

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN CENTER FOR TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH

Austin IAC Task 9 Implementing an Objective and Proactive Measure of Road Safety Performance for the Austin District

Hui Wu, Ph.D., P.E., Research Associate Michael R. Murphy, Ph.D., P.E., Research Engineer Zhanmin Zhang, Ph.D., Associate Professor Mike Arellano, P.E., District Pavement Engineer



Motivation (1/2)

- Newly built highway: i.e., SH 130 section 1-6
- Regression-to-the-mean bias



Source: FHWA, Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Manual



Motivation (2/2)

- Provide the Austin District with a method to identify locations for potential road safety improvements:
 - -Performance-based
 - -Proactive
 - -Reliable
 - -Effective



Road Safety Performance Indices (RSPIs)



Framework





Formulation of RSPIs (1/2)

- Road safety performance index for individual drivers (*RSPI*_{Ind}): reflect the average individual risk of each exposure on a homogenous roadway segment.
 - Crash history data
 - Highway system
 - Lane width, number of lanes
 - Shoulder, curb, median
 - Horizontal/vertical curve
 - Traffic, truck volume
 - Skid/condition scores
 - Crash costs by severity levels



Formulation of RSPIs (2/2)

- Road safety performance index of roadway sections

 (*RSPI_{Acu}*) : describe the collective risk which
 influences the reliability of service on a roadway
 segment :
 - Same factors in developing RSPI Ind
 - Exposure on roadway section (mil. vehicle-miles of travel)



Overview of the RSPIs tool

File	Edit	View	Bookmarks	Insert	Selection	Ge	oprocessing	Cu	stomize	Wir	ndows	Help	e e	Sen (3	як ка < 🔶	🏷 - 🛛	🖗 🚺 🤞	🔛 🛤	🗄 👷 📧	1 🔍 🖕	_
Table (Of Con	ntents			Ψ×				014 0				1								×	<u> </u>
8.							Λ++	rih	uto	T.	ahl	0	Severity		00.01	Collsn_Desc		Intrsct_Rel	Surt_Cond	Wthr_Cond	Rd_AI A	
18 6	\sim	۵					ALL	IN	ule		avi	C		3 5	SDON	E STRAIGHT-ONE LEFT TURN		INTERSECTION	WET	RAIN	STRAIGHT, LEVEL	
								2011		9775111	-90.0197.1		RED		SD ON	E STRAIGHT-ONE STOPPED	TITORN	INTERSECTION RELATED	WET	CLEAR	STRAIGHT GRADE	
	Layer				_		5.783	434	0.772 30.3	61099	-97.69810	3 NOT INJ	URED	4	ANGLE	E - ONE STRAIGHT-ONE LEFT	T TURN	INTERSECTION	WET	RAIN	STRAIGHT, LEVEL	
+	R	efMarker	r_Austin				15.518	436	0.474 30.3	52469	-97.79531	8 POSSIBI	LE INJURY	5	SD ON	E STRAIGHT-ONE STOPPED		NON INTERSECTION	WET	CLEAR	STRAIGHT, LEVEL	
+	🔽 Fa	atal Crasl	h Austin 2010-	-2014			0.829	466	0.743 29.8	70897	-97.8583	2 NOT INJ	URED	0	OMV \	/EHICLE GOING STRAIGHT		NON INTERSECTION	WET	RAIN	STRAIGHT, LEVEL	
		let West	her Crach Aug	tin 2010	-2014		0.009	562	50 30.	94085	-99.28252	6 NOT INJ	URED	0	OMV \	/EHICLE GOING STRAIGHT		NON INTERSECTION	WET	RAIN	CURVE, GRADE	
		rei_weat		5011_2010	-2014	ШH	1.436	570	0.772 30.1	10689	-97.30754	1 NOT INJ	URED	S	SD ON	E STRAIGHT-ONE STOPPED		INTERSECTION RELATED	WET	CLEAR	STRAIGHT, LEVEL	
+	✓ C	rash_Aus	stin_2010-2014				Select by	Attribu	tes					x		E STRAIGHT-ONE STOPPED		INTERSECTION RELATED	WET	RAIN	STRAIGHT, HILLCRES	
+		rash_Aus	stin_2003-2009							18 A	-					TH GOING STRAIGHT-REAR I	END	INTERSECTION RELATED	WET	RAIN	STRAIGHT LEVEL	
			uctin				Enter a	NHERE	clause to a	select re	ecords in th	ne table wir	ndow.			EHICLE GOING STRAIGHT	2.10	NON INTERSECTION	WET	RAIN	CURVE, LEVEL	
±		I III VO_AU	isun				Method								ON	E STRAIGHT-ONE STOPPED		INTERSECTION RELATED	WET	RAIN	STRAIGHT, GRADE	
+	G	eoHINI_A	Austin				Method	<u> </u>	eate a new	selecti	on			•	ON	E STRAIGHT-ONE RIGHT TUR	RN	INTERSECTION RELATED	WET	RAIN	STRAIGHT, LEVEL	
	🗹 🛚 🛛	SPIs_ACU	J_Lc				RRI_I	d_Pr						- T	BO	TH GOING STRAIGHT-SIDESV	WIPE	NON INTERSECTION	WET	RAIN	STRAIGHT, LEVEL	
_	_		- ulc				RRI_I	d_NB							ON	E STRAIGHT-ONE STOPPED	END.	INTERSECTION RELATED	WET	CLOUDY	STRAIGHT, LEVEL	_
							RRI_A	cu_Lc								F STRAIGHT-REAR I	END	INTERSECTION	WET		STRAIGHT, LEVEL	
	-	-0.0 - 2.0)				RRI_A	cu_Pr						=		E STRAIGHT-ONE STOFFED		NON INTERSECTION	WET	RAIN	CURVE, LEVEL	
	-	2.1 - 4.0)				RRI_4	cu_NB						-	ON	E STRAIGHT-ONE STOPPED		INTERSECTION RELATED	WET	CLOUDY	STRAIGHT, LEVEL	
		41-60)		E			\square							GLI	- ONE STRAIGHT-ONE LEFT	T TURN	INTERSECTION	WET	RAIN	STRAIGHT, LEVEL	
		C 1 0.0	, ,					\sim	Like	0				Â	V V	/EHICLE GOING STRAIGHT		NON INTERSECTION	WET	RAIN	STRAIGHT, LEVEL	
	. –	-0.1 - 8.0)					>=	And										1. No.			200
	-	8.1 - 10	.0					\equiv				orv			R	1 - T 🔝		A LAN				
Ŧ		SPIs ACU	J Pr				<	< =	Or		Qu	CIY			13	and the second s	بالعادي		¥ -1			
			Dr					\square	Not	0.263	543			-			S 🕇 🍂 🗖					
±			_F1						INOL					*							1	
+	R:	SPIs_IND	Lc				ls			Get U	nique Valu	es Go To	D:			Hanna	7	SAN T 74	arop 📥	e 🖅	- V	\sim
+		MIS_Sco	res_Austin_201	0-2014			SELECT	• FROM	I RSPIs_C	G_Austi	in_V5 WH	ERE:						S. S. X. 1	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		i i i	
+	🗹 Ti	raffic					"RRI_/	cu_Lc"	> 8										J_277	·		
+	R	TE Austi	n																- /			
Ŧ		– /ater lak	e Polv Austin														- <u>6</u>	Wells .				
Ŧ	۲ N	/ater Stri	m In Austin											-			- X (2)	$\sim c$	y			
		aseman					Clea		Verify		Help	Load	Save	e		• •						
			Austin						- 1													
+			Austin									Apply	Clos	e								
+	ЦН	uP_inven	tory_Austin														/					
+		XDOT_R	OUTE_RTE_LN_	Austin																		
+		XDOT_R	TE_RDBD_LN_E	OY_2010)_Austi																	
+		XDOT_R	TE_RDBD_LN_E	OY_2010)_Austi												1					
	~ ^		1.1.1 2010 00	N.4									1 1				$\langle \cdot \rangle$					· ·
× [P	ا تقار	101															P







Evaluating a Specific Measure

Empirical Bayes Before-After Study on

Safety Effect of Narrow Pavement

Widening Projects

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN CENTER FOR TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH





Background and Motivation

- Texas -- 40,000 lane-miles narrow two-lane FM/RM roads
- Crash rate -- 108.4 per 100 million VMT in 2012
- Crashes happed on these roads -- relative high risk of fatal, run-off-the-road (ROR), head-on (HO) crashes





Objectives

- To investigate if narrow pavement widening projects can improve overall traffic safety or reduce for the risks of certain *types* and/or *severity* levels of crashes;
- To quantify the impact, if they are significant.
 - Treatment Effect
 - Exposure Effect
 - o Trend Effect
 - Random Effect



Before-After Study



Source: FHWA, Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Manual



Data Description

- 22 Narrow Widening (NW) projects in Austin rural areas from 2004 to 2011
 - Average length of 3.54 miles
 - Crash data from 2003 to 2012
 - For each project, a minimum of 12 months of crash data was available for the before/after periods
- **Reference group**: 1,585 roadway segments with similar characteristics as the 22 NW projects



Before-after Analysis Results (1/2)

	All	ROR	НО
# of crashes in after period	287	147	10
Expected crashes in after period without widening (STDV)	418.7 (22.1)	228.6 (15.6)	22.4 (4.4)
% reduction in crashes (STDV)	31.5 (5.4)	35.7 (6.8)	55.4 (15.4)
Index of effectiveness (STDV)	0.68 (0.05)	0.64 (0.07)	0.43 (0.15)



- Expected crashes during after period without widening
- Count of crashes during after period



Before-after Analysis Results (2/2)

	All	F+I	Injury	PDO
# of crashes in after period	287	127	120	146
Expected crashes in after period without widening (STDV)	418.7 (22.1)	180.2 (15.8)	173.2 (12.7)	213.6 (15.1)
% reduction in crashes (STDV)	31.5 (5.4)	29.5 (8.7)	30.7 (8.0)	31.7 (7.4)
Index of effectiveness (STDV)	0.68 (0.05)	0.70 (0.09)	0.69 (0.08)	0.68 (0.07)



- Expected crashes during after period without widening
- Count of crashes during after period



Conclusions

- Project and forecast road safety management efforts under Department policy goals
- Screen the network to identify sites for treatment
- Monitor the effectiveness of safety actions applied
- Easily integrate safety analysis in the current pavement management system



