 |
| Figure 6.9 Steep dropoff at creek crossing (Rossey et al., 2009)..... | 113 |
| Figure 6.10 Driveway locations difficult to discern due to heavy foliage (Rossey et al., 2009)..... | 114 |
| Figure 6.11 Pavement rutting on St. Charles Road (Rossey et al., 2009)..... | 114 |
| Figure 6.12 Drainage problem at intersection of St. Charles Road and Route Z (Rossey et al., 2009)..... | 115 |
| Table 6.1 Partial listing of concerns and countermeasures in RSA example (Rossey et al., 2009)..... | 116 |
| Figure 6.13 Drainage improvements at the intersection of St. Charles Road and Route Z (Rossey et al., 2009)..... | 118 |
| Figure 6.14 Design visualization for Burma Road South Corridor (FHWA, Winter 2011)..... | 120 |

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO S-HAL

A system for improving safety for all local communities.

Local communities are faced with very distinct needs and challenges in planning and maintaining the local transportation network for their citizens. An important goal is to improve the safety of highways and streets. Local communities in Missouri vary significantly in population, population density, land area, land use, road facilities—even climate. For example, Missouri contains several very large counties by population, including St. Louis, Jackson, St. Charles, Greene, Clay, Jefferson, and Boone Counties (US Census, 2010). The largest, St. Louis County, holds almost one million residents. Missouri also contains several large cities by population, including Kansas City, St. Louis, Springfield, Independence, Columbia, and Lee's Summit; the largest, Kansas City, is approaching half a million residents. But the majority of Missouri's 114 counties and their corresponding cities are rural, containing much smaller populations. Local agency staffing also varies considerably. A few large cities maintain dedicated staff for transportation engineering or highway safety, but the vast majority employ city staff members that serve multiple roles related to public works. The S-HAL manual is intended to be a resource for cities of all shapes and sizes. Whether your community is large and urban or small and rural, the S-HAL can be a tool for achieving your local safety goals.

The Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) works with local agencies and law enforcement to improve the safety of local streets and highways. MoDOT can offer valuable assistance and expertise toward addressing safety issues within a community's transportation network. For example, the Technology Transfer Assistance Program (TTAP) of the U.S. Department of Transportation (US DOT), as administered by MoDOT, offers advice on design and construction. Local agencies may request assistance by contacting the District Liaison Engineer at the nearest MoDOT district office. The MoDOT districts and their contact information are shown in Figure 1.1. The district office's contact and other information are also available on the MoDOT website at <http://www.modot.org>.




Figure 1.1 MoDOT districts and contact information.

Changes from Previous Editions

The present 4th edition of the S-HAL contains both stylistic and content changes from the previous edition. In terms of style, a main goal was to make the manual more reader-friendly for local communities. A more contemporary style sheet was used in the present edition, accompanied by improvements in the appearance of figures, tables, headings, and labels. When numerical examples are presented, numerical analysis is employed to help the reader follow the units of each variable, providing for a better understanding of the computations. When advanced techniques are presented, the required effort is presented graphically; in this way, the reader can quickly ignore techniques that are beyond their resources.



Content Changes

Systematic vs. Blackspots

Updated Countermeasures

Economic Analysis

Technology

Modern Safety Tools

Since the publication of the 3rd edition in 1999, significant substantive advances have been achieved in the area of highway safety. These advances are reflected in the contents of this edition. One main advance that has taken place is a change in focus from blackspot identification to system-wide analysis. In other words, the national approach to safety has moved beyond the simplistic pursuit of high-

crash locations—i.e., it has become proactive, rather than reactive. Traffic crashes are rare, because many circumstances must occur simultaneously to cause a crash; the possibility that the same set of circumstances will recur exactly carries only a tiny probability. This is not to say, however, that it is not important to examine the contributing circumstances of a crash. These are typically divided into three categories: human factors, vehicle factors, and roadway factors (including environmental factors). As such, the title of this manual was changed from HAL (Identification, Analysis, and Correction of High-Crash Locations) to S-HAL (Safety Handbook for Locals). Another reason for the new title was the desire to relate the S-HAL to a recently published national safety handbook, the Highway Safety Manual (HSM) (AASHTO, 2010). The HSM is expected to significantly influence local policy and engineering practice, in the same way that the Highway Capacity Manual transformed traffic impact analysis for planning and site development. It is important that the S-HAL be consistent with the principles and techniques promoted in the HSM, which was developed using a wealth of national highway safety knowledge and experience. The S-HAL takes advantage of the same wellspring of knowledge.

The current chapter on countermeasures has been improved significantly through incorporating the HSM approach to countermeasure effectiveness analysis. Utilizing the HSM approach, problems such as regression-to-the-mean and data randomness are increasingly being reduced. Also noteworthy is the abundance of countermeasure evaluations that have been performed over the past 20 years. The local community now possesses the experiences of other communities, translated into user-friendly quantitative measures (the primary measure being the Crash Modification Factor [CMF]). The economic analysis procedure for countermeasures has been completely

re-written and expanded. For example, three different methods—net present value, benefit/cost ratio, and cost effectiveness—are now presented.

Though this manual is aimed toward individuals who are involved in public works and transportation engineering, the current trend in safety is a movement toward a partnership-based approach, in contrast to the primarily engineering-based approach to safety of yesteryear. This new edition encourages the formation of partnerships and coalitions for improving safety. One indispensable partner is local traffic enforcement. Local police collect vital crash data and enforce traffic laws; in some communities, it is local police, not engineers, who are in charge of traffic safety. Another important “partner” is education. Education can refer to formal ways of improving driver education, especially among higher risk younger drivers, but can also refer to general public outreach via the media and/or news releases. For example, the success of new engineering techniques such as roundabouts and the flashing yellow arrow indication relies heavily upon the public’s understanding and acceptance of these techniques. Education can also refer to the changing of behaviors and attitudes towards risky behavior like driving while intoxicated, not using seatbelts, or using improper child restraints. Emergency medical services comprise another important class of partners. How quickly the injured are transported and treated following a crash can have a significant impact on severity and the prognosis for recovery. Many additional partners have a vested interest in safety, including public schools, neighborhood associations, and pedestrian coalitions, just to name a few.

One major change in the past decade is that technology has made it easy to access electronic sources and documents. Rather than requesting, then waiting for, paper documents, electronic information can be accessed instantaneously. This 4th edition takes full advantage of the availability of safety-related information, and thereby becomes a gateway for many additional sources, many of which, e.g., publications and websites, are fully documented throughout this edition.

Many new tools have also recently been developed. A brand new chapter has been devoted to the Road Safety Audits or Assessments (RSA) tool. This new tool incorporates modern and varied perspectives that were previously unaccounted for. It reflects the new attitude of utilizing community partnerships to achieve safety-related goals.

How to Use the S-HAL System

This manual can be used as a reference for specific safety-related topics such as project prioritization, crash analysis, and countermeasure selection, to name a few. Chapters are written in a self-contained fashion; thus, the reader is able to review the table of contents and jump straight ahead to sections that will assist them with a specific issue. The greatest value to local communities, however, occurs through the use of this manual for setting up a comprehensive approach to local transportation safety. This allows a community to plan and execute a sustainable approach toward safety improvements. Figure 1.2 presents the core S-HAL system components that will lead to a long term community safety improvement plan. These core components include

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION TO S-HAL

the development of a traffic records system, performance evaluation of the network, analysis of crashes, and the implementation and evaluation of crash-mitigating countermeasures.

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION TO S-HAL




Figure 1.2 The Core S-HAL System.

Evolution of Substantive Safety

Several key concepts pertaining to safety have evolved over the years. One is the use of crash frequency and severity as the fundamental basis for all safety work, including analysis, prioritization, countermeasure selection, and evaluation. Crash frequency is simply the number of crashes occurring at a facility per year. Crash severity is typically categorized as either fatal injury, incapacitating injury, non-incapacitating injury, possible injury, or property damage only (PDO). At times, all injury categories are combined. One motivation for the use of crash frequency and severity is the desire to make the safety process more objective and data-driven, rather than relying on the more subjective perceptions of stakeholders. This new emphasis does not detract from the worthy goal of making the public feel subjectively safer.

Another key concept is the inherent randomness of crashes. This leads to the problems of bias and regression-to-the-mean (RTM). Randomness implies that the number of crashes naturally rises and falls, meaning that small sample sizes and short-term observations are unreliable. RTM refers to the phenomenon in which a period of relatively high crash frequency will naturally be followed by a period of relatively low crash frequency. Making decisions without accounting for RTM can result in the mis-prioritization of safety projects and the misuse of budgets on less critical facilities.

A third key concept is that of moving away from merely describing historical numbers, and toward the prediction of expected numbers. Historical numbers summarize only what has happened previously in terms of number of crashes, crash rate, crash severity, and crash type. These numbers have a significant random component, and are of limited value in terms of prediction. Newer methods included in the 4th edition attempt to calculate the expected number of crashes by minimizing the effect of randomness.

The final key concept is the difference between nominal and substantive safety. Nominal safety refers to compliance with applicable standards, guidelines, and procedures; examples include compliance with the AASHTO Green Book's (2011) guidelines for geometric design, or the MUTCD (2009) manual for implementing traffic control devices such as signing, signals, and striping. However, achieving nominal safety requirements does not necessarily equate to achieving substantive safety, or to improvements in expected or actual crash frequencies and severities. This is due to the fact that guidelines typically address one specific area without taking into account the full, dizzying array of factors that are relevant to the substantive safety of a particular facility. Furthermore, nominal safety is an absolute threshold, while substantive safety is a continuum. Thus, improvements to a facility's safety can always be considered, irrespective of the nominal safety threshold. Figure 1.3 contrasts the nominal safety approach of meeting individual standard thresholds with the substantive safety approach of examining the complexities and trade-offs that exist when attempting to improve the actual safety performance of a particular facility. Thus, a fuller picture is obtained through the approach advocated by the S-HAL, because safety factors are not considered in isolation.




Figure 1.3 Substantive versus nominal safety.

S-HAL Organization

Each chapter of the S-HAL is followed by a bibliographic section to enable the reader to explore additional resources. The S-HAL manual is organized into the following chapters:

Chapter 1: Introduction to the HAL System

Chapter 1 describes the purpose of the S-HAL and depicts the benefits that the use of this manual can produce for local communities. The chapter explains the role of S-HAL's sponsor, the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT), and discusses ways in which MoDOT can assist with local highway safety. Stylistic and substantive changes from the second to the current edition are clearly outlined. An overview of the S-HAL system as a comprehensive safety approach is presented. The important concept of substantive safety is discussed.

Chapter 2: Developing a Crash Records System

The use of crash data is indispensable in the analysis of transportation safety. Chapter 2 introduces the Missouri Uniform Crash Report (MUAR) and the Statewide Traffic Accident Records System (STARS). Possible sources and interfaces for crash data are presented. Modern tools for developing a local community crash database are also illustrated.

Chapter 3: Network Screening

Chapter 3 describes the process of network screening, or, the systematic process of prioritizing facilities according to potential benefits. Fundamental traffic variables such as annual average daily traffic (AADT) are reviewed. Ten safety performance measures are discussed, including crash frequency, crash rate, critical crash rate, and Empirical Bayes (EB) adjustments. The described safety performance measures are rated by effort required, and are accompanied by illustrative numerical examples.

Chapter 4: Tools for Crash Analysis

In Chapter 4, several tools for crash analysis are described, including tools for analyzing individual, as well as local, locations. Example tools include collision diagrams, site observations, condition diagrams, traffic patterns, and several tools provided by MoDOT, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).

Chapter 5: Countermeasures

Chapter 5 is divided into two main sections. The first focuses on the selection of countermeasures; this involves the identification of crash contributing factors and the tailoring of solutions based upon those contributing factors. The second section focuses on the economic analysis of countermeasures. Benefit-cost analysis and cost-effectiveness analysis are presented as methods for assessing individual projects and developing a systematic, community-wide approach.

Chapter 6: Road Safety Audits

Chapter 6 presents a special safety tool—the Road Safety Audit or Assessment (RSA). This new tool takes a proactive approach to safety, utilizing an independent and multidisciplinary safety review team. Such an audit can reveal safety issues and solutions often omitted from traditional safety analysis by local agencies. The eight steps of RSA are discussed in detail. A comprehensive example is provided to illustrate the RSA tool.

Chapter 7: Additional Resources

The final chapter presents additional resources that may be of assistance to local communities. A number of agencies and organizations exist and provide a variety of resources at both the national and local levels. FHWA is one particular agency highlighted in the current manual, being a sponsor of the Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP) focusing on local communities. Free and publicly available resources abound, including a number of publications that address local roads.

Chapter 1 Bibliography

AASHTO (2010) *Highway Safety Manual*. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. Washington, D.C.

AASHTO (2011) *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*. 6th Edition. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. Washington, D.C.

MUTCD (2009) *Manual of Traffic Control Devices*. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C.

US Census (2010) *Population Estimate Program 2012*. 2006-2010 American Community Survey. United States Bureau of the Census.

CHAPTER 2: TRAFFIC RECORDS SYSTEM

Setting up a crash database.

A traffic records system is vital to the entire S-HAL process because it provides critical crash data necessary for decision making. The use of this data moves a community away from subjective safety assessments, and toward an objective, data-driven safety improvement process. Due to advances in computing and database technology, and with the support of the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) and the Missouri State Highway Patrol (MSHP), setting up a traffic records system in Missouri has become a relatively simple task. Even a small community can establish a basic traffic records system to meet its particular needs.

Crash Data

The Statewide Traffic Accident Records System (STARS) manual (MTRC, 2002) is the document that describes in detail the Missouri Uniform Accident Report (MUAR). As the name of the report implies, the STARS manual seeks to bring uniformity to accident reporting throughout the state. Such uniformity facilitates the effective analysis of traffic crashes throughout the state—even nationwide. The STARS manual provides guidelines and procedures for local police who are completing the MUAR. The four-page MUAR contains information such as the location of an accident, driver- and vehicle-related information, collision diagrams, road characteristics, and traffic conditions.

Figures 2.1-2.4 picture the four pages of the 2012 MUAR form. Figure 2.1 depicts general information about the accident, including data on severity, date, time, crash type, location, and pedestrians. A blank page for drawing a collision diagram is pictured in Figure 2.2. Figure 2.3 contains detailed information on drivers, vehicles, owners, occupants, and circumstances of the crash. Driver information includes license and insurance information. Vehicle information includes vehicle make and model, damage sustained, vehicle sequence, and commercial motor vehicle details, when applicable. Circumstances may involve driver error, impairment, traffic control, and work zones. Figure 2.4 presents the codes used on previous pages. The various codes simplify the coding of fields such as seat location, injury type, vehicle actions, event sequences,

CHAPTER 2 – TRAFFIC RECORDS SYSTEM

objects, and driving distractions. Figure 2.4 also depicts space provided for the narrative description of the crash. For pre-2012 data, an earlier version of the MUAR is used to record crash information. Significant content similarities exist between the previous and current MUAR forms.

CHAPTER 2 - TRAFFIC RECORDS SYSTEM

MISSOURI UNIFORM CRASH REPORT

PAGE _____ OF _____

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1 - GENERAL CRASH INFORMATION | | | | AGENCY NAME AND ORI | | | |
| SPACE USED FOR BARCODE | | | | | | | |
| LEFT THE SCENE | | DRIVER NO. | | CLEARED | | CRASH CLASSIFICATION | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| NO. VEH. INV. | | CRASH DATE | | CRASH TIME (MIL) | | NOTIFIED DATE | |
| | | | | | | | |
| TIME NOTIFIED (MIL) | | INVESTIGATION DATE | | TIME ARRIVED (MIL) | | INVEST. AT SCENE | |
| | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| CRASH TYPE | ROADWAY | | NON-COLLISION | | COLLISION INVOLVING | | DIRECTIONAL ANALYSIS FOR IMPACT WITH MOTOR VEHICLE |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> On Roadway <input type="checkbox"/> Off Roadway | | <input type="checkbox"/> Overturning <input type="checkbox"/> Fire / Explosion <input type="checkbox"/> Immersion <input type="checkbox"/> Jackknife <input type="checkbox"/> Other Non-Collision | | <input type="checkbox"/> Animal <input type="checkbox"/> Pedalcycle <input type="checkbox"/> Fixed Object <input type="checkbox"/> Other Object <input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian <input type="checkbox"/> Railway Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> Animal Drawn Veh. / Animal Ridden Trans. <input type="checkbox"/> Motor Vehicle in Transport <input type="checkbox"/> Parked Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> Working Motor Vehicle | | |
| COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE INVOLVEMENT CRITERIA - Answer the following to determine if the "Commercial Vehicle" fields in Section 7G must be completed. 1. Does this crash involve any of the following? 1a. A person fatally injured, OR 1b. A person transported for medical attention, OR 1c. A vehicle towed due to disabling damage. <input type="checkbox"/> No - No commercial vehicle fields need completion. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Go to number 2. | | | | | | | |
| 2. Examine each vehicle to determine if it is a commercial vehicle based upon the following: 2a. A truck / cargo van with GVWR / GCWR of more than 10,000 lbs, OR 2b. A motor vehicle with seating for 9 or more including driver, OR 2c. A vehicle with a hazardous materials placard. <input type="checkbox"/> No - No commercial vehicle fields need completion. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - Complete Section 7G for appropriate vehicle. | | | | | | | |
| EVIDENTIARY PHOTOS TAKEN | | BY WHOM | | AVAILABLE FROM | | <input type="checkbox"/> Investigating Agency | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | | | | | | |
| RECONSTRUCTION | | BY WHOM | | AVAILABLE FROM | | <input type="checkbox"/> Investigating Agency | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | | | | | | |
| 2 - LOCATION | | | | | | | |
| COUNTY | | MUNICIPALITY | | BEAT / ZONE | | TRP/DIST/PT | |
| | | | | | | | |
| ON | | RDWY. DIR. | | DISTANCE FROM | | LOCATION | |
| | | | | | | | |
| SPEED LIMIT | | ROAD MAINTAINED BY | | INTERSECTING | | SPEED LIMIT | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> State <input type="checkbox"/> County <input type="checkbox"/> Municipal <input type="checkbox"/> Private Property <input type="checkbox"/> Other | | <input type="checkbox"/> After <input type="checkbox"/> Before <input type="checkbox"/> At | | <input type="checkbox"/> Level <input type="checkbox"/> Downhill <input type="checkbox"/> Uphill | |
| | | | | | | | |
| TRAFFICWAY | | ROAD ALIGNMENT | | ROAD PROFILE | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> One-Way <input type="checkbox"/> Two-Way, Not Divided <input type="checkbox"/> Two-Way, Divided, Protected Median <input type="checkbox"/> Two-Way, Divided, Positive Median Barrier <input type="checkbox"/> Other | | <input type="checkbox"/> Straight <input type="checkbox"/> Curve <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown (Explain) | | <input type="checkbox"/> Level <input type="checkbox"/> Downhill <input type="checkbox"/> Uphill <input type="checkbox"/> Dip <input type="checkbox"/> Hillcrest <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown (Explain) | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Two-Way, Not Divided, Continuous Center Turn Lane | | | | | | | |
| INTERSECTION TYPE | | ROAD CONDITION | | WEATHER CONDITION | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> 4-way Intersection <input type="checkbox"/> Y-Intersection <input type="checkbox"/> 5-way / More <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> T-Intersection <input type="checkbox"/> Roundabout <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain) | | <input type="checkbox"/> Dry <input type="checkbox"/> Snow <input type="checkbox"/> Slush <input type="checkbox"/> Standing Water <input type="checkbox"/> Sand / Gravel <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> Wet <input type="checkbox"/> Ice / Frost <input type="checkbox"/> Mud / Dirt <input type="checkbox"/> Moving Water <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain) | | <input type="checkbox"/> Clear <input type="checkbox"/> Rain <input type="checkbox"/> Sleet / Hail <input type="checkbox"/> Fog / Mist <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> Cloudy <input type="checkbox"/> Snow <input type="checkbox"/> Freezing (Temp) <input type="checkbox"/> Severe Crosswind <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown (Explain) | | | |
| ROAD SURFACE | | WEATHER CONDITION | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input type="checkbox"/> Brick <input type="checkbox"/> Dirt / Sand <input type="checkbox"/> Cobblestone <input type="checkbox"/> Asphalt <input type="checkbox"/> Gravel <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-Surface <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown (Explain) | | | | | | | |
| LIGHT CONDITION | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Daylight <input type="checkbox"/> Dark-Lighted <input type="checkbox"/> Dark-Unlighted <input type="checkbox"/> Dark-Unknown Lighting <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown (Explain) | | | | | | | |
| 3 - DAMAGE TO PROPERTY OTHER THAN VEHICLES <input type="checkbox"/> None | | | | | | | |
| LIST OWNER'S NAME & ADDRESS, DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY, AND DAMAGE. <input type="checkbox"/> MoDOT <input type="checkbox"/> County <input type="checkbox"/> Municipality | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 4 - WITNESS <input type="checkbox"/> None Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Witnesses in Narrative | | | | | | | |
| NAME | | ADDRESS (Street, City, State, Zip) | | | | PHONE NUMBER | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 5 - PEDESTRIAN <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement Officer <input type="checkbox"/> Other Emergency Services Personnel <input type="checkbox"/> MoDOT Worker <input type="checkbox"/> Other Trafficway Worker <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pedestrian | | | | | | | |
| NO. | | NAME (Last, First, MI) & ADDRESS (Street, City, State, Zip) | | | | PHONE NUMBER | |
| | | | | | | | |
| DATE OF BIRTH | | SEX | | STRUCK BY VEH # | | INJ. TRANSPORT | |
| | | | | | | | |
| CROSSING ROAD | | OTHER ACTIONS | | LOCATION | | SCHOOL INFO. | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> With Signal <input type="checkbox"/> Not At Crosswalk <input type="checkbox"/> Against Signal <input type="checkbox"/> In Marked Crosswalk <input type="checkbox"/> No Signal <input type="checkbox"/> In Unmarked Crosswalk <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown | | <input type="checkbox"/> Getting On / Off Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> Standing / Lying / Sitting in Trafficway <input type="checkbox"/> Pushing / Working On Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> Behind / In Front of Parked / Stopped Veh. | | <input type="checkbox"/> On Roadway <input type="checkbox"/> In Driveway Access <input type="checkbox"/> On Median / Crossing Island <input type="checkbox"/> On Sidewalk <input type="checkbox"/> Off Roadway <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown | | <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> Going To / From School <input type="checkbox"/> Getting On / Off School Bus <input type="checkbox"/> Both Of The Above <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown (Explain) | |
| | | | | | | | |
| PROBABLE CONTRIBUTING CIRCUMSTANCES | | DISTRACTION / INATTENTION CODE(S) | | ALCOHOL USE | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Failed To Yield <input type="checkbox"/> Alcohol <input type="checkbox"/> Vision Obstructed (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> Distracted / Inattentive <input type="checkbox"/> Drugs <input type="checkbox"/> Physical Impairment (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown (Explain) | | <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown | | | | | |

DISTRIBUTION: COPY - AGENCY FILE; ORIGINAL - MISSOURI STATE HIGHWAY PATROL - TRAFFIC RECORDS DIVISION - P.O. BOX 968 - JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65102

SHF-3Q 01/12

Figure 2.1 MUAR page 1, general information, location.

CHAPTER 2 - TRAFFIC RECORDS SYSTEM

| 6. COLLISION DIAGRAM | | Compass Direction Before Crash Event(s) (Circle One) | V1 NESWU | V2 NESWU | V3 NESWU | V4 NESWU | V5 NESWU | V6 NESWU |
|---|--|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <div style="position: relative; width: 100%; height: 100%;"> <div style="position: absolute; top: 10px; right: 10px; text-align: right;">INDICATE NORTH</div> <div style="position: absolute; bottom: 10px; left: 10px; text-align: left;">INDICATE ROAD NAMES</div> <div style="position: absolute; bottom: 10px; right: 10px; text-align: right;">DIAGRAM NOT TO SCALE</div> </div> | | | | | | | | |

Figure 2.2 MUAR page 2, collision diagram.

CHAPTER 2 – TRAFFIC RECORDS SYSTEM

| 7 - DRIVERS, VEHICLES, OWNERS, & OCCUPANTS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | REPORT # | PAGE | OF | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--------------|------|----|------------------------------|--|
| 7A. DRIVER - NAME (Last, First, MI) & ADDRESS (Street, City, State, Zip) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PHONE NUMBER | | | | |
| DRIVER LICENSE / ID NUMBER | | STATE | | LIC STATUS | | Valid <input type="checkbox"/> Invalid <input type="checkbox"/> Susp / Rev / Denied <input type="checkbox"/> Expired <input type="checkbox"/> Disqual CDL <input type="checkbox"/> Canceled / Oth Invalid <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> | | LIC TYPE | | Operator Class <input type="checkbox"/> CDL Class <input type="checkbox"/> Permit <input type="checkbox"/> MC Only <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> | | MC ENDORSEMENT | | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | |
| DATE OF BIRTH | | SEX | | SEAT LOC | | INJ | | TRANSPORT | | EJECTION | | AIR BAG | | SAFETY DEVICES | | | | | |
| VISION OBSTRUCTED <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> | | Not Obstructed <input type="checkbox"/> | | Trees / Brush <input type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Hillcrest <input type="checkbox"/> Moving Veh <input type="checkbox"/> Stopped Veh <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> | | Load on Veh <input type="checkbox"/> Embankment <input type="checkbox"/> Parked Veh <input type="checkbox"/> Glare <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PROOF OF INSURANCE | | INSURANCE COMPANY | | Expired <input type="checkbox"/> | | PHONE NO. (Optional) | | POLICY NUMBER | | NA <input type="checkbox"/> | | Driver <input type="checkbox"/> Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | |
| 7B. VEHICLE - OWNER NAME (Last, First, MI) & ADDRESS (Street, City, State, Zip) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | PHONE NUMBER | | | SAO <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| YEAR | | MAKE | | MODEL | | COLOR | | VEH TYPE | | TOTAL NO. OF OCC | | | | | | | | | |
| LICENSE - PLATE NO. | | STATE | | YEAR | | VIN | | TOWED FROM SCENE | | TOWED DUE TO DIS. DAMAGE | | | | | | | | | |
| VEHICLE DAMAGE (Mark all damaged areas) | | None / No Damage <input type="checkbox"/> | | TOWED BY | | Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| INITIAL IMPACT NO. | | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | | 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | | 22 23 24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NA <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| VEHICLE BODY TYPES - Automobiles / Specialty Vehicles <input type="checkbox"/> Vehicle Used As Public Conveyance <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Passenger Car <input type="checkbox"/> | | Small Bus (9-15 W/Driver) <input type="checkbox"/> | | Motorcycle <input type="checkbox"/> | | Motor Home <input type="checkbox"/> | | Single-unit Truck, 2 axles, 6 tires <input type="checkbox"/> | | GVW / GCW RATING (Not Licensed Weight) <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | |
| Van (< 9 W/Driver) <input type="checkbox"/> | | Large Bus (16+ W/Driver) <input type="checkbox"/> | | ATV <input type="checkbox"/> | | Farm Implements <input type="checkbox"/> | | Single-unit Truck, 3 or more axles <input type="checkbox"/> | | Pickups, Cargo Vans, All Trucks, Truck Tractors, or HAZ MAT Placed Veh. Only <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | |
| Passenger Van (9+ W/Driver) <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | Construction Equip. Heavy Mach <input type="checkbox"/> | | Veh. Pulling Another Unit(s) (Does not apply to Truck Tractors) <input type="checkbox"/> | | Less than or equal to 10,000 lbs. <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | |
| Sport Utility Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | Other Vehicle (Code) <input type="checkbox"/> | | Truck Tractor With No Unit <input type="checkbox"/> | | 10,001 - 26,000 lbs. <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | |
| Limousine (7-8 W/Driver) <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | 2 Wh <input type="checkbox"/> | | Truck Tractor With One Unit <input type="checkbox"/> | | Greater than 26,000 lbs. <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | |
| Limousine (9-15 W/Driver) <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | 3 Wh <input type="checkbox"/> | | Truck Tractor With Two Units <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Motorized Bicycle <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | 4 Wh <input type="checkbox"/> | | Truck Tractor With Three Units <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pedalcycle <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | 5 Wh / More <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| To / From School <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | Unknown (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EMERGENCY VEHICLE INVOLVEMENT <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Police <input type="checkbox"/> | | Ambulance <input type="checkbox"/> | | A. Emergency Vehicle on Emergency Run <input type="checkbox"/> | | B. Stationary With Emergency Equip. Activated <input type="checkbox"/> | | CONTRIBUTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fire <input type="checkbox"/> | | Other (Must check "A" / "B") <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | Congestion Ahead <input type="checkbox"/> | | Other Incident Ahead <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | Crash Ahead <input type="checkbox"/> | | Unknown (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | |
| 7C. VEHICLE ACTION / SEQUENCE OF EVENTS CODES <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Codes Listed in Narrative (See Codes in Section 8) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEQUENCE OF EVENTS CODES <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> | | ANIMAL CODE(S) | | FIRE OBJECT CODE(S) | | ALCOHOL USE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7D. PROBABLE CONTRIBUTING CIRCUMSTANCES <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vehicle Defects (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> | | Vision Obstructed <input type="checkbox"/> | | Failed To Dim Headlights <input type="checkbox"/> | | Improper Towing / Pushing <input type="checkbox"/> | | Object / Obstruction in Roadway <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Speed - Exceeded Limit <input type="checkbox"/> | | Driver Fatigue / Asleep <input type="checkbox"/> | | Failed To Use Lights <input type="checkbox"/> | | Improperly Stopped On Roadway <input type="checkbox"/> | | Distracted / Inattentive (Designate Type) <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Too Fast For Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> | | Improper Signal <input type="checkbox"/> | | Following Too Close <input type="checkbox"/> | | Improper Lane Usage / Change <input type="checkbox"/> | | Unknown (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation Signal / Sign <input type="checkbox"/> | | Improper Backing <input type="checkbox"/> | | Wrong Side (Not Passing) <input type="checkbox"/> | | Overcorrected <input type="checkbox"/> | | Other (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Failed To Yield <input type="checkbox"/> | | Improper Turn <input type="checkbox"/> | | Wrong Side (One-Way) <input type="checkbox"/> | | Improper Riding / Clinging To Veh. Exterior <input type="checkbox"/> | | DISTRACTED / INATTENTIVE CODE(S) <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alcohol <input type="checkbox"/> | | Improper Passing <input type="checkbox"/> | | Physical Impairment (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> | | Failed To Secure Load / Improper Loading <input type="checkbox"/> | | (See Codes in Section 8) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Drugs <input type="checkbox"/> | | Improperly Parked <input type="checkbox"/> | | Improper Start From Park <input type="checkbox"/> | | Animal(s) in Roadway <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7E. WORK ZONE <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> | | TRAFFIC CONTROL <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> | | Electric <input type="checkbox"/> Green/Yellow/Red <input type="checkbox"/> Flashing Red <input type="checkbox"/> Flashing Yellow <input type="checkbox"/> Ramp Meter <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> | | CONTROL MALFUNCTIONING / INOPERATIVE / MISSING <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Explain) <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Figure 2.3 MUAR page 3, drivers, vehicles, owners, and occupants.

CHAPTER 2 - TRAFFIC RECORDS SYSTEM

REPORT # _____ PAGE _____ OF _____

| 9 - CODES | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| SEAT LOCATION XX - Not Known B - Pedalcycle M - Motorcycle CP - Commercial Passenger OE - Occupant - Enclosed Load Area OU - Occupant - Unenclosed Load Area RC - Rail Crew SV - Other (Explain in Narrative) NA - Not Applicable | | INJURY 1. Fatal 2. Disabling 3. Evident - Not Disabling 4. Probable - Not Apparent 5. None Apparent U. Unknown N. NA | | TRANSPORTED (For Medical Treatment) 1. No 2. EMS 3. Other U. Unknown N. NA | | EJECTION 1. NA 2. No 3. Partially 4. Totally U. Unknown | | AIR BAG 1. None / NA 3. Not Deployed 4. Removed 5. Deployed - Front 6. Deployed - Side 7. Deployed - Curtain 8. Deployed - Other (Knee, Air Belt, etc.) 9. Deployed - Combination 10. Deployment Unknown U. Air Bag Presence Unknown | | SAFETY DEVICES 1. None 2. Not Used 3. Shoulder Belt Only 4. Lap Belt Only 5. Shoulder and Lap Belt 7. DOT Compliant MC Helmet 8. No Helmet 10. Booster Seat 11. Child Restraint - Forward Facing 12. Child Restraint - Rear Facing 13. Other Helmet 14. Reflective Clothing 15. Other U. Use Unknown N. Not Applicable | |
| VEHICLE ACTION / SEQUENCE OF EVENTS (Items with double-asterisk (**) require additional coding) 1. Going Straight 2. Overtaking 3. Making Right Turn 4. Right Turn on Red 5. Making Left Turn 6. Making U-Turn 7. Skidding / Sliding 8. Slowing / Stopping 9. Start in Traffic 10. Start From Parked 11. Backing 12. Stopped in Traffic 13. Parked 14. Changing Lanes 15. Avoiding 16. Cross Median 17. Cross Center Of Road 18. Cross Road 19. Airborne 20. Ran Off Roadway - Right 21. Ran Off Roadway - Left 22. Overtaken / Rollover 23. Fire / Explosion 24. Immersion 25. Jackknife 26. Cargo Loss / Shift 27. Equipment Failure 28. Separation Of Units 29. Returned To Roadway 30. Collision Inv. Pedestrian 31. Collision Inv. Bicycle/Pedalcycle 32. Collision Inv. Railway Veh. 33. Collision Inv. Animal (**) 34. Collision Inv. MV in Transport 35. Collision Inv. Parked MV 36. Collision Inv. Fixed Object (**) 37. Collision Inv. Other Object (Explain) 38. Other Non-collision 39. Collision Inv. Bicycle/Pedalcycle 40. Collision Inv. Animal Drawn Vehicle / Animal Ridden For Transportation 41. Collision Inv. Working MV 42. Downhill Runaway 43. Fell/Jumped From MV 44. Thrown/Falling Object 45. Struck By Falling, Shifting Cargo, Object Set in Motion By Own MV 46. Ran Off Roadway - Other (Explain) 47. Cross Separator | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ANIMAL CODES FOR VEHICLE ACTION / SEQUENCE OF EVENTS 60. Deer 61. Farm Animal 62. Dog 63. Other Animal U. Unknown | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FIXED OBJECT CODES FOR VEHICLE ACTION / SEQUENCE OF EVENTS 20. Tree / Stump (Standing) 21. Embankment / Onway / Ground / Rock Bluff 22. Guardrail Face 23. Utility Pole 24. Fence 25. Street Light Support 26. Culvert 27. Highway Traffic Sign Post / Support 28. Bridge Pier / Abutment / Support 29. Curb 30. Mail Box 31. Concrete Traffic Barrier 32. Building 33. Traffic Signal Support 34. Impact Attenuator / Crash Cushion 35. Fire Hydrant 36. Other (Explain) 37. Bridge Pier/End 38. Bridge Rail 39. Guardrail End 40. Other Traffic Barrier 41. Overhead Sign Support 42. Ditch 43. Other Post / Pole / Support 44. Wall 45. Cable Barrier 46. Bridge Overhead Structure 47. Overhead Line / Cable U. Unknown | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DISTRACTED / INATTENTIVE CODES 1. External Distraction 2. Passengers 3. Stereo / Audio / Video Equipment 4. Navigation Device 5. Communication Device - Hand-held 6. Communication Device - Hands Free 7. Communication Device - Texting / E-mailing 8. Communication Device - Web Browsing 9. Eating / Drinking 10. Reading 11. Tobacco Use 12. Grooming 13. Computer Equipment / Electronic Games / etc. 14. Adjusting Vehicle Controls 15. Other (Explain) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| VEHICLE TYPE CODES 1. Motor Vehicle In Transport 2. Parked Motor Vehicle 3. Working Motor Vehicle 4. Pedalcycle 5. Animal Drawn Vehicle / Animal Ridden For Transport Purposes U. Unknown | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OTHER VEHICLE CODES 1. Riding Mower / Garden Tractor 2. Golf Cart 3. Snowmobile 4. Forklift 5. Animal Drawn Vehicle / Animal Ridden For Transportation 6. Low Speed Vehicle 7. Other (Explain) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. NARRATIVE / STATEMENTS (If additional room is necessary, use Section 11 - Narrative / Statements Continuation) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. REPORTING AND REVIEWING OFFICER INFORMATION | | | | | | | | | | | |
| REPORTING OFFICER NAME | | | | DSN / BADGE NO. | | BEAT / ZONE | | TROOP / DISTRICT / PRECINCT | | | |
| REVIEWING OFFICER NAME | | | | DSN / BADGE NO. | | REVIEWING OFFICER 2 NAME | | DSN / BADGE NO. | | | |

Figure 2.4 MUAR page 4, codes and narrative.

The MSHP is Missouri's lead agency in terms of providing STARS training for all police agencies. The agency partners with MoDOT to store and archive MUAR data. Since such information is comprised of standardized fields and is stored in an electronic database, it can be easily queried and manipulated using the tools that will be discussed throughout the remainder of this chapter.

The STARS (2012) manual contains a thorough description of all of the fields contained in the MUAR. The following fields are highlighted, as they are frequently used in the analysis of crash patterns: Crash type refers to the first harmful event in a crash. Non-collision events include overturning, fire, and cargo loss. Collisions can involve other vehicles, fixed objects, animals, pedestrians, or trains. For vehicle-to-vehicle impacts, the nature of the impact is reported, e.g., head-on, rear-end, sideswipe, or angle. Site particulars are described in fields such as road alignment, road profile, intersection type, road condition, road surface, weather condition, and light condition. Road alignment refers to an either curved or straight horizontal alignment. Road profile refers to vertical alignment, and can be classified as level, uphill, downhill, or at the top or bottom of a hill. Intersection types include four-way, T, Y, roundabout, or multi-point. Road conditions can include dry, snow, ice, slush, mud, water, or sand. The surface layer of the road material can be coded as concrete, asphalt, brick, gravel, dirt, cobblestone, or multi-surface. Weather conditions include clear, cloudy, rain, snow, sleet, freezing, fog, and severe crosswind. Light condition includes daylight, man-made lighting, and unlighted. Probable contributing circumstances could involve driver error, vehicle defects, or other miscellaneous circumstances; common circumstances include speeding, traveling too fast for conditions, signal/signage violations, failure to yield, drugs and alcohol, vision obstruction, fatigue, various improper maneuvers, and following too closely. Crash severity can be categorized as fatal (i.e., a person died within 30 days), disabling injury, evident injury, probable injury, or property damage only (PDO).

The MUAR contains a wealth of information that can be mined for a better understanding of local crashes and possible trends among crashes. Missouri's Blueprint to Save More Lives (2012) illustrates the usefulness of the MUAR. One major piece of information obtained from the MUAR is crash severity; thus, more serious fatal and disabling injury crashes can be viewed separately from PDO crashes. The Blueprint reported the most serious crash types occurring in Missouri: run-off-road, horizontal curve, intersection, tree/pole, and head-on. The Blueprint also examined driver behavior data from the MUAR, finding that the highest crash-related risk factors were aggressiveness, unrestrained occupants, distraction, impairment, young drivers, and invalid licenses. By tracking MUAR information across multiple years, the Blueprint documented the performance of different crash areas over multiple years. Even though the Blueprint is produced at the state level, similar analyses of crash data can be conducted at the local level.

Crash Data Interfaces

Local communities can choose among three different methods of accessing crash data. The first is to obtain data directly from the local police department, though this may

not be the preferred method since other methods have much quicker turnaround times. The two additional methods involve accessing the statewide crash database maintained by the MSHP and MoDOT. Local police departments compile and report crashes in their jurisdictions to the centralized MSHP database.

MoDOT's Transportation Management System (TMS) is designed to collect, organize, and process data to support decision making throughout the state. TMS's primary components include data inventory, report generation, and data analysis. Types of data available within TMS that are relevant to safety include crashes, travelway information, and pavement data. TMS supports various interfaces, such as desktop, web, and ODBC (Open Database Connectivity). The web-based applications can be made available to local agencies via the use of a Virtual Private Network (VPN). A VPN is a dedicated connection that grants access to MoDOT's intranet via a public network.

The web-based TMS accident browser tool allows local communities to search and obtain crash information regarding specific facilities (MoDOT, n.d.). Figure 2.5 provides an example of a query for crashes on US 50 in Cole County. This figure illustrates how crashes can be queried for any portion of US 50. The resulting list of crashes is shown in Figure 2.6. The crashes include information on the county name, travelway identifier, continuous log, crash type, crash date, severity rating, image number, and county log unit. The image number is a unique identifier that can be used to find the applicable police report to obtain additional information on a particular crash. Five options exist for display in the accident browser:

1. All approach legs of an intersection
2. Non-intersection only
3. A particular travelway only
4. Within a travelway range
5. All interchange accidents

CHAPTER 2 - TRAFFIC RECORDS SYSTEM

| Desig | Travelway | Dir | County Lines | County Log | Continuous Log |
|-------|-----------|-----|--------------|------------|----------------|
| US | 50 | E | BEGIN OF | 0.00000 | 125.35000 |
| | | | END OF | 26.65000 | 152.05000 |

| Desig | Travelway / Bridge | Dir | County | County Log | Continuous Log |
|-------|---|-----|--------|------------|----------------|
| CST | JEFFERSON ST | W | COLE | 15.63700 | 140.89700 |
| CST | MADISON ST | N | COLE | 15.62800 | 140.86800 |
| CST | MADISON ST | S | COLE | 15.62000 | 140.86000 |
| BRG | BRIDGE OVER WEARS CR (A0565) | | COLE | 15.71600 | 141.07000 |
| CST | MONROE ST | N | COLE | 15.72800 | 141.08900 |
| CST | MONROE ST | S | COLE | 15.72800 | 141.08900 |
| CST | ADAMS ST | E | COLE | 15.82200 | 141.18200 |
| CST | ADAMS ST | W | COLE | 15.82200 | 141.18200 |
| CST | JACKSON ST | E | COLE | 15.91000 | 141.27000 |
| CST | JACKSON ST | W | COLE | 15.91000 | 141.27000 |
| BRG | BRIDGE OVER CST LAFAYETTE ST, WEARS (A0565) | | COLE | 16.00800 | 141.36800 |
| CST | LAFAYETTE ST | E | COLE | 16.03700 | 141.39700 |
| CST | LAFAYETTE ST | W | COLE | 16.03700 | 141.39700 |
| CST | CHERRY ST | E | COLE | 16.15000 | 141.55000 |

Figure 2.5 Example of an accident browser selection.

| County | Desig | Travelway | Dir | Cont Log | Accident Class | Date |
|--------|-------|-----------|-----|-----------|----------------------------------|-------|
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.65600 | REAR END | 04-12 |
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.65600 | REAR END | 02-15 |
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.65600 | REAR END | 11-05 |
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.65600 | REAR END | 03-05 |
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.67300 | REAR END | 05-28 |
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.67500 | REAR END | 03-15 |
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.67500 | REAR END | 03-12 |
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.67500 | REAR END | 03-27 |
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.67500 | RIGHT TURN/RIGHT ANGLE COLLISION | 03-25 |
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.67500 | OUT OF CONTROL | 03-27 |
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.67500 | OUT OF CONTROL | 04-20 |
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.67500 | RIGHT TURN/RIGHT ANGLE COLLISION | 09-05 |
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.67500 | LEFT TURN | 09-05 |
| COLE | US | 50 | E | 140.67500 | RIGHT TURN/RIGHT ANGLE COLLISION | 10-25 |

Figure 2.6 Example of a listing of crashes.

Another TMS tool is the statewide average accident rates tool from the TMS safety management system. This tool displays accident rates for segments and intersections. Accident rate is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

CHAPTER 2 - TRAFFIC RECORDS SYSTEM

A third method of accessing crash data is through the MSHP Accident Characteristics Summary Reports website. The website is publicly accessible at

<http://www.mshp.dps.missouri.gov/TR15Reports/850ReportMenu.htm>.

Figure 2.7 shows a screen capture of the MSHP crash report interface. Various types of reports are available, including reports by highway character, highway condition, highway classification, crash severity, day of the week, contributing circumstances, impairment, and young drivers. The user can search for crashes within a range of dates, and a location defined by county, city, or specific highway. Figure 2.7, for example, displays a Highway Characteristics Report for MO-740 (Stadium Boulevard) for dates occurring between January and December, 2013. Figure 2.8 shows the output of this query. The output row displays accident type, while the output column reports on geometric elements, such as location on the tangent and curved sections of roadways.

The screenshot displays the 'State of Missouri STARS Reporting' website. The header includes the state seal, the text 'State of Missouri STARS Reporting', and navigation links for 'MoSAC Home', 'MSHP Search', and 'MSHP Home'. Below the header is a search bar with the text 'Enter Keywords or Phrase...' and a 'Search' button. A navigation menu contains links for 'UCR Query', 'Arrest Reports', 'MoSAC News / Announcements', 'Sex Offender Registry', 'Data', 'Traffic/Boat Crashes', 'STARS Crash Reporting', and 'Arrest Related Deaths'. The main content area is titled 'Accident Characteristics Summary Reports' and contains several search filters: 'Select a Report Scope' (Crash), 'Select a Report' (850-R01: Crashes, Accident Type By Highway Character), 'Select The Year/Month for Your Report' (Begin Date: January 2013, End Date: December 2013), 'Select a Report Area' (All Accidents Investigated - By Area), 'Refine your "By Area" Search with one of the Following Criteria' (Troop, County, City: COLUMBIA, Highway, Ori), and 'Further Refine a "By Area" Search by Providing a Highway or an ORI' (Highway: MO-740, Ori). At the bottom are 'Submit' and 'Reset' buttons.

Figure 2.7 Example of the MSHP online traffic crash report interface.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-------|-------|--------|----------|-----|-------|-------|-------|--------|----------|-----|-----------------|-------|
| 10/19/2013 16:48 | Missouri Statewide Traffic Accident Records System (STARS) | | | | | | | | | | | | TR150850-R01 | |
| Agency: All | Motor Vehicle Traffic Accident Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | City: COLUMBIA | |
| | Report Period: 01-2013 thru 12-2013 | | | | | | | | | | | | Highway: MO-740 | |
| | Crashes, Accident Type by Highway Character | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accident Type | straight | | | | | | Curve | | | | | | Unknown | Total |
| | Level | Grade | Crest | Uphill | Downhill | Dip | Level | Grade | Crest | Uphill | Downhill | Dip | | |
| Animal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedalcycle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fixed Object | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Other Object | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Train | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MV in Transport | 36 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Parked Vehicle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Overturning | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Non-Collision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Animal Drawn/Ridden | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Working Motor Vehicle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fire/Explosion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Immersion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jackknife | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fell/Jumped from MV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cargo/Equipment Loss/Shift | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 36 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 54 |

Figure 2.8 Example of an MSHP traffic crash report output.

Local Crash Database

After a local community has obtained crash data relevant to their jurisdiction, the data can be stored in a local database for further analysis and processing. A number of common computer tools exist for the creation of a local database. Three common electronic tools for maintaining a local database include spreadsheets, database software, and geographical information systems. Chapters 3 and 4 of the S-HAL manual will further discuss data analysis using a local database.

Spreadsheets

An electronic spreadsheet is a good choice for handling a moderate amount of data and simple queries. A query is a request for information from a database, such as “find all injury crashes occurring in Columbia from 2009 to 2011 at intersections.” Each cell of a spreadsheet represents one piece of data, either numerical or text. One advantage of using a spreadsheet database is that a spreadsheet possesses data analysis capabilities. Thus, a spreadsheet can be used to perform a number of arithmetic computations, such as computing crash rates or net present values. The sort function can be used to separate crash data based on specific characteristics, such as severity. Spreadsheets have built-in statistical functions. For example, the descriptive statistics function provides a statistical overview of the data by presenting the average, median, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum values. Data can be plotted in a spreadsheet, for example, to show the percentage of crashes by crash type. The cross-tabulation function in a spreadsheet allows an agency to explore relationships among crash-related circumstances, such as the percentage of injury crashes that are head-on. But a spreadsheet is unable to easily handle queries of multiple databases. Thus, a spreadsheet would not adequately handle a simultaneous query to a crash database and an Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) database.

One way to organize crash data in a spreadsheet is to represent each crash as a separate row, and to use columns to capture different characteristics of a crash. Table 2.1

presents an example of a portion of a crash database that includes year, MSHP crash number, county, route designation, travelway name, direction, log mile, severity, and date.

Table 2.1 Example of a Spreadsheet Crash Database

| YR | IMAGE_# | COUNTY | DES. | TWAY_NAME | DIR. | Log | SEVERITY | DATE |
|------|------------|-----------|------|----------------|------|---------|------------|-----------|
| 2009 | 0090010139 | St. Louis | MO | 340 | E | 2.039 | Minor Inj. | 1/10/2009 |
| 2009 | 0090011443 | St. Louis | CST | Jefferson Ave. | S | 2.651 | PDO | 1/14/2009 |
| 2009 | 0090012001 | Jackson | CST | Langford Rd. | E | 2.508 | Minor Inj. | 1/30/2009 |
| 2009 | 0090012277 | Cass | US | 71 | N | 180.685 | PDO | 1/23/2009 |
| 2009 | 0090012278 | Cass | US | 71 | N | 179.199 | PDO | 1/17/2009 |

Spreadsheets are commonly included in commercial work productivity software packages, such as Microsoft Office. In the case of Microsoft Excel (2010), the size of the worksheet is limited to 65,536 rows, or, crashes (Microsoft, 2013). Other commercial spreadsheets include Lotus 1-2-3 and Corel Quattro. Open source and free spreadsheets, such as Gnumeric and OpenOffice.org Calc, also exist.

Database Software

Database software is designed for database management; as such, it is much more powerful than spreadsheets. The software can define data, handle complex queries, produce reports, and maintain and update databases. Examples of database software include Microsoft Access, MySQL, and Oracle. SQL stands for “sequential querying language,” and is one method of querying data. Modern software has graphical querying capabilities that are more user-friendly than is SQL. Figure 2.9 provides an example of a graphical data query. The top of the figure shows how three crash-related databases are linked together, while the bottom shows the query criteria for 2009-2011, i.e., work zones only, highway patrol number, and sequence of events. Table 2.2 displays the same query using SQL.




Figure 2.9 Example of a graphical query.

Table 2.2 Example of an SQL Query

| |
|---|
| SELECT DISTINCT TMS_HP_ACCIDENT_VW.ACCIDENT_YR, TMS_HP_VEHICLE_DRIVER.TRAFFIC_CONTROL_ZN, TMS_HP_ACCIDENT_VW.HP_ACC_IMAGE_NO, TMS_HP_SEQ_OF_EVENTS.EVENT_CODE |
| FROM TMS_HP_SEQ_OF_EVENTS INNER JOIN (TMS_HP_VEHICLE_DRIVER INNER JOIN TMS_HP_ACCIDENT_VW ON TMS_HP_VEHICLE_DRIVER.HP_ACC_IMAGE_NO = TMS_HP_ACCIDENT_VW.HP_ACC_IMAGE_NO) ON TMS_HP_SEQ_OF_EVENTS.HP_ACC_IMAGE_NO = TMS_HP_VEHICLE_DRIVER.HP_ACC_IMAGE_NO |
| WHERE (((TMS_HP_ACCIDENT_VW.ACCIDENT_YR)>="2009" And (TMS_HP_ACCIDENT_VW.ACCIDENT_YR)<="2011") AND ((TMS_HP_VEHICLE_DRIVER.TRAFFIC_CONTROL_ZN)="1" Or (TMS_HP_VEHICLE_DRIVER.TRAFFIC_CONTROL_ZN)="2")) |
| ORDER BY TMS_HP_ACCIDENT_VW.HP_ACC_IMAGE_NO; |

After crash data is obtained from sources such as the MoDOT Accident Browser or the MSHP online reporting tool, it can be imported into a local database. Database

software possesses an external data menu with functions to import and link a number of database formats.

GIS Databases

A geographical information system (GIS) is a spatial database, meaning that data is linked to a geographical location. GIS could be useful for crash analysis, since the data is stored according to where the crash occurred. GIS is useful for displaying spatial crash trends. It uses layers of data that can be turned on or off. For example, GIS layers could include the road network, crashes, AADT, and land use. These layers can be turned on in different combinations—for example, to examine the effect of land use on crash frequency. One common reference system in GIS is the latitude/longitude coordinate system, e.g., World Geodetic System 1984 (WGS84). Though the MUAR contains fields for global positioning system (GPS) coordinates, such coordinates may not be available for all crashes, especially crashes from previous years. The MUAR does contain the alternate log mile referencing system, which locates crashes with respect to a point from the beginning of a route. However, locating crashes using log miles instead of latitude/longitude in GIS is more challenging. Some GIS layers for local communities may be available from the planning organization related to the local agency. In the case of urban areas with populations larger than 50,000, the local metropolitan planning organization (MPO) may supply GIS basemaps and shapefiles. Examples of Missouri MPOs include the East West Gateway Coordinating Council (EWGCC), the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC), the Springfield Area Transportation Study Organization (SATSO), and the Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization (CATSO).

Many GIS software packages are available, including those at no cost. One popular family of GIS software packages is produced by ESRI (Environmental System Research Institute). ESRI makes available a free GIS tool entitled ArcGIS Explorer. There also exist open source and free GIS tools. GRASS (Geographical Resources Analysis Support System) is a free public-domain software originally developed by the U.S. government. Chapter 4 contains additional discussions on graphical tools that can be used for analyzing crashes.


Chapter 2 Bibliography

MCRS (2012) *Missouri's Blueprint to Save More Lives*. Missouri Coalition for Highway Safety. Jefferson City, Missouri.

Microsoft (2013) *Excel Specifications and Limits*. Microsoft Office Help. Available at [http://http://office.microsoft.com/](http://office.microsoft.com/).

MoDOT (n.d.) *TMS Overview Training*. Missouri Department of Transportation. Jefferson City, Missouri.

STARS (2012) *Missouri Uniform Accident Report Preparation Manual*. (Statewide Traffic Accident Records System (STARS) Manual). Missouri STARS Committee. Available from http://epg.modot.org/files/1/11/907.4_MUARP.pdf.



CHAPTER 3: NETWORK SCREENING

Prioritizing safety improvements and locations.

Every community has a limited quantity of time and funding available for spending on infrastructure improvements. Thus it becomes necessary to prioritize possible improvements/locations on the basis of potential benefits.

The amount of benefit per dollar expended is a common measure used for such purposes. Because communities have different priorities, each community can customize the procedure described in this chapter using the community's own criteria and performance measures.

Network screening is the term given to the systematic process of examining a community's transportation network and ranking possible improvements or facilities according to their potential benefits. In previous editions of the HAL Manual, this process was referred to as "high crash location identification." However, "network screening" is now a more appropriate term, since it reflects the newer and more comprehensive approach to safety adopted by many agencies. For example, the FHWA Highway Safety Improvement Program Manual (Herbel et al., 2010) discusses the current focus on entire road segments, corridors, or systematic improvements, in lieu of chasing after high crash locations, which are often random. Note that this approach is not in conflict with the fact that some fixed locations could be problematic, such as intersections or horizontal curves.

The current chapter's techniques could be applied to both annual, city-wide analysis or early warning analysis. Both procedures are systematic ways for cities to document their safety efforts and allocate resources to achieve maximum safety benefits. Prior to this chapter's discussion of these procedures, several safety performance measures are described. The sources referenced in the discussion of safety performance measures include the Highway Safety Manual (HSM) (AASHTO, 2010), the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Manual (Herbel et al., 2010), and research literature.

Annual Average Daily Traffic

Before discussing crash data, a review of traffic data is in order. Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) is useful for annual safety analysis, because it averages daily and seasonal/monthly variations. The Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) and other agencies often estimate and publish AADT values for all of their facilities. If AADT is not readily accessible, it can be estimated by the following formulae:

$$AADT = ADT * ACF * D * M \quad (3-1)$$

Where,

ADT = short duration traffic volume data in 24-hour periods;

ACF = axle correction factor when axle counters are used to account for multi-axle vehicles, e.g., axle tube counters;

D = daily factor to account for variability among days of the week;

M = monthly or seasonal factor to account for seasonal variability.

Figure 3.1 illustrates the concept of the daily factor, D . The horizontal line represents an AADT value of 3,400 vehicles per day. Figure 3.1 shows traffic exceeding AADT on Friday through Sunday. If the ADT is collected on Monday through Thursday, then D is greater than 1. Likewise, if the ADT is collected on Friday through Saturday, then D is less than 1.




Figure 3.1 Example of daily traffic variations on a rural highway.

Figure 3.2 illustrates the concept of the monthly/seasonal factor, D . The horizontal line again shows an AADT value of 3,400 vehicles per day. Figure 3.2 shows traffic exceeding AADT during the months of May through October. If the ADT is collected

from December to April, then D is greater than 1. Likewise, if the ADT is collected from May to October, then D is less than 1.




Figure 3.2 Example of monthly/seasonal traffic variations on a rural highway.

AADT Numerical Example



Assume your agency collected 48-hour ADT counts on Main Street on a Tuesday and Wednesday in July. ADT was 1,000 vehicles per day. Assume the axle correction factor, ACF , was 0.9 to account for multi-axle trucks. Also assume that the daily factor for Tuesday and Wednesday, D , was 1.2, and that the monthly factor for July, M , was 0.7.

$$AADT = 1000 \frac{\text{vehicles}}{\text{day}} * 0.9 * 1.1 * 0.8 = 792 \frac{\text{vehicles}}{\text{day}}$$



Safety Performance Measures

Safety performance measures are quantitative measures that can be used to perform network screening. Popular ways in which these measures are used include simple ranking, sliding window, and peak searching.

The following 10 safety performance measures are used in the HSM and the HSIP; they differ significantly in data requirements, ease of use, and accuracy of results. The first six measures are comparatively simpler, and are recommended for any local community. The latter four measures require some comprehension of advanced statistics and/or the HSM. For detailed explanations of the latter methods, the reader is referred to the HSM or the HSIP Manual, both of which are listed in the bibliography at the end of this chapter. While the complete list of 10 performance measures may

seem overwhelming, a local community could simply select the one that is the best fit for its particular needs.

1. Average Crash Frequency
2. Crash Rate
3. Equivalent Property Damage Only
4. Relative Severity Index
5. Critical Crash Rate
6. Method of Moments
7. Level of Service of Safety
8. Excess Safety Performance Function Crash Frequency
9. Specific Crash Type Proportion Threshold
10. Empirical Bayes Adjustments

| ICON KEY | |
|---|---------------------------------|
|  | Numerical Example |
|  | Effort Required (1 to 5 clocks) |

Two icons are used provide helpful information to the reader. The “Numerical Example” icon indicates a numerical example that is intended to illustrate a particular method. The “Effort Required” icon is a rough graphical representation of the amount of effort

required to use a particular method; the simplest method is rated at one clock, while the most difficult is rated at five clocks. A rating of four or five clocks indicates a method that may be beyond the resources of local communities. However, some discussion of these methods is provided so that local communities can become familiar with such tools. At times, such tools are used at the regional level by organizations such as MoDOT, or a local metropolitan planning organization.


Average Crash Frequency

Average crash frequency is typically defined as the number of crashes occurring on a roadway or at an intersection over a specified time period, e.g., one year. When an adequate sample size is available, crashes can be analyzed by type (e.g., angle) and/or severity. Table 3.1 illustrates the major strength of the crash frequency measure, which is simplicity.

Table 3.1 Crash Frequency Characteristics

| Data Needs | |
|---|---|
| # of crashes | |
| Strengths | Limitations |
| <p>Simple</p> <p>Availability of data through HP/MoDOT.</p> <p>Easy way of forecasting # of crashes using traffic volumes as only variable.</p> <p>Can analyze by type and/or severity.</p> | <p>Omits other variables for more accurate forecasting.</p> <p>Not account for RTM bias.</p> <p>Not account for exposure; can overemphasize high volume sites.</p> <p>Requires arbitrary threshold.</p> |

**Crash Frequency
Numerical
Example**



Assume that the intersection of Main Street and Broadway Avenue experienced 21 crashes from 2009-2011. The crash frequency is $21 \text{ crashes} / 3 \text{ years} = 7 \text{ crashes/year}$.

Crash Rate ⓘ

In terms of safety, exposure refers to how often or how long a driver is exposed to traffic risks. Thus, travelers who travel more frequently or over longer distances are exposed to greater risk. Crash rate accounts for exposure through the use of traffic volumes. Table 3.2 reveals that crash rate has similar trade-offs to those of crash frequency, but, unlike crash frequency, accounts for exposure. AADT is a measure of traffic volume commonly used to account for exposure.

Table 3.2 Crash Rate Characteristics

| Data Needs | |
|--|---|
| # of crashes, traffic volumes | |
| Strengths | Limitations |
| <p>Simple.</p> <p>Availability of data through MSHP/MoDOT.</p> <p>Easy way of forecasting # of crashes using traffic volumes as only variable.</p> <p>Can analyze by type and/or severity.</p> <p>Accounts for exposure.</p> | <p>Omits other variables for more accurate forecasting.</p> <p>Not account for regression-to-the-mean bias.</p> <p>Assumes linear relationship between traffic volume and crash frequency.</p> <p>Can overemphasize low volume, low crash sites.</p> <p>Requires arbitrary threshold.</p> <p>Cannot compare across sites with significant volume differences.</p> |

Crash Rate for Intersections

The following equation is used to compute the intersection (or spot) crash rate:

$$RSP = \frac{1,000,000 * C}{365 * T * V} \quad (3-2)$$

Where,

C = # of reported crashes during the analysis time frame;

T = analysis time frame in years;

V = AADT, or the sum of all entering volumes.

The resulting unit of measure of the RSP is crashes per million entering vehicles (MEV). Alternately, the scaling value of the equation can be changed to 100,000,000 so that the RSP results in more convenient values, i.e., per 100 million entering vehicles.

Crash Rate for Road Segments

To compute the crash rate for road segments (or sections) the following equation is used:

$$RSEC = \frac{100,000,000 * C}{365 * T * V * L} \quad (3-3)$$

Where,

C = # of reported crashes during the analysis time frame;


T = analysis time frame in years;

V = AADT, or the volume on the road segment;

L = length of the road segment in miles.

The resulting unit of measure of the $RSEC$ is crashes per million vehicle miles (MVM).

Crash Rate Numerical Example



Assume that Main Street and Broadway Avenue experienced 21 crashes from 2009-2011. Also assume that the sum of the AADT's from all of the approaches was 10,000 vehicles/day.

$$RSP = \frac{1,000,000 * 21 \text{ crashes}}{365 \text{ days/year} * 3 \text{ years} * 10,000 \text{ vehicles/day}} = 1.92 \frac{\text{crashes}}{\text{MEV}}$$

Equivalent Property Damage Only ⓘ

Though Equivalent Property Damage Only (EPDO) contains “property damage only (PDO)” in its wording, it is really about combining different crash severities into a

single measure with the use of weights. It is common to classify crash severity into fatal, injury, or PDO crashes. Often, the “injury” category is further divided into “disabling” or “minor.” Some agencies divide injury crashes into “incapacitating,” “non-incapacitating,” or “possible injury.”

Each local community could develop their own weights for determining the relative importance of each of the severity categories. For example, a community could base the weights on crash costs. If one were to use crash costs from the AASHTO Red Book (2010), then the weights for fatal, injury, and PDO crashes would be 18,619; 543; and 1, as computed by dividing total crash costs by PDO crash cost. However, agencies often modify weights based on pure crash costs, since fatal crashes tend to dominate such weights: fatal crashes could be random in any crash sample, and the presence of even one fatal crash can disproportionately inflate crash costs at a given location (Council et al., 2005). For example, an agency might choose to assign the same weight to fatal and injury crashes by assigning each a weight of 11. Crash costs typically include both direct and indirect costs. Direct costs include property damage, insurance costs, and incident management costs (e.g., fire, police, emergency medical services). Indirect costs include pain and suffering and loss of enjoyment of life.

The following equation is used to compute EPDO:

$$EPDO = W_{fatal} * N_{fatal} + W_{injury} * N_{injury} + W_{PDO} * N_{PDO} \quad (3-4)$$

Where,

W_{fatal} = relative weight of fatal crashes;

W_{injury} = relative weight of injury crashes;

W_{PDO} = relative weight of PDO crashes;

N_{fatal} = number of fatal crashes;

N_{injury} = number of injury crashes;


N_{PDO} = number of PDO crashes.

Table 3.3 illustrates a major strength of EPDO, i.e., it accounts for severity.

Table 3.3 EPDO Characteristics

| Data Needs | |
|---|--|
| # of crashes, crash costs by severity | |
| Strengths | Limitations |
| Simple Availability of data through HP/MoDOT Easy method of forecasting # of crashes using traffic volumes as only variable Considers severity | Omits other variables for more accurate forecasting Not account for RTM bias Not account for exposure Requires arbitrary threshold May overemphasize severe crashes depending on weight values |

EPDO Numerical Example



Assume that the 21 crashes at the intersection of Main Street and Broadway Avenue comprised 0 fatal, 3 injury, and 18 PDO crashes. Assume that your agency used 11; 11; and 1 for severity weights for fatal, injury, and PDO crashes, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
 EPDO &= 11 * 0 + 11 * 3 + 1 * 18 \\
 &= 51 \text{ equivalent PDO crashes}
 \end{aligned}$$

Relative Severity Index ⓘ ⓘ

As the term “relative” implies, the Relative Severity Index (RSI) compares a particular crash site against similar sites. A similar site is one displaying similar characteristics, such as traffic demand and geometry. RSI determines whether a particular site is experiencing higher or lower crash costs than an average, similar site. The average RSI for a particular site i , \overline{RSI}_i , can be computed as:

$$\overline{RSI}_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_T} N_j * C_j}{\sum_{j=1}^{n_T} N_j} \quad (3-5)$$

Where,

n_T = # of different types of crashes (e.g., rear-end, angle, sideswipe);

N_j = # of crashes of a particular crash type, j ;

C_j = average crash cost for a particular crash type, j .

In the absence of local data, national agency data (e.g., Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] data) can be used to estimate crash costs by crash type (Council et al., 2005). Table 3.4 shows examples of crash costs for different types of crashes in 2001 dollars. Steps for translating previous year costs to current year costs can be found in Chapter 5, under the section entitled “Economic evaluation of countermeasures.”

Table 3.4 Example of Crash Cost by Crash Type¹

| Crash Type | Crash Cost |
|--|------------|
| Single vehicle struck human, at intersection | \$158,866 |
| Single vehicle struck human, not at intersection | \$287,917 |
| Single vehicle struck object | \$94,669 |
| Single vehicle rolled over | \$239,721 |
| Multiple vehicles cross paths at signal (angle) | \$47,333 |
| Multiple vehicles cross paths at sign (angle) | \$61,114 |
| Multiple vehicles rear-end at all locations | \$30,544 |
| Multiple vehicle sideswipe | \$34,004 |
| Multiple vehicles, opposite direction not at intersection (head-on) | \$375,075 |
| Multiple vehicles, opposite direction at signalized intersection (head-on) | \$24,069 |
| Multiple vehicles, opposite direction at signed intersection (head-on) | \$47,478 |

The RSI for an average, similar site, \overline{RSI}_s , is computed as:

$$\overline{RSI}_s = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^{n_{j,T}} N_{j,k} * C_{j,k}}{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^{n_T} N_{j,k}} \quad (3-6)$$

Where,

n = # of similar sites;

$n_{j,T}$ = # of different types of crashes for a particular site j ;

$N_{j,k}$ = # of crashes of a particular crash type k at site j ;

$C_{j,k}$ = average crash cost for a particular crash type k at site j .

Table 3.5 calls attention to the fact that RSI requires crash type information and crash cost estimates for each type of crash.

¹ Taken from Council et al. (2005), Table 11: Level 4 without speed limits.

Table 3.5 RSI Characteristics

| Data Needs | |
|--|---|
| # of crashes by type and location, crash costs by type | |
| Strengths | Limitations |
| <p>Relatively simple.</p> <p>Availability of data through HP/MoDOT.</p> <p>Easy way of forecasting # of crashes using traffic volumes as only variable.</p> <p>Considers severity.</p> | <p>Omits other variables for more accurate forecasting.</p> <p>Not account for RTM bias.</p> <p>Not account for exposure.</p> <p>Requires arbitrary threshold.</p> <p>May overemphasize locations with severe crashes.</p> <p>Requires crash and cost data by crash type.</p> |

RSI Numerical Example



Assume that the 21 crashes at the signalized intersection of Main Street and Broadway Avenue comprised 5 angle, 10 rear-end, and 6 sideswipe crashes.

$$\overline{RSI}_i = \frac{5 * \$47,333 + 10 * \$30,544 + 6 * \$34,004}{5 + 10 + 6} = \$35,530$$

Assume that 10 similar sites were used for comparison against Main and Broadway. These sites totaled 198 crashes comprising 38 angle, 105 rear-end, and 55 sideswipe crashes.

$$\overline{RSI}_s = \frac{38 * \$47,333 + 105 * \$30,544 + 55 * \$34,004}{38 + 105 + 55} = \$34,727$$

Since $\overline{RSI}_i > \overline{RSI}_s$, Main and Broadway experienced slightly higher crash costs than did similar sites.

Critical Crash Rate ⌚⌚

Critical crash rate is a threshold value computed using locations with similar characteristics. If the observed crash rate at a particular location is greater than this threshold, then further analysis is recommended for the location. The agency assigns a level of confidence to the threshold value. Thus, the higher the threshold value, the less likely a location will exceed the threshold. The following critical crash rate equations assume that crashes follow a Poisson distribution.

$$OBR_i = XS + K \sqrt{\frac{XS}{V_i}} + \frac{1}{2V_i} \quad (3-7)$$

$$V_i = \frac{TEV}{1,000,000} * n * 365 \quad (3-8)$$

Where,

OBR_i = crash rate observed at location i ;

XS = mean crash rate for similar locations;

V_i = traffic volume at location i , in units of million entering vehicles;

K = level of confidence constant;

TEV = total entering volume per day;

n = number of years of crash data.

The level of confidence constant, K , is taken from the standard normal table. Table 3.6 displays popular confidence level values.

Table 3.6 Common Values for Confidence Level Constant


| 90 Percent | 95 Percent | 99 Percent |
|------------|------------|------------|
| 1.282 | 1.645 | 2.326 |

As shown in Table 3.6, critical crash rate has characteristics similar to crash rate, with the addition of a statistical threshold. The critical crash rate is also similar to the RSI in its method of comparing a specific site against similar locations.

Table 3.7 Critical Crash Rate Characteristics

| Data Needs | |
|--|--|
| # of crashes, traffic volumes | |
| Strengths | Limitations |
| <p>Relatively simple.</p> <p>Availability of data through HP/MoDOT.</p> <p>Easy method of forecasting # of crashes using traffic volumes as only variable.</p> <p>Accounts for exposure.</p> <p>Can analyze by type and/or severity.</p> <p>Considers variance in crash data.</p> <p>Establishes comparison threshold.</p> | <p>Omits other variables for more accurate forecasting.</p> <p>Not account for RTM bias.</p> <p>Cannot compare across sites with significant volume differences.</p> |

Critical Crash Rate Example



Assume that Main Street and Broadway Avenue experienced 21 crashes from 2009-2011, and that the sum of the AADT's from all approaches was 10,000 vehicles/day. The same values were used in the crash rate example. Also, assume the mean crash rate for similar locations, \bar{X}_S , to be 1.5 crashes per million entering vehicles. Use a 95% confidence level.

$$V_i = \frac{10,000 \frac{\text{vehicles}}{\text{day}}}{1,000,000} * 3 * 365 = 10.95 \text{ million entering vehicles}$$

$$1.5 \frac{\text{crashes}}{\text{MEV}} + 1.645 \sqrt{\frac{1.5 \frac{\text{crashes}}{\text{MEV}}}{10.95 \text{ MEV}}} + \frac{1}{2 \cdot 10.95 \text{ MEV}} = 2.15 \frac{\text{crashes}}{\text{MEV}}$$

Thus, the observed crash rate at Main Street and Broadway of 1.92 crashes/MEV is less than the critical crash rate of 2.15 crashes/MEV.

Method of Moments Adjustment ⓘ ⓘ

The method of moments (MEM) is a way of adjusting the observed site crash frequency using the variability of similar sites. In other words, this method assumes that a specific site value should not fall outside the natural variability of similar sites. This adjustment partially corrects the regression-to-the-mean (RTM) problem. Loosely, the term stems from the fact that the mean and variance are also called statistical moments, and such moments are estimated using a sample of similar sites.

The variance in crash frequency for all similar sites is computed as:

$$Var(N) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (N_{observed,i} - N_{observed,rp})^2}{n_{sites} - 1} \quad (3-9)$$

Where,

$N_{observed,i(adj)}$ = observed crash frequency at site i ;

$N_{observed,rp}$ = average crash frequency for similar sites (i.e., reference population);

N_{sites} = number of similar sites (i.e., reference population).

The adjusted observed crash frequency is computed as,

$$N_{observed,i(adj)} = N_{observed,i} + \frac{N_{observed,rp}}{Var(N)} * (N_{observed,rp} - N_{observed,i}) \quad (3-10),$$

where the variables are the same as those previously defined in Equation 3-9. If the observed crash frequency is lower than the average crash frequency, then the observed


crash frequency is adjusted upwards. If the observed crash frequency is lower, then the crash frequency is adjusted downwards. In other words, if a particular site falls too far outside the variability of similar sites, then it is brought back “closer to the pack.” In contrast to the critical crash rate method, MEM adjusts the observed crash frequency, and not the average crash frequency, of similar sites.

Table 3.8 lists MEM characteristics, and illustrates that MEM’s dependence on similar sites is both a strength and a limitation. Using similar sites can establish a threshold for comparison and a measure of variability, but can also influence screening results.

Table 3.8 MEM Characteristics

| Data Needs | |
|--|---|
| # of crashes by type and location | |
| Strengths | Limitations |
| <p>Relatively simple.</p> <p>Availability of data through HP/MoDOT.</p> <p>Establishes a comparison threshold.</p> <p>Considers variance of similar sites.</p> | <p>Omits other variables for more accurate forecasting.</p> <p>Partial accounting of RTM bias.</p> <p>Does not consider traffic volume.</p> <p>Screening is affected by crash frequency of similar sites.</p> |

MEM Numerical Example



Assume that the intersection of Main Street and Broadway Avenue experienced 21 crashes from 2009-2011, or, a crash frequency of 7 crashes/year. Assume that 8 similar intersections with the same type of signal control and phasing averaged 5 crashes/year, with a variance of 4.9.

$$N_{observed,i(adj)} = 7 \frac{\text{crashes}}{\text{year}} + \frac{5 \frac{\text{crashes}}{\text{year}}}{4.9} * (5 - 7) = 4.96 \frac{\text{crashes}}{\text{year}}$$

Here, the MEM adjustment reduced the observed crash frequency to near that of the average crash frequency for similar sites. Contrast this with the use of crash frequency without adjustments.

Introduction to HSM-Based Service Performance Measures

The last four safety performance measures are based on the HSM. Therefore it is important to include a discussion of HSM modeling, and to provide a specific example of an HSM model. One major benefit of HSM is that it is a national manual, like the Highway Capacity Manual or the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Green Book. The HSM utilizes research data from across the U.S.; therefore, it benefits from a wealth of safety research from multiple states. One major component of the HSM is its presentation of safety performance functions (SPF). SPF is not to be confused with “safety performance

measures,” a term also used in this chapter. SPF predicts a “normal expected level of safety” for specific types of facilities. Thus, SPFs model the expected number of crashes at a particular facility. SPF enables the type of “what-if scenario” analysis that is impossible when using only observed data. The flexibility and usefulness of SPF comes at the cost of being labor- and data-intensive. Also, national data may not be locally applicable, and it requires calibration. Still, this relatively new manual appears to have gained widespread acceptance and use at the state level.

The following example illustrates the use of HSM SPF. The example applies to rural, two-lane roadways. The base SPF expressing crash frequency is computed as follows:

$$N_{spf} = AADT * L * 365 * 10^{-6} * e^{(-0.312)} \quad (3-11)$$

Where,

$AADT$ = annual average daily traffic;

L = length of the road segment in miles.

Equation 3-11 is easy to use. It indicates that crash frequency is proportional to exposure in terms of the amount of traffic and the length of the roadway. But each SPF has a set of associated crash modification factors (CMF) that requires extensive data to produce accurate results. The predicted crash frequency is comprised of the base SPF multiplied by the CMF, as follows:

$$N_{predicted} = N_{spf} * CMF_1 * CMF_2 * CMF_3 * ... * C \quad (3-12)$$

The types of data required for CMF include lane width, shoulder width and type, roadside hazard rating (in terms of the number and closeness of roadside objects), driveway density, and curve geometrics for curved sections. The details of the curve geometrics include curve length and radius and the use of spiral curves.

Level of Service of Safety 🚗🚗🚗🚗

The level of service of safety (LOSS) method assigns a qualitative grade (i.e., I-IV) to a particular location. This method replicates the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) (IRB, 2010) process of assigning a user-friendly qualitative grade based on a quantitative measure. The grade is based on the difference between observed crash frequency and the HSM-predicted average crash frequency. The LOSS grades are assigned as follows:

$$0 < \text{LOSS I} < N - 1.5\sigma < \text{LOSS II} < N < \text{LOSS III} < N + 1.5\sigma < \text{LOSS IV} \quad (3-13)$$

$$\sigma = \sqrt{k + N^2} \quad (3-14)$$

Where,

N = predicted average crash frequency from the HSM;

σ = standard deviation of predicted crashes;

k = SPF overdispersion parameter.

The overdispersion parameter is used in the HSM to reflect the fact that the variance exceeds the mean for crash data.


LOSS I represents a low potential for crash reduction at a particular site, while LOSS IV represents a high potential for crash reduction. Expressed verbally, Equation 3-11 says that LOSS I indicates an observed crash frequency that is less than 1.5 standard deviations from the predicted crash frequency. LOSS II indicates an observed crash frequency that is greater than LOSS I, but does not exceed the predicted crash frequency. LOSS III indicates an observed crash frequency that is greater than the predicted crash frequency but less than 1.5 standard deviations above the predicted crash frequency. LOSS IV indicates an observed crash frequency that is greater than 1.5 standard deviations above the predicted crash frequency.

The crux of the LOSS method is the computation of N using the HSM. Table 3.9 illustrates the single major issue with HSM-based measures, i.e., that they are labor- and data-intensive; not only does the HSM method require the user to be familiar with HSM models, it also necessitates extensive data collection for modeling the safety of facilities. One major benefit of LOSS is that the end product, a grade of I-IV, is user-friendly and accessible to the general public.

Table 3.9 LOSS Characteristics

| Data Needs | |
|---|---|
| # of crashes by location, HSM SPF and necessary data (e.g., geometrics, traffic demand, land-use, signalization), overdispersion factor | |
| Strengths | Limitations |
| Establishes a comparison threshold. Considers variance in crash data. Accounts for traffic volume. Produces a user-friendly qualitative grade. | Partial account for RTM bias. HSM is data and labor intensive. Set thresholds at 1.5σ intervals. |

LOSS Numerical Example



Assume that the intersection of Main Street and Broadway Avenue experienced 21 crashes from 2009-2011, or, a crash frequency of 7 crashes/year. Assume that the HSM SPF predicts the crash frequency to be 5 crashes/year, and $k = 0.5$.

$$\sigma = \sqrt{0.5 + 5^2} = 5.05 \text{ crashes/year}$$

$$0 < \text{LOSS I} < 5 - 1.5(5.05) < \text{LOSS II} < 5 < \text{LOSS III} < 5 + 1.5(5.05) < \text{LOSS IV}$$

Since the observed crash frequency is 7 crashes/year, LOSS III is assigned, as it includes between 5 and 12.57 crashes/year.

Excess Safety Performance Function Crash Frequency 🕒🕒🕒🕒

The excess is the difference between the observed crash frequency and the predicted crash frequency using HSM SPF. Thus, any excess means that the observed site crash frequency was higher than predicted. The excess is computed as:

$$\text{Excess}(N) = \overline{N_{\text{observed},i}} - \overline{N_{\text{predicted},i}} \quad (3-15)$$

Where,

$\overline{N_{\text{observed},i}}$ = observed crash frequency for site i ;

$\overline{N_{\text{predicted},i}}$ = HSM predicted crash frequency for site i .

Table 3.10 Excess SFP Characteristics

| Data Needs | |
|--|--|
| # of crashes by location, HSM SPF and necessary data (e.g., geometrics, traffic demand, land-use, signalization) | |
| Strengths | Limitations |
| Establishes a comparison threshold. Accounts for traffic volume. | Partial account for RTM bias. HSM is data- and labor-intensive. |

Excess SPF Example



Assume that the intersection of Main Street and Broadway Avenue experienced 21 crashes from 2009-2011, or, a crash frequency of 7 crashes/year. Assume that the HSM SPF predicts the crash frequency to be 5 crashes/year.

$$\text{Excess}(N) = 7 - 5 = 2 \text{ crashes/year.}$$

Thus, the crash frequency is slightly higher than predicted for this example site.

Specific Crash Type Proportion Threshold 🕒🕒🕒🕒

This method estimates the probability that the true proportion of a particular crash type is greater than a threshold based on similar sites. Though the object of this method is easy to understand, its use is somewhat more complex, since it requires the estimation of mathematical distribution parameters. The reader is referred to the HSM, and to Lyon et al. (2007), for detailed explanations of this method. As illustrated by Table 3.11, the fundamental difference between this method and those based on the HSM is that this method does not require the computation of SPF. Thus the data requirement is not as great, since only enough information is required as to classify sites as a particular type. This method can be used as a diagnostic tool to identify crash types toward which treatments could be targeted.

Table 3.11 Specific Crash Type Proportion Threshold Characteristics

| Data Needs | |
|---|---|
| # of crashes by type and location | |
| Strengths | Limitations |
| Establishes a comparison threshold. Can be used as a diagnostic tool. Not affected by RTM. Considers variance in crash data. | Does not account for traffic volume. Requires distribution parameter estimation. |

Empirical Bayes Adjustments 🕒🕒🕒🕒🕒

Empirical Bayes (EB) is a method of combining observed crash data with the safety performance of similar sites. Two main advantages of using EB include increased precision when using limited data (e.g., two or three years of crash data) and correction for RTM bias. EB adjustments can be applied to several of the previous methods, namely, average crash frequency, equivalent property damage only average crash frequency, and excess safety performance function crash frequency.

Previous measures have combined observed and predicted data, such as to compute an excess or a level of safety. EB differs by combining crash data with the expected crash frequency at similar sites in order to produce a single estimate. This combination is performed via a weighted average, as follows:

$$\text{Estimate of the expected crashes at a site} = \text{weight} * \text{crashes expected at similar sites} + (1 - \text{weight}) * \text{crashes at a site} \quad (3-16)$$

The weight is based on the strength of the crash record and the reliability of the SPF. The strength of the crash record is the number of crashes expected at a site. The SPF reliability is the degree to which the safety of a specific site is expected to differ from the SPF average. The weight is computed as,

$$weight = \frac{1}{1 + (\mu * Y) / \varphi} \quad (3-17)$$

Where,

μ = predicted crash frequency;

Y = number of years;


φ = overdispersion factor.

The standard deviation of the estimate, $\sigma(\text{estimate})$, is computed as,

$$\sigma(\text{estimate}) = \sqrt{(1 - weight) * \text{estimate}} \quad (3-18)$$

The estimate in Equation 3-18 is the same as the estimate of the expected crashes at a site that was presented in Equation 3-16.

Empirical Bayes Example



Assume that the intersection of Main Street and Broadway Avenue experienced 21 crashes from 2009-2011, or, a crash frequency of 7 crashes/year. Assume that the HSM SPF predicts the crash frequency to be 5 crashes/year. Also assume $\varphi = 1.9$.

$$weight = \frac{1}{1 + (5 * 3) / 1.9} = 0.11$$

Estimate = $0.11 * 5 + 0.89 * 7 = 6.78$ crashes per year.

$$\sigma(\text{estimate}) = \sqrt{(1 - 0.11) * 6.78} = 2.45 \text{ crashes per year}$$

Note how, in this example, the observed crash rate of 7 crashes/year was pulled toward the mean of five crashes/year, thus correcting for regression-to-the-mean bias.

Chapter 3 Bibliography

AASHTO (2010) *Highway Safety Manual*. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. Washington, D.C.

AASHTO (2010) *User and Non-User Benefit Analysis for Highways*. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. Washington, D.C.

Council, F., Zaloshnja, E., Miller, T. and Persaud, B. (2005) *Crash Cost Estimates by Maximum Police-Reported Injury Severity*. FHWA-HRT-05-051. McLean, Virginia. Pg. 15.

Hauer, E., Harwood, D., Council, F. and Griffith, M. (2002) *Estimating Safety by the Empirical Bayes Method: A Tutorial*. Transportation Research Record, Iss. 1784. TRB. Pp. 126-131.

Herbel, S., Laing, L. and McGovern, C. (2010) *Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Manual*. Federal Highway Administration. FHWA-TS-81-218. Washington, D.C.

Lord, D. (2006) *Modeling Motor Vehicle Crashes using Poisson-Gamma Models: Examining the Effects of Low Sample Mean Values and Small Sample Size on the Estimation of the Fixed Dispersion Parameter*. Accident Analysis & Prevention, Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 751-766.

Lord, D. and Mannering, D. (2010) *The Statistical Analysis of Crash-Frequency Data: A Review and Assessment of Methodological Alternatives*. Transportation Research Part A. Vol. 44, Iss. 5, June. Elsevier. Pp. 291-305.

Lyon, C., Gotts, B., Wong, F. and Bhagwant, P. (2007) *Comparison of Alternative Methods for Identifying Sites with High Proportion of Specific Accident Types*. Transportation Research Record, Iss. 2019. TRB. Pp. 212-218.

CHAPTER 4: SAFETY ANALYSIS TOOLS

Maximizing use of the toolbox to improve safety.

An important part of developing a safety plan for local communities involves the analysis of locations in order to identify safety concerns. There are a variety of tools available that can be used by an analyst to evaluate safety at individual locations and multiple locations simultaneously. The analyst may elect to utilize several of these tools as part of a comprehensive evaluation of safety in a local community. For example, the analyst might utilize tools to evaluate multiple locations, in order to identify specific locations with safety concerns. The user could then use other tools to evaluate the safety of individual locations that were identified during the first stage of the analysis.

Tools for Analyzing Individual Locations

There are a number of tools that can be used by analysts to evaluate safety concerns at individual locations. Some of these tools include collision diagrams, on-site observation reports, condition diagrams, traffic data collection, spot speed studies, traffic conflict studies, sight distance evaluations, and location analysis worksheets. These tools are described in greater detail in the following sections.

Collision Diagram 🕒 🕒

A collision diagram quickly reveals where crashes are occurring at each high-crash location and provides detailed information pertaining to each crash. Using the diagram, it is easy to observe any patterns in crash type that formed during the analysis period. However, since the examination of the collision diagram is a critical point in conducting a successful analysis, it is helpful to review all information pertaining to the location.

Use the following steps to prepare a collision diagram:

1. Obtain crash reports for all crashes occurring at the location during the previous one to three years. If significant changes (e.g., signals, stop signs, construction, etc.)

were made to the location in recent years, do not include reports for crashes that occurred prior to those changes.

2. Sketch a collision diagram similar to the one found in Figure 4.1. The diagram must show the general path of all vehicles involved in each crash, as well as the approximate point of each impact. The diagram need not be to scale, but it should allow for sufficient room to illustrate the paths and object(s) involved in each crash.
3. Be sure to include all of the information shown in Figure 4.1, such as the type and location of all traffic control devices. Use the symbols suggested on the form to show the type and severity of each crash. Label other basic characteristics of each crash, such as:
 - date, day, and time of crash,
 - lighting conditions (day or night),
 - pavement conditions at the time of the crash (dry, wet, icy, etc.), and
 - number of injuries or fatalities.
4. Note any special circumstances associated with a crash; particularly, any comments from a driver or investigating officer concerning glare, non-functional traffic control devices, poor pavement conditions, or sight obstructions.
5. Display any non-involved (non-contact) vehicles or pedestrians on the diagram; an example could include an incident during which a vehicle was sitting in traffic behind a left-turn vehicle and, while waiting at the end of the line, was struck in the rear by an approaching third vehicle. The vehicle making the left turn would be considered a non-involved vehicle since it was not involved in the actual collision; its intended path should be marked with a dashed line, since the vehicle affected the behavior of other vehicles that were involved in the crash.
6. Identify any crash patterns that are present. Note the types of crashes occurring on each intersection approach or along the section of street.
7. Summarize the times when crashes occurred, as well as weather and pavement conditions. These summaries will be entered in Part D of the Location Analysis Worksheet (Fig. 4.4).

CHAPTER 4 - SAFETY ANALYSIS TOOLS

Indicate North by Arrow

INTERSECTION COLLISION DIAGRAM

Third St.

Street Name

[Form ICD]

Crashes shown:

- 9:00 pm Mon. Jan. 4: Dry, Clear
- 4:00 pm Mon. Oct. 10: Wet, Raining
- 5:11 pm Fri. Apr. 1: Dry, Clear
- 1:20 pm Tues May 10: Wet, Raining, 2 Injuries
- 4:45 pm Fri. Aug. 5: Wet, Cloudy
- 7:50 am Mon. Jan. 18: Dry, Clear
- 9:00 am Mon. Feb. 1: Wet, Raining
- 7:15 pm Sat. Dec. 3: Wet, Melting Snow

| Crash Summary | | | |
|---------------|-----|-------|-------|
| Severity | Day | Night | Total |
| Fatal | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Injury | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| PDO | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Total | 6 | 2 | 8 |

SYMBOLS

- Moving Vehicle
- Backing Vehicle
- Pedestrian
- Non-Involved Vehicle
- Parked Vehicle
- Fixed Object
- Fatal Crash
- Injury Crash

TYPES OF COLLISIONS

- Rear End
- Head On
- Side Swipe
- Out of Control
- Overturn
- Left Turn
- Right Angle

SHOW FOR EACH CRASH

1. Approximate location of crash
2. Type of collision
3. Time, day, date
4. Other pertinent factors from crash reports as severity, pavement and weather conditions, etc.

INTERSECTION THIRD ST. AND LINCOLN ST. DATE MARCH 1, 1989

TIME PERIOD COVERED: FROM JAN. 1, 1988 TO DEC. 31, 1988 PREPARED BY EJD

Figure 4.1 Collision diagram.

On-Site Observation Report ⓘ ⓘ

The on-site observation report tool can provide a useful perspective for analysis and countermeasure selection at an individual location. The on-site observation report shown in Figure 4.2 can be of great assistance in conducting inspections.

Careful preparations should be made for the on-site visit. Information concerning the site, including collision diagrams, crash summaries, and traffic counts, should be reviewed. Schedule the visit to correspond with predominant crash characteristics; for example, nighttime, peak volume, or wet pavement conditions. Be sure to fill in the first three lines of the report in advance of the field trip. Complete the observation report as follows:

1. **Observation Points:** Upon arriving at the site, drive through the location several times from different directions, paying close attention to how drivers might see the environment. Identify several good vantage points that provide a clear view of traffic from a safe position. Ensure that the observation points are situated so that motorists will not notice they are being observed (drivers will act differently if they suspect they are being watched).
2. **Physical Checklist:** Complete the “Physical Checklist” to become familiar with the features of the location and to identify potential hazards. Place a mark after the items on the list that might create problems or contribute to crashes.
3. **Operational Checklist:** Observe pedestrian and driver activity at the location to complete the “Operational Checklist.” Note any sudden or erratic maneuvers, instances of driver or pedestrian confusion, and/or violations. Place a mark following items on the “Operational Checklist” that may be associated with confusing or hazardous site characteristics.
4. **Comments:** After observing traffic for approximately one hour, reconsider the items in the “Physical Checklist” to determine whether anything may have been overlooked during the original location assessment. Prior to leaving the site, list all marked items under the “Comments” section at the bottom of the second page. For each item listed, provide comments and descriptions that could be helpful in identifying any crash contributing factors. To produce useful and valuable documentation of the on-site observations, each commentary should be made as complete as possible. Use extra pages if necessary.
5. **Photographs:** Taking photographs of the site in order to document location characteristics is advised. Number each photograph sequentially. If there is a need to specify a physical dimension of a photographed feature (e.g., length), place markers of a known dimension next to the feature before photographing it. Another method is to take a measurement, carefully noting it on the rear of the report form along with the number of the photograph.

6. Interviews: It may also be advisable to interview individuals who live or work near the site location, recording their remarks concerning hazardous conditions or dangerous operational characteristics.

| ON-SITE OBSERVATION REPORT | | | | [Form OSOR-1] | |
|--|----------------------------------|------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| LOCATION | <i>Third St. and Lincoln St.</i> | | CONTROL DEVICES | <i>2-way stop</i> | |
| OBSERVER | <i>EJD</i> | DAY | <i>Tues.</i> | DATE | <i>June 5, 1999</i> |
| | | TIME | <i>4:30 pm</i> | WEATHER | <i>Occasional Rain</i> |
| PHYSICAL CHECKLIST: | | | | | CHECK ITEM IF PROBLEM EXISTS |
| 1. Obstructions block view of traffic control devices at or near the location? | | | | | |
| 2. Obstructions block view of opposing or conflicting traffic? | | | | | |
| 3. The legal parking layout restricts sight distances? | | | | | <i>X</i> |
| 4. Traffic signs are satisfactory as to number, size, message, placement, reflectivity, and visibility? (see MUTCD) | | | | | <i>X</i> |
| 5. Traffic signals are satisfactory as to number, lense size, placement, visibility, and timing? (see MUTCD) | | | | | |
| 6. Pavement markings are satisfactory as to location, size, message, color, and visibility? (see MUTCD) | | | | | <i>X</i> |
| 7. Channelization devices, such as islands, are adequate for: | | | | | |
| A. Reducing traffic conflict areas? | | | | | |
| B. Defining traffic movement paths? | | | | | |
| C. Separating traffic flows? | | | | | |
| 8. Curb radii are adequate for turning vehicles? | | | | | |
| 9. Roadway horizontal curves too sharp? | | | | | |
| 10. Approach grades at intersection too steep? | | | | | |
| 11. Pavement has proper crown and superelevation? | | | | | <i>X</i> |
| 12. Lane and street widths are adequate? | | | | | |
| 13. The pavement surface condition is satisfactory? (Consider potholes, rutting wash board, edge drop-offs, raveling, bleeding surface, cracking, and poor drainage.) | | | | | <i>X</i> |
| 14. The roadside is clear of hazardous objects? | | | | | |
| 15. Driveways are properly placed and designed? | | | | | |
| 16. Pedestrian crosswalks are properly placed and designed? | | | | | |
| 17. Street lighting is satisfactory? | | | | | |
| 18. Advertising signs or lights reduce driver visual capability? | | | | | |

Figure 4.2 On-site observation report – Page 1.

| ON-SITE OBSERVATION REPORT - PAGE 2 | | [Form OSOR-2] |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------|
| OPERATIONAL CHECKLIST: | CHECK ITEM IF PROBLEM EXISTS | |
| 1. Drivers respond correctly to traffic control devices at and near the location? | | |
| 2. Repeated violations of traffic control devices or regulations? | | |
| 3. Vehicle speeds too high for existing conditions? | | |
| 4. Vehicles change speeds or stop unexpectedly? | | |
| 5. Vehicles change lanes unexpectedly? | | |
| 6. Certain traffic movements could create a hazard? | | |
| A. Left-turning vehicles: | X | |
| B. Straight-through vehicles: | X | |
| C. Right-turning vehicles: | X | |
| 7. Parked vehicles or parking maneuvers create hazards? | X | |
| 8. Vehicles entering or departing from driveways create hazards? | | |
| 9. Traffic congestion and/or delays create hazards? | | |
| 10. Bicycles at the location cause confusion or conflicts? | | |
| 11. Pedestrians at the location cause confusion or conflicts? | | |
| <p>COMMENTS AND DESCRIPTION OF EACH PROBLEM IDENTIFIED ON CHECKLISTS:</p> <p>(P = Physical with item number; O = Operational with item number)</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0ffff; padding: 10px; min-height: 200px;"> <p><i>P-3 Parking too close to corners; causes restricted view from Lincoln in all directions.</i></p> <p><i>P-4 Signs for parking restrictions not in place.</i></p> <p><i>P-6 Yellow curb markings faded.</i></p> <p><i>P-11 No crown on Lincoln - causes ponding.</i></p> <p><i>P-13 "Washboard" on Lincoln, slick patches & raveling on 3rd.</i></p> <p><i>O-6 Any movement from Lincoln could be risky depending on location of parked vehicles.</i></p> <p><i>O-7 Parking as close as 10 feet from corner.</i></p> </div> | | |
| (Continue comments as necessary on additional pages.) | | |

Figure 4.2 On-site observation report – Page 2.

Condition Diagram 🕒 🕒

A condition diagram, or roadway inventory, is a drawing (to scale) of the existing roadway, control device locations, and major features in the nearby environment. When prepared for a high-crash location, the diagram assists in relating crash patterns and probable causes to the physical features on and near the roadway.

A scale of 1 inch = 20 feet or 1 inch = 50 feet is typically used when drawing the condition diagram. The amount of information placed on the diagram is related to the type of improvements being considered. A location receiving only minor improvements, such as the installation of warning signs, would probably need only a few important measurements. A more detailed evaluation involving sight distance problems, possible alignment changes, or left-turn channelization might require a complete drawing with lane widths, approach grades, and distances to sight obstructions.

A completed condition diagram for a high-crash location (Fig. 4.3) should contain the following items:

- Date the diagram was prepared
- Observer's name
- Street names
- Street functional classification (arterial, collector, local)
- Traffic control devices (signs, signals, markings)
- North direction arrow
- Intersection angle
- Speed limits on all approaches
- Other traffic regulations
- Widths of all streets, lanes, medians, and parking stalls
- Parking set-backs and regulations
- Sidewalk and crosswalk locations
- Location and height of objects obstructing view (fences, shrubs)
- Location of fixed objects (buildings, utility poles, large trees, culvert headwalls, curb-side mail boxes, fire hydrants)
- Position of street lights and light poles

- Driveway locations and widths
- Road surface materials and significant surface irregularities
- Grades on all approaches
- Corner radii
- General classification of nearby land use and building use




Figure 4.3 Condition diagram.

Traffic Data Collection ⓘ ⓘ

A complete analysis of a high-crash location requires additional traffic data. Basic 24-hour traffic volume estimates are required in order to estimate average daily traffic (ADT). Volume counts at an intersection should show the incoming directions, turns, and departing directions for all vehicles. Counts taken at a mid-block section should specify the amount of traffic in each direction and in each lane. In urban areas, especially near schools, pedestrian and bicycle counts may be very helpful for high-crash location analysis.

Spot Speed Studies ⓘ ⓘ ⓘ

Speed studies should be conducted when vehicle speed is a possible crash causal factor. Because speed is related to stopping distance, it is necessary to determine vehicle speed. The spot speed study makes it possible to properly evaluate speed regulation in the vicinity, and to check for adequate sight distances at critical locations, such as intersections and driveways.

Traffic Conflicts Studies ⓘ ⓘ ⓘ ⓘ

Traffic conflicts analysis is a method for observing situations in which one driver is forced to take evasive action, such as swerving or braking, to avoid colliding with another vehicle. The frequency of the different types of conflicts is assumed to indicate the potential for crashes at the site. It is generally agreed that a traffic conflicts analysis should not be used to replace crash data analysis; however, it can be used as a supplementary tool to help identify possible countermeasures.

Sight Distance Evaluations ⓘ ⓘ ⓘ

Sight distance evaluations are essential for evaluating locations in which sight distance appears to be a contributing factor to a location's crash history. It is also important for determining the type of control device to be used at an unsignalized intersection. These studies are primarily concerned with sight distances across intersection quadrants and along roads that must be crossed or entered. It is advisable to coordinate traffic control device selection with traffic characteristics and available sight distances.

Location Analysis Worksheet ⓘ ⓘ ⓘ

A location analysis worksheet can be a useful tool to help identify specific safety concerns at a given location. The following steps describe how to complete the location analysis worksheet (Fig. 4.4).

1. Location Identification: Record the location name, date, and existing traffic control devices at the top of the page.
2. Part A: Complete this section based on the crash data for the location.
3. Part B or Part C: If the location is an intersection, complete Part B. If it is a mid-block section, complete Part C.
4. Part D: Complete this section with the information found in the collision diagram.

5. Part E, “Crash Patterns Identified”: Using the information in Parts B or C, the collision and condition diagrams, and the observation report, identify any single predominant crash pattern. Other patterns are classified as secondary.
6. Part E, “Probable Causes”: Determine probable causes of crashes and their general countermeasures.
7. Part E, “Supporting Data Attached”: Place a mark next to the data that will be included with the report.
8. Part E, “General Conclusions”: Using supporting data, summarize the findings of the analysis.
9. Part E, “Specific Countermeasures”: Prior to entering the specific countermeasures, determine that each is feasible and satisfies established warrants. It is essential that warrants be considered to assure the selection of appropriate countermeasures. The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) contains warrants for installing signals and other traffic control devices. Even if the warrants for a particular countermeasure are satisfied, alternative improvements should be compared. Finally, it may be necessary to review additional information about the site, such as right-of-way plans, to determine whether a specific improvement would require property acquisition.
10. Part E, “Best Countermeasure, Benefit/Cost Ratio, etc.”: Select the best countermeasure or combination of countermeasures from the specific countermeasures. Wait to enter the B/C ratio, costs, savings, and priority until the analysis of countermeasures has been completed.

CHAPTER 4 - SAFETY ANALYSIS TOOLS

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| LOCATION ANALYSIS WORKSHEET | | [Form LAW-1] |
| LOCATION | <i>Third Street and Lincoln Street</i> | DATE <i>June 6, 1999</i> |
| EXISTING TRAFFIC CONTROL | <i>two-way stop (on Lincoln)</i> | |

PART A - CRASH NUMBER, RATE AND EPDO SUMMARY

| Section Length (in miles) <i>mid-block only</i> | Year | Number of Crashes | | | | EPDO Number | ADT | Exposure | Crash Rate | EPDO Rate |
|---|------------------|-------------------|--------|------|-------|----------------|-------|-----------|---------------|--------------|
| | | Fatal | Injury | PDO | Total | | | | | |
| | 1988 | | 1 | 7 | 8 | 13 | 3,600 | 1,314,000 | 6.088 | 9.893 |
| | 1987 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 16 | 3,550 | 1,295,750 | 4.631 | 12.348 |
| | 1986 | | 1 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 3,400 | 1,241,000 | 3.223 | 7.252 |
| | TOTALS | 1 | 3 | 14 | 18 | | | | | |
| | 2 OR 3 YR AVG | 0.33 | 1.00 | 4.67 | 6.00 | 12.667 | 3,517 | 1,283,583 | 4.674 | 9.868 |

PART B - INTERSECTION-RELATED CRASHES

| | Right Angle | Rear End | Side-Swipe | | Head On | Ped. | Fixed Object | Right Turn | Left Turn | Other | TOTAL |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------|------------|---------|---------|------|-----------------|---------------|-----------|-------|-------|
| | | | Meeting | Passing | | | | | | | |
| Number of Crashes | 8 | 6 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | 18 |
| Percent of Total | 44.4% | 33.3% | | | | 5.6% | | 5.6% | 11.1% | | 100% |

PART C - MID-BLOCK CRASHES

| | Vehicle Striking | | | | | | | Non-Collision | | TOTAL |
|----------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|------|-------|-------|---------------|-------|-------|
| | Vehicle on Street | Parked Car | Vehicle at Drive | Fixed Object | Ped. | Train | Other | Over- Turn | Other | |
| Number of Crashes | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent of Total | | | | | | | | | | 100% |

PART D - NUMBER OF CRASHES AND EXISTING CONDITIONS

| | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|----|--------------------|----|
| Time of Day: | 6:00 am - Noon | 5 | 6:00 pm - Midnight | 5 |
| | Noon - 6:00 pm | 7 | Midnight - 6:00 am | 1 |
| Light Conditions: | Day | 13 | Night | 5 |
| Surface Conditions: | Dry | 7 | Wet | 10 |
| | | | Snow or Ice | 1 |
| Weather: | Cloudy | 5 | Clear | 6 |
| | | | Rain | 7 |
| | | | Snow | |
| Other: | | | Other | |

Figure 4.4 Location Analysis Worksheet – Page 1.

| LOCATION ANALYSIS WORKSHEET - | | [Form LAW-2] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|--------------------|-------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------|
| LOCATION | <i>Third Street and Lincoln Street</i> | DATE <i>June 6, 1999</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PART E - CRASH ANALYSIS SUMMARY | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COLLISION DIAGRAM ATTACHED </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> <div> <p>CRASH PATTERNS IDENTIFIED:</p> <p>Predominant <i>Right Angle</i></p> <p>Secondary <i>Rear End</i></p> </div> <div> <p>Probable Causes and Possible Countermeasures:</p> <div style="background-color: #e0f7fa; padding: 5px; margin-top: 5px;"> <p><i>Restricted Site Distance:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Install 4-way</i> 2. <i>Remove sight obstructions</i> 3. <i>Restrict parking near corners</i> 4. <i>Reduce speed limits</i> 5. <i>Install overhead beacon</i> <p><i>Slippery Pavement Surface:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Deslick</i> 2. <i>Improve drainage & crown</i> </div> </div> </div> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>OPERATIONAL AND PHYSICAL DATA ANALYSIS</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 10px;"> <div> <p>Supporting Data Attached:</p> <div style="background-color: #e0f7fa; padding: 5px; margin-top: 5px;"> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On-Site Observation Report</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intersection Sight Distances</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Volume/Turning Movement Count</p> <p>Other:</p> </div> </div> <div> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Condition Diagram</p> <p>Spot Speed Study</p> <p>Traffic Conflict Study</p> </div> </div> <p>General Conclusions from Supporting Data:</p> <div style="background-color: #e0f7fa; padding: 5px; margin-top: 5px;"> <p><i>Sight distance in all directions from Lincoln is restricted by cars and vans parking too closely to corner.</i></p> <p><i>Pavement has no crown on Lincoln.</i></p> <p><i>Both Lincoln and Third have areas of "bleeding asphalt".</i></p> <p><i>"Washboard" on Lincoln near stop line.</i></p> </div> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>COUNTERMEASURE SELECTION</p> <p>Specific Countermeasures:</p> <div style="background-color: #e0f7fa; padding: 5px; margin-top: 5px;"> <p>1. <i>Restrict parking.</i></p> <p>2. <i>Deslick pavement.</i></p> <p>3. <i>Combination of 1 and 2.</i></p> </div> <p>(Note: For each countermeasure, fill out a Countermeasure Analysis Worksheet)</p> <table style="width: 100%; margin-top: 10px;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;">Best Countermeasure</td> <td style="width: 30%;"><i>3 - Combination</i></td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Benefit/Cost Ratio</td> <td><i>28.2</i></td> <td>Implementation Cost</td> <td><i>\$13,300</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average Annual Net Savings</td> <td><i>\$62,527</i></td> <td>Priority Assigned</td> <td><i>1</i></td> </tr> </table> | | | Best Countermeasure | <i>3 - Combination</i> | | | Benefit/Cost Ratio | <i>28.2</i> | Implementation Cost | <i>\$13,300</i> | Average Annual Net Savings | <i>\$62,527</i> | Priority Assigned | <i>1</i> |
| Best Countermeasure | <i>3 - Combination</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Benefit/Cost Ratio | <i>28.2</i> | Implementation Cost | <i>\$13,300</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average Annual Net Savings | <i>\$62,527</i> | Priority Assigned | <i>1</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |

Figure 4.4 Location Analysis Worksheet – Page 2.

Tools for Analyzing Multiple Locations

In some cases, an analyst may wish to investigate many locations simultaneously. Since the publication of the previous HAL manual, many tools for the evaluation of multiple locations have been developed or enhanced, such as GIS and software packages, based on the Highway Safety Manual (HSM). Several of these tools are discussed in the following sections.

MoDOT Crash Statistics

The Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) website contains a variety of crash statistics for crashes that have occurred on Missouri's highway system. The user can select from a variety of report formats based on location or type of crash. These reports can help the analyst to identify trends in the contributing factors for crashes in a specific area.

Location reports can be generated for a city, county, MoDOT region, Missouri State Highway Patrol (MSHP) troop, or the entire state. The output of the location reports includes the number of fatalities and serious injuries occurring at the selected location versus the number of crashes in the state, as well as the number of fatalities and serious injuries by target area. An example location report for Jefferson City for the years 2009-2011 is shown in Table 4.1. This report shows that 11 fatalities (0.44% of state total) and 208 serious injuries (1.14% of the state total) occurred in Jefferson City during this time period. The top three target areas associated with fatalities were horizontal curves, run-off-road crashes, and unrestrained occupants killed. The top three target areas involved in serious injuries were signalized intersection crashes, young drivers, and inattention.

In addition to reports for crash locations, reports can also be generated for different types of crashes, such as fatalities involving a horizontal curve, fatalities involving a vehicle following too closely, or fatalities involving an inattentive driver. Table 4.2 presents an example crash report for fatalities involving inattentive drivers. The output of this report reveals that 498 fatalities relating to this issue occurred between 2009-2011. The breakdown of fatalities by age group for this report shows that the 66-and-over age group comprised the largest percentage (17.3 percent) of fatalities involving an inattentive driver.

CHAPTER 4 - SAFETY ANALYSIS TOOLS

Table 4.1 Crash Report for Jefferson City (MoDOT)

City JEFFERSON CITY

Total Fatalities and Serious Injuries by Target Area
2009 - 2011

JEFFERSON CITY vs STATE

| Total Fatalities | | | | Total Serious Injuries | | | |
|------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Year | Jefferson City | State | % | Year | Jefferson City | State | % |
| 2009 | 5 | 878 | 0.57% | 2009 | 46 | 6,540 | 0.70% |
| 2010 | 5 | 821 | 0.61% | 2010 | 66 | 6,096 | 1.08% |
| 2011 | 1 | 786 | 0.13% | 2011 | 96 | 5,643 | 1.70% |
| Total | 11 | 2,485 | 0.44% | Total | 208 | 18,279 | 1.14% |

JEFFERSON CITY

| Fatalities Involving | | | | | Serious Injuries Involving | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|-------|--|------|------|------|-------|
| Description | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total | Description | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
| Horizontal Curves | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | Signalized Intersection Crashes | 14 | 32 | 30 | 76 |
| Run-off-Road Crashes | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | Young Drivers - 15-20 | 8 | 21 | 29 | 58 |
| Unrestrained Occupants Killed | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 | Inattention | 16 | 10 | 22 | 48 |
| Commercial Motor Vehicle | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | Unsignalized Intersection Crashes | 15 | 12 | 19 | 46 |
| Head-On Crashes (Non-Interstates) | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | Inattentive Drivers | 15 | 9 | 20 | 44 |
| Aggressive Driving-Speed Exceeded Limit | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | Unrestrained Occupants Seriously Injured | 12 | 15 | 17 | 44 |
| Alcohol and - or Other Drugs | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Older Drivers -65-75 | 8 | 13 | 16 | 37 |
| Young Drivers - 15-20 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | Run-off-Road Crashes | 8 | 10 | 19 | 37 |
| Aggressive Driving-Too Fast for Conditions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Older Drivers 76 or Older | 4 | 8 | 12 | 24 |
| Inattention | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | Horizontal Curves | 1 | 9 | 12 | 22 |
| Older Drivers 76 or Older | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Aggressive Driving-Following Too Close | 3 | 13 | 4 | 20 |
| Pedestrians Killed | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | Aggressive Driving-Too Fast for Conditions | 4 | 3 | 10 | 17 |
| Signalized Intersection Crashes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | Alcohol and - or Other Drugs | 5 | 2 | 9 | 16 |
| Unlicensed Drivers | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Head-On Crashes (Non-Interstates) | 1 | 9 | 6 | 16 |
| Unsignalized Intersection Crashes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | Motorcyclists Seriously Injured | 2 | 6 | 8 | 16 |
| Aggressive Driving-Following Too Close | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Pedestrians Seriously Injured | 5 | 1 | 8 | 14 |
| Bicyclists Killed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Unlicensed Drivers | 2 | 0 | 9 | 11 |
| Collision with Tree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Commercial Motor Vehicle | 3 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| Collision with Utility Pole | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Bicyclists Seriously Injured | 3 | 1 | 4 | 8 |
| Head-On Crashes (Interstates) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Collision with Utility Pole | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| Inattentive Drivers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Collision with Tree | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Motorcyclists Killed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Aggressive Driving-Speed Exceeded Limit | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Older Drivers -65-75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Work Zones | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| School Buses/Bus Signal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Head-On Crashes (Interstates) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Work Zones | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | School Buses/Bus Signal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 4.2 Crash Report for Fatalities Involving Inattentive Drivers (MoDOT)

**Total Fatalities by Age and Target Area
2009 - 2011**


| Killed Involving an Inattentive Driver | | |
|--|------------|-----------------------------|
| Age | Fatalities | Percent of Total Fatalities |
| * >= 66 | 86 | 17.27% |
| 15-20 | 63 | 12.65% |
| 21-25 | 52 | 10.44% |
| 26-30 | 46 | 9.24% |
| 41-45 | 42 | 8.43% |
| 51-55 | 40 | 8.03% |
| 56-60 | 39 | 7.83% |
| 46-50 | 37 | 7.43% |
| 61-65 | 30 | 6.02% |
| 36-40 | 23 | 4.62% |
| 31-35 | 19 | 3.82% |
| 9-14 | 5 | 1.00% |
| 5 | 3 | 0.60% |
| 1 | 2 | 0.40% |
| 2 | 2 | 0.40% |
| 3 | 2 | 0.40% |
| 6 | 2 | 0.40% |
| 7 | 2 | 0.40% |
| 8 | 2 | 0.40% |
| 4 | 1 | 0.20% |
| ** < 1 | 0 | 0.00% |
| UNKNOWN | 0 | 0.00% |
| Total | 498 | 100.00% |

* Greater than or equal to 66

** Less than 1

MSHP Traffic Crashes Online Mapping Tool

The MSHP hosts a website that provides crash data in both graphic and tabular formats. The user can query for crashes by many different factors, such as a range of dates, city, county, crash severity, vehicle type, circumstances, gender, and level of injury. The output table of crashes that is generated provides information such as crash image number, crash report number, date, time, number of vehicles, severity, crash type, location, and light conditions. The user has the option to save the output table to a spreadsheet. The query output also includes summary statistics with the number of total crashes, number of injuries, and number of fatalities. The graphical output of the query shows a map with crash locations marked. The crashes are color coded by severity type. The user can click on the map crash icon to obtain additional information about a crash, such as date and severity. Figure 4.5 shows a sample graphical output for the number of crashes occurring in Columbia, Missouri in 2013. The summary statistics also provided in the output show that 938 crashes occurred in Columbia in 2013, with 465 injuries and four fatalities.



© Copyright 2012 ESRI. All rights reserved. Printed on Mon Oct 21 2013 04:22:00 PM.

Figure 4.5 Crashes in 2013 in Columbia, Missouri from MSHP Traffic Crashes Online Mapping Tool (MSHP).

LETS ⓘ ⓘ

The Law Enforcement Traffic System (LETS) was developed in cooperation with the MoDOT Highway Safety Division. LETS provides Missouri law enforcement agencies with tools to manage crash reports, as well as citation, warning, and complaint data. LETS also allows local agencies to customize certain functions to meet their requirements. It includes optional user interfaces to retrieve driver and vehicle registration information and to create and submit crash reports electronically to the Missouri State Highway Patrol. LETS is currently the only system approved for the electronic submission of crash reports in Missouri. The electronic submission of crash reports helps to facilitate more efficient and accurate crash reporting, since reports not entered electronically must be submitted manually. LETS also has the ability to generate reports to aid in various tasks, such as the identification of problem areas and the evaluation of the effectiveness of enforcement activities. The LETS Crash Reporting function includes graphical location mapping tools, as shown in Figure 4.6.




Figure 4.6 LETS Graphical Map Interface (REJIS 2012).

Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) Mapping Tool ⓘ ⓘ

The Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) is a database of fatal motor vehicle crashes that includes all qualifying fatalities that have occurred within the United States and Puerto Rico since 1975. To be classified as a FARS crash, the crash must involve a motor vehicle traveling on a roadway open to the public, and must result in the death of a motorist or non-motorist within 30 days of the crash. The FARS website includes documentation and raw data. The website also allows users to query crash data from the FARS encyclopedia. Queries can be made based on location and contributing factors. For example, the user could obtain crash statistics for all fatal crashes in Missouri in which alcohol was a contributing factor (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3 FARS Crash Data for Alcohol Related Crashes in 2011 (NHTSA)

Persons Killed, by STATE and Highest Driver Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) in Crash - State : Missouri, Year : 2011

SELECT REPORT CRITERIA: STATE: YEAR:

| State | Highest Driver Blood Alcohol Concentration in Crash | | | | | | | | Total Killed | |
|----------|---|---------|---------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | BAC = .00 | | BAC = .01-.07 | | BAC = .08+ | | BAC = .01+ | | | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Missouri | 479 | 61 | 40 | 5 | 258 | 33 | 299 | 38 | 784 | 100 |

The FARS encyclopedia also includes mapping tool features that allow the user to create pin maps and intensity maps from custom FARS crash database queries. Pin maps show the locations of individual crashes, while intensity maps show the tabulation of fatal crashes by county or state.

Another graphical interface for FARS crash data can be found at the SafeRoadMaps website. This website allows the user to locate fatal crashes in the vicinity of a street address. These crash locations can be displayed on a map or aerial photograph (Fig. 4.7). The user can click on the icon for an individual crash to obtain information about the crash, such as date, accident information, person information, and vehicle information. Individual layers for crashes for each year from 2001 to 2010 can be turned on and off. The graphical interface also includes tools enabling the user to measure distances or to draw annotations on the map.




Figure 4.7 Example map from SafeRoadMaps showing locations of fatal crashes in Columbia, Missouri in 2010 (SafeRoadMaps).

Pedestrian and Bicycle GIS Safety Analysis Tools (FHWA) 🕒 🕒 🕒 🕒

GIS tools from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are available to facilitate the analysis of safety issues related to pedestrians and bicyclists. Three tools are available: Safe Route to School, bicycle compatible routes, and high pedestrian crash zones. The Safe Route to School tool creates a walk route and associated directions for three possible criteria: shortest route, safest route based on hazard information, or route based on user preferences. The tool for bicycle compatible routes includes two possible output options: quickest or best bicycle route to a destination or color-coded map, based on the bicycle compatibility index of a given area. The bicycle compatibility index of a street is calculated based on its characteristics. The tool for high pedestrian crash zones generates a map which provides the user with information regarding the frequency of crashes in different areas (Fig. 4.8).




Figure 4.8 High Pedestrian Crash Zone View (FHWA).

Pedestrian and Bicycle Crash Analysis Tool (PBCAT) 🕒 🕒 🕒 🕒

The Pedestrian and Bicycle Crash Analysis Tool (PBCAT) is a software package designed to help engineers, planners, and pedestrian and bicycle coordinators to address concerns related to pedestrian and bicycle crashes. PBCAT allows users to develop a database of details describing crashes between motor vehicles and pedestrians or bicyclists. The database includes crash type, and goes beyond typical crash database information, such as crash location and time, to describe the actions of motor vehicles and pedestrians or bicyclists prior to the crash. Once the database is

developed, the user can analyze the data and select appropriate countermeasures to help reduce the number of pedestrian and bicycle crashes.

Highway Safety Manual (HSM) Spreadsheets

Spreadsheets have been developed to help users apply the crash predictive methods described in the HSM for three facility types: rural two-lane roads, rural multi-lane roads, and urban and suburban arterials. Two versions of these spreadsheets exist: the original spreadsheets and extended spreadsheets.

The original spreadsheets were developed by Dr. Karen Dixon as part of a volunteer effort to help support HSM training efforts. Each spreadsheet file includes a worksheet with instructions, as well as worksheets for entering segment data, worksheets for entering intersection data, and worksheets containing results. During the data inputting process, the user can either incorporate default HSM values or provide locally-derived values as needed. The input data worksheets show the results for the calculations of crash modification factors (CMF) to provide the user insight into the sensitivity of the results to the input data. The results obtained from the worksheets provide the predicted average crash frequencies by severity type for each roadway segment and intersection. The expected average crash frequencies determined by an Empirical Bayes (EB) analysis for each roadway segment and intersection are also provided in the output. One limitation of the original spreadsheets is that they are set up for a study area having two segments and two intersections. Analysis of a study area having a different number of project elements requires additional spreadsheet manipulation, which can be time consuming and has the potential to introduce errors into the analysis. The original spreadsheets are available as a free download from the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) HSM website.

The extended spreadsheets were developed through a project funded by the Alabama Department of Transportation in order to provide additional functionality to the original spreadsheets through the use of macros. Specifically, the extended spreadsheets provide automation for the manipulation required in the original spreadsheets to facilitate different numbers and combinations of roadway segments and intersections; they add standard reports that show results in tabular, graphical, and text formats; and they add the ability to perform multiyear analysis. The extended spreadsheets include instructions, a worksheet to enter project information, and a worksheet with a report. The user begins the analysis with this spreadsheet by entering general project information such as project description, the number of segments in the study area, the number of intersections in the study area, whether or not a multiyear analysis will be performed, and whether the analysis includes the calculation of the predicted average crash frequency only, or both the predicted and expected average crash frequencies. Upon completion of this preliminary input data, a macro generates a worksheet for each roadway segment and intersection. The user then completes the data entry for each segment and intersection in the study area. The input data worksheets show the base conditions, in addition to the actual conditions provided by the user. Once data entry is complete, a macro performs the analysis and generates reports. The worksheet with the reports summarizes the results in tabular, graphical, and text format. The

extended spreadsheets are available as a free download from the website of the Highway Safety Performance Committee of the Transportation Research Board.

**HSM Spreadsheet
Example**



The crash frequency for a study area consisting of two segments and three intersections on an urban two-lane undivided arterial needs to be determined. Two of the intersections are four-leg signalized intersections, and one of the intersections is a four-leg unsignalized intersection.

A completed worksheet for general project information is pictured in Table 4.4. The type of traffic control for the intersections has been entered, along with other project information. Completed input data worksheets for the roadway segments and intersections are shown in Tables 4.5-4.9. Excerpts from the summary report are shown in Table 4.10. The predicted average crash frequencies for the study area are 3.5 property damage only (PDO) crashes per year, 1.7 fatal and injury crashes per year, and 5.2 total crashes per year.

CHAPTER 4 - SAFETY ANALYSIS TOOLS

Table 4.4 General Project Input Data for HSM Spreadsheet Example

| PROJECT SAFETY PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS INPUT SHEET | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| General Information | | | | |
| Project Name | Practical Case Study | | Contact Email | email |
| Project Description | Route A from Int. 1 to Int. 2 | | Contact Phone | (123) 456-7891 |
| Reference Number | STARS Report A-1 | | Date Performed | 05/12/11 |
| Analyst | John Smith | | Analysis Year | 2011 |
| Agency/Company | ABC Company | | Multiple Year Analysis? | Yes |
| # of Segments in Analysis | 2 | | Predicted/expected crashes | Predicted |
| # of Intersections in Analysis | 3 | | | |
| | | | | |
| INDIVIDUAL PROJECT ELEMENTS | LOCATION INFORMATION | | JURISDICTION | INTERSECTIONS ONLY |
| | Route | Location Description | | Signalized or Unsignalized? |
| SEGMENTS | | | | |
| Segment 1 | Route A | From Int. 1 to Int. 2 | | - |
| Segment 2 | Route A | From Int. 2 to Int. 3 | | - |
| INTERSECTIONS | | | | |
| Intersection 1 | Route A | First St. | State | Signalized |
| Intersection 2 | Route A | Second St. | State | Unsignalized |
| Intersection 3 | Route A | Third St. | State | Signalized |

CHAPTER 4 – SAFETY ANALYSIS TOOLS

Table 4.5 Input Data for Segment 1 in HSM Spreadsheet Example

| General Information | | Location Information | |
|---|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Analyst | John Smith | Roadway | Route A |
| Agency or Company | ABC Company | Roadway Section | From Int. 1 to Int. 2 |
| Date Performed | 05/12/11 | Jurisdiction | State |
| Segment for Analysis | Segment 1 | Analysis Year | 2011 |
| Input Data | | Site Conditions | Base Conditions |
| Roadway type (2U, 3T, 4U, 4D, 5T) | | 2U | -- |
| Length of segment, L (mi) | | 0.25 | -- |
| AADT (veh/day) | is within range AADT _{MAX} = 32,600 (veh/day) | 8,500 | -- |
| Type of on-street parking (none/parallel/angle) | | None | None |
| Proportion of curb length with on-street parking | | 0 | -- |
| Median width (ft) - for divided only | | | 15 |
| Lighting (present / not present) | | Present | Not Present |
| Auto speed enforcement (present / not present) | | Not Present | Not Present |
| Major commercial driveways (number) | | 1 | -- |
| Minor commercial driveways (number) | | 2 | -- |
| Major industrial / institutional driveways (number) | | 1 | -- |
| Minor industrial / institutional driveways (number) | | 1 | -- |
| Major residential driveways (number) | | 0 | -- |
| Minor residential driveways (number) | | 4 | -- |
| Other driveways (number) | | 0 | -- |
| Speed Category | | Posted Speed Greater than 30 mph | -- |
| Roadside fixed object density (fixed objects / mi) | | 27 | 0 |
| Offset to roadside fixed objects (ft) [If greater than 30 or Not Present, input 30] | | 15 | 30 |
| Calibration Factor, Cr | | 1.00 | 1.00 |

CHAPTER 4 – SAFETY ANALYSIS TOOLS

Table 4.6 Input Data for Segment 2 in HSM Spreadsheet Example

| General Information | | | Location Information | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|
| Analyst | John Smith | | Roadway | Route A | | |
| Agency or Company | ABC Company | | Roadway Section | From Int. 2 to Int. 3 | | |
| Date Performed | 05/12/11 | | Jurisdiction | State | | |
| Segment for Analysis | Segment 2 | | Analysis Year | 2011 | | |
| Input Data | | | Site Conditions | | Base Conditions | |
| Roadway type (2U, 3T, 4U, 4D, 5T) | | | 2U | | -- | |
| Length of segment, L (mi) | | | 0.94 | | -- | |
| AADT (veh/day) | is within range | AADT _{MAX} = 32,600 (veh/day) | 5,500 | | -- | |
| Type of on-street parking (none/parallel/angle) | | | None | | None | |
| Proportion of curb length with on-street parking | | | 0 | | -- | |
| Median width (ft) - for divided only | | | | | 15 | |
| Lighting (present / not present) | | | Not Present | | Not Present | |
| Auto speed enforcement (present / not present) | | | Not Present | | Not Present | |
| Major commercial driveways (number) | | | 0 | | -- | |
| Minor commercial driveways (number) | | | 9 | | -- | |
| Major industrial / institutional driveways (number) | | | 0 | | -- | |
| Minor industrial / institutional driveways (number) | | | 2 | | -- | |
| Major residential driveways (number) | | | 0 | | -- | |
| Minor residential driveways (number) | | | 2 | | -- | |
| Other driveways (number) | | | 0 | | -- | |
| Speed Category | | | | | -- | |
| Roadside fixed object density (fixed objects / mi) | | | 43 | | 0 | |
| Offset to roadside fixed objects (ft) [If greater than 30 or Not Present, input 30] | | | 12 | | 30 | |
| Calibration Factor, Cr | | | 1.00 | | 1.00 | |

CHAPTER 4 – SAFETY ANALYSIS TOOLS

Table 4.7 Input Data for Intersection 1 in HSM Spreadsheet Example

| General Information | | Location Information | |
|--|--|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Analyst | John Smith | Roadway | Route A |
| Agency or Company | ABC Company | Location Information | First St. |
| Date Performed | 5/12/2011 | Jurisdiction | State |
| Intersection | Intersection 1 | Analysis Year | 2011 |
| Signalized/Unsignalized | Signalized | Ped Volume (after Intx Type) | Known |
| Input Data | | Site Conditions | Base Conditions |
| Intersection type (3ST, 3SG, 4ST, 4SG) | | 4SG | -- |
| AADT _{major} (veh/day) (total entering on major approaches)* | AADT _{MAX} = 67,700 (veh/day) | 12,000 | -- |
| AADT _{minor} (veh/day) (total entering on minor approaches)* | AADT _{MAX} = 33,400 (veh/day) | 5,500 | -- |
| Intersection lighting (present/not present) | | Not Present | Not Present |
| Calibration factor, C _i | | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <u>Data for unsignalized intersections only:</u> | | | |
| Number of major-road approaches with left-turn lanes (0,1,2) | | 0 | 0 |
| Number of major-road approaches with right-turn lanes (0,1,2) | | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Data for signalized intersections only:</u> | | | |
| Number of approaches with left-turn lanes (0,1,2,3,4) [for 3SG, use maximum value of 3] | | 4 | 0 |
| Number of approaches with right-turn lanes (0,1,2,3,4) [for 3SG, use maximum value of 3] | | 4 | 0 |
| Number of approaches with left-turn signal phasing [for 3SG, use maximum value of 3] | | 4 | -- |
| Type of left-turn signal phasing for Leg #1 | | Protected | Permissive |
| Type of left-turn signal phasing for Leg #2 | | Protected | -- |
| Type of left-turn signal phasing for Leg #3 | | Protected | -- |
| Type of left-turn signal phasing for Leg #4 (if applicable) | | Protected | -- |
| Number of approaches with right-turn-on-red prohibited [for 3SG, use maximum value of 3] | | 0 | 0 |
| Intersection red light cameras (present/not present) | | Not Present | Not Present |
| Sum of all pedestrian crossing volumes (PedVol) -- Signalized intersections only | | 700 | -- |
| Maximum number of lanes crossed by a pedestrian (n _{lanesx}) | | 3 | -- |
| Number of bus stops within 300 m (1,000 ft) of the intersection | | 0 | 0 |
| Schools within 300 m (1,000 ft) of the intersection (present/not present) | | Not Present | Not Present |
| Number of alcohol sales establishments within 300 m (1,000 ft) of the intersection | | 1 to 8 | 0 |

CHAPTER 4 – SAFETY ANALYSIS TOOLS

Table 4.8 Input Data for Intersection 2 in HSM Spreadsheet Example

| General Information | | Location Information | |
|--|--|----------------------|-----------------|
| Analyst | John Smith | Roadway | Route A |
| Agency or Company | ABC Company | Location Information | Second St. |
| Date Performed | 5/12/2011 | Jurisdiction | State |
| Intersection | Intersection 2 | Analysis Year | 2011 |
| Signalized/Unsignalized | Unsignalized | | |
| Input Data | | Site Conditions | Base Conditions |
| Intersection type (3ST, 3SG, 4ST, 4SG) | | 4ST | -- |
| AADT _{major} (veh/day) (total entering on major approaches)* | AADT _{MAX} = 46,800 (veh/day) | 3,700 | -- |
| AADT _{minor} (veh/day) (total entering on minor approaches)* | AADT _{MAX} = 5,900 (veh/day) | 310 | -- |
| Intersection lighting (present/not present) | | Present | Not Present |
| Calibration factor, C _i | | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Data for unsignalized intersections only: | | | |
| Number of major-road approaches with left-turn lanes (0,1,2) | | 0 | 0 |
| Number of major-road approaches with right-turn lanes (0,1,2) | | 0 | 0 |
| Data for signalized intersections only: | | | |
| Number of approaches with left-turn lanes (0,1,2,3,4) [for 3SG, use maximum value of 3] | | 0 | 0 |
| Number of approaches with right-turn lanes (0,1,2,3,4) [for 3SG, use maximum value of 3] | | 0 | 0 |
| Number of approaches with left-turn signal phasing [for 3SG, use maximum value of 3] | | 0 | -- |
| Type of left-turn signal phasing for Leg #1 | | Permissive | Permissive |
| Type of left-turn signal phasing for Leg #2 | | | -- |
| Type of left-turn signal phasing for Leg #3 | | | -- |
| Type of left-turn signal phasing for Leg #4 (if applicable) | | | -- |
| Number of approaches with right-turn-on-red prohibited [for 3SG, use maximum value of 3] | | 0 | 0 |
| Intersection red light cameras (present/not present) | | Not Present | Not Present |
| Sum of all pedestrian crossing volumes (PedVol) -- Signalized intersections only | | | -- |
| Maximum number of lanes crossed by a pedestrian (n _{lanesx}) | | | -- |
| Number of bus stops within 300 m (1,000 ft) of the intersection | | 0 | 0 |
| Schools within 300 m (1,000 ft) of the intersection (present/not present) | | Not Present | Not Present |
| Number of alcohol sales establishments within 300 m (1,000 ft) of the intersection | | 0 | 0 |

CHAPTER 4 – SAFETY ANALYSIS TOOLS


Table 4.9 Input Data for Intersection 3 in HSM Spreadsheet Example

| General Information | | Location Information | |
|--|--|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Analyst | John Smith | Roadway | Route A |
| Agency or Company | ABC Company | Location Information | Third St. |
| Date Performed | 5/12/2011 | Jurisdiction | State |
| Intersection | Intersection 3 | Analysis Year | 2011 |
| Signalized/Unsignalized | Signalized | Ped Volume (after Intx Type) | Known |
| Input Data | | Site Conditions | Base Conditions |
| Intersection type (3ST, 3SG, 4ST, 4SG) | | 4SG | -- |
| AADT _{major} (veh/day) (total entering on major approaches)* | AADT _{MAX} = 67,700 (veh/day) | 8,700 | -- |
| AADT _{minor} (veh/day) (total entering on minor approaches)* | AADT _{MAX} = 33,400 (veh/day) | 1,500 | -- |
| Intersection lighting (present/not present) | | Not Present | Not Present |
| Calibration factor, C _i | | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Data for unsignalized intersections only: | | | |
| Number of major-road approaches with left-turn lanes (0,1,2) | | 0 | 0 |
| Number of major-road approaches with right-turn lanes (0,1,2) | | 0 | 0 |
| Data for signalized intersections only: | | | |
| Number of approaches with left-turn lanes (0,1,2,3,4) [for 3SG, use maximum value of 3] | | 2 | 0 |
| Number of approaches with right-turn lanes (0,1,2,3,4) [for 3SG, use maximum value of 3] | | 1 | 0 |
| Number of approaches with left-turn signal phasing [for 3SG, use maximum value of 3] | | 0 | -- |
| Type of left-turn signal phasing for Leg #1 | | Permissive | Permissive |
| Type of left-turn signal phasing for Leg #2 | | Permissive/Protected | -- |
| Type of left-turn signal phasing for Leg #3 | | Protected | -- |
| Type of left-turn signal phasing for Leg #4 (if applicable) | | Protected | -- |
| Number of approaches with right-turn-on-red prohibited [for 3SG, use maximum value of 3] | | 0 | 0 |
| Intersection red light cameras (present/not present) | | Not Present | Not Present |
| Sum of all pedestrian crossing volumes (PedVol) -- Signalized intersections only | | 700 | -- |
| Maximum number of lanes crossed by a pedestrian (n _{lanesx}) | | 3 | -- |
| Number of bus stops within 300 m (1,000 ft) of the intersection | | 0 | 0 |
| Schools within 300 m (1,000 ft) of the intersection (present/not present) | | Not Present | Not Present |
| Number of alcohol sales establishments within 300 m (1,000 ft) of the intersection | | 1 to 8 | 0 |

CHAPTER 4 - SAFETY ANALYSIS TOOLS

Table 4.10 Results Report for HSM Spreadsheet Example

PROJECT SUMMARY



| Project Element | Total Crashes/yr (KABCO) | | | Fatal and Injury Crashes/yr (KABC) | | | Property Damage Only Crashes/yr (PDO) | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|------------------------------|---|--|------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|
| | Predicted average crash frequency | Expected average crash frequency | Potential for Improvement | Predicted average crash frequency | Expected average crash frequency | Potential for Improvement | Predicted average crash frequency | Expected average crash frequency | Potential for Improvement |
| | N _{predicted} (KABCO) | N _{expected} (KABCO) | | N _{predicted} (KABC) | N _{expected} (KABC) | | N _{predicted} (O) | N _{expected} (O) | |
| INDIVIDUAL SEGMENTS | | | | | | | | | |
| Segment 1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Segment 2 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| INDIVIDUAL INTERSECTIONS | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection 1 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Intersection 2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Intersection 3 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| COMBINED (sum of column) | 5.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Interactive Highway Safety Design Model (IHSDM) Software ⌚ ⌚ ⌚ ⌚

The Interactive Highway Safety Design Model (IHSDM) software is a suite of software tools used to assist in the evaluation of the safety and operational effects of geometric and design decisions. The IHSDM software provides decision-makers with information regarding the expected operational and safety performance of a highway facility. The IHSDM software includes six prediction modules: Crash Prediction, Policy Review, Design Consistency, Traffic Analysis, Driver/Vehicle, and Intersection review.

The IHSDM crash prediction module incorporates the HSM methodology for both intersections and segments on rural two-lane roads, rural multi-lane roads, and urban and suburban arterials. A module for crash prediction on freeway segments is also included. The crash prediction module guides the user through the process of entering data for the intersections and segments on the highway being evaluated. Figure 4.9 shows an input data panel from the IHSDM for average annual daily traffic (AADT).

Run Project 1 : (Highway) ihsdm pike : Evaluation 1 (Crash Prediction)

This panel displays the data issues associated with the current/proposed evaluation highway, titled *ihsdm pike*.

Crash Prediction Data

- Two-way Left Turn Lane
- Cross Slope
- Shoulder Section
- Annual Average Daily Traffic**
- Design Speed
- Driveway Density
- Roadside Hazard Rating
- Lighting
- Automated Speed Enforcement
- Centerline Rumble Strip

Annual Average Daily Traffic

This element specifies the annual average daily traffic (AADT).

| Start Sta. | End Sta. | Year | AADT (vpd) |
|------------|------------|------|------------|
| 0.000 | 14+281.693 | 1993 | 3,000 |
| 0.000 | 14+281.693 | 1994 | 3,200 |
| 0.000 | 14+281.693 | 1995 | 3,500 |
| 0.000 | 14+281.693 | 2001 | 5,000 |
| 0.000 | 14+281.693 | 2010 | 7,000 |

Buttons: Add..., Edit..., Delete..., Validate..., Help...

Navigation: Back, Next, Interrupt, Cancel

Figure 4.9 Sample input screen from IHSDM software (FHWA).

After the user enters the required data, IHSDM processes the data and generates an output report. The report opens automatically in an html browser, and includes information in both tabular and graphic format. The graphic report includes information regarding the location of intersections, horizontal and vertical curvature, and segment and intersection crashes, as shown in Figure 4.10. The tabular output includes the predicted crash frequencies for the entire study area, as well as for individual segments and intersections. Example tabular output from the IHSDM is provided in Table 4.11.

The IHSDM software includes tutorials to help the user become familiar with the various modules. The tutorial for the crash prediction module walks the user through the process of estimating crash frequencies for rural two-lane highways, rural multi-lane highways, urban arterials, and freeway segments.




Figure 4.10 Sample graphic output from IHSDM (FHWA).

Table 4.11 Sample Tabular Output from IHSDM (FHWA)

| | |
|---|--------|
| First Year of Analysis | 2013 |
| Last Year of Analysis | 2018 |
| Evaluated Length (mi) | 2.7049 |
| Average Future Road AADT (vpd) | 7,000 |
| Expected Crashes | |
| Total Crashes | 94.20 |
| Fatal and Injury Crashes | 30.98 |
| Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes | 14.99 |
| Property-Damage-Only Crashes | 63.23 |

SafetyAnalyst ? ? ? ? ?

SafetyAnalyst is a set of software tools that can be used by state and local highway agencies for highway safety management. SafetyAnalyst is the result of a cooperative effort between FHWA and participating state and local agencies. Distribution and technical support for SafetyAnalyst is handled by AASHTO. The package is intended for the evaluation of countermeasures related to physical modifications to the highway system. It does not apply to non-site-specific highway safety programs, such as education or enforcement programs.

SafetyAnalyst helps to identify sites with specific safety concerns by analyzing crash patterns at specific sites, and can be used to aid in the development of countermeasures to help address these safety concerns. It includes automation of the statistical methodologies described in the HSM. SafetyAnalyst consists of six analytical tools:

- The *Network Screening Tool* uses network screening algorithms to help identify sites that have the potential for safety improvement. These include sites with crash frequencies that are higher than expected, as well as additional sites with a significant number of crashes which have the potential to be addressed with cost-effective improvements.
- The *Diagnosis Tool* facilitates the identification of safety concerns at specific locations. It includes utilities for generating crash summary statistics and collision diagrams. It also has the ability to interface with other collision diagramming software packages.

- The *Countermeasure Selection Tool* helps the user to select countermeasures to reduce the frequency and severity of crashes at specific sites. The tool provides a list of suggested countermeasures based on site characteristics, crash history, and safety concerns identified by the diagnosis tool. An example countermeasures report from SafetyAnalyst is shown in Table 4.12.
- The *Economic Appraisal Tool* facilitates the economic analysis of specific countermeasures that are under consideration for a given site based on cost effectiveness (cost of countermeasure per crash reduced), benefit-cost ratio (ratio of monetary benefits to countermeasure costs), or net benefits (monetary benefits minus countermeasure costs).
- The *Priority Ranking Tool* utilizes the estimates of benefits and costs developed by the economic analysis tool to develop a prioritized list of projects. The tool can also be used to determine the optimal set of projects that will maximize the net safety benefits to the system.
- The *Countermeasure Evaluation Tool* enables the user to perform before-and-after evaluations of safety improvements that have been implemented.

Table 4.12 Example Countermeasures Report from SafetyAnalyst (FHWA 2006)

| Countermeasure | Contraindication | Recommended by * | Accident pattern(s) | Implemented |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Provide signal coordination | Only aids mainline | 16 | Rear-end | no |
| Add advanced detection | May increase delay | 16 | Rear-end | no |
| Install dilemma detection system | | 16 | Rear-end | no |
| Improve change plus clearance interval | May increase delay | 16 | Rear-end | no |
| Narrow cross section by reducing number of approach lanes | Reduced capacity | 18 | Rear-end | no |
| Reduce speed limit on approaches | | 18 | Rear-end | no |
| Increase enforcement to reduce speed on intersection approach | | 18 | Rear-end | no |
| Narrow cross section by physically narrowing lanes | | 18 | Rear-end | no |
| Change streetscape to increase stimulation of peripheral vision | | 18 | Rear-end | no |
| Restrict movements to right-in and right-out at the access using channelizing island | Accidents may migrate with changes in volume patterns | 18 | Rear-end | no |
| Improve sight distance to intersection | | User | user-selected CM | no |
| Improve sight distance to traffic signal | | User | user-selected CM | no |

* A scenario ID ending in 'u' indicates the countermeasure was user-selected and is not a result of the diagnosis.

Surrogate Safety Assessment Module (SSAM) 🕒 🕒 🕒 🕒 🕒

The Surrogate Safety Assessment Module (SSAM) uses traffic conflicts as a surrogate measure of crashes to evaluate the safety of a facility. A conflict is a situation in which two road users will likely collide unless evasive action is taken. For example, Figure 4.11 depicts a conflict situation in which a collision between two vehicles could occur unless evasive action such as braking is taken; one of the vehicles has angled across two lanes and cut in front of another vehicle. SSAM works with simulation packages such as VISSIM, AIMSUN, Paramics, and TEXAS to process vehicle trajectory data that provide information regarding the location and dimensions of each vehicle approximately every 10th of a second. SSAM identifies and catalogs conflict events based on analysis of the interactions between vehicles. SSAM provides surrogate measures such as minimum time to collision, maximum deceleration rate, maximum speed differential, and conflict time for each conflict event.




Figure 4.11 Conflict between two vehicles (FHWA).

Chapter 4 Bibliography

- AASHTO. *Highway Safety Manual*. Washington, D.C., 2010.
- AASHTO. *Highway Safety Manual Website*.
<http://www.highwaysafetymanual.org/Pages/default.aspx>. Accessed September 17, 2013.
- CH2MHILL. *Extended HSM Spreadsheets*.
http://www.ce.udel.edu/dct/T2/T2TechnicalBriefs/HSM%20Tech%20Briefs/Spreadsheets/ExtendedSpreadsheets_V3_Instructions_122311.pdf. Accessed September 30, 2013.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). *Interactive Highway Safety Design Model (IHSDM) Software*. <http://www.ihsdm.org/wiki/Welcome>. Accessed September 17, 2013.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). *Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Analysis Tools*. Federal Highway Administration. <http://www.hsisinfo.org/ped-bike-gis.cfm>. Accessed September 17, 2013.
- Gettman, D., Pu, L., Sayed, T., and S. Shelby. *Surrogate Safety Assessment Model and Validation: Final Report*. Report FHWA-HRT-08-051. Federal Highway Administration: McClean, Virginia, 2008.
- Harkey, D.L., Tsai, S., Thomas, L., and W.W. Hunter. *Pedestrian and Bicycle Crash Analysis Tool (PBCAT): Version 2.0 Application Manual*. Report FHWA-HRT-06-089. Federal Highway Administration: McClean, Virginia, 2006.
- Harwood, D.W., Torbic, D.J., Richard, K.R., and M. M. Meyer. *SafetyAnalyst: Software Tools for Safety Management of Specific Highway Sites*. Report FHWA-HRT-10-063. Federal Highway Administration: McClean, Virginia, 2010.
- Highway Safety Performance Committee of the Transportation Research Board (TRB). *Extended HSM Spreadsheets*.
<http://www.safetyperformance.org/uploads/2013/02/ExtendedSpreadsheets/zip/>. Accessed September 30, 2013.
- Missouri State Highway Patrol. *Traffic Crashes Online Mapping*. (n.d.)
<http://www.mshp.dps.mo.gov/TR15Map/index.jsp>. Accessed November 4, 2013.
- MoDOT. *1999 Manual on Identification, Analysis and Correction of High-Crash Locations (the HAL Manual)*. Third Edition. Technology Transfer Assistance Program, Missouri Department of Transportation.

- MoDOT. *Missouri Crash Statistics*. Missouri Department of Transportation. Jefferson City, MO.
<http://www.modot.org/safety/BlueprintCrashStatistics.htm>. Accessed September 17, 2013.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). *FARS Analytical User's Manual 1975-2011*. Washington, D.C., 2013.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). *Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) Encyclopedia*. <http://www-fars.nhtsa.dot.gov/Main/index.aspx>. Accessed September 17, 2013.
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center. *Pedestrian and Bicycle Crash Analysis Tool (PBCAT)*.
<http://www.walkinginfo.org/facts/pbcats/index.cfm?/pc/pbcats.htm>. Accessed September 17, 2013.
- Pu, L., and R. Joshi. *Surrogate Safety Assessment Model (SSAM)-Software User Manual*. Report FHWA-HRT-06-089. Federal Highway Administration: McClean, Virginia, 2008.
- Regional Justice Information Service (REJIS) *LETS 3 Administrator: Law Enforcement Traffic System 2012*. St. Louis, Missouri, 2012.
- SafeRoadMaps. *FARS Mapping Tool*. <http://www.saferoadmaps.org/>. Accessed September 17, 2013.

CHAPTER 5: SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

Matching countermeasures with contributing circumstances.

Countermeasures are intended to improve safety by lowering the frequency of crashes and/or crash severity. An important precursor to selecting countermeasures is to identify all possible contributing factors to crashes occurring at the site. The Highway Safety Manual (HSM) groups crash contributing factors into roadway factors, vehicle factors, and human factors (driver). Roadway factors include pavement characteristics such as wet pavement, low friction, sight distance issues, signage problems, and others. Vehicle factors include vehicle operating characteristics such as wear on tires, brakes, safety features, and others. Human factors involve anything related to the driver; factors such as driver distraction, fatigue, age, and gender are all included as human factors.

The HSM recommends the use of the *Haddon matrix*, a tabular listing different contributing factors that occurred before, during, and after a crash. Table 5.1 displays an example of a Haddon matrix, showing a right-angle crash at a signalized intersection. As shown in the table, roadway factors, human factors, and vehicle factors could all contribute to the different time periods within a crash.

Table 5.1 Haddon Matrix of Contributing Factors for a Right-Angle Crash at a Signalized Intersection

| Period | Roadway factors | Human factors | Vehicle factors |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Before the crash (causal factors) | Poor visibility of signals | Distraction | Worn tires |
| | Inadequate signal timing | Fatigue | Worn brakes |
| | Slippery pavement | Age | |
| | Inadequate sight distance | Speeding | |
| During the crash (causes of severity) | | Drivers running red light | |
| | | Alcohol influence | |
| | Excessive speed | Age | Bumper height |
| | Pavement friction | Seat belt use | Headrest design |
| After the crash (crash outcome) | Grade | Alcohol influence | Airbag design |
| | Emergency response | Age | Ease of removal of |
| | | Gender | injured passengers |
| | | | |

Among the three groups of factors, local agencies have the most control over selecting countermeasures that address roadway factors. For example, inadequate lighting at a roadway intersection can be addressed with additional lighting, whereas driver distractions, such as cell phone use, may be harder to address. Thus, roadway factors will be discussed in greater detail in this chapter in order to aid in countermeasure selection. Comprehensive guidance on driver factors can be found in a recent National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) report (Hedlund et al., 2008), and vehicle factors are available in a (1998) National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) report. The NHTSA report addresses driver factors such as alcohol and drug impairment, seat belts and child restraints, aggressive driving, distracted and drowsy driving, motorcycles, young and older drivers, and bicycles and pedestrians.

Roadway factors contributing to crashes at different facilities are described in the HSM. The major factors are presented in graphical form in Figures 5.1-5.5. Figure 5.1 lists the contributing factors for a roadway segment by the most prevalent types of crashes: fixed-object, rollover, run-off-the-road, nighttime, and head-on or sideswipe. The most prevalent types of crashes at signalized intersections are right angle, nighttime, and rear-end/sideswipe. Figure 5.2 displays the applicable contributing factors. Figure 5.3 shows the contributing factors related to the most prevalent types of crashes at unsignalized intersections: angle, driveway, nighttime, and rear-end. Crash contributing factors for pedestrians and bicycles are shown in Figure 5.4. At the state level in Missouri, areas of focus for serious crash types include run-off-the-road, horizontal curve, intersection, trees or utility poles, and head-on crashes (MCRS, 2012).




Figure 5.1 Contributing factors to roadway segment crashes.




Figure 5.2 Contributing factors to crashes at signalized intersections.




Figure 5.3 Contributing factors to crashes at unsignalized intersections.




Figure 5.4 Contributing factors to pedestrian and bicyclist crashes.

Selection of countermeasures to address contributing factors

After the contributing factors are identified for crashes occurring at a facility, the next step is to select one or more countermeasures to address the problem(s). The HSM provides a comprehensive list of countermeasures, and their associated crash modification factors (CMF). Additional countermeasures that may as of yet lack established CMFs are also included in the HSM. For the current document, HSM countermeasures were reviewed, and two condensed lists of countermeasures were generated for roadway segments and intersections, as presented in Tables 5.2 and 5.3, respectively. These tables include treatments that are of the most interest to local agencies.

Table 5.2 Countermeasures for Reducing Roadway Segment Crashes (Based on Chapter 13 of HSM)

| Roadway elements | Roadside elements | Alignment elements | Roadway signs | Pedestrians and Bicyclists | Others |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Widen lanes Road diets (4 to 2) Add or widen shoulder Modify shoulder type Add raised median Increase median width | Flatten sideslope Increase distance to roadside barriers Less rigid roadside barriers Add median barrier Add crash cushions | Increase horizontal curve radius Add spiral transitions on curves Increase superelevation Decrease vertical grade | Add advisory speeds for horizontal curves Use dynamic message signs to display incidents, queue, other warnings Add individual dynamic speed warning signs | Add sidewalk Add shoulder Add raised pedestrian crosswalk Widen median Add bicycle lanes Use shared bike lanes Pave existing shoulder and use as bike lane | Add edgeline/centerline marking Add shoulder/centerline rumble strips Add speed bumps for calming Add traversable rumble strips for calming Add lighting Reduce access point density |

Table 5.3 Countermeasures for Intersections (Based on Chapter 14 of HSM)

| Intersection types | Intersection design | Traffic control and operations |
|--|---|--|
| Convert signalized intersection to roundabout Convert stop sign to roundabout Convert minor road stop to all-way stop Remove unwarranted signals Convert stop sign to signal control Close or relocate access points in intersection functional area Increase distance between intersection and driveways | Decrease intersection skew angle Add left-turn lane on one or more approaches Add channelized left-turn lanes Add right turn lanes Add lighting | Add signs prohibiting left turns and/or U-turns at a signal Add "Stop Ahead" pavement markings Add flashing beacons at stop signs Change permissive to protected phasing for left turns Change permissive to protected/permissive or permissive/protected Replace direct left turns with right turn plus U-turn combination Prohibit right turn on red |

The process of crash type analysis and countermeasure identification is best illustrated using an example. The following is an example of an S-HAL safety evaluation of a high-crash signalized intersection.

Example problem 1: Countermeasure Identification

A four-leg signalized intersection in an urban area is experiencing a high number of injury crashes, and the City wants to identify countermeasures that will address this problem. The average annual daily traffic (AADT) on the major road and minor road are 25,000 vehicles per day (vpd) and 9,000 vpd, respectively. Both major road approaches contain one left-turn lane each, while the minor road approaches do not contain a turn lane. The signal is currently operating in three phases – phase 1: protected left on major road; phase 2: through movement on the major road; phase 3: through movement with permissive left on the minor road. Crash analysis revealed the following proportions for different crash severities: 0.64% fatal, 25.5% injury, and 73.86% property damage only (PDO) crashes.

A traffic study reported long delays for minor road vehicles during the peak period, with minor road turning vehicles becoming impatient and accepting short, risky gaps. Vehicles running the red light were also a regular occurrence during the peak period. During off-peak hours, mainline vehicles were found to significantly exceed the posted speed limit of 50 mph. There were no concerns regarding sight distance, unexpected crossing traffic, or pavement friction.

Based on the traffic study, it was concluded that the contributing factors for the crashes were high traffic volume, high approach speed, low speed limit compliance, and red-light-running. The following countermeasures were identified to address the crash problem at the intersection:

- 1) Add turn lanes on the minor road and convert phasing for the minor road from permissive to protected left turns. The CMF value for this countermeasure from the HSM is 0.01 for left-turn crashes, with no significant changes for all severities. Rather than protected phasing, the minor road left-turn phasing could be protected/permissive or permissive/protected, with a CMF of 0.84 for left-turn injury crashes and 0.99 for all severities.
- 2) Replace the signal with a roundabout. The HSM presents a CMF value of 0.99 for all severities, and 0.40 for injury crashes.
- 3) Install red-light-running cameras. The HSM presents a CMF value of 0.74 for right angle and left-turn crashes, 0.84 for right angle left-turn injury crashes, 1.18 for rear-end crashes (all severities), and 1.24 for rear-end injury crashes.

The following section presents methods for performing economic analysis of countermeasures to rank and select from the best possible.

Economic evaluation of countermeasures

After identifying one or more countermeasures that address the crash problem, an economic evaluation is conducted to assess the benefits resulting from the countermeasures, as well as the costs of their implementation. The reduction in crash frequency or severity resulting from a countermeasure is used to compute its benefits. Implementation costs are always monetized, while benefits may or may not be monetized. A benefit-cost analysis monetizes benefits, whereas a cost-effectiveness analysis does not. The HSM recommends two types of benefit-cost analysis: net present value (NPV) analysis and benefit-cost ratio (b/c) analysis. NPV analysis quantifies the difference between the present value of the benefits resulting from a countermeasure and the project's costs. A positive NPV value indicates that the benefits exceed the costs of the project. The b/c value is the ratio of the present value of benefits to the project costs. A b/c value greater than 1.0 indicates that the benefits outweigh the project's costs. The goal of cost-effectiveness analysis is to determine the annual cost of achieving a unit reduction in crash frequency, also known as the cost-effectiveness index. Cost-effectiveness analysis is often used to avoid the monetization of benefits.

The NPV, b/c, and cost-effectiveness index values are used to rank all potential countermeasures. Although these three measures are recommended for ranking, an agency may use other measures to rank countermeasures. Measures such as project costs, monetized benefits, total crash frequency reduction, and fatal and injury crash frequency reduction are included in the HSM as alternatives.

The ability to quantify the benefits resulting from a countermeasure is predicated upon the computation of the expected reduction in crash frequency due to that countermeasure. The HSM provides a state-of-the-practice method to predict changes in crash frequency. The HSM predictive methodology uses CMFs to quantify the impact of countermeasures toward reducing crash frequency. Part D of the HSM includes CMFs for a variety of countermeasures for different facility types, such as roadway segments, signalized intersections, unsignalized intersections, and others. Additional sources, such as the CMF Clearinghouse (HSRC, n.d.), provide up-to-date information and a larger number of CMFs than does the HSM. The CMF Clearinghouse compiles existing research on countermeasures, provides a quality rating of the CMF, and links to the original research report. Table 5.4 provides examples of some of the proven safety countermeasures promoted by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Office of Safety. The CMFs in Table 5.4 are a few examples of highly proven countermeasures. Some countermeasures have values closer to 1, or, can even negatively impact safety.

Table 5.4 Countermeasures for Intersections

| Countermeasure | CMF | Source |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| Convert signalized intersection to modern roundabout for suburbs | 0.52 for all severities | HSM 14.4.2.3 |
| Access management, replace direct left-turn with right-turn/U-turn | 0.49 for all severities | CMF Clearinghouse ID 357 |
| Provide medians and pedestrian crossing islands | 0.54 for pedestrians crashes, 0.61 for vehicles | FHWA-SA-12-011 |

Annual reduction in crash frequency is monetized using the severity-based societal costs of crashes. One (2005) FHWA report determined the comprehensive societal costs of crashes for various severities. These costs are reported in the HSM, and are reproduced below (Table 5.5).

Table 5.5 Societal Costs of Crashes by Severity*

| Crash type | Crash costs |
|------------------|-------------|
| Fatal | \$4,008,900 |
| Disabling injury | \$216,000 |
| Evident injury | \$79,000 |
| Fatal/injury | \$158,200 |
| Possible injury | \$44,900 |
| PDO | \$7,400 |

** This table is based on FHWA (2005) and HSM (2010)*

Since fatal crash costs are so high, and because fatal crashes are infrequent, an alternative approach to using fatal crash cost is to combine the fatal and injury crash categories into one “fatal/injury” category. This combined category could prevent a single fatal crash from overwhelming the economic analysis. A city can choose to use the fatal/injury value from the HSM, as shown in Table 5.5, or to develop the value using local data, as follows:

$$F + I \text{ Cost} = \frac{F\% * F_{cost} + I\% * I_{cost}}{F\% + I\%}$$

Where,

$F\%$ is the percentage of fatal crashes;

F_{cost} is the cost of a fatal crash;

$I\%$ is the percentage of injury crashes;

I_{cost} is the cost of an injury crash.

For example, according to Missouri State Highway Patrol (MSHP) data, 0.64% of all crashes in 2005 were fatal, and 25.5% were physical injury. Thus, the cost of $F+I$ for 2005 is $(0.64\% * \$4,008,900 + 25.5\% * \$79,000) / 100\% = \$174,876$.

The concept of *time value of money* refers to the difference in buying power between money in the present and money in the future. This concept is based on the notion that money in the present can both earn interest and be affected by inflation, and is thus different than its future value. Therefore, future benefits and costs should be discounted relative to their present value. According to the AASHTO Red Book, i.e., User and Non-User Benefit Analysis for Highways, a good rule of thumb for the discount rate is to use three percent per year, or a riskless treasury bond yield, such as the 10-year treasury bond (AASHTO, 2010).

Because information is sometimes gathered from different years, the dollar amount from such years cannot be compared directly. It is typical to translate all dollar amounts to present values, or to those of the year during which the safety analysis was undertaken. Economic tools such as discounting and compounding are used to manipulate monetary time units. Compounding converts monetary time units forward in time, while discounting converts monetary time units back in time to find present values given future benefits; for example.

The equation for compounding is:

$$FV = PV(1 + i)^n$$

Where,

FV is the future value;

PV is the present value;

i is the discount rate;

n is the number of years.

As an example of compounding, assume that fatal crash costs are needed for the year 2013. Table 5.5 gives the fatal crash cost as \$4,008,900 in terms of 2005 dollars. Assume that FV represents the year 2013, and PV represents the year 2005; then, $n = 2013 - 2005 = 8$. In this example, PV might be more aptly termed the “older value,” and FV the “newer value” in the classic compounding equation. Assuming a discount rate, i , of 3%, or, 0.03, then,

$$FV = \$4,008,900 (1 + 0.03)^8 = \$5,078,355$$

Once the annual crash reduction benefits are quantified using the crash costs shown in Table 5.5, the present value of benefits is estimated as,

$$PV_B = \left[\frac{(1+i)^n - 1}{i(1+i)^n} \right] A$$

Where,

PV_B is the present value of benefits;

A is the uniform annual monetary benefits;

i is the discount rate;

n is the service life of the countermeasure.

The NPV, b/c, and cost-effectiveness index are computed as:

$$NPV = PV_B - PV_C$$

$$b/c = \frac{PV_B}{PV_C}$$

$$\text{cost - effectiveness index} = \frac{PV_C}{N_P - N_O}$$

Where,

PV_C is the present value of costs;

N_P is the predicted crash frequency per year (with countermeasure);

N_O is the observed crash frequency per year (without countermeasure).

The present value of project costs is determined using the same discounting method as that used for projected benefits, demonstrated above. The AASHTO Redbook (AASHTO, 2010) provides guidance for quantifying project costs. Several cost elements are taken into consideration when determining project costs. These include right-of-way acquisition costs, planning and design costs, material and equipment costs, environmental impact costs, maintenance costs, and traffic control costs. Many cost elements, such as right-of-way acquisition and project design cost, are based on the current year, and are therefore currently at their present values. Few costs that occur in the future, such as maintenance, need to be discounted to the current year to determine present value.

Example 2: Economic Analysis

A local agency conducted an analysis of crashes occurring at a two-way stop control (TWSC) intersection on a high-speed rural segment with stop control on the two minor road approaches only. The major road AADT was 14,500, and the minor road AADT was 3,200. Based on the analysis, the agency is considering replacing the TWSC intersection with a traffic signal. An economic analysis is conducted to determine the net present value, benefit-cost ratio, and cost-effectiveness index values. Assume the analysis was conducted in 2005:

The following notations will be used in this example.

$AADT_{major}$ -major road AADT.

$AADT_{minor}$ -minor road AADT.

N_{TWSC} -expected crash frequency for the TWSC.

N_{Sig} -expected crash frequency after signalization.

CMF_{Sig} -modification factor for converting a TWSC to a signalized intersection.

ΔN_{Sig} -reduction in crash frequency due to signalization.

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| ΔN_{Sig}^{fatal} | -reduction in the frequency of fatal crashes. |
| ΔN_{Sig}^{injury} | -reduction in the frequency of injury crashes. |
| ΔN_{Sig}^{PDO} | -reduction in the frequency of PDO crashes. |
| A_{Sig} | -annual benefits resulting from the reduction in crash frequency due to signalization. |
| PV_B^{Sig} | -present value of benefits due to signalization. |
| PV_C^{Sig} | -present value of costs of signalization. |
| M_{Sig} | -annual costs for maintaining traffic signal. |

Step 1: Calculate the expected crash frequency without the countermeasure in place (i.e., for the TWSC).

The HSM safety performance function for the rural arterial intersection is used to calculate the expected crash frequency. It is found in Section 10.6.2 of the HSM as:

$$N_{TWSC} = e^{[a+b \ln(AADT_{major}) + c \ln(AADT_{minor})]}$$

For a four-leg rural intersection with minor road stop control,

$$N_{TWSC} = e^{[-8.56 + 0.60 \ln(AADT_{major}) + 0.61 \ln(AADT_{minor})]}$$

Inputting the volumes for the major and minor approaches,

$$N_{TWSC} = e^{[-8.56 + 0.60 \ln(14500) + 0.61 \ln(3200)]} = 8.27 \text{ crashes/year.}$$

The expected crash frequency can also be adjusted for the intersection skew angle, left-turn lanes, right-turn lanes, and lighting, if they exist.

Step 2: Calculate the expected crash frequency with the countermeasure:

The CMF for the signalization countermeasure is available in Part D of the HSM. According to Section 14.4.2.6 of the HSM, installing a traffic signal at a TWSC (base condition) in a rural area has a CMF of 0.56 for all types of crashes (includes all severities). There are no separate CMF values for fatal and/or injury crashes. The expected crash frequency, N_{Sig} , if a traffic signal replaced the stop control is computed as,

$$N_{Sig} = CMF_{Sig} \cdot N_{TWSC} = 0.56 \cdot 8.27 = 4.63 \text{ crashes/year.}$$

Step 3: Calculate the reduction in crash frequency due to the countermeasure:

$$\Delta N_{Sig} = N_{TWSC} - N_{Sig} = 8.27 - 4.63 = 3.64 \text{ crashes/year.}$$

Step 4: Based on 2005 Missouri crash severity data, the proportions of different crash severities were 0.64% fatal, 25.5% injury, and 73.86% PDO. Since separate CMF values based on crash severities are not currently available for the conversion of TWSC to traffic signal control, the reduction in crash frequency by severity can be computed using the total crash reduction frequency calculated in step 3, and the crash severity proportions, as:

$$\Delta N_{Sig}^{fatal} = \Delta N_{Sig} * 0.0064 = 3.64 * 0.0064 = 0.0233 \text{ crashes/year,}$$

$$\Delta N_{Sig}^{injury} = \Delta N_{Sig} * 0.255 = 3.64 * 0.255 = 0.928 \text{ crashes/year,}$$

$$\Delta N_{Sig}^{PDO} = \Delta N_{Sig} * 0.7386 = 3.64 * 0.7386 = 2.69 \text{ crashes/year.}$$

Step 5: Calculate the annual benefits, A_{Sig} , resulting from the reduction in crashes:

$$A_{Sig} = 0.0233 * \$4,008,900 + 0.255 * \$79,000 + 0.7386 * \$7,400 = \$186,614/\text{year.}$$

Step 6: Calculate the present value of benefits, PV_B^{Sig} , assuming a 4% discount rate and 10 years of service life for the countermeasure:

$$PV_B^{Sig} = \left[\frac{(1+i)^n - 1}{i(1+i)^n} \right] A_{Sig} = \left[\frac{(1+0.04)^{10} - 1}{0.04(1+0.04)^{10}} \right] \$186,614 = \$1,513,607.$$

Step 7: Calculate the present value of signalization costs, PV_C^{Sig} . For simplicity, in this example it is assumed that the only costs involved with signalization are the initial capital costs of the traffic signal and a fixed annual maintenance fee. In reality, signalization may involve additional costs, such as right-of-way acquisition, channelization, and others. The US DOT ITS Joint Program Office website provides the average capital and maintenance costs of adding signals at a four-leg intersection. Adjusting the costs to the current year using a 4% discount rate, the capital costs are about \$70,000, and annual maintenance costs equate to \$1,500. The present value of annual maintenance costs over the 10-year service life of the signal is computed as,

$$\begin{aligned} PV_C^{Sig} &= \text{Capital cost} + \left[\frac{(1+i)^n - 1}{i(1+i)^n} \right] M_{Sig} \\ &= \$70,000 + \left[\frac{(1+0.04)^{10} - 1}{0.04(1+0.04)^{10}} \right] \$1,500 = \$82,166 \end{aligned}$$

Step 8: Calculate the NPV, b/c, and cost-effectiveness index values:

$$NPV_{Sig} = PV_B^{Sig} - PV_C^{Sig} = \$1,513,607 - \$82,166 = \$1,431,441$$

$$b/c_{Sig} = \frac{PV_B^{Sig}}{PV_C^{Sig}} = \frac{1,431,441}{82,166} = 18.4:1$$

$$\text{cost} - \text{effectiveness index}_{Sig} = \frac{PV_C^{Sig}}{\Delta N_{Sig}} = \frac{\$82,166}{3.64} = \frac{\$22,573}{\text{crash}}.$$

CHAPTER 5 - SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

The results of the economic analysis showed that the benefits significantly outweighed the costs in this instance. The net present value is \$1,431,441 over 10 years. For every dollar invested in safety improvement, approximately 18 times that amount is returned in benefits. Per crash savings are \$22,573.

Chapter 5 Bibliography

AASHTO (2010) *Highway Safety Manual*. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. Washington, D.C.

AASHTO (2010) *User and Non-user Benefit Analysis for Highways*. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. Washington, D.C.

HSRC (n.d.) Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse. North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center. Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
<http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org>

Hedlund, J. et al (2008). Countermeasures that Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices , Third Edition. Report No. DOT-HS-810-891. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Washington, D.C.

MCRS (2012) *Missouri's Blueprint to Save More Lives*. Missouri Coalition for Highway Safety. Jefferson City, Missouri.

NCHRP (1998). National Cooperative Highway Research Report 500: Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan. NCHRP, Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C.

CHAPTER 6: ROAD SAFETY AUDITS

A proactive approach to safety.

There are a variety of tools available to local communities to assist in the improvement of highway safety. One low-cost, proactive tool that can be very beneficial for improving safety is the Road Safety Audit (RSA). If a community dislikes the word “audit,” then an alternate title, “Road Safety Assessment,” can be used. This chapter provides a general overview of RSAs, and describes the eight-step RSA process. The chapter also includes a list of resources on RSAs for the benefit of practitioners.

Introduction

Overview of RSAs

An RSA (FHWA, 2006) is a formal safety examination of an existing or proposed road segment or intersection conducted by an independent, multidisciplinary review team. The goals of an RSA are to identify safety concerns, generate a list of possible countermeasures to address those concerns, and present findings to the project owner or designer for considered implementation. The objective of an RSA is not to redesign the project, but rather to identify proactive ways to enhance the safety of the facility. An RSA considers the safety of all road users, including automobiles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and trucks. An RSA can address concerns related to geometry, operations, and user characteristics and interactions. An RSA is not just a check of the design against design standards, although design standards can be a useful starting point for evaluating safety.

There are some key differences between an RSA and traditional safety reviews. The RSA process encourages the development of a broad coalition for safety. The composition of the RSA team is independent and multidisciplinary, whereas team members in traditional reviews are affiliated with the owner, and specialize in design or safety only. An RSA typically considers a broader set of users beyond motorized traffic alone. An RSA attempts to emphasize human factors issues and road user limitations, while a traditional safety examination may or may not include such concerns. Further, a formal response report is considered to be an essential element of the RSA process.

One concern that has been raised with respect to the RSA process is the possibility of the RSA increasing tort liability. For example, the RSA report could be used to show that a particular facility was unsafe and that the agency had notice of the unsafe facility and did not address the issue. The national research project NCHRP 336 (Wilson and Lipinski, 2004), and Owers and Wilson (2001), both examined such RSA legal issues. Counterbalancing this increase in liability argument, the following issues should be considered: First, the legal doctrines of sovereign immunity and rules of discovery could potentially protect an agency from liability, or exclude RSA evidence from being used in litigation. NCHRP 336 found that there was no correlation between the application of RSA and sovereign immunity. To assist states in developing highway safety improvement projects and programs, 23 U.S.C. §409 forbids the discovery or admission into evidence or reports, data or other information compiled or collected for activities required pursuant to Federal highway safety programs such as Sections 130, 144 and 148 (Hazard Elimination Program). In *Pierce County, Washington v. Guillen*, 537 U.S. 129 (2003), the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of Section 409 by indicating that it protects “all reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data actually compiled or collected for §152 [now §148].” However, this prohibition from use in litigation is not a prohibition against public disclosure. Some states, such as Kansas, limit their RSA report to internal staff use only.

Second, the general policy of promoting public safety could stand in opposition to a plaintiff’s interest in a lawsuit. Some states have actually found that RSAs could aid in tort defense by demonstrating an agency’s proactive approach to safety and by documenting an agency’s financial limitations and timelines for addressing various issues. Thus, an RSA could be used to counter the findings of an expert witness safety review. The reader is cautioned that the aforementioned national perspectives offer examples only from other states; tort laws are specific to a particular state, therefore examples from other states may or may not fully apply to Missouri.

When to Conduct RSAs

RSAs can be performed during any stage of a project’s life, including pre-construction, construction, and post-construction. RSAs during the pre-construction phase could occur at various phases of the design process, including the planning, preliminary design, and detailed design stages. There is greater flexibility in the range of countermeasures that can be considered for a project during its early stages of design. As the design of the project progresses and right-of-way for the project is purchased, options for countermeasure-based safety improvement become more limited. A construction RSA can be performed while a project is under construction to attempt to improve the safety of the work zone. A pre-opening RSA can be undertaken following the completion of road construction, before the road facility is opened to the public. Finally, a post-construction RSA can be performed for an existing road segment or intersection. The RSA for an existing facility can incorporate crash history to help identify safety concerns and countermeasures. However, implementation costs for countermeasures at an existing facility are typically higher than implementation costs for countermeasures at a proposed facility. This increase in countermeasure cost as the project progresses is illustrated in Figure 6.1.




Figure 6.1 Safety implementation cost versus stage of project life.

Benefits of RSAs

RSAs are highly beneficial for aiding the discovery and mitigation of safety concerns that may not have been identified by other means. For example, the New York State DOT reported a 20% to 40% reduction in crashes at 300 high-crash locations due to the introduction of low-cost safety improvements implemented as a result of RSA findings (FHWA, 2006). RSAs also help to promote the awareness of safe practices, and create a proactive culture for addressing safety. RSAs are also relatively low cost: the typical cost for conducting an RSA and implementing countermeasures in the design stage is estimated as 5% of engineering fees (FHWA, 2006). RSAs also help to identify multimodal user interactions and human factors that contribute to crashes; they bring together perspectives from multiple stakeholders, thus revealing safety concerns and solutions that are often unperceived by a single party.

RSA Process

The RSA process includes eight steps, during which safety concerns and countermeasures are identified and presented to the project owner or designer for possible implementation (FHWA, 2006). The RSA team, project owner, and project design team have different levels of responsibility during each stage of the RSA process.

RSA Process

1. *Identify Project*
2. *RSA Team*
3. *Start-Up Meeting*
4. *Field Reviews*
5. *RSA Analysis*
6. *RSA Findings*
7. *Formal Response*
8. *Incorporate Findings*

Step 1: Identify Project

The RSA process begins with the design team and project owner, who identify the facility to be evaluated in the RSA. The facility can be an extant facility or one that is in the design stage. Agencies can use a variety of criteria to determine which road segments or intersections could undergo an RSA. For example, a road intersection or segment that does not meet current design standards and has a significant crash history would be a good candidate for an RSA. Stakeholder concerns can also help to identify sites that would be good candidates for RSAs. Other criteria, such as the minimum threshold of construction costs, could also be utilized to identify sites for RSAs.

Step 2: Select RSA Team

The design team and project owner are responsible for selecting the multidisciplinary team to conduct the RSA. The size of the RSA team varies based on the scope and RSA stage of the project, as well as on the need for input from specialists, such as signing or bridge specialists. The RSA team should encompass core skills related to geometry, operations, and human factors. An RSA team should include a representative with local knowledge of the project area. It is also helpful to have a representative from law enforcement. The members of the RSA team should be independent from the design team and project owner. The RSA team should include a leader who is knowledgeable of the RSA procedure and who can work with the design team and project owner.

Step 3: Conduct Start-Up Meeting

After selecting the RSA team, the project owner and design team meet with the RSA team to familiarize the team with the project. The project owner and design team should provide the RSA team with as much information as possible to help them identify safety concerns and countermeasures. Information that should be provided if available includes traffic data, design criteria, and traffic signal timing plans. Other information pertinent to the project stage should also be delivered. For a pre-construction RSA, design drawings should be provided to the RSA team. The design drawings should be of a scale sufficiently large to allow the RSA team to easily review them. The plan drawings should include horizontal and vertical design information, as well as typical cross sections. For a construction RSA, if the evaluation includes work zone traffic control plans, then the maintenance of traffic plans should be provided.

For a post-construction RSA, as-built design drawings should be delivered, along with copies of any previous audits that may have been undertaken.

Step 4: Perform Field Reviews

A field review should always be performed, regardless of the type of RSA. For a pre-construction RSA, the RSA team should look at the project site in the context of the proposed design to try to visualize potential safety concerns. For a post construction RSA, the RSA team will have the benefit of observing facility geometry, operations, and user interactions. The field review should consider the viewpoints of all users of the facility, such as pedestrians, bicyclists, children, trucks, farm vehicles, and older drivers. Prompt lists, such as those provided in *FHWA Road Safety Audit Guidelines* (FHWA, 2006) can help the RSA team to identify potential safety concerns in the field. Some of the items that should be reviewed in the field include sight distance, roadside safety, pavement drop-offs, pavement conditions, pavement markings, signs, drainage, traffic signals, and accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Step 5: Conduct RSA Analysis

During this stage, the RSA team finalizes the list of safety concerns and identifies possible countermeasures to address them. Safety concerns can originate from any of the previous RSA steps. Crash history, crash diagrams, road condition diagrams, or design conditions not meeting current design standards could all be utilized from Step 1. From Steps 2 and 3, the RSA team could raise concerns stemming from personal knowledge, interaction with the public, and/or plans and drawings. Most importantly, the field review from Step 4 will identify concerns as they appear through the eyes of a diverse range of team members. It may be important to prioritize or rank safety concerns and countermeasures to outline a pathway to safety improvements. The RSA team prepares a written report to document their findings. The RSA report is submitted to the project owner and design team.

Step 6: Present RSA Findings to Owner and Design Team

The RSA team meets with the project owner and design team to present specific safety concerns and suggest possible countermeasures. This meeting allows the project owner, design team, and RSA team the opportunity to discuss the findings of the RSA in an informal setting. The RSA team should be sensitive to the fact that agencies have limited budgets and a large number of facilities to maintain. Likewise, the project owner and design team should be mindful that the RSA team has devoted significant effort to developing recommendations. It is important to undertake a team approach toward advocating safety.

Step 7: Prepare Formal Response

A joint written response to the findings should be prepared by the project owner and design team. This response should contain documentation regarding the implementation of countermeasures suggested by the RSA team. Possible responses from the project owner and design team include:

- Agree with the suggested countermeasure and outline a plan for its implementation.
- Disagree with the suggested countermeasure and suggest an alternative. The owner and design team should document the reasons for not implementing the suggested countermeasure.
- Agree with the suggested countermeasure but provide documentation for constraints that prevent the countermeasure from being implemented (such as cost, environmental impacts, or right-of-way constraints).

Step 8: Incorporate Findings

The project owner and design team should then implement the countermeasures based on the plan outlined in the formal response. The work of the owner and designer does not end with the implementation of countermeasures. An attentive owner or designer verifies that the intended safety improvements were indeed realized with the implemented countermeasures. The RSA constitutes an ongoing process, since transportation demand, land-use, and engineering practices change over time.

RSA Field Examples

As presented in Figures 6.2-6.7, the following are examples of safety concerns that could be identified during an RSA. Figure 6.2 illustrates a situation where the intersection sight distance at a stop-controlled approach was limited by a hill on the mainline. In this case, a project was undertaken to improve sight distance at the intersection by cutting from the hill to change the profile of the mainline. As seen in Figure 6.3, utility poles and trees were located adjacent to the roadway on the inside of a horizontal curve. Possible countermeasures that were identified in this case included tree removal, relocation of the utility poles, and/or installation of a guardrail. Figure 6.4 shows a tree adjacent to the roadway that was marked with a delineator sign. Roadside safety in this situation could be improved by removing the tree. In Figure 6.5, the stop sign is obscured by foliage. Trimming the foliage would greatly improve the visibility of the sign, and thereby improve safety. In Figure 6.6, the two sets of overlapping pavement markings could confuse drivers. The superfluous pavement markings should be removed. Figure 6.7 shows an example of the effects of operations on safety. In this example, the truck stopped in the median is blocking one direction of through traffic. Possible countermeasures for this situation could include signaling the intersection, re-routing truck traffic to an alternate route, or installing a J-turn intersection that would require traffic to turn right before making a U-turn, instead of turning left.



Figure 6.2 Intersection sight distance obstructed by hill.



Figure 6.3 Utility poles and trees on inside of horizontal curve.



Figure 6.4 Tree adjacent to roadside.



Figure 6.5 Stop sign obscured by foliage.



Figure 6.6 Overlapping sets of pavement markings.



Figure 6.7 Truck in median blocking highway.

Example RSA

This section describes an example RSA that was conducted on St. Charles Road and Lake of the Woods Road in Columbia, Missouri in 2008 (Rossy et al., 2009). The example is described in the context of the eight-step RSA process.

Step 1: Identify Project

The City of Columbia and Boone County requested that the University of Missouri (MU) perform an RSA for a study area consisting of two roads in Columbia. The City of Columbia and Boone County share maintenance responsibilities for these facilities. The study area (Fig. 6.8) included the entire length of Lake of the Woods Road from Route PP to St. Charles Road (1.5 miles) and a segment on St. Charles Road from Lake of the Woods Road to Route Z (2.5 miles). The primary factor contributing to the selection of this site for an RSA related to concerns regarding the construction of a new high school on St. Charles Road.

Both roads consisted of asphalt pavement, and were classified as rural minor arterial collectors. The approximate average daily traffic (ADT) values were 4,000 vehicles per day (2006) for Lake of the Woods Road and 2,000 vehicles per day (2007) for St. Charles Road. There was a fire station located at the intersection of these two roads, and a golf course was located approximately a half mile to the east of their intersection. The study area included three stop-controlled intersections: St. Charles Road and Route Z, St. Charles Road and Lake of the Woods Road, and Lake of the Woods Road and Route PP. The study area experienced 23 vehicular crashes from 2003 to 2008, including one disabling injury crash. Most crashes occurred at stop-controlled intersections, while many of the other crashes involved private property entrances or collisions with roadside objects.




Figure 6.8 Study area for RSA example (Rossy et al., 2009).

Step 2: Select RSA Team

Due to concerns related to the construction of a new high school, a relatively large RSA team of 11 members was selected. The RSA team included representatives from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT), the City of Columbia Police Department, the Columbia Public Schools Board, Jefferson City Public Works, Linn State Technical College, and MU. Representatives from the City of Columbia and Boone County Public Works were not included on the team, since they were the clients and primary stakeholders.

Step 3: Conduct Start-Up Meeting

The start-up meeting, field inspection, and post-audit meeting for the RSA analysis were all conducted on April 10, 2008. During the start-up meeting, the team members were provided with background information on the project, including a sketch of the study area and a summary of crash reports. A question and answer session was also held. The RSA team members were also given a prompt list developed by the National

Cooperative Highway Research Program (Wilson and Lipinski, 2004) to help provide guidance for the field review.

Step 4: Perform Field Reviews

The RSA team visited the study area for approximately one hour to identify potential safety concerns. Weather conditions were clear during the time of the field visit, although a heavy rainfall had ended a few hours prior. The team inspected the entire study area and paused at some locations for a more detailed review. A few example pictures illustrating concerns identified during the field review are shown in Figures 6.9-6.12.




Figure 6.9 Steep dropoff at creek crossing (Rossy et al., 2009).



Figure 6.10 Driveway locations difficult to discern due to heavy foliage (Rossy et al., 2009).



Figure 6.11 Pavement rutting on St. Charles Road (Rossy et al., 2009).



Figure 6.12 Drainage problem at the intersection of St. Charles Road and Route Z (Rossy et al., 2009).

Step 5: Conduct RSA Analysis

Upon completion of the site visit, the RSA team met to discuss their observations. The discussion included the identification of safety concerns and possible countermeasures. A list of some of the concerns and suggestions identified during the analysis is shown in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Partial Listing of Concerns and Countermeasures in RSA example (Rossy et al., 2009)

| Concern | Suggestions |
|--|---|
| Intersection of Lake of the Woods Road and St. Charles Road | |
| Pavement rutting | Mill and repave pavement |
| Limited sight distance on southbound approach | Stop ahead sign, lighting, rumble strips |
| Other improvements | Replace intersection with roundabout |
| St. Charles Road | |
| View of driveways limited by vegetation | Trim and remove vegetation |
| Lack of pavement markings or shoulders | Add edgeline and pedestrian markings, add shoulder |
| Horizontal curves | Add chevron sign for sharp curves |
| Intersection of St. Charles Road and Route Z | |
| Improper drainage | Improve drainage |
| Dense vegetation limits visibility of stop sign | Trim and remove vegetation |
| Limited sight distance on northbound and southbound approaches | Consider signal, roundabout, flashing yellow, or intersection ahead signing |
| Lake of the Woods Road | |
| Steep drop at culvert creek crossing | Add guardrail, delineate drop-off |
| Fixed objects close to pavement edge | Relocate mailboxes, relocate or remove trees |
| Intersections with minor roads | Install intersection ahead signs, install stop signs on minor roads |
| Intersection of Lake of the Woods Road and Route PP | |
| Faded signs | Replace signs |
| Pavement damage | Improve drainage |
| Other improvements | Provide lighting, implement mowing policy |

Step 6: Present RSA Findings to Owner and Design Team

A preliminary report of the RSA findings was submitted to both the Boone County Office of Public Works and the City of Columbia Public Works Department.

Step 7: Prepare Formal Response

The City of Columbia Public Works Department and the Boone County Office of Public Works both prepared responses in which they acknowledged the validity of the findings. The City of Columbia Public Works Department accepted all of the suggestions for road improvements. The independent nature of the RSA process helped the City of Columbia provide the necessary justification to request additional funding for safety improvements. The Boone County Office of Public Works indicated that they would be unable to implement long term improvements due to limited resources. They also expressed concerns regarding some of the challenges to implementing the low-cost improvements, arising from potential conflicts with other state and federal agencies. For example, requests for residents to relocate mailboxes further from the road could create conflicts with the United States Postal Service.

Step 8: Incorporate Findings

Within one year of the RSA's completion, the following improvements were implemented on Lake of the Woods Road:

- Re-establishment of drainage ditches
- Cleaning of culvert inlets
- Regular mowing of grassy areas adjacent to the pavement.

The following improvements were implemented at the intersection of St. Charles Road and Route Z:

- Trimming of trees to improve visibility
- Drainage treatments (Fig. 6.13)



Figure 6.13 Drainage improvements at the intersection of St. Charles Road and Route Z (Rossy et al., 2009).

RSA Case Studies

This section describes a few RSA case studies from different areas of the country. These case studies demonstrate the use of RSAs for a variety of applications, including safety improvements to existing highway sections, Bicycle Road Safety Audits (BRSA), design visualization projects in the conceptual stage, and safety improvements for routes to schools.

Case Study 1: Arizona Bullhead Parkway

In 2007, an RSA was conducted on a 10.2-mile section of Bullhead Parkway in Bullhead City, Arizona (Nabors et al., 2012). The RSA was requested by the Bullhead City Department of Public Works because the segment was one of the City's top priorities for safety improvements, being listed as a high crash location in the state of Arizona. Bullhead Parkway is a four-lane, divided rural roadway with four signalized intersections, 13 unsignalized intersections, and a posted speed limit of 50 mph. The RSA team consisted of five members from the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Traffic Safety, ADOT Traffic Design, ADOT Kingman District, FHWA, and the City of Yuma.

Several key findings and suggestions were implemented shortly after the completion of the RSA. The sole suggestion not considered or evaluated further due to cost and right-of-way constraints was the flattening of roadside slopes. Some of the key countermeasures that were implemented included:

- Installation of guardrail at locations where embankment slopes were steeper than 4:1.
- Paving inside and outside shoulders with rumble strips.
- Raising center storm drains to grade.
- Extending guardrail in some locations.
- Decreasing spacing of flexible delineators in curves from 300 ft to 150 ft.
- Moving signs in the shoulders to at least 8 ft from the travel lane.

This RSA produced a number of benefits. An analysis of crash data (Nabors et al., 2012) estimated a 54% reduction in total crashes resulting from implementation of the aforementioned improvements. The RSA benefited the City in terms of education by providing an increased awareness of best practices for roadway and roadside hazard safety. This increased awareness led the City to revisit its practices for installing trees along the roadway for landscaping. The City has appreciated the benefits of the RSA process, and has conducted two additional RSAs since the completion of the Bullhead Parkway RSA.

Case Study 2: Bicycle Road Safety Audit (BRSA) in Grant Teton National Park

In September 2012, a BRSA was held in Grand Teton National Park (Goughnour, 2013). The BRSA was a joint effort between Grand Teton National Park staff, the National Park Service Intermountain Regional Office, the Wyoming Department of Transportation, FHWA, and the Western Federal Lands Highway Division. The BRSA team included members with backgrounds in law enforcement, engineering, sustainability, and landscape architecture. The study area for the BRSA was a bicycle crossing at the intersection of

Gros Ventre Road and US Highway 26/89/191. The crossing was part of a 20-mile shared use path from Jackson to Jenny Lake. The BRSA was requested by Grand Teton National Park in response to concerns by intersection users who witnessed many near-misses between cyclists and motor vehicles. The BRSA team developed suggestions for short-term, intermediate, and long-term improvements. Suggested short-term improvements included increased signage and pavement markings for the roadways and shared use path. Suggested intermediate and long-term improvements included the relocation of the shared use path crossing, the construction of a tunnel at the crossing, and the construction of a roundabout, among others.

Case Study 3: Design Visualization for Conceptual Corridor in Rhode Island

In this example, design visualization was utilized to evaluate two alternatives at the conceptual design stage (FHWA, 2011a). This project was located on Aquidneck Island near Newport, Rhode Island. Due to concerns about increasing congestion from driveway access points and traffic signals, the conceptual alignment for a new limited-access roadway along the Burma Road South corridor was studied. A field review was not possible since the alignment was only a concept. The RSA team conducted the RSA by utilizing a detailed 3D model of the proposed road. The RSA included the evaluation of two alternatives: the use of signalized intersections at the limits of the alignment, and the use of roundabouts at the limits of the alignment. The roundabout (Fig. 6.14) was the preferred option due to its aesthetic appeal, its elimination of left-turn conflicts at intersections, and the resulting decreased traffic delay. The RSA team provided recommendations for the conceptual design that included the use of lighting, the use of sufficient radii to accommodate large vehicles, and the extension of left-turn lanes for additional storage space at intersections.



Figure 6.14 Design visualization for Burma Road South Corridor (FHWA, 2011a).

Case Study 4: Safe Routes to School in Albany, Georgia

In Albany, Georgia, RSAs have been conducted to improve safety for pedestrians walking to neighborhood elementary schools (FHWA, 2011b). The RSA team included representatives from the City of Albany Engineering Department, the Georgia Department of Transportation, the Dougherty County Board of Education, and the Parent/Teacher Association. A consultant was provided by the Georgia Safe Routes to School Resource Center to facilitate the RSA process. Recommendations from the RSA process included improvements to traffic signs and pavement markings on streets near schools, installation of sidewalk around the boundaries of school grounds, and the addition of a High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk (H.A.W.K) signal to supplement an intersection school crossing guard. This example demonstrates that RSAs can be very effective at the local level.

RSA Resources

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) RSA Website

FHWA maintains a website containing helpful information and resources regarding RSAs. Some of the resources on the website include RSA guidelines, sample RSA reports, RSA software, and RSA case studies. Visitors to the website can also order an RSA Toolkit CD containing additional materials such as RSA videos and RSA training information.

FHWA (accessed 8/14/2013). *Road Safety Audits*. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/rsa/>.

RSA Newsletters

FHWA also publishes a quarterly newsletter that is available on the FHWA website. The newsletter includes information on state RSA programs, news stories discussing RSAs, and other resources related to RSAs.

FHWA (accessed 8/14/2013). *Road Safety Audits: Newsletters*. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/rsa/newsletter/>.

Transportation Safety Resource Center

This website includes links to many RSA resources, including an RSA brochure, a sample RSA checklist, a sample RSA response letter, and a sample RSA report.

Transportation Safety Resource Center (accessed 8/14/2013). *Road Safety Audit Resources*. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://cait.rutgers.edu/tsrc/road-safety-audit-resources>.

Chapter 6 Bibliography

- Federal Highway Administration (2006). *FHWA Road Safety Audit Guidelines*. Washington, D.C.
- Federal Highway Administration. (accessed October 3, 2013a). *RSAs Make History: Design Visualization*. RSA Newsletter. Winter 2011. Volume 3, Number 1. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/rsa/newsletter/2011/winter/>.
- Federal Highway Administration. (accessed October 3, 2013b). *RSAs Lead to Safe Routes to School*. RSA Newsletter. Spring/Summer 2011. Volume 3, Number 2. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/rsa/newsletter/2011/sprsum/>.
- Gibbs, M., Zein, S., Nabors, D., McGee, H., Eccles, K. (2006). *Road Safety Audits: Case Studies*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C.
- Goughnour, E.. (accessed October 3, 2013). *Grand Teton National Park Conducts Bike RSA to Improve Intersection Safety*. RSA Newsletter. Winter 2013. Volume 4, Number 2. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/rsa/newsletter/2013/winter/>.
- Nabors, D., Goughnour, E., Thomas, L., DeSantis, W., and Sawyer, M. (2012). *Bicycle Road Safety Audit Guidelines and Prompt Lists*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C.
- Nabors, D., Gross, P., Kevin Moriarty, K., Sawyer,M., and C. Lyon. (2012). *Road Safety Audits: An Evaluation of RSA Programs and Projects*. Report FHWA-SA-12-037. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C.
- Owers, R. and Wilson, E. (2004). *Safety Analysis Without the Legal Paralysis: the Road Safety Audit Program*. Department of Civil and Architectural Engineering, University of Wyoming. Laramie, Wyoming.
- Rossy, G., Edara, P., Nemmers, C., *Evaluation of a Road Safety Audit Pilot Project in Missouri: Case Studies of Two Roads in Boone County*. Missouri DOT and City of Columbia Research Report. 2009. (also presented at TRB annual meeting 2010).
- Wilson, E., and Lipinski, M. (2004). *Road Safety Audits: A Synthesis of Highway Practice*. NHCRP 336. National Cooperative Highway Research Program. Transportation Research Board. Washington, D.C.

CHAPTER 7: ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Utilizing the collective wisdom of others.

A local community is not alone in its quest to improve safety. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2007), there are approximately 36,000 local municipalities and townships in the United States. Even though there is great diversity among these local communities in terms of population, land area, revenue, driver population, and land use, many communities share similar safety concerns and experiences. The collective wisdom of these communities can help to improve the situation in your local community. This chapter documents useful resources that capture experiences and tools from across the United States. Many of the resources discussed in this chapter are free, and some can be easily downloaded or viewed on the Internet.



S-HAL Supports the data-driven approach required of grant funding

One principal source of assistance is the Federal Government. Several agencies from the U.S. Department of Transportation exist that can offer expertise, support, and even funding for local communities. S-HAL itself could be a key to successful Federal or other types of grant applications, in light of the recent trend requiring data-driven evidence for securing grants. For example, §31102 of MAP-21 (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century) continues the data-driven approach of the Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program. Though transportation funding legislation will continue to change, the principles discussed in S-HAL should have relevance for the foreseeable future.

FHWA is a central figure in coordinating safety resources for local communities. The FHWA Office of Safety and the Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP) are two resources that could be the first stops for any local communities requiring assistance with safety matters.

Agencies and Organizations

There exist many agencies and organizations that are involved in improving safety for local communities. The following is a list of the most prominent safety organizations at the national level. Even though some of these organizations are national, they often operate state divisions or chapters that work more closely with each state.

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)

AASHTO is comprised of all state and highway transportation departments in the United States (AASHTO, 2013). Though its board is composed only of state officials, the organization is concerned with all aspects of transportation, including highway safety, at the local level. AASHTO publishes several resources related to local highway safety, and is the publisher of the Highway Safety Manual and the Green Book (A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets).

AASHTO (accessed 6/26/2013) *AASHTO Overview*. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. Washington D.C. Available at <http://www.transportation.org>.

American Public Works Association (APWA)

The APWA is an international professional organization for individuals who are involved in public works (APWA, 2013). It consists of individuals from both the public and private sectors, and includes all levels of government. One of APWA's goals is to improve the quality of life in all communities.

APWA (accessed 6/26/2013) *APWA: Who We Are*. American Public Works Association. Kansas City, Missouri. Available at <http://www.apwa.net>.

American Traffic Safety Services Association (ATSSA)

ATSSA is an international trade association representing the traffic control and roadway safety industries (ATSSA, 2013). ATSSA members produce products that could be deployed for use as safety countermeasures. Such products include markings, road signs, temporary traffic control devices, and guardrails. The core purpose of ATSSA is to advance roadway safety.

ATSSA (accessed 6/26/2013) *ATSSA: About Us*. American Traffic Safety Services Association. Fredericksburg, Virginia. Available at <https://www.atssa.com>.

Center for Excellence in Rural Safety (CERS)

The national Center for Excellence in Rural Safety, based out of the University of Minnesota and sponsored by FHWA, assists in research and training in rural transportation safety (CERS, 2013). CERS sponsors the Rural Highway Safety Clearinghouse, which is intended to be a starting point for all rural safety resources (RHSCH, 2013).

CERS (accessed 6/26/2013) *About the Center for Excellence in Rural Safety*. Center for Excellence in Rural Safety. Minneapolis, Minnesota. Available at <http://www.ruralsafety.umn.edu>.

RHSCH (accessed 6/26/2013) *Rural Highway Safety Clearinghouse*. University of Minnesota. Minneapolis, Minnesota. Available at <http://www.ruralsafety.umn.edu/clearinghouse>.

Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA)

The GHSA focuses on behavioral highway safety issues such as teen driving, occupant protection, impaired driving, and speeding (GHSA, 2013). The name stems from the fact that the state governor selects the highway safety representative to administer the state's highway safety office created by the State and Community Highway Safety Grant Program (U.S.C. Title 23, Section 402).

GHSA (accessed 6/26/2013) *What is GHSA?* Governors Highway Safety Association. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://www.ghsa.org>.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

Out of all the organizations here listed, FHWA is arguably the most important resource for local transportation safety. FHWA is an agency within the U.S. Department of Transportation that supports the design, construction, and maintenance of U.S. highways at all levels including the local level (FHWA, 2013a). Specifically, the Office of Safety works to promote safety at the local level (FHWA, 2013b). The Office emphasizes the “four E’s”: engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency medical services. It sponsors the local and rural road safety program, which provides a host of resources to the local community. Examples include funding and policy guidance, as well as training and countermeasure information.

FHWA also sponsors the Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP), which provides support for local counties and cities in terms of roads and bridges. The four focus areas of LTAP's Strategic Plan include safety, workforce development, infrastructure management, and organizational excellence. The following are examples of each area: the area of safety could involve work zones, intersection design, heavy equipment, road safety audits, and worker safety. Pavement maintenance and heavy equipment operation are examples of infrastructure management. Workforce development could involve leadership and management training, succession planning, and career day and school outreach. An example of organizational excellence is promoting involvement in professional organizations such as the National Local Technical Assistance Program Association, the Transportation Research Board, and local government associations. LTAP provides training programs, a Clearinghouse website, technology updates, and technical assistance. The Clearinghouse is operated under contract by the American Road & Transportation Builders Association (ARTBA). There is a physical LTAP center in each of the states (LTAP, 2013).

FHWA (accessed 6/26/2013a) *About FHWA*. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov>.

FHWA (accessed 6/26/2013b) *FHWA Safety*. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov>.

LTAP (accessed 6/26/2013b) *About the National Program*. Local Technical Assistance Program. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://www.ltap.org>.

Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE)

ITE is a professional organization for transportation engineers who are involved in the areas of safety and mobility. ITE supports professional development in the areas of research, planning, functional design, implementation, operation, policy, and management. Ground transportation is the focus of ITE. ITE accomplishes its goals through its headquarters, regional chapters, and local chapters. Examples of ITE resources include design manuals, annual meetings, seminars, research publications, and local meetings. Missouri ITE is associated regionally with the 11-state Midwestern District, the four-state Missouri Valley Section, and the local chapters of Central Missouri, Kansas City, Ozark, and St. Louis.

ITE (accessed 7/5/2013) *About ITE*. Institute of Transportation Engineers. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://www.ite.org>.

Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS)

The IIHS was originally founded by insurance associations to support highway safety (IIHS, 2013). It then became an independent research organization dedicated to the reduction of crashes and crash severity. IIHS provides information on human factors, crash avoidance and crashworthiness, and road design and hazards.

IIHS (accessed 6/26/2013b) *About the Institutes*. Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. Arlington, Virginia. Available at <http://www.iihs.org>.

Missouri Coalition for Highway Safety

The Missouri Coalition for Highway Safety (MCHS, 2013) is composed of a large and diverse number of coalition partners, including law enforcement, educators, emergency responders, and engineers. The Coalition publishes Missouri's Blueprint to Save More Lives, which is the state's strategic highway safety plan. The Blueprint provides a framework to reduce roadway fatalities and serious injuries. The eight guiding principles behind the Blueprint include:

- Focus on fatalities and serious injuries
- Consider education, enforcement, emergency response, engineering and public policy strategies
- Collaborate with all safety partners
- Use evidence-based strategies
- Support system-wide safety enhancements
- Implement countermeasures at both state and regional levels
- Monitor and evaluate progress
- Apply to all roadways.

MCHS (accessed 6/26/2013) *Missouri's Blueprint to Save More Lives*. Missouri Coalition for Highway Safety. Jefferson, City. Available at <http://savemolives.org>.

National Association of Counties (NACo)

NACo represents the 3,069 counties in the U.S., and assists them with issues including highway safety (NACo, 2013).

NACo (accessed 6/26/2013) *About NACo – The Voice of America's Counties*. National Association of Counties. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://www.naco.org>.

National Association of County Engineers (NACE)

NACE is the national voice for county road officials (NACE, 2013). The major objectives of NACE are to advance county engineering and management, to stimulate the growth of county engineers and officials, to improve cooperation among counties, and to monitor national legislation affecting counties.

NACE (accessed 6/26/2013) *About NACE*. National Association of County Engineers. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://www.countyengineers.org>.

National Association of Development Organizations (NADO)

NADO provides education, research, training, and advocacy for regional development organizations (RDOs) (NADO, 2013). RDOs perform multi-jurisdictional and cooperative planning so that local communities within a region can work together to improve the entire region. RDOs are known by various names, such as area development districts, planning and development councils, and regional councils. NADO provides resources to improve upon rural transportation safety.

NADO (accessed 6/26/2013) *About NADO*. National Association of Development Organizations.

National Association of Towns and Townships (NATaT)

NATaT represents smaller communities, towns, and townships in the U.S. Eighty-five percent of NATaT communities have fewer than 10,000 people, and around fifty percent have fewer than 1,000 people (NATaT, 2013).

NATaT (accessed 6/26/2013) NADO: About Us. National Association of Towns and Townships. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://www.natat.org>.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA)

One NHTSA program of special interest to local communities is Safe Communities (NHTSA, 2013). This program uses a shared community approach to improving transportation safety. The main characteristics of Safe Communities are:

- Crash data analysis
- Partnerships, including medical and businesses
- Public involvement and input
- Integrated and comprehensive injury control system

NHTSA (accessed 6/26/2013) *Safe Communities*. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Available at <http://www.nhtsa.gov>

Roadway Safety Foundation (RSF)

RSF is a nonprofit organization with the mission of reducing the frequency and severity of motor vehicle crashes. Their goals include investing in cost-effective safety programs, facilitating public and private sector cooperation in safety initiatives, and increasing awareness of safety programs.

RSF (accessed 6/26/2013) About Us. Roadway Safety Foundation. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://www.roadwaysafety.org>.

Transportation Research Board (TRB)

TRB is an organization under the National Academies of Sciences that promotes research and innovation in all areas of transportation (TRB, 2013). TRB produces and provides much information that is relevant to local community safety. One specific TRB program is the National Cooperative Highway Research Program, which has produced significant research on specific safety topics relevant to local communities.

TRB (accessed 6/26/2013) *The Transportation Research Board*. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://www.trb.org>.

Publications

Roadway Safety Information Analysis: A Manual for Local Rural Road Owners

This manual promotes a data-driven approach to improving local roadway safety, since federal funding mechanisms often require such an approach (Bolembiewski and Chandler, 2011a). For example, the High Risk Rural Roads Program (HRRRP) maintains a funding pre-requisite, in that roads are expected to experience a higher than average number of crashes. Several approaches to countermeasure selection are presented, including systematic, spot location, and comprehensive.

Intersection Safety: A Manual for Local Rural Road Owners

More than 80 percent of rural intersection fatalities occur at unsignalized intersections. If available, local agencies are encouraged to consult with their state's safety implementation plan. Three main safety approaches are discussed in this manual: systematic, spot location, and comprehensive (Bolembiewski and Chandler, 2011b). A data driven approach involving law enforcement crash reports and other roadway and traffic data is recommended. Countermeasures, such as signage and markings, are described. Funding mechanisms are also discussed.

Roadway Safety Departure: A Manual for Local Rural Road Owners

Road departure crashes are often serious, and account for 53 percent of all traffic fatalities. This manual provides a way for local agencies to tie into their state's Roadway Departure Safety Implementation Plan (Bolembiewski and Chandler, 2011c). Three main safety approaches are discussed: systematic, spot location, and comprehensive. The field review process is outlined. Various countermeasures, especially low cost countermeasures, are described. Case studies in Georgia, California, and New Jersey are also presented.

Low-Cost Treatments for Horizontal Curve Safety

Horizontal curves account for nearly 25 percent of all fatal crashes, and contribute significantly to road departure crashes. This publication focuses on six types of local treatments (McGee and Hanscom, 2006). They include basic MUTCD signs and markings, enhanced traffic control devices, MUTCD-complementary traffic devices, rumble strips, minor roadway treatments, and innovative treatments. Basic MUTCD components could be related to centerlines, edge lines, horizontal curve segments, speed advisories, delineators, and chevrons. Enhanced devices could include larger devices, doubling-up on devices, increasing retroreflectivity, flashing beacons, and raised pavement markers. Reflective barrier delineation, roadside object delineation, dynamic curve warning systems, and speed limit advisory in lane markings are examples of MUTCD-complementary techniques. Minor improvements could involve paving shoulders, adding surface skid resistance, and eliminating shoulder drop-offs. Two examples of innovative treatments include optical speed bars and PennDOT curve advance markings.

Noteworthy Practices: Addressing Safety on Locally Owned and Maintained Roads

This 2010 publication documents successful practices from the following seven states: Alabama, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, and Washington (Anderson et al., 2010). The focus is on identifying best practices in funding, coordination, and technical assistance between state departments of transportation (DOTs) and local agencies. These best practices share the themes of crash data collection and analysis, project prioritization/identification, project administration, funding distribution and streamlining, training, technical assistance, outreach and partnerships, and integration with state safety programs.

Guidance Memorandum on Consideration and Implementation of Proven Safety Countermeasures

The following are some of the proven safety countermeasures promoted and discussed by the FHWA in this memorandum (Lindley, 2008). A *road safety audit* is an examination of the safety performance of a facility by an independent, multi-disciplinary team. *Rumble strips and stripes* are raised or grooved pavement treatments that provide audible and physical warnings. *Median longitudinal barriers* reduce cross-median frequency and severity, and redirect vehicles. The *safety edge* is an angled pavement treatment that minimizes drop-offs and improves road recovery. The *modern roundabout* improves safety through offset, deflection, reverse superelevation, and channelization.

Funding Resources

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

HSIP was established by SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users) in 2005, and continued with MAP-21 through 2013 (FHWA, 2013). HSIP is a core federal aid program that seeks to significantly reduce traffic fatalities and injuries. HSIP is an umbrella program that covers several programs potentially affecting local communities.

FHWA (accessed 6/27/2013) *HSIP History*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. Available at <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov>.

Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)

SHSP is a principal component of the HSIP, and requires states to develop a coordinated and comprehensive highway safety plan (FHWA, 2013a). Such a plan identifies safety needs and prioritizes safety investments. This state-level plan covers all public roads, including local roads; thus, it is to the advantage of local communities to align their own safety goals with this plan. In fact, MAP-21 requires that SHSP involve the participation of local road jurisdictions (FHWA, 2013b). The local municipality is encouraged to review Missouri's SHSP, the Blueprint to Save More Lives, and to explore ways in which the municipality can further the goals of the Blueprint.



Aligning Local Efforts with Missouri's Blueprint

coordinated and comprehensive highway safety plan (FHWA, 2013a). Such a plan identifies safety needs and prioritizes safety investments. This state-level plan covers all public roads,

FHWA (accessed 6/27/2013a) *Strategic Highway Safety Plan*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. Available at <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov>.

FHWA (accessed 6/27/2013b) *Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) Questions & Answers*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. Available at <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov>.

High Risk Rural Road Program (HRRRP)

As defined in MAP-21, a high-risk rural road refers to any “roadway functionally classified as a rural major or minor collector or a rural local road with significant safety risks, as defined by a State in accordance with an updated State strategic highway safety plan” (23 USC 148(a)(1)). This definition emphasizes the need for local municipalities to coordinate their safety efforts and needs with Missouri’s Blueprint in order to take advantage of federal funds through the state. MAP-21 obligates Missouri to expend safety funds if the “fatality rate on rural roads increases over the most recent 2-year period.” Such fatality rates are computed according to the method described in Chapter 3 of S-HAL, and are rounded to the nearest tenth. For example, if a rural road experienced a five-year average fatality rate increase from 2.3 to 2.4 100 MVMT (million vehicle miles traveled), then the municipality would be eligible to receive HRRR funds to improve safety on that road.

State and Community Highway Safety Grant Program (Section 402)

The Section 402 program is jointly administered by the FHWA and the NHTSA, with the goal of improving driver behavior and reducing fatal and injury crashes (GHSA, 2013). This program has been in place since 1966, and has been continued under various transportation legislations, including MAP-21. The areas addressed by this program include impaired driving, speeding, occupant protection, motorcycle safety, pedestrian and bicycle safety, school bus safety, unsafe driving, traffic enforcement, driver performance, traffic records, emergency services, and teen driving. Missouri’s program must be coordinated with Missouri’s Blueprint. Under this program, Missouri received slightly less than \$5 million each year from 2006 to 2012.

GHSA (accessed 7/3/2013) *Section 402 State and Community Highway Safety Grant Program*. Governors Highway Safety Association. Washington, D.C. Available at <http://www.ghsa.org>.

Hazards Elimination Fund (HEF)

The Hazards Elimination Fund seeks to reduce the frequency and severity of crashes at hazardous highway locations, sections, and elements on any public road, public surface transportation facility, or any publicly owned bicycle or pedestrian pathway (Horne, 2000). Examples of projects include intersection improvements such as channelization, signalization, and sight distance; pavement and shoulder widening; barriers and guardrails; road re-alignment; signing and delineation; skid-resistant overlays; and rumble strips. The typical share is 90% federal and 10% local or state, although a 100% federal contribution could apply to signing, markings, active warning devices, and crossing closure projects.

Horne, D. (2000) *Hazard Elimination Program Guidance Memorandum*. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C.

The following is a sample list of specific issues or conditions for which funding could be available to local communities. This list is related to the aforementioned HSIP, SHSP, HRRRP, and HEF programs.

Railroad-Highway Crossings

The Railroad-Highways Crossing Program (23 U.S.C. 130) focuses on the elimination of hazards at crossings (FHWA, 2006, 2013). Applicable types of crossings include roads, bike trails, and pedestrian paths. Funding could be used to install protective devices at crossings, improve signals and signage, eliminate hazards, and even incentivize local agencies to close crossings. The typical federal share is 90%, although certain projects qualify for full federal funding.

FHWA (accessed 7/3/2013) *Railway-Highways Crossing (Section 130) Program*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. Available at <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov>.

FHWA (2006) *Guidance on 23 U.S.C. §130 Annual Reporting Requirements for Railway-Highways Crossings*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. May 5.

Highway Lighting

Funding under 23 U.S.C. 148, the Highway Safety Improvement Program, could be used for the purpose of reducing traffic fatalities and serious injuries on public roads. According to FHWA (Alicandri, 2005), highway lighting is covered under “traffic lights,” and is eligible for 100% federal funding.

Alicandri, E. (2005) *Eligibility of 23 USC 120(c) for Highway Lighting*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. December 1.

Sign Retroreflectivity and Replacement

FHWA allows the use of HSIP funds for sign replacement, but there are several requirements (Lindley, 2008). The replacement has to arise from a demonstrated safety benefit and need that is supportable by data. Such a replacement has to be consistent with the SHSP. Such replacement should not be funded by the safety program if it is part of a routine, broader project.

According to the 2008 federal regulation on sign retroreflectivity requirements, public agencies were required to adopt new minimum reflectivity levels on January, 2012; to replace regulatory, warning, or ground-mounted non-street name guide signs by 2015; and to replace non-compliant street and overhead guide signs by 2018 (NATaT, 2013). NATaT lists several programs that could fund sign replacement. These include the Interstate Maintenance Program, the Surface Transportation Program, the Highway Safety Improvement Program, the High Risk Rural Roads Program, the State and Community Highway Safety Grant Program, and the State Planning and Research Program.

CHAPTER 7 - ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Lindley, J. (2008) *Eligibility of HSIP Funds for Sign Replacement*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. February 27.

NATaT (accessed 7/3/2013) *Sign Retroreflectivity Update and Funding Assistance*. National Association of Towns and Townships. Available at <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov>.

Chapter 7 Bibliography

- Anderson, R., Yunk, K., Lovas, D. and Scism, M. (2010) *Noteworthy Practices: Addressing Safety on Locally-Owned and Maintained Roads A Domestic Scan*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C.
- Bolembiewski, G. and Chandler, B. (2011a) *Intersection Safety: A Manual for Local Rural Road Owners*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C.
- Bolembiewski, G. and Chandler, B. (2011b) *Roadway Safety Information Analysis: A Manual for Local Rural Road Owners*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C.
- Bolembiewski, G. and Chandler, B. (2011c) *Roadway Departure Safety: A Manual for Local Rural Road Owners*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C.
- Lindley, J. (2008) *Guidance Memorandum on Consideration and Implementation of Proven Safety Countermeasures*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C.
- McGee, H. and Hanscom, F. (2006) *Low-Cost Treatments for Horizontal Curve Safety*. Office of Safety. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2007) *Population of Interest – Municipalities and Townships*. List & Structure of Governments. Washington, D.C. Available at http://www.census.gov/govs/go/municipal_township_govs.html.