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Member of the SNC-Lavalin Group

## Performance Based Practical Design/Data Driven Safety Analysis

Module 1 - What is DDSA

Session Starts at 10 am

Welcome

## Instructors




Mark Bott, PE
Engineer of Traffic and Safety
Michigan Department of Transportation
517-335-2625
BottM@michigan.gov
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## Agenda

- Welcome
- Intro from MDOT to set the stage
- Intro to DDSA - What is DDSA; HSM vs traditional safety analysis vs systemic
- Intro to DDSA - examples
- Break
- The HSM - What is the HSM and how it works, HSM performance measures, and examples
- HSM examples
- Wrap-up
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Intro from MDOT
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Introduction to DDSA

What is DDSA?

## Data Driven

Safety Analysis
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## What is DDSA?



Using tools to analyze crash and roadway data to predict the safety impacts of highway projects allows agencies to target investments with more confidence and reduce severe crashes on the roadways.
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## Safety Data Analysis



Crash Data
Collection


Spot vs. Systemic


Predictive/HSM
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## Crash Data Collection

## Crash Data Collection



## Crash Data Collection



## Crash Data Collection
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## Spot vs. Systemic

## Clusters of Traffic Crashes



## Distributed Traffic Crashes



## Distributed Traffic Crashes



## Spot vs. Systemic

## Clusters of Crashes $\rightarrow$ Spot

## Distributed Crashes $\rightarrow$ Systemic
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## Spot Analysis

## Similar Intersections

## Study Intersection
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## Spot Analysis

| Intersection Details |  | Traffic Volumes |  | Traffic Crashes |  |  | Crash Type Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minor | Configuration | Major | Minor | FI | PDO | TOT | Single | Head On | Angle | Rear <br> End | $\begin{aligned} & \text { S.S. } \\ & \text { Same } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { S.S. } \\ & \text { Opp. } \end{aligned}$ |
| Minor 1 | Three Leg Stop | 17,600 | 2,500 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 56\% | 0\% | 33\% | 11\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Minor 2 | Three Leg Stop | 17,600 | 2,500 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 10\% | 20\% | 40\% | 20\% | 10\% | 0\% |
| Minor 3 | Three Leg Stop | 17,600 | 2,500 | 6 | 7 | 13 | 8\% | 0\% | 77\% | 15\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Minor 4 | Four Leg Signal | 20,250 | 5,650 | 27 | 58 | 85 | 4\% | 2\% | 31\% | 56\% | 4\% | 4\% |
| Minor 5 | Three Leg Stop | 19,900 | 1,250 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 0\% | 33\% | 33\% | 17\% | 0\% | 17\% |
| Minor 6 | Four Leg Signal | 19,050 | 7,640 | 13 | 75 | 88 | 3\% | 2\% | 35\% | 50\% | 9\% | 0\% |
| Minor 7 | Four Leg Stop | 18,200 | 800 | 2 | 17 | 19 | 5\% | 0\% | 68\% | 11\% | 11\% | 5\% |
| Minor 8 | Four Leg Stop | 18,200 | 1,250 | 11 | 26 | 37 | 3\% | 3\% | 78\% | 11\% | 5\% | 0\% |
| All Corrid | tersections | 18,550 | 3,011 | 66 | 201 | 267 | 6\% | 3\% | 44\% | 39\% | 6\% | 2\% |
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## Spot Analysis - Collision Diagram



$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\longrightarrow & \text { - Rear-end } \\
\longrightarrow & \text { - Head-on } \\
\longrightarrow & \text { - Left/Right Rear-end } \\
\longrightarrow & \text { - Sideswipe Same Direction } \\
\longrightarrow & \text { - Angle } \\
\longrightarrow & \text { - Left-turn Head-on } \\
\longrightarrow & \text { - Left/Right Turn } \\
\longrightarrow & \text { - Single Vixed Object }
\end{array}
$$

## Spot Analysis
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## Spot Analysis
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## Example Spot Improvement



## Example Spot Improvement



## Systemic Analysis

Table 4: Percentage Distribution of Lane Departure Crashes by County, 2010-2014

| Location | Crashes | Fatalities | A-injuries | K\&A |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Alger | $34 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $69 \%$ |
| Baraga | $24 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| Chippewa | $27 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| Delta | $16 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| Dickinson | $14 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Gogebic | $32 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| Houghton | $25 \%$ | $82 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| Iron | $23 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Keweenaw | $40 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $64 \%$ |
| Luce | $26 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
| Mackinac | $30 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| Marquette | $24 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| Menominee | $18 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $54 \%$ |
| Ontonagon | $20 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $52 \%$ |
| Schoolcraft | $23 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Upper Peninsula | $23 \%$ | $\mathbf{6 2 \%}$ | $53 \%$ | $54 \%$ |
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## Systemic Analysis - Comparisons

| Fatal and Severe Injury Crashes (2007-2011) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent by Jurisdiction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Systemic Analysis - Crash Tree <br> BONNER COUNTY, IDAHO

2014 to 2018 Crash Data Overview for All Emphasis Areas
Local System - Major Collector Roadways and Local Roads

Level 1: K, A, B, C, PDO Crashes
Level 2 Severities: $K, A$ Crashes Emphasis Area: All Emphasis Areas Highlighted Text: Largest proportion in category level


## CRASH TYPE

 ABBREVIATIONSRE: Rear End
FO+OVT: Fixed Object and
OV: Fixed
Overturned
HO: Head-On SOD+SSD: Sideswipe Opposite Direction and Sideswipe
Same Direction
ANM:Animal
PED: Pedestrian
PDC: Pedalcyclist Other: Other Non-Collision/Other ObjectParked Car/Train/ Unknown
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| Grash Type Breakdown |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| ANG | 13 | $10 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| RE | 3 | $2 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| FO+OVT | 10 | $8 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| HO | 3 | $2 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| SOD+SSD | 11 | $9 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| ANM | 1 | $1 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| PED | 2 | $1 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| PDC | 5 | $4 \%$ | 1 | $50 \%$ |
| Other | 80 | $63 \%$ | 1 | $50 \%$ |


| Crash Type Breakdown |  |  |  |  | Crash Type Breakdown |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ANG | 42 | 65\% | 0 | 0\% | ANG | 5 | 2\% | 0 | 0\% |
| RE | 2 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | RE | 9 | 4\% | 2 | 13\% |
| FO+OVT | 3 | 5\% | 0 | 0\% | FO+OVT | 131 | 62\% | 10 | 67\% |
| H0 | 5 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | H0 | 12 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% |
| SOD+SSD | 5 | 7\% | 0 | 0\% | SOD+SSD | 19 | 9\% | 0 | 0\% |
| ANM | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | ANM | 18 | 9\% | 0 | 0\% |
| PED | 3 | 5\% | 0 | 0\% | PED | 2 | 1\% | 2 | 13\% |
| PDC | 3 | 5\% | 0 | 0\% | PDC | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Other | 2 | 3\% | 0 | 0\% | Other | 14 | 7\% | 1 | 7\% |


| Grash Type Breakdown |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| ANG | 14 | $27 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| RE | 4 | $8 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| FO+OVT | 20 | $38 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| H0 | 1 | $2 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| SOD+SSD | 7 | $13 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| ANM | 2 | $4 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| PED | 1 | $2 \%$ | 1 | $100 \%$ |
| PDC | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Other | 3 | $6 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |

## Systemic Improvements -Rumble Strips
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## Systemic Improvements - Delineation
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## Systemic Strategies

## Lane Departure

1. Re-grading side slopes to $1: 4$, or flatter, to eliminate the need for guardrail
2. Guardrail improvements (SWA Funding eligible only)
3. Fixed object removal including clear zone widening, tree removal
4. Extending or modifying culvert ends to eliminate a fixed-objects in the clear zone
5. High-friction surface treatment (multi-location throughout Region)
6. Installing impact attenuators where one does not currently exist
7. Installing delineators as laid out in Standard Plan R-127
8. Installing channelization: quick curb, access management (right in/right out, etc.)
9. Installing curve warning signs: chevrons, target arrows with reflective sign post strips
10. Eliminate edge drop-offs/rutting using Safety Edge installation
11. Construct centerline or shoulder rumble or mumble strips including widening shoulders to accommodate installation
12. Widen shoulders to decrease lane departure crashes
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## Systemic Strategies

## Intersections

1. Improvements to sight vision corners: tree/shrub removal, minimal site grading
2. Reflective sign post strips for horizontal alignment signs and /or stop, stop ahead, yield, or yield ahead signs.
3. Signing treatments for All Way Stop and Cross Traffic Does Not Stop Conditions as per SIGN-145-A

## Pedestrians

1. Road Diets- Restriping only with no pavement overlays or reconstruction. (Form 1629 still needs to be followed)
2. Pedestrian Refuge Islands
3. Special Emphasis Pedestrian

Crosswalk Markings as per PAVE-945
4. Rectangular Rapid Flashing

Beacon (RRFB) - Approval per the Crosswalk Guidance Document
5. Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (PHB) Approval per the Crosswalk Guidance Document
6. Gateway Treatment as per the R16 User Guide
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Five Minute Break

## Predictive Analysis/HSM

## Issues with Traditional Crash Analysis

HSM Addresses:

- Quality \& accuracy
- Reporting thresholds
- Frequency-severity
- Differences between jurisdictions
- Randomness and change
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## Natural Variability in Crash Frequency



Years

## Highway Safety Manual

- Predictive modeling (safety performance functions)
- Network screening
- Scenario analysis
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## HSM Performance Measures
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## HSM Analysis
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## Level of Service Safety



## Level of Service Safety

| LOSS Category | Category Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| I | Indicates a low potential for crash reduction |
| II | Indicates a low to moderate potential for crash reduction |
| III | Indicates a moderate to high potential for crash reduction |
| IV | Indicates a high potential for crash reduction |
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Applying DDSA on MDOT Projects

## MDOT DDSA Guidance

## Areas of Application

- Project development safety analysis
- Design Exceptions/Design Variances

Data Driven Safety Analysis (DDSA)
Guidance

## CMDOT <br> Michigan Department of Transportation

- Alternative analysis as part of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- Interstate Access Requests
- Performance Based Practical Design (PBPD)
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## Tier I - Maintenance/Safety Non-Pavement
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## Tier II - 3R Projects
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## Tier III - 3R (pavement only)
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## Tier IV - 4R or New Construction

TIER IV - 4R or New Construction
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## Design Exception Process

Design Exception Process


Develop new site-specific model using MDOT HSM spreadsheet, IHSDM or other appropriate safety crash analysis tool to quantify existing conditions Identify and evaluate potential design alternatives using MDOT HSM spreadsheet, IHSDM or other appropriate safety analysis tool to quantify potential safety performance impacts

Ensure potential design alternatives have limited safety and connectivity impact on non-motorized road users

Review all crash reports involving nonmotorized road users and ensure potential design alternatives have limited safety and connectivity impact
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## Upgrade to Existing vs. New Construction

Figure 2-15

## Preferred Alternative

Detroit River International Crossing Study


## Upgrade to Existing vs. New Construction

| Project Type | Type of Improvement | HSM Performance <br> Measure |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Maintenance | Upgrade to existing | Excess expected crashes |
| 3R | Upgrade to existing | Excess expected crashes |
| 3R (Pavement) | Upgrade to existing | Excess expected crashes |
| 4R | New construction | Predicted crashes |
| Design exception | Upgrade to existing | Excess expected crashes |
| Design exception | New construction | Predicted crashes |
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## Case Studies

## Case Study - US-31 in Grand Traverse County
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## Case Study - US-31 in Grand Traverse County

HSM Analysis for Intersections

| Intersection |  | Predicted Crashes |  |  | Expected Crashes |  |  | Excess Crashes per Year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Major | Minor | FI | PDO | Total | FI | PDO | Total | FI | PDO | Tot |
| US-31 | Five Mile Road | 0.54 | 2.22 | 2.75 | 0.12 | 3.54 | 3.66 | -0.42 | 1.32 | 0.91 |
| US-31 | Holiday Road | 0.10 | 1.27 | 1.37 | 0.47 | 6.99 | 7.46 | 0.37 | 5.72 | 6.09 |
| Overall |  | 0.64 | 3.49 | 4.12 | 0.59 | 10.53 | 11.12 | -0.05 | 7.04 | 7.00 |
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## Case Study - US-31 in Grand Traverse County

HSM Analysis for Segments

| Section |  | Predicted Crashes |  | Expected Crashes |  |  | Excess Crashes per |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | Cross-Section | FI | PDO | Total | FI | PDO | Total | FI | PDO | Tot |
| US-31 | Four-Lane <br> Multi-Vehicle | 5.58 | 33.48 | 39.06 | 2.59 | 7.38 | 9.97 | -2.99 | -26.1 | -29.09 |
| US-31 | Five-Lane Multi- <br> Vehicle | 5.46 | 21.6 | 27.06 | 1.46 | 6.17 | 7.63 | -4 | -15.43 | -19.43 |
| US-31 | Four-Lane <br> Single Vehicle | 0.72 | 7.41 | 8.13 | 0.88 | 8.90 | 9.78 | 0.16 | 1.49 | 1.65 |
| US-31 | Five-Lane <br> Single-Vehicle | 0.57 | 3.58 | 4.25 | 0.78 | 7.23 | 8.01 | 0.21 | 3.55 | 3.76 |
|  | Overall | $\mathbf{1 2 . 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 . 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 . 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 . 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{- 6 . 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{- 3 6 . 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{- 4 3 . 1 1}$ |
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## Case Study - M-129 in Chippewa County



## Case Study - M-129 in Chippewa County
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## Case Study - M-129 in Chippewa County
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## Case Study - I-94 in Jackson
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## Case Study - I-94 in Jackson
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## Case Study - I-94 in Jackson

| Location |  | Predicted crashes without treatment |  |  | Predicted crashes with treatment |  |  | Change in predicted crashes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FI | PDO | TOT | FI | PDO | TOT | FI | PDO | TOT |
| I-94 | Segment | 49.22 | 91.89 | 141.11 | 37.80 | 62.30 | 100.10 | 11.42 | 29.59 | 41.01 |
| US-127 | Segment | 7.12 | 12.21 | 19.33 | 10.59 | 17.29 | 27.88 | -3.47 | -5.08 | -8.55 |
| US-127/US-127BR/M-50 to EB I-94 | Ramp | 0.84 | 1.27 | 2.11 | 0.49 | 0.97 | 1.46 | 0.35 | 0.30 | 0.65 |
| WB I-94 to US-127 | Ramp | 0.57 | 1.01 | 1.58 | 0.66 | 1.04 | 1.70 | -0.09 | -0.03 | -0.12 |
| US-127/US-127BR/M-50 to EB I-94 | Ramp | 0.43 | 0.60 | 1.03 | 0.22 | 0.35 | 0.57 | 0.21 | 0.25 | 0.46 |
| EB I-94 to US-127BR/M-50 | Ramp | 0.30 | 0.40 | 0.70 | 0.14 | 0.20 | 0.34 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.36 |
| EB I-94 to Elm Ave | Ramp | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.21 | -0.04 | -0.07 | -0.11 |
| Elm Ave to EBI-94 | Ramp | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.19 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.25 | -0.01 | -0.05 | -0.06 |
| WB I-94 to Elm Ave | Ramp | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.25 | -0.05 | -0.05 | -0.10 |
| Elm Ave to WB I-94 | Ramp | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.11 | -0.03 | -0.02 | -0.05 |
| Elm Ave \& Carmen Dr | Intersection | 0.65 | 1.97 | 2.62 | 0.18 | 0.47 | 0.65 | 0.47 | 1.50 | 1.97 |
| Elm Ave \& Rosehill Rd/Seymour Rd | Intersection | 1.41 | 4.07 | 5.48 | 0.56 | 1.55 | 2.11 | 0.85 | 2.52 | 3.37 |
| Elm Ave \& Barrett Ln/Blake Rd | Intersection | 0.18 | 0.47 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 1.97 | 2.62 | -0.47 | -1.50 | -1.97 |
| TOTAL |  | 60.94 | 114.17 | 175.11 | 51.64 | 86.61 | 138.25 | 9.30 | 27.56 | 36.86 |
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