

Data-Driven Safety Training Introduction Part IV

Carlos Sun, Praveen Edara, Yaw Adu-Gyamfi University of Missouri

Missouri Center for Transportation Innovation



Outline

- Background/motivation
- Subjective vs. objective safety
- Complexity of traffic crashes & data
- Regression to the mean bias
- Review of statistics
- Use and application of data-driven safety methods



- De-mystifying safety analysis
- Important two words: sampling distributions
- Lay/simplified explanation
 - sampling obtaining some data to help us get at overall trends
 - distribution if enough data, then obtain a picture of how data behaves to get at overall trends/systematic behavior



• Sampling distributions





- Sampling distributions
 - Data-driven safety methods require good safety data
 - Many challenges in obtaining adequate safety data
 - money & time
 - aforementioned problems: unavailability measurement error, subjectivity, data entry
 - data bias, not being representative of systematic trends
 - e.g. one off, outlier



- Statistics is all about distributions
- Distribution lay explanation
 - an adequate picture of how specific data behaves for different ranges of values
- Distribution statistical explanation
 - possible values of data and how frequently each type of value occurs
 - central tendency (e.g. average), variability
- Distribution leads to trends/systematic behavior



- An exercise in sampling distributions
- Roll 2 dies 10 times



- Use: real dice, web e.g. <u>https://www.random.org/dice</u>, Excel randbetween(1,6) function, etc.
- Compute average of the 2 dice
- Plot number of occurrences (y-axis) for each dice roll value (x-axis)
- Do the same for 4 dies



• What do we see when the number of dice increases from 2 to 4 to even more?





- Point of experiment?
- When N increases, i.e. we have a large sample
 - we obtain a nice smooth distribution
 - the distribution shape can be modeled
 - we can use this distribution to find systematic trends in data
 - when sample size is limited we run into problems
 - resulting decisions are less ideal



Data Sources for Safety Analysis

- Crash police completed crash reports using Missouri Uniform Crash Report
- Traffic/exposure data annual average daily traffic (AADT), MoDOT Transportation Management Systems
- Facility Data roadway pavement, geometrics, median, shoulder, etc.
 - measures from aerial photographs using CAD
 - Automated Road Analyzer (ARAN) data



Data Sources for Safety Analysis

- Land-use e.g. alcohol venues, bus stops
- Signal signal timing charts, street view photo of signal & signage (e.g. permitted/protected)
- Weather



Code Nast Traveler 2020



Hierarchy of Data Sources

- Anecdotal information
 - e.g. comments from police, staff, citizens
- Use one database, e.g. crash
- Fusion of easily available databases
 - e.g. MoDOT TMS data + aerial photos





Hierarchy of Data Sources

- Fusion of all available databases
 - crash, road information, driver, vehicle, weather (NOAA), detector/probe, district signals, aerial photos, social media, TMC alerts, mass media
- Field measurement of current site conditions
 - e.g. accident reconstruction, total stations, GPS surveying + all available sources of info from databases
- Use what is practicably available to you considering resource and time

Hierarchy of Methodology

- Intuition/experience (not quantitative/data-driven)
- Naïve/simple before/after study
- Data-driven using HSM defaults
- Data-driven using HSM calibrated
- Data-driven using HSM calibrated + MO severity distributions
- MO-specific models

Applications of Data-Driven Safety

- Design exceptions
 - estimate the actual safety of designs vs. just the nominal safety
- Prioritizing safety improvements
 - how to choose sites or systematic improvements from a list of sites or alternatives





Applications of Data-Driven Safety

- Traffic impact studies
 - consider not just traffic generation but safety impacts of development
- Safety design-build
 - utilize safety concepts in contracting, maximize return on investment



Typical Safety Prediction Model

- N = SPF x CMFs x C
- N predicted crash frequency
- SPF safety performance function
 - relates fundamental exposure variables to crashes
 - AADT and length (for segments)
- CMFs crash modification factors
 - relate other variables to crashes
- C calibration factor
 - calibrate safety model to local conditions



Final Thoughts Practitioner Encouragement

- Not binary safety process
 - not let unavailability of some data or method stop you
 - missing aspects might not be very impactful overall, e.g. CMF examples (0.01% impact)
 - partial info better than no info, limited accuracy better than no data
 - no such thing as perfect safety modeling
 - limitations exist throughout safety modeling process
 - e.g. time, data quality and availability, engineering judgment/discretion



Final Thoughts Practitioner Encouragement

- Justify your reasonable approach and document your approach
- Data-driven safety method is littered with engineering discretion
 - e.g. section length, def. of intersection crash, which CMFs to apply, calibration sample size
- Incorporate workshop material as time & opportunity allows



Final Thoughts Practitioner Encouragement

- Reach out to MoDOT safety experts if you have questions
 - Others might have encountered the same issue before