

# Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Performance Functions for the Highway Safety Manual (NCHRP 17-84)

# **Research Team**

MRIGlobal Larson Institute SafeTREC Abley, NZ

**Texas A&M Transportation Institute** 

Transportation Research Center



1/10/2023

# Agenda

- Background
- Research objective and scope
- Review details and results of primary work plans
- Conclusions and recommendations
- Spreadsheet tools
- Future research

# Background

- The Highway Safety Manual (HSM) is the premier guidance document for incorporating quantitative safety analysis in the highway transportation project development process
- HSM Part C models are most suited for estimating expected frequencies of motor-vehicle crashes, excluding pedestrian and bicycle crashes
- Explicit consideration of pedestrian and bicycle safety is critical for implementation of future editions of the HSM



# **Research Objective and Scope**

- Objective
  - Develop pedestrian and bicycle SPFs for transportation practitioners at all levels to better inform planning, design, and operations decisions
- Scope
  - Develop pedestrian and bicycle SPFs for:
    - Roadway segments and intersections
    - Rural and urban areas

# **Primary Work Plans**

- Develop Pedestrian and Bicycle SPFs Incorporating Available Pedestrian and Bicycle Exposure Data
- Develop Pedestrian and Bicycle Models Based on Road Assessment Program (RAP) Methodology
- Develop Pedestrian and Bicycle Models in the Absence of Pedestrian and Bicycle Exposure Data

#### Development of Pedestrian and Bicycle Models Incorporating Available Pedestrian and Bicycle Exposure Data

- Focused on developing pedestrian and bicycle SPFs for roadway segments and intersections in urban/suburban areas, for which exposure, crash, and inventory data were available
- Collected inventory, traffic volume, pedestrian and bicycle volume, and crash data in two urban/suburban areas:
  - Minneapolis (MN)
    - Database included up to 13 yrs of data (2006 2018)
  - Philadelphia (PA)
    - Database included up to 6 yrs of data (2013 2018)

# **Data Collection – Site Characteristics (Roadway Segments)**

#### General Segment Elements

- Presence of lighting
- Posted speed limit
- Median type
- Median width
- Presence of traffic calming

- No. of driveways
- No. of bus/transit stops
- No. of schools
- No. of alcohol sales establishments

#### **Directional Elements**

- Number of travel lanes
- Width of travel lanes
- Shoulder width
- Parking lane width
- Bicycle facility types
  - Type of protection
  - Buffer width
  - Lane width
  - One-way vs two-way
  - Colored pavement

- Shared use path
  - Path width
  - Buffer width
- Sidewalks
  - Width
  - Buffer width
  - Type of protection
- Midblock Crossings
  - Control type
  - Advanced yield/stop lines
  - Crossing length

# **Data Collection – Site Characteristics (Intersections)**

#### **General Intersection Elements**

- Number of legs
- Control type
- Lighting
- Overhead flashing beacon

- School zone
- No. of bus/transit stops
- No. of schools
- No. of alcohol sales establishments

#### Elements by Leg (Inbound and Outbound)

- Width of through lanes
- Width of left-turn lanes
- Width right-turn lanes
- Presence of right-turn channelizing islands
- Parking lane width
- Outside shoulder width
- Inside shoulder width
- Median type / width
- Bike lane width / buffer width

- Type of left-turn or right-turn operations
- Presence of colored pavement for bike lanes
- Presence of bike box
- Presence of crosswalk
- Crosswalk type
- Total crosswalk length
- Presence of median refuge island
- Presence of shared-use path crossing
- Presence of advance yield/stop lines
- Posted speed limit

# Pedestrian and Bicycle Exposure Data

Developed direct demand models to obtain pedestrian and bicycle ٠ exposure for study sites in database

 $Ped \ or \ Bike \ Volume = f \left( \begin{array}{c} sociodemographics \\ land \ use \\ street \ network \end{array} \right)$ transit access etc.

- Developed models at multiple scales
  - e.g. Population within 0.5, 0.25, and 0.1 miles

# Develop Pedestrian and Bicycle SPFs using Available Exposure Data

- Models for urban roadway segments
  - Two lane roads
  - Four lane roads (divided and undivided)
  - One-way roads (1-ln, 2-ln, and 3-ln)
- Models for urban intersections
  - Three-leg stop controlled
  - Three-leg signalized
  - Four-leg stop controlled
  - Four-leg signalized (2×2 and 2×1)
- Severity levels
  - All injuries
  - Fatal and serious
- Exposure only and expanded models (i.e., include adjustment factors)

# Final Pedestrian SPF (Two-Lane Undivided Roadway Segments) (2U)



Two-Lane Undivided Roads (2U) (Expanded Model) vs HSM

# Final Bicycle SPF (Two-Lane Undivided Roadway Segments) (2U)



Two-Lane Undivided Roads (2U) (Expanded Model) vs HSM

# **Adjustment Factors for Segment Models**

- Pedestrian models:
  - Presence of sidewalk buffer
  - Lane width
  - Presence of a median
  - Speed limit (greater than 25 mph)
  - Number of lanes (one-way roads)
  - Number of bus stops within 1,000 ft
  - Number of schools within 1,000 ft
  - Number of liquor establishments within 1,000 ft
- <u>Bicycle</u> models
  - Presence of a buffered bike lane
  - Lane width
  - Presence of a median
  - Speed limit (greater than 25 mph)
  - Number of lanes (one-way roads)
  - Number of bus stops within 1,000 ft
  - Number of schools within 1,000 ft
  - Number of liquor establishments within 1,000 ft

## Adjustment Factors for Intersection Models (4SG 2×2):

- <u>Pedestrian</u> models
  - Right turn on red
  - Type of left-turn signal phasing
  - Number of liquor establishments within 1,000 ft
- <u>Bicycle</u> models:
  - Presence of bicycle facilities entering the intersection
  - Type of left-turn signal phasing
  - Number of schools within 1,000 ft

#### Development of Pedestrian and Bicycle Models Incorporating Available Pedestrian and Bicycle Exposure Data (Summary)

- Pedestrian and bicycle SPFs were developed for potential consideration in urban/suburban arterial predictive chapter and network screening chapter of HSM2
- Three levels of models were developed:
  - Reduced model to estimate total ped/bike crashes
  - Expanded model to estimate total ped/bike crashes
  - Reduced model to estimate FS ped/bike crashes
- Comparisons of new pedestrian and bicycle SPFs with existing Part C models showed that several models may not be compatible with existing HSM models
- Calibration of new pedestrian and bicycle SPFs will be critical for compatibility with existing HSM models

# Develop Pedestrian and Bicycle Models Based on Road Assessment Program (RAP) Methodology

# Summary of the RAP Prediction Model

- Developed by the International Road Assessment Program over the period since 2006
  - Development overseen by iRAP's Global Technical Committee
  - Based on best knowledge from international research literature
  - Applied in at least 70 countries since 2008
- Predicts fatalities and serious injuries per year for a road network based on roadway characteristics data for 100-m road segments
- Separate predictions for:
  - Vehicle occupants
  - Motorcyclists
  - Pedestrians
  - Bicyclists

# Separate Predictive Models by Crash Type

#### VEHICLE-PEDESTRIAN MODELS

Roadway Segments:

- Pedestrian movements along the left side of the road
- Pedestrian movements along the right side of the road
- Pedestrian movements crossing the road at a midblock location

#### VEHICLE-BICYCLE MODELS

Roadway Segments:

Bicycle movements along the road

Intersections:

 Pedestrian movements crossing each leg of an intersection Intersections:

Bicycle movements **through** an intersection

# General Form of Roadway Segment Model for Vehicle-Pedestrian Crashes

$$N_{pedr} = \left( N_{alongleft-ped} + N_{alongright-ped} + \sum_{x=1}^{n} N_{midcrossing-ped} \right) \times FT_{pedr} \times C_{pedr}$$

<sup>1</sup> N pedr	N	pedr
---------------------	---	------

- N<sub>alongleft-ped</sub>
- N<sub>alongright-ped</sub>
- N<sub>midcrossing-ped</sub>

FT<sub>pedr</sub>  $C_{pedr}$ n

- = predicted number of vehicle-pedestrian crashes per year for all crash severity levels combined
- = predicted number of vehicle-pedestrian crashes per year involving pedestrian movements along the left side of the road for a specific roadway segment
- = predicted number of vehicle-pedestrian crashes per year involving pedestrian movements along the right side of the road for a specific roadway segment
- = predicted number of vehicle-pedestrian crashes per year involving pedestrians crossing the road at a specific midblock location on a specific roadway segment
- = facility type factor for vehicle-pedestrian crashes
- = calibration factor for vehicle-pedestrian crashes
- = maximum number of midblock crossing locations within a specific roadway segment

## Vehicle-Pedestrian Crash Prediction Model for Pedestrian Movements Along the Left Side of the Road

 $N_{alongleft-ped} = Likelihood_{alongleft-ped} \times Severity_{alongleft-ped} \\ \times MVTSF_{along-ped} \times MVTFF_{along-ped} \times PFF_{alongleft} \times \left(\frac{L}{0.0622}\right)$ 

Likelihood<br/>alongleft-ped=Severity<br/>alongleft-ped=MVTSF<br/>alongleft-ped=MVTFF<br/>along-ped=PFF<br/>alongleft=L=

crash likelihood adjustment factor for vehicle-pedestrian crashes involving pedestrian movements along the **left side of the road** for a specific roadway segment crash severity adjustment factor for vehicle-pedestrian crashes involving pedestrian movements along the **left side of the road** for a specific roadway segment motor-vehicle traffic speed factor for traffic along the **left side of the road** for a specific roadway segment motor-vehicle traffic flow factor for traffic along the **left side of the road** for a specific roadway segment motor-vehicle traffic flow factor for traffic along the **left side of the road** for a specific roadway segment pedestrian flow factor for pedestrian flow along the **left side of the road** for a specific roadway segment length (mi) of a specific roadway segment

## Vehicle-Pedestrian Crash Prediction Model for Pedestrian Movements Along the Left Side of the Road

 $N_{alongleft-ped} = Likelihood_{alongleft-ped} \times Severity_{alongleft-ped} \\ \times MVTSF_{along-ped} \times MVTFF_{along-ped} \times PFF_{alongleft} \times \left(\frac{L}{0.0622}\right)$ 

$$AFs - \begin{cases} Likelihood_{alongleft-ped} = \\ Severity_{alongleft-ped} = \\ \\ MVTSF_{alongleft-ped} = \\ \\ MVTFF_{along-ped} = \\ \\ \\ \\ L = \\ \end{cases}$$

crash likelihood adjustment factor for vehicle-pedestrian crashes involving pedestrian movements along the **left side of the road** for a specific roadway segment crash severity adjustment factor for vehicle-pedestrian crashes involving pedestrian movements along the **left side of the road** for a specific roadway segment motor-vehicle traffic speed factor for traffic along the **left side of the road** for a specific roadway segment motor-vehicle traffic flow factor for traffic along the **left side of the road** for a specific roadway segment pedestrian flow factor for pedestrian flow along the **left side of the road** for a specific roadway segment pedestrian flow factor for pedestrian flow along the **left side of the road** for a specific roadway segment length (mi) of a specific roadway segment

# **Factors in Portion of Models Analogous to SPFs**

	Vehi	cle-Pedestrian Cra	Vehicle-Bicycle Crashes			
Factors	Along the road	Midblock crossing	Intersection crossing	Along the road	Through an intersection	
Motor-vehicle traffic speed factor	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
Motor-vehicle traffic flow factor	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	
Pedestrian flow factor	Х	Х	Х			
Bicycle flow factor				Х	Х	
Length of roadway segment	Х			Х		
Facility type factors	X			Х		
Calibration factors	X			Х		
Proportion of crashes by severity level	Х			Х		
Number of injuries per crash	Х			Х		

- SPFs are based on factors from published literature, not on negative binomial regression models
- EB procedure cannot be applied because the SPFs have no overdispersion parameters

#### Factors in Portion of Pedestrian Models Analogous to CMFs/AFs

Factor	Along the road	Midblock crossing	Intersection crossing
Presence of sidewalk/distance from traveled way	Х		
Presence and width of paved shoulder	Х		
Presence of school zone with warning signs	Х	Х	Х
Lane width	Х		
Horizontal curvature	Х		
Advance visibility of a curve	Х		
Percent grade	Х		
Presence and condition of delineation	Х		
Presence of shoulder rumble strips	Х		
Presence of vehicle parking	Х	Х	Х
Presence of street lighting	Х	Х	Х
Pedestrian crossing facility type		Х	Х
Advance visibility of a pedestrian crossing		Х	Х
Presence of pedestrian fencing		Х	Х
Number of lanes to be crossed		Х	Х
Median type and width		Х	Х
Intersection type			Х

#### Factors in Portion of Bicycle Models Analogous to CMFs/AFs

Factor	Along the road	Through an intersection
Presence and type of bicycle facilities	Х	Х
Presence and width of paved shoulder	Х	Х
Lane width	Х	
Horizontal curvature	Х	
Advance visibility of a curve	Х	
Presence and condition of delineation	Х	
Presence of shoulder rumble strips	Х	
Presence of vehicle parking	Х	
Presence of street lighting	Х	
Presence and type of pedestrian crossing facility		Х
Intersection type		Х
Advance visibility of an intersection		Х
Intersection channelization		Х

# Pedestrian Models (Two-Lane Undivided Roadway Segments) (2U)



#### Development of Pedestrian and Bicycle Models Based on RAP Methodology (Summary)

- Pedestrian and bicycle SPFs were developed for potential consideration in Part C predictive chapters of HSM2
- Modified RAP models appear compatible with existing HSM Part C models
  - Note: modified RAP models are based on peak-hour pedestrian and bicycle volumes
- Limitations of modified RAP models:
  - Cannot be directly applied with EB method
  - Do not address roundabouts

# Develop Regression Models for Pedestrians and Bicycles Based on Crash Data in the Absence of Pedestrian and Bicycle Volume Data

# Development of Pedestrian and Bicycle Models in the Absence of Pedestrian and Bicycle Volume Data

- Models were developed to estimate the potential of a pedestrian or bicycle crash occurring on various roadway segment and intersection types when the associated pedestrian or bicycle exposure data are not available
- Logistic regression models developed for:
  - Rural roadway segments (non-freeways)
  - Urban and suburban roadway segments (non-freeways)
  - Urban and suburban signalized intersections
- Models provide practitioners with a list of factors that either increase or decrease the potential for pedestrian and bicycle crashes
  - Results may be incorporated into forthcoming chapters on pedestrians and bicyclists and systemic safety management planned for HSM2

# **Conclusions and Recommendations**

- Pedestrian and bicycle SPFs presented herein have been developed for use in the HSM to help inform planning, design, and operation decisions by transportation practitioners at all levels
  - SPFs recommended for use in Part C chapters and network screening chapter of HSM2
- SPFs will likely need some level of calibration to be compatible with the existing HSM models for multiple- and single-vehicle crashes
- Results may be incorporated into forthcoming chapters on pedestrians and bicyclists and systemic safety management planned for HSM2

## **Spreadsheet Tools**

- Spreadsheet tools were updated to incorporation pedestrian and bicycle SPFs for use with HSM procedures
- Updated recent versions of HSM spreadsheet tools available from HSM website
  - Rural Two-Lane Roads Spreadsheet v3.0
    - Updated July 2019
  - Rural Multilane Highways Spreadsheet v3.0
    - Updated July 2019
  - Urban and Suburban Arterials Spreadsheet v3.11
    - Updated April 2020

# **Spreadsheet Tools (Rural Two-Lane)**

File Home Insert Draw Page Layout Formulas Data Review View Help	Acrobat						Comments	: 🖻 Share 👻
Cut Arial → 10 → A <sup>*</sup> A <sup>*</sup> = = → ≫ → ab Wrap Text	Number -	Comma 2 Norm	nal 2 Norma			∑ AutoSum ~ A		
	t v 0∠ s €0 .00 Conditional Format a	Bad Good	Neutr	ral –	Insert Delete Format	Fill × Sort & F	Find & Analyze Sensitivity	
V V Format Painter	Formatting ~ Table ~			Ť	· · ·	♦ Clear × Filter × S	elect ~ Data ~	
Clipboard 🖾 Font 🖾 Alignment	רש Number רש	Styles			Cells	Editing	Analysis Sensitivity	^
D63 💌 : X 🗸 $f_{\rm x}$ ='Ped&Bike (Segment Results)'!J44								~
A B C	D E F	G H	I.	J	К	L M	Ν	0
1								
2 Worksheet 1A General Ir	nformation and Input Data for Rural Two-I	ane Two-Way Road	way Segments	3				
3 General Information		Development		Location Inf	formation			
4 Analyst	(enter name)	Roadway Section			(enter roadwa	ay name)		
C Data Data mand	(enter agency)	Itoadway Section			(enter toadwa	y seculony		
o Date Penormed	(enter date)	Junsaiction			(enter jurisc			
1 Input Data		Rase Conditions			Site Conditions			
9 Length of segment 1 (mi)		Base Conditions			1			
10 AADT (veb/day)	$AADT_{wax} = 17.800$ (veh/day)				15,000			
11 Lane width (ft)	···· (voinday)	12			12			
12 Shoulder width (ft)		6	Right Shld:	6		Left Shld: 6		
13 Shoulder type		Paved	Right Shld:	Paved		Left Shld: Paved		
14 Length of horizontal curve (mi)		0			0.0			
15 Radius of curvature (ft)		0			0		Radius Value OK	
16 Spiral transition curve (present/not present)		Not Present			Not Present			
17 Superelevation variance (IVII)		< 0.01			0			
19 Driveway density (driveways/mile)		5	Spreadsheet Tools		5.00			
20 Centerline rumble strips (present/not present)		Not Present	spreadsneet roois		Not Present			
21 Passing lanes [present (1 lane) /present (2 lane) / not present)]		Not Present			Not Present			
22 Two-way left-turn lane (present/not present)		Not Present			Not Present			
23 Roadside hazard rating (1-7 scale)		3			3			
24 Segment lighting (present/not present)		Not Present			Not Present			
26 Calibration Eactor. Cr		1			1 00			
27					1.00			
Lise the "Ped& Pike (Segment	te)" Morkeboot to input data	to addrose p	odoctrian	and him		<b>c</b>		
Use the redablike (Segment	(s) worksheet to input data	to address pe	euesman	and bicy	cie comsion	5.		
28								
29								
30 Worksheet 1B Crash	Twodification Factors for Rural Two-Lane	Two-way Roadway	Segments	(10)	(11)	(10) (10)		
CME for Lane CME for shoulder Width and Dee CME for	CME for Super- CME for CME for	CME for CME for	CME for Two	CME for	CME for C	(12) (13) ME for Combined (	CME	
32 Mildth Horizontal	alevation Grades Driveway	Contorlin Passing	Way Loff Turn	Roadeido		tomated		
Instructions Segmen 1 Ped&Bike (Segments) Intersection_1 Ped&Bike (Intersection_1)	rsections) Ped&Bike (Segment Results) Pe	d&Bike (Intersection Results	s) Summary 1	Tables (Site Tota	ls) Summary Tabl	es (Project Total) Refe	rence Tables ( 🕀 🗄 🔳	•
Ready 🔀 Accessibility: Investigate						다ઝ Display Settings	▦ ▣ 罒	+ 120%

# Spreadsheet Tools (Rural Two-Lane) (cont.)

$\frac{1}{1000} \text{ mert} D \text{ for } Page Layot formata Data Revere View Neth Acobat Containing Factors Acobat Containing Fact$						
Non-wide and a construction of the section of the sectin of the section of the section of the section of the s	File	Home Insert Draw Page Layout Formulas Data Review	View Help Acrobat		P	Comments 🖻 Share 👻
Corpure       Control       Contro       Control       Control	<u>^</u>	$\bigwedge$ Cut $A_{\text{right}} = - \bigotimes_{n \to \infty} A_n A_n A_n = - \bigotimes_{n \to \infty} A_n A_n A_n A_n A_n A_n A_n A_n A_n A_n$	Wan Test	Comma 2 Normal 2 Normal	$\square$ AutoSum $\sim$ A $\square$ $\square$	
Print         Print <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>						
Ciple of the speed	Paste	Sormat Painter B I U ~ ⊞ ~ △ ~ △ ~ Ξ Ξ Ξ Ξ Ξ Ξ Ξ	Merge & Center ~ \$ ~ % 9 ← Conditional Form	nat as Bad Good Neutral Unsert	Delete Format Sort & Find & Analyze S	ensitivity
Number of through target and the state of the s	,		E Number E	Choles	Colle Editine Appluin (	
C         C         C         D         E           A         B         C         D         E         C		Cipboard isi Font isi Alignment	IS NUMBER IS	styles	Cells I Editing I Analysis I S	
A     B     C     D     E       1     A <td>C5</td> <td><math>\overline{}</math> : <math>\times</math> <math>\checkmark</math> <math>f_{\rm x}</math> 5000</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>~</td>	C5	$\overline{}$ : $\times$ $\checkmark$ $f_{\rm x}$ 5000				~
Note     Note     Note       2     Roadway:     Interstein (m)		В	с	D	F	
2     Roadway:     Readway:     Readway: <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	1					
2         KOdoway:         Intervention         Intervention <t< td=""><td></td><td>Deedway</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>		Deedway				
Image: space in the s	2	Roadway:				
4         Rodoway segment length (m)         1         1         1           6         Motor vehicle trafits (volume (veh/day (directional)         6         500           7         Peak hour pedestrian volume (veh/day (directional)         6         6         20         6         20         6         0         7         9         Notor vehicle speci (mi)         6         26	3		Left side of roadway	Right side of roadway		
6       Motor-vehicle traffic volume (veh/ydw) (directional)       6       5.000       5.000         6       Peak hour pedestrian volume (peds/rn) (ventextional)       26 to 50       26 to 25       6         7       Peak hour bicycle volume (bike/yh/) (includes both directions of travel combined)       26 to 50       26 to 25       6         8       Motor vehicle speed (mph)       0 ne Lane       0 ne Lane       6       6         9       Number of through traffic lanes       0 ne Lane       0 ne Lane       6 </td <td>4</td> <td>Roadway segment length (mi)</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td>	4	Roadway segment length (mi)	1		1	
6       Peak hour pedestrian volume (peds/hr) (directional)       0       6 to 25       0         7       Peak hour bickes /hr) (includes oth directions of trave (combine)       0       26 to 50       26 to 50       0         8       Motor vehicles peed (mph)       0	5	Motor-vehicle traffic volume (veh/day) (directional)	5,000		5,000	
Peak hour bicycle volume (bikes/hng (includes both directions of travel combined)       26 to 50       26 to 50         Motor volues peed (inph)       0 net are       0         Is Motor of through traffic lanes       0 net are       0         Is an width       Narrow (< 9 ft)	6	Peak hour pedestrian volume (peds/hr) (directional)	6 to 25	6	to 25	
Motor venuice speed (mpn)         Mo	1	Peak hour bicycle volume (bikes/hr) (includes both directions of travel combined)	26 to 50	26	to 50	
9     Number of through fraticianes     One Lane     One Lane       0     Lane width     Narrow (< 9 ft)	8	Motor vehicle speed (mph)	55	-	55	
Image: Instrume       Image: Instrume       Narrow (4 9 H)       Narrow (4 9 H)       Narrow (4 9 H)         Image: Instrume       Straight or gently curving (advisory speed >= 60 mph or curve radius >= 260 mph or cu	9	Number of through traffic lanes	One Lane	One Lane		
Important Curvature       Straight or gentry Curving (advisory speed >= b0 mph or Curve Fradius == b0 mph or Curve Fradius == b0 mph or Curve F	10	Lane width	Narrow (< 9 ft)	Narrow (<9 ft)		
Advanced visibility of a Curve       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)         Advanced visibility of a Curve       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)         Image: Advanced visibility of a Curve       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)         Image: Advanced visibility of a Curve       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)         Image: Advanced visibility of a Curve       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)         Image: Advanced visibility of a Curve       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)         Image: Advanced visibility of a Curve       Not present       Not present       Clearly visible         Image: Advanced visibility of a Curve       Not applicable (no horizontal Curve present)       Not present       Not present         Image: Advanced visibility of a Curve       Not applicable (no school zone at this location)         Image: Advanced Visibility of a Curve       Not applicable (no school zone at	11	Horizontal curvature	Straight or gently curving (advisory speed >= 60 mph or curve	Straight or gently curving (advisory speed >= 60 mph or curve radius >	2600 ft)	
image:	12	Advanced visibility of a curve	Not applicable (no norizontal curve present)	Not applicable (no norizontal curve present)		
a       Presence and conduction or definitation       cost or fretectivity (e.g., weat the of label) or abenin       Clearly visible       and conduction or definitation       and conduction or definitation       and conduction or definitation         5       Shoulder runble strips       Not present       Not present       and <7.9 ft	13	Percent grade	U% TO < 7.5%	0% t0 < 7.5%		
3       Shoulder function strips       Not present       Not present       Not present         4       School zone warning       Not applicable (no school zone at this location)       Not applicable (no schoo zone at this location)       Not applicable	14	Presence and condition of delineation	Not present	Clearly Visible		
a Subwark of parkets structure provision       parket structure provision	10	Silouider Fumble Strips	Not present Payod chould or procent with width $>= 2$ ft and $< 7.9$ ft	Payed should a procent with width $>= 2$ ft and $< 7.9$ ft		
Vehicle parking (Pedestrians)       Two sides       Non e         Vehicle parking (Pedestrians)       Two sides       Non e         Vehicle parking (Pedestrians)       Two sides       Non e         Street lighting       Not present       Image: Street lighting       Not present         Bicycle facilities and paved shoulder provision       Pedestrian Midblock Crossing       Not present       Image: Street lighting         Pedestrian Midblock Crossing       Number of Midblock Crossing       Image: Street lighting 2       Midblock Crossing 3       Midblock Crossing 4         Pedestrian Volume, midblock (ped/hr)       26 to 50       26 to 50       6 to 25       6 to 25         Location of pedestrian crossing       Locations other than schools       Locations other than schools       Locations other than schools       Locations other than schools	17	School zone warning	Not applicable (no school zone at this location)	Not applicable (no school zone at this location)		
Vehicle parking (Boyclist)       Two sides       Two sides       Two sides         Vehicle parking (Boyclist)       Two sides       Two sides       Image: Separated bicycle parking (Boyclist)         Vehicle parking (Boyclist)       Not present       Not present       Image: Separated bicycle parking (Boyclist)         Bicycle facilities and paved shoulder provision       Peed shoulder provision       Peed shoulder present with width >= 3 ft and <7.9 ft	18	Vehicle parking (Pedestrians)	Two sides	None		
Control of protecting       Not present       Not present         21       Bicycle facilities and paved shoulder provision       Paved shoulder present with width >= 3 ft and <7.9 ft	19	Vehicle parking (Fedesitians)	Two sides	Two sides		
21       Bicycle facilities and paved shoulder provision       Paved shoulder present with width >= 3 ft and <7.9 ft	20	Street lighting	Not present	Not present		
22       Pedestrian Midblock Crossing       Number of Midblock Crossing       0       Image: Constribution of the constributicon of the constributicon of the constribution o	21	Bicycle facilities and paved shoulder provision	Paved shoulder present with width $\geq 3$ ft and $\leq 7.9$ ft	Separated bicycle path without barrier		
Pedestrian Midblock Crossing     Number of Midblock Crossing     Midblock Crossing 2       Image: A state of the stat	22	and here				
23     Pedestrian initial processing     Number of Midblock Crossing     O       24     Midblock Crossing 1     Midblock Crossing 2     Midblock Crossing 3     Midblock Crossing 3       25     Peak hour pedestrian volume, midblock (ped/hr)     26 to 50     6 to 25     6 to 25       26     Location of pedestrian crossing     Locations other than schools     Locations other than schools     Locations other than schools		Dedestrien Midbleck Cressing				
24     Midblock Crossing 1     Midblock Crossing 2     Midblock Crossing 3     Midblock Crossing 3       25     Peak hour pedestrian urose, midblock (ped/hr)     26 to 50     26 to 50     6 to 25     6 to 25       26     Location of pedestrian crossing     Locations other than schools     Locations other than schools     Locations other than schools     Locations other than schools	23	Pedestrian wildblock Crossing	Number of Midblock Crossing		0	
25     Peak hour pedestrian volume, midblock (ped/hr)     26 to 50     26 to 50     6 to 25     6 to 25       26     Location of pedestrian crossing     Locations other than schools	24		Midblock Crossing 1	Midblock Crossing 2	Midblock Crossing 3	Midblock Crossing 4
20 Locations other than schools Locations oth	25	Peak nour pedestrian volume, midblock (ped/hr)				6 to 25
1/1 Dedectries creating tagility INe facility	20	Location of pedestrian crossing	Locations other than schools	Locations other than schools	Locations other than schools	Locations other than sch
Precessing routing to the type     Not acting	21	School zono warning	Not applicable (no school zone at this location)	Not applicable (no school zone at this location)	School zono flacking boscons or other active warnings	ponsignalized marked cro
2 biology and a padestrian crossing substantial substantia	20	Advance visibility of a nedestrian crossing	Substantial	Substantial	Limited	Limited
normal province resonance of a processing of a	30	Dedestrian fencing	None	None	None	None
l Vehicle arking Mone None None None None None	31	Vehicle parking	None	None	None	None
2 Steel lighting to the sent t	32	Street lighting	Not present	Not present	Not present	Not present
Median type (Centerline only (no median) (Centerline only (no median) (Centerline only (no median) (Centerline (1) to 3 ft) (Centerline (1) to 3 f	33	Median type	Centerline only (no median)	Centerline only (no median)	Wide centerline (1 to 3 ft)	Wide centerline (1 to 3 t
A Number of auxiliary lanes	34	Number of auxiliary lanes	1		0	)
35	35	,				
36	36					
37	37					
		Instructions Segment 1 Ped&Bike (Segments) Intersection 1	Ped&Bike (Intersections) Ped&Bike (Seament Results)	Ped&Bike (Intersection Results) Summary Tables (Site Totals)	Summary Tables (Project Total) Reference Tables ( (	
Instructions Segment.1 Ped&Bike (Segment.1 Ped&Bike (Intersection.1 Ped&Bike (Intersections) Ped&Bike (Segment Results) Ped&Bike (Intersection Results) Summary Tables (Site Totals) Summary Tables (Project Total) Reference Tables ( 🕂 :		instructions segment_1 Peddolike (segments) intersection_1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

# **Future Research**

- Future research should be undertaken to:
  - Pedestrian and bicycle safety performance at roundabouts
  - Further evaluate approaches to defining boundaries of an intersection for purposes of assigning pedestrian and bicycle crashes to the intersection for model development
  - Develop pedestrian and bicycle SPFs to address additional site types

# **Future Research (cont.)**

- Future research should be undertaken to:
  - Develop pedestrian and bicycle SPFs by crash type for potential consideration in HSM
  - Investigate counterintuitive findings related to installation of sidewalks and pedestrian crashes along the roadway
  - Investigate counterintuitive findings related to motor vehicle speed and pedestrian and bicycle crashes along the roadway
  - Address underreporting of crashes in HSM predictive methods and models

## **Questions???**

Darren Torbic Research Scientist Traffic Operations and Roadway Safety Division Texas A&M Transportation Institute <u>d-torbic@tti.tamu.edu</u> 814-574-9194

