

www.roadsafety.unc.edu



Presented by Offer Grembek, Joy Pasquet, Catalina Vanoli UC Berkeley SafeTREC

September 6, 2019

Reactive =

Proactive



Spot approach: Improvement at a specific location in response to a-higher-than-expected crash rate at a site



<u>Corridor approach:</u> Improvement across a corridor in response to a-higher-than-expected crash rate, or recurring safety concerns along a corridor



Systemic approach:

"An improvement that is widely implemented based on high-risk roadway features that are correlated with particular crash types" FHWA



Safe Systems approach:

"Building a system in which people cannot be fatally or severely injured on despite human error" *Soames Job*



Systemic approach:

- reactive it uses historical crash data to identify priorities
- proactive make improvements also at low or non-crash sites

FHWA's Systemic Safety Program



Example of a pedestrian safety matrix



What type of crashes are happening on what type of facilities?

Urban and Urbanized	Control Type	STEP		U	nsignaliz	ed						STEP 3	Signa	alized						
Conventional Highway	# of Lanes - Main	2	<:	=3		>3				•		MIC			>	>3				
and City One-Way	# of Lanes - Cross	FILLL	<:	=3	<	=3	2	26			3 —		n		•		>	3		Total
Street 2009-2013	AADT - Main	IN	<50,000	>=50,000	<50,000	>=50,000	<5 000	(🖉 🔬 ۹		< 5	00	V.0	,夏人		,000,	< 50	,000	>= 50	0,000	
547664, 2005 2015	AADT - Cross	MATR			<12,000			<12,000	>=12,000	<12,00	>=12,000	<120	12,000	<12,000	>=12,000	<12,000	>=12,000	<12,000	>=12,000	
# of Int	ersections		1197	15	2347	335	3	166	22	23	21	901	54	148	15	271	208	56	67	5876
Pedestrian Movements	Primary Collision Fa	ctors																		
	Influence of Alcohol		1		1					1						1				4
	Following too close				1															1
Xing Xwalk –	ure to Yield		45	1	67	5	2	34	3	1	3	94	4	12	1	28	28	4	16	348
Intersection	in proper Turn				6							2					2		1	11
	eding		1		2							2		1						6
	her Violations		12		36	1		12		4	2	35	3	9	2	14	14	4	8	156
	ure to Yield				2	1			1										2	6
	per Turn				1															1
	Other Violations				1						1									2
	mflu nce of Alcohol				1															1
	Sailure to Yield		6		10	2						3				1				22
Xing – Not Xwalk	Improper Turn				1								1	1					1	4
	Speeding		4		2							1					1			8
	other Violations		31		51	1	2	3	2	1		22	1	4		16	3	1	4	142
	uence of Alcohol		3									1				1		1		6
Desidence include	a ure to Yield		1		1	1								1			2			6
Roadway – Include	In proper Turn		4		3							1								8
shoulder	op. reding		5		4							1								10
	Coner Violations		11	1	9	1				1		5		1		2	3		1	35
	uence of Alcohol													1			1			2
	lure to Yield		3		1	1						7				1	2		3	18
Not in Roadway	In Jroper Turn		2		1	1										3				7
	speeding		2		4			1									2			9
	Other Violations				2			1				6	1	2		1	1			14
Т	otal		131	2	207	14	4	51	6	8	6	180	10	32	3	68	59	10	36	827
Rate (crashe	s/intersection)		0.11	0.13	0.09	0.04	1.33	0.31	0.27	0.35	0.29	0.20	0.19	0.22	0.20	0.25	0.28	0.18	0.54	0.14

What type of crashes are happening on what type of facilities?

Urban and Urbanized	Control Type		U	nsignaliz	ed						STEP 3	Signa	alized						
Conventional Highway	# of Lanes - Main 2	<	=3		>3				•		MIC			>	>3				1
and City One-Way	# of Lanes - Cross FILLI	- <	=3	<	=3		26		7 - 1	3 —				k		>	3		Total
Street, 2009-2013	AADT - Main	<50,000	>=50,000	<50,000	>=50,000	<5 000	(🥑 🛃		< 5	00		<u>, 9</u> , 1		,000,	< 50	,000	>= 5	0,000	1
011000 2000 2010	AADT - Cross	к		<12,000			<12,000	>=12,000	<12,00	>=12,000	<120	12,000	<12,000	>=12,000	<12,000	>=12,000	<12,000	>=12,000	
# of Inte	ersections	1197	15	2347	335	3	166	22	23	21	901	54	148	15	271	208	56	67	5876
Pedestrian Movements	Primary Collision Factors	7																	
	Influence of Alcohol	1		1					1						1				4
	Following too close																		1
Xing Xwalk –	ure to Yield	45	1	67	5	2	34	3	1	3 (94	4	12	1	28	28	4	16	348
Intersection	in proper Turn										Y					2		1	11
	5 eding	1		2							2		1						6
	ner Violations	12		36	1		12		4	2	35	3	9	2	14	14	4	8	156
	ure to Yield			2	1			1										2	6
	per Turn			1															1
	Other Violations			1						1									2
_	mflu nce of Alcohol			1															1
	Failure to Yield	6		10	2			h	1		3	-1		-1-	1				22
Xing – Not Xwalk	Improper Turn			1				DV:	ste	m	СГ	1	SD	OTS				1	4
	Speeding	4		2				~ ~ ~			1				1	1			8
	Other Violations	31		51	1	2	3	2	1		22	1	4		16	3	1	4	142
	uence of Alcohol	3									1				1		1		6
Readway Include	a lure to Yield	1		1	1								1			2			6
Shouldor	In proper Turn	4		3							1								8
Shoulder	an reding	5		4							1								10
	Coner Violations	11	1	9	1				1		5		1		2	3		1	35
	uence of Alcohol												1			1			2
	ilure to Yield	3		1	1						7				1	2		3	18
Not in Roadway	In Jroper Turn	2		1	1										3				7
	Speeding	2		4			1									2			9
	Other Violations			2			1				6	1	2		1	1			14
Т	otal	131	2	207	14	4	51	6	8	6	180	10	32	3	68	59	10	36	827
Rate (crashe	s/intersection)	0.11	0.13	0.09	0.04	1.33	0.31	0.27	0.35	0.29	0.20	0.19	0.22	0.20	0.25	0.28	0.18	0.54	0.14

What are the relevant countermeasures for each matrix cell?

Urban and Urbanized,	Control Type	STEP		ι	Insignali	zed						ST	EP 3	Sigr	nalized		_				
Conventional Highway	# of Lanes - Main	2	<	=3		>3							MIC			2	>3				H
and City One-Way	# of Lanes - Cross	FILLL	<	=3	<	<=3		21	~		3							>	• 3		Iotal
Street, 2009-2013	AADT - Main	- MATR	<50,000	>=50,00	0 <50,000	>=50,000	000 <5			< ا	51 00		,0,			,000	< 50),000	>= 5	0,000]]
	AADT - Cross				<12,000)		<12,000	>=12,00	0 <12,00	>=12,	,000 <1	12 0	12,00	0 <12,000	>=12,000	<12,000	>=12,000	<12,000	>=12,000	
# of Inte	ersections		1197	15	2347	335	3	166	22	23	21	L	901	54	148	15	271	208	56	67	5876
Pedestrian Movements	Primary Collision F	Factors									Counter N	Aeasures									
	Influence of Alcoho	ol	30 30	30 31 30 31	31 30	30 33 33 33 33	33 30	30 33	33 21	28	31 31 31 31	30	30 31	31	30 30	32 32	30 30	32 32	28 28	31 31 31 31	•
	Following too close	e	27	27 27	27 27	27 29	29 27	27 29	29 25	5 25	27 27	22	22 22	22	22 22	23 23	22 22	23 23	20 20	22 22	
Xing Xwalk –	Jure to Yield	-	16	16 16	16 16	16 17	17 16	16 17 19 21	17 14	14	16 16 19 19	13 13	13 13	13	13 13	14 14 14 14	13 13	14 14 14 14	11 11	13 13	-
Intersection	in proper Turn		30 🔪 :	30 31 31	31 30	30 33 3	33 30	30 33	33 21	3 28	31 31	30	30 31	31	30 30 30	32 32	30 30 30	32 32	28 28	31 31	
	eding	-	25	25 25	25 25	25 26	26 25	25 26	26 24	24	25 25	23	23 23	23	23 23	23 23	23 23	23 23	22 22	23 23	
	ner Violations	-	23	23 22	22 23	23 23	23 23	23 23	28 23	2 22	20 20 20	16	16 15	15	16 16	15 15	16 16	15 15	15 15	15 15	-
	Jure to Yield		12	12 11	11 12	12 11	11 12	12 11	11 11	11	11 11	7	7 6	6	7 7	6 6	7 7	6 6	6 6	6 6	1
S	per Turn		25	16 15 25 25 25	25 25	25 26	26 25	25 26	26 24	15 1 24	15 15 25 25 25	23	23 23	23	23 23	23 23	23 23	23 23	22 22	23 23	•
	Other Violations		23	23 23	23 23	23 24	24 23	23 24	4 24		2 2	2	22 22	22	22 22	22 22	22 22	22 22	21 21	22 22	
	will pre-of Alcoho	ol .	23 20	23 23	23 23	23 24	24 23	23 24	22		3 23			22		22 22	22 22	22 22	21 21	22 22	1
Ľ	Failure to Vield		9	9 8	8 9	9 8	8 9	9 8	8 8		8 8	5	5 4	4	50	4 4	5 5	4 4	4 4	4 4	
Ving - Not Ywalk	language True	-	14	14 13	13 14	14 14	14 14	14 14	14 13	13	13 13	9	9 8	8	9 9	8 8	9 9	8 8	8 8	8 8	
Ang Not Awang	Improper rum		14	14 14	14 14	14 14	14 14	nn	1 14		rr				"I'I'r		14 14	14 14	13 13	14 14	-
	speeding		14	14 14	14 14	14 14	14 14				714	14			UI		14 14	14 14	13 13	14 14	
	Other violations		2	9 8 2 1	1 2	2 1	1 2	2 1		1	8 8	2	2 1	1	2 2	1 1	2 2	1 1	1 1		-
	uence of Alcoho	ol -	5	5 4	4 5	5 4	4 5	5 4	4 4	4	4 4	5	5 4	4	5 5	4 4	5 5	4 4	4 4	4 4	
Roadway – Include	a ure to Yield		14	14 14	14 14	14 14	14 14	14 14	14 13	3 13	14 14 24 24	14	14 14	14	14 14	14 14	14 14	14 14	13 13	14 14	-
Shoulder	In proper Turn		33 3	33 34	34 33	33 36 3	36 33	33 36	36 3	1 31	34 34	33	33 34	34	33 33 33	35 35	33 33 33	35 35	31 31	34 34	
	an reding		27	27 27	27 27	27 29	29 27	27 29	29 25	5 25	27 27	22	22 22	22	22 22	23 23	22 22	23 23	20 20	22 22	
	Caner Violations		16	16 16 19 19	16 16	16 17	21 19	16 17	21 17	14	16 16 19 19	13	13 13	13	13 13	14 14	13 13 13 13	14 14	11 11	13 13	-
2	uence of Alcoho	ol	33 3	33 34	34 33	33 36	36 33	33 36	36 3	1 31	34 34	33	33 34	34	33 33	35 35	33 33	35 35	31 31	34 34	
	lure to Yield		33	33 34	34 33	33 36	36 33	33 36	36 3	1 31	34 34 24 24	33	33 34	34	33 33	35 35	33 33	35 35	31 31	34 34	-
Not in Roadway	In Proper Turn		27	27 27 27	27 27	27 29	29 27	27 29	29 2	5 25	27 27	22	22 22	22	22 22	23 23	22 22	23 23	20 20	22 22	
	Speeding		16	16 16	16 16	16 17	17 16	16 17	17 14	14	16 16	13	13 13	13	13 13	14 14	13 13	14 14	11 11	13 13	
	Other Violations		19 33 1 :	33 34	34 33	33 36	36 33	33 36	21 17	1/	19 19 34 34 34	33	33 34	34	33 33	35 35	33 33	35 35	31 31	34 34	
Te	otal																	I			
Rate (crashe	s/intersection)																				

An Enhanced Systemic Approach to Safety

Three overarching objectives:

1

Enhance methods to identify systemic safety concerns

Enhance countermeasure scope to include engineering and nonengineering improvements

3

Enhance process to determine high priority locations

Project goals and activities



Enhance methods to identify systemic safety concerns

Develop method to determine crash types and the facility types that need to be included in a matrix for a specific mode



populate mode-specific crash matrices using the data from multiple states



Project goals and activities

2

Enhance countermeasure scope to include engineering and nonengineering improvements

develop a list of engineering safety countermeasures to address crash profiles identified for the different matrices



develop a list of non-engineering improvements to address crash profiles identified for the different matrices



Project goals and activities



Enhance process to determine high priority locations

explore the advantages and disadvantages of different methods to identify systemic hotspots



define guidelines for determining upper and lower thresholds for systemic projects



ROAD SAFETY September 6, 2019

Expected outcomes

1	Guidelines for determining matrix structure across different modes	
2	Basic toolbox for engineering and non-engineering improvements	
3	Considerations for screening criteria for systemic projects	

Enforcement countermeasures

- How can it be used?
 - Police enforcement targeted at the identified problematic facilities
- What is the promise?
 - Filling the gaps in the driving code
- What are the limitations?
 - Burdensome state by state legislative analysis
- Guidelines for future considerations





Education countermeasures

- How can it be used?
 - Elaborating an educational countermeasures matrix
- What are the limitations?
 - Multitude of entities involved in road safety trainings
- What is the promise?
 - Lead the development of learning modules
- Guidelines for future considerations





Data requirements

- Three categories of data
 - Crash data (rows)
 - Roadway data (columns)
 - Operations data (columns or risk)
- Source: HSIS (Highway Safety Information System) files
 - accident subfile
 - vehicle/occupant subfiles
 - roadway file
 - intersection file

- Challenge: linking the data



Data collection

HSIS Data for 5 years across 7 states:

- California 2010 2014
- North Carolina 2010 2014
- Ohio 2011 2015
- Washington 2011 2015
- Illinois 2006 2010
- Minnesota 2006- 2010
- Maine 2011 2015

Data cleaning in Python

name	year	info	numb_records	numb_variables	variables						
ca10acc	2010	acc	154438	56	'acc_date'	'acctype'	'accyr'	'alch_flg'	'bike_flg'	'caseno'	'cause1'
ca11acc	2011	acc	150465	56	'acc_date'	'acctype'	'accyr'	'alch_flg'	'bike_flg'	'caseno'	'cause1'
ca12acc	2012	acc	145776	56	'ACC_DATE'	'ACCTYPE'	'ACCYR'	'ALCH_FLG'	'BIKE_FLG'	'CASENO'	'CAUSE1'
ca13acc	2013	acc	146529	56	'ACC_DATE'	'ACCTYPE'	'ACCYR'	'ALCH_FLG'	'BIKE_FLG'	'CASENO'	'CAUSE1'
ca14acc	2014	acc	150587	56	'ACC_DATE'	'ACCTYPE'	'ACCYR'	'ALCH_FLG'	'BIKE_FLG'	'CASENO'	'CAUSE1'
ca10int	2010	int	17795	38	'cntyrte'	'county'	'district'	'hwy_grp'	'int_dte'	'int_popgrp'	'int_prf'
ca11int	2011	int	17484	38	'cntyrte'	'county'	'district'	'hwy_grp'	'int_dte'	'int_popgrp'	'int_prf'
ca12int	2012	int	17224	38	'cntyrte'	'county'	'DISTRICT'	'HWY_GRP'	'int_dte'	'INT_POPGRP'	'int_prf'
ca13int	2013	int	0	0							
ca14int	2014	int	17145	38	'cntyrte'	'county'	'DISTRICT'	'HWY_GRP'	'int_dte'	'INT_POPGRP'	'int_prf'
ca10road	2010	road	47399	54	'aadt'	'acc_dte'	'access'	'begmp'	'city'	'cntyrte'	'county'
ca11road	2011	road	49523	54	'aadt'	'acc_dte'	'access'	'begmp'	'city'	'cntyrte'	'county'
ca12road	2012	road	54354	54	'AADT'	'ACC_DTE'	'ACCESS'	'BEGMP'	'CITY'	'cntyrte'	'COUNTY'
ca13road	2013	road	54721	54	'AADT'	'ACC_DTE'	'ACCESS'	'BEGMP'	'CITY'	'cntyrte'	'COUNTY'
ca14road	2014	road	55196	54	'AADT'	'ACC_DTE'	'ACCESS'	'BEGMP'	'CITY'	'cntyrte'	'COUNTY'
ca10veh	2010	veh	308297	29	'accyr'	'caseno'	'cause'	'contrib1'	'contrib2'	'defect'	'dir_trvl'
ca11veh	2011	veh	304266	29	'accyr'	'caseno'	'cause'	'contrib1'	'contrib2'	'defect'	'dir_trvl'
ca12veh	2012	veh	293992	29	'ACCYR'	'CASENO'	'CAUSE'	'CONTRIB1'	'CONTRIB2'	'DEFECT'	'DIR_TRVL'
ca13veh	2013	veh	301104	29	'ACCYR'	'CASENO'	'CAUSE'	'CONTRIB1'	'CONTRIB2'	'DEFECT'	'DIR_TRVL'
ca14veh	2014	veh	307395	29	'ACCYR'	'CASENO'	'CAUSE'	'CONTRIB1'	'CONTRIB2'	'DEFECT'	'DIR_TRVL'



Choosing the Rows and Columns

Facilities





The Countermeasure Matrix

ALL PROPERTY AND	Control Type						Unsi	ignalized													Signal	lized						
Intersections, Zone:ALL, Road:	# of Lanes - Main				> 3					<= 3							> 3							41	3			
Conventional/One-way city street	# of Lanes - Cross	1	>3	3		<	× 3					<= 3				> 3			<* 3	-		>	3			<= 3		
	AADT - Main	>=	50,000	< 50,0	000	>= 50,000	50,000 < 50,000 >= 50,000 < 50,000					>= 50,000 < 50,000		< 50,000	>= 50,	,000,	< 50,	000	>= 50,000	< 50	,000	>= 50	,000	< 50	,000,	>= 50,000	<	50,000
ALL Districts	AADT - Cross	>=12,000	<12,000	>=12,000 <	12,000	=12,000 <12,000	>=12,000 <12,00	00 >=12,0	<12,000	>=12,000 <12,0	00 >=12	2,000 <1	12,000 >=12,	000 <12,000	>=12,000	<12,000	>=12,000	<12,000 >	=12,000 <12,00	0 >=12,000	<12,000	>=12,000	12,000	>=12,000	<12,000	>=12,000 <12,0	0 >=12,0	00 <12,000
		1		-					- 13	1		-	1	6			-	_									-	
# of Intersecti	ions	0	3	3	28	0 284	10 365	9 0	0	0 2	1 0	0	5 18	10611	55	49	186	264	14 116	69	1129	0	0	30	41	0 2	36	478
Pedestrian Movements	Primary Collision Factors					4 A		в			С	D	E	F	G		н	1	J	K	L	M	N	C				
	Influence of Alcohol						Count		curor.		1								1	1.007	tions							
	Following too close					1	Count	erniea	sures				_		_				_	LUCA	luons			-				
Xing Xwalk - Intersection	Failure to Yield	-																										
	Improper Turn	-											Internet	Midblock	Along	Eve	or of the last			Unciroali	High	Low	High	Low				
	Other Violations										Urban	Rural	I .	- Wildbildek	- Milling		-		Signalized		design	design		COW.				
	Influence of Alexhol												ions	Crossing	roadwa	ays y/F	Freeway			zed	speed	speed	volume	e volu				
	Enflowing too date																											
	Failure to Yield					-										_												
Xing Xwalk – Not Intersection	Improper Turn					3 1 Insta	ll sidewalks	and w	alkways		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
	Speeding					4 14 Wide	n sidewalks				Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
	Other Violations					- EQ Main	tain a cideu	alk lov	al acros	c the	v	v	N	N	v		N	v	N	N	v	v	v	v				
	Influence of Alcohol					5 JS Wall	tain a sidev		er acros	suie	1	1	IN	IN	1	_	IN .	-	IN	IN .		1	1	1				
	Following too close					6 18 insta	ll bike lanes	5			Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Ving - Not Ywalk	Failure to Yield					7 2 Curb	ramps				Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Aing - Not Awark	Improper Turn					11 Curb	outonsions				V	NI	V	v	N		N	v	V	v	N	v	V	v				
	Speeding					8 II Curb-	extensions				T	IN	T	T	IN	-	IN	T	T	T	IN	T	T	1				
	Other Violations					3 23 Curb	radius redu	ction			Y	N	Y	N	N		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y				
	Influence of Alcohol					10 3 Mark	ed crosswa	lks at s	ignalize	d	Y	N	Y	N	N		Ν	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y				
	Following too close					. C Marele	ad as a sum	lin at	ne lene li	and	v		v				NI	v	NI	v	V	v	v	v				
Roadway - Include Shoulder	Failure to Yield	-				11 O IVIAIK	ed crosswal	iks at u	insignati	zeu	T	IN	T	IN	IN	_	N	T	IN	T	T	T	T	T				
- 10	Improper Ium					12 12 mark	ed crosswal	ks at m	nidblock	crossings	Y	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y				
	Other Violations					13 4 Non-r	notorist gui	ding si	ens		Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
	Influence of Alcohol					E unersta					v	NI	v	v	v		N	v	N	v	v	v	v	v				
	Following too close					14 D warnin	ng signs for mo	otorists		arning sign, SPEED	T	IN	T	T	T	-	IN	T	IN	T	T	T	T	1				
100000000000000000000000000000000000000	Failure to Yield					15 53 Adult	Crossing G	uards			Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Not in Roadway	Improper Turn					16 52 Schoo	ol zone signi	als			Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
	Speeding					a E4 Safe a	outes to sel	hool			v	NI	v	v	v		N	v	v	v	V	v	v	v				
	Other Violations					11 J4 Jale 1	outes to ser	1001			T	IN	1	1	1	_	IN	1	1		1	1	I	-				
	Influence of Alcohol					18 7 Advar	nced "STOP"	marki	ngs		Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
	Following too close					19 44 Advar	nced stop li	ne			Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Approach/Leave School Bus	Failure to Yield	-				AE Sign	Stop have fo	or pode	stringe"		v	NI	v	v	NI.		N	v	N	v	v	v	v	v				
	Improper Turn					20 45 Sign	stop nere it	or peue	surians		T	IN	I	T	IN	_	IN	T	IN	T	T	T	T	T				
	Speeding																											
	Other violations				_															_					_			
SUMMARY	1																											
District # or All	AU																											
UNSTITUT & OF AM	ALL																											
Total B of conducting to the	1202																											
rotal # of crashes in district	1302																											
# of Null crashes (not counted)	125																											



Collaborative Sciences Center for ROAD SAFETY









Different Matrices Reveal Different Insights



Bicycle-involved matrix for intersection crashes in California (2010-2011)



Pedestrian-involved matrix for intersection crashes in California (2010-2011)



⊟4 way St	to 🗆 2 way St	op signs											☐Yield signs	■ No controls		Grand Total
2+2	2+2	∃ 3+2	- 4+1	4+2		□5+0	∃5+2	− 5+4	−6+2		−6+3	8+2	2+2	2+1	⊇2+2	
<= 50000	<= 50000	<= 5000	0 <= 50000	<= 50000	> 50000	<= 50000	<= 50000	> 50000	<= 50000	> 50000	<= 50000	> 50000	<= 50000	<= 50000	<= 50000	
		2														3
		2		2	2				2			1				15
	1	12	5	1 28	3 1	L		1 1	. 10	1	L	1			1	<mark>1</mark> 158
		2		2	2											10
		2		-	1				1							10
																2
	1	16	5	2:	1	1	L							1	L 1	1 96
		3		3	3						1		1			13
		2	1	2	2 1	L								_		19
	2	41	11	1 59	9 2	2 1	L :	1 1	13	1	L 1	. 2	. 1	. 1	ι 2	2 326

Left portion of the non-PDO auto-only matrix for intersection crashes in California (2010-2011)



Right portion of the non-PDO auto-only matrix for intersection crashes in California (2010-2011)



Trade-offs when setting safety screening priorities:

Inclusive approach	Restrictive approach
Capturing all potential systemic safety challenges	Higher cost-effectiveness
Lower cost-effectiveness	Potentially missing valuable safety- improving opportunities



Summary

- Data-driven methodology to identify recurring safety concerns within a road network, by identifying the crash profiles that are associated with certain roadway features
- Flexible enough to allow agencies with varying degrees of data availability to implement it—regardless of the level of performance their data management systems
- Provide aggregate information on the crashes that occurred to identify systemic hotspots, which then allows to target blanket improvements across an entire facility type.
- Support transition from existing practices in road safety to approaches such as safe systems



