

IMPROVE

IMPROVE I-70 KC J4I1486D

BEYOND HSM?

Traffic Safety Analysis for the Access Justification Report (AJR) Urban Kansas City I-70, Downtown to I-435

Project Overview - Location

- Kansas City
- From The Paseo to US 40 in Kansas City
- Approx. 5 miles in length
- Urbanized area





Project Overview

- 12 interchanges
- 25 mainline and overhead bridges
- 6 / 8 thru lanes of pavement
- 96,000 to 120,000 vpd
- 18% trucks
- Heavy AM and PM rush hour traffic
- Heavy pedestrian and transit traffic
- Corridor of concern for serious crashes







IMPROVE I-70 KC

We are making progress in our ability to predict crashes!

Progress in Traffic Safety Analysis



Let's bash HSM! (ISATe specifically)

IMPROVE I-70 KC J4I1486D

ISATe doesn't understand sideslopes ISATe doesn't understand fixed objects ISATe doesn't understand vertical alignment ISATe doesn't understand congestion ISATe doesn't understand lighting ISATe doesn't understand pedestrians

Longer road = more crashes More traffic = more crashes



What does ISATe understand?

IMPROVE I-70 KC J4I1486D

Lane/Shoulder widths

Curves

Guardrail

Ramp locations

If you put a bunch of people on a road, some of them will crash



A different approach

IMPROVE I-70 KC J4I1486D

A modular approach Use what works well Toss what doesn't Add what works better



Baseline crashes



If you build it, they will crash

- Uses ISATe
- Crashes that occur because the road exists
- Straight, flat road with no access





Horizontal Curves





- ISATe based
- Only looked at Benton & Jackson Curves







Lane & Shoulder widths

ISATe based

Number o	f through lanes (n):	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	9	8	8	9
		Segment 1- Station 0 to	Segment2- Station 10.5	Segment3- Station 21to	Segment 4 - Station 28 to	Segment 5 - Station 40 to	Segment 6 - Station 52 to	Segment 7 - Station 57 to	Seamont 8 -	Segment 9- Station 95.5	Segment 10 - Station 97.5	Segment 11- Station 118	Segment 12 Station 137	Segment 13 - Station 140	Segment 14- Station 156	Segment 15 - Station 171	Segment 1 Station 19
Freeways	egment description:	10.5	to 21	28	40	52	57	61.5	61.5 to 95.5	to 97.5	to 118	te 137	to 140	ta 156	to 171	ta 193	ta 200
Segment	length (L), mi:	0.068	0.303	0.076	0.474	0.074	0.108	0.573	0.183	0.235	0.142	0.35	0.336	0.271	0.322	0.096	0.133
Allanma	ent Llata																
1	Horizontal curve in segment?:	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Both Dir.	Both Dir.	Both Dir.	No	No	No
	Curve radius (R ₁), ft:											5721	5721	5721			
	Length of curve (L, 1), mi:											0.476	0.476	0.476			
	Length of curve in segment (L.1,), mi:											0.114	0.336	0.026			
2	Horizontal curve in segment?:											No	No	No			
	Curve radius (R ₂), ft:																
	Length of curve (L _{s2}), mi:																
	Length of curve in segment (L.z.,.,), mi:																
3	Horizontal curve in segment?:																
	Curve radius (H ₈), H:																<u> </u>
	Length of curve (L ₁), mi:																
Crocce	Cention Refer						L										L
LIUSS 2		11	11	11	11	11	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	11	11	12
Duteido el	r (wij, rc koulder width (57.). (t	8	8	8	84	10	10	10	10	8	10	10	10	10	8	11	11
Ducside sha	uddar width (W.), rc	10	10	10	9.5	95	10	10	10	1154	11.54	10	12	12	10	10	
Inside sho	ulder wath (w _{id}), rc	22	22	22	21	3.0	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	22	22	19
Rumble st	ath (w_), it: trins on outside shoulders?:	22 Var	ZZ Yac	22 	21 Yee	22 	Z0 Vac	20	20 Vac	20	20 Yes	20	20	20	22 	22 Var	13 Yes
i idinbie si	Longth of rumble strips for travelining earing mileport direction, mi:	0.068	0.303	0.076	0.474	0.074	0.108	0.573	0.183	0.235	0.142	0.35	0.336	0.271	0.322	0.096	0,133
	Longth of rumble strips for travel in decreasing milepart direction, mi:	0.068	0.303	0.076	0.474	0.074	0.108	0.573	0.183	0.235	0.142	0.35	0.336	0.271	0.322	0.096	0.133
Rumble st	trips on inside shoulders?:	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Longth of rumble strips for travel in increasing mileport direction, mi:	0.068	0.303	0.076	0.474	0.074	0.108	0.573	0.183	0.235	0.142	0.35	0.336	0.271	0.322	0.096	0.133
Presence	of barrier in median:	Center	Center	Center	Center	Center	Center	Center	Center	Center	Center	Center	Center	Center	Center	Center	Center
1	Length of barrier (Like), mi:	0.068	0.303	0.076	0.252	0.074	0.108	0.573	0.183	0.235	0.142	0.35	0.336	0.271	0.322	0.096	0.133
1	Distance from edge of traveled way to barrier face (W. et	10	10	10	10	9.5	12	12	12	11.54	11.54	12	12	12	10	10	8
2	Length of barrier (La,z), mi:																
	Distance from edge of traveled way to barrier face (W_sec.,,z), ft:																
3	Length of barrier (L _{11,1}), mi:																
	Distance from edge of traveled way to barrier face (W, ##, in, a), ft:																
4	Length of barrier (L _{is,4}), mi:																
	Distance from edge of traveled way to barrier face (W _{aff,in,t}), ft:																
5	Length of barrier (L _{14,5}), mi:																
	Distance from edge of traveled way to barrier face (W _{*ff,is,5}), ft:																
Median ba	arrier width (V_a), ft:	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Nearest distance from edge of traveled way to barrier face (W,,,,), ft:																	
Readsi	se Data																_
Clear zon	e width (V _{ke}), ft:	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Presence	of barrier on roadside:	None	Some 0.100	Some	Some	Full	Full	Some	Some	Some 0.100	Some	Some	Some	None	None	None	Full
1 '	Length of barrier (L.,,) mi:		0.130	0.076	0.047			0.063	0.10	0.103	0.067	0.114	0.202	0.25	0.07		<u> </u>
-	Listance from edge of traveled way to barrier face (W .rr, ., 1), it		10	10	10			10	10	10	10	10	10	14	•		<u> </u>
2	Length of barrier (L _{11,2}), mi:		0.152					0.211	0.028	0.043	0.052		0.095	0.138			<u> </u>
	Distance from edge of traveled way to barrier face (W, 16, ., 2), ft		10					10	10	10	10		22	14			
3	Length of barrier (L _{16,1}), mi:							0.047		0.036							<u> </u>
	Distance from edge of traveled way to barrier face (W, 16, ., a), ft							10		8							<u> </u>
4	Length of barrier (L,,,,), mi:																
	Distance from edge of traveled way to barrier face (W_+++,+,+), ft																
5	Length of barrier (L_s, s), mi:																
	Distance from edge of traveled way to barrier face $(V_{*H,*,5})$, f																
Dirtance from Dirtance f	n odge af traveled way ta barrier face, increaring milepart (W _{effin}), ft: n odge af traveled way ta barrier face, down winned increased (M. 1997).			<u> </u>		10	10			<u> </u>			<u> </u>		<u> </u>	├ ──	11
Rame	n expense raveled way to parrier race, decreasing milepart (W _{166,des}), ft:				-	10	10						1				
Traveli	n Increasing Milepost Direction																
Entrance	Ramp entrance in segment? (If yes, indicate type.):	No	Lane Add	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Lane Add	No	No	Lane Add	No	Lane Ac
Bamp	Dirtanco fram bogin milopart ta uprtroam ontranco ramp garo (84, , ,), mi:	999		0.2	0.33	999	999	999	999	999	999		0.31	0.44		0.28	
1	Length of ramp entrance (L _{ration}), mi:																
1	Length of ramp entrance in segment (L,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,																
-	Entrance side?:																
Exit	Hamp exit in segment? (If yes, indicate type.):	No	No 999	No 999	No 0.32	S-C Lane	S+C Lane	No 999	S+C Lane	S-C Lane	No 0.37	Lane Drop	No 999	No 0.27	Lane Drop	No 999	999
a rantp	Length of ramp exit (L) mi:	535	000	000	0.02	0,133	0,133	500	0,142	0,142	0.01		333	0.61	<u> </u>	535	000
1	Length of ramp exit in segment (-		-	0,038	0,095		0,117	0,025			-	1			<u> </u>
1	Exit side?:		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Bight	Bight	<u> </u>	Bight	Bight			<u> </u>		<u> </u>	├ ──┤	<u> </u>
Weave	Type B weave in segment?:	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
1	Length of weaving section (L), mi:																
	Length of weaving section in segment (Larrante), mi:																
Traveli	n Decreasing Milepost Direction																
Entrance	Ramp entrance in segment? (If yes, indicate type.):	No	No	No	No	S-C Lane	S-C Lane	No	No	No	S-C Lane	Lane Add	Lane Add	No	Lane Add	S-C Lane	No
Hamp	Dirtance from and mileport to uprtream entrance ramp gore (X _{r, rel}), mi:	333	393	999	0.32	0.100	0.422	333	333	0.23	0.005		-	0.32		0.000	999
1	Length or ramp entrance (L _{10,00}), mit					0.133	0.133			 	0.080		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	0.096	<u> </u>
1	Length of ramp entrance in segment (L.,,,,,,,,,,,), mi:			L		0.038	0.095			L	0.085		l			0.096	
Exit	Enviance side ?: Barrin exit in segment? (If uses indicate tune):	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Lane Drop	No	No	Lane Dren	No	No
Bamp	Distance from begin mileport to downstream exit ramp gare (X _{k,rel}), mi:	999	999	999	999	999	999	999	999	999	999		0.34	0.4	Lances op	0.28	999
1	Length of ramp exit (L,,,,,,,), mi:																
1	Length of ramp exit in segment (L.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,																
	Exit side?:																
Weave	Type B weave in segment?:	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
1	Length of weaving section (Larradore), mi:													I		ļ	<u> </u>
1	Length of weaving section in segment (Larrandra), mi:		I	I	I .	1	I	1	I	1	I	I	1	1	I.	I	I





IMPROVE I-70 KC J4I1486D

No ISATe!

Traffic Data Proportion of AADT during high-volume hours (P_{hv}):

New York City Congestion





Kansas City Congestion





Congestion

IMPROVE I-70 KC J4I1486D





No way to account for bottlenecks in ISATe





Congestion

SHRPZ LU/	SHRP2	L07
-----------	-------	-----



				20	26	20	45	20	26	2045			
	Link	Name	Length	PHV AM	PHV PM	PHV AM	PHV PM	Density AM	Density PM	Density AM	Density PM		
	215	5E	614.98	3006	6006	3138	6904	12.69	65.29	13.25	72.74		
	8	22E	343.40	2362	5845	2496	7042	13.34	62.75	13.96	36.74		
	315	22E	383.99	2362	5845	2496	7042	10.04	49.16	10.46	27.12		
	320	23E	246.77	2308	5449	2439	6621	13.01	67.58	13.60	33.36		
	306	24E	498.36	2308	5449	2439	6621	13.01	71.14	13.71	33.43		
<u></u>	325	24E	1580.39	2446	5955	2592	7151	10.49	52.64	10.90	27.19		
S E	330	24E	1288.36	2446	5955	2592	7151	10.51	41.10	10.98	27.51		
FA	335	24E	498.36	2311	5893	2450	7086	13.12	52.13	10.28	27.50		
Γ	307	25E	472.86	2311	5893	2450	7086	13.12	53.07	10.34	27.66		

	No-Build	Preferred Build		
Evaluated Length (mi)	5.50	5.45		
Total Crashes	542	472		
Fatal and Injury Crashes	183	159		
Property-Damage-Only Crashes	359	313		
Percent Fatal and Injury Crashes (%)	33.8%	33.8%		
Percent Property-Damage-Only Crashes (%)	66.2%	<mark>66.2%</mark>		







Ramp Spacing

IMPROVE I-70 KC J4I1486D

Ramp Spacing Safety Analysis - Modifed Preferred Build

NCHRP 687

								2026				2045					
	Basic Route Data									Volumes, vpd			v	olumes, v	For en-ex only		
User Entries										U	ser Entrie	s	User Entries			User Entries	
Route	Start	End	Segment Type	Painted gore- to-gore distance (ft) S	Upstream cross street to starting ramp gore point (ft)	Downstream cross street to ending ramp gore point (ft)	Calculated length L	Segment Length (mi) L	MAX. Painted gore-to-gore distance (ft) S ₂	upstr ramp	dnstrm ramp	upstr fwy	upstr ramp	dnstrm ramp	upstr fwy	system ramp?	continuous Aux?
EB 70	Paseo	Brooklyn	en-ex	783	896	607	2286	0.43	2600	3264	1951	57592	3840	2132	63072	no	yes
EB 70	Brooklyn	Prospect	ex-ex	1027	0	765	1792	0.34	2200	1951	4054	60856	2132	4250	66912		
EB 70	Prospect	Truman	en-ex	1448	842	0	2290	0.43	2600	2527	10015	54851	2884	10499	60530	no	yes
EB 70	Truman	18th	ex-ex						2200								
EB 70	18th	23rd	en-ex						2600							no	yes
EB 70	23rd	27th	en-ex	1616	594	780	2989	0.57	2600	1032	1031	47363	1340	2449	52915	no	yes
EB 70	Jackson	Van Brunt	en-ex	2167	1029	777	3973	0.75	2600	0	2046	49826	3745	2145	54621	no	yes
EB 70	Van Brunt	US 40	en-ex	1339	557	975	2871	0.54	2600	3491	1414	49744	3894	1482	56221	no	yes
WB 70	US 40	Van Brunt	en-ex	1346	874	651	2871	0.54	2600	2301	4214	52872	2503	4417	58195	no	yes
WB 70	Van Brunt	Jackson	en-ex	1963	1067	942	3973	0.75	2600	2237	3929	50959	2423	4195	56281	no	yes
WB 70	27th	23rd	en-ex	1386	691	912	2989	0.57	2600	1949	3226	49267	2043	1088	54509	no	yes
WB 70	18th	Truman	en-en	1231	996	0	2227	0.42	2200	4170	7078	47990	4371	7420	53060		
WB 70	Truman	Propsect	en-ex	1054	741	1066	2861	0.54	2600	7078	2755	52160	7420	2966	57431	no	yes
WB 70	Prospect	Brooklyn	en-en	1168	0	842	2010	0.38	2200	6030	1835	56483	6320	2280	61885		
WB 70	Brooklyn	Paseo	en-ex	780	607	896	2283	0.43	2600	1835	2191	62513	2280	2297	68205	no	yes



Results

Predictive Safety Results Summary, 20-Year Crashes

	Eval Number of Crashes						Number of Crashes				
	(mi)	PDO	F&I	Tot	EPDO	Length (mi)	PDO	F&I	Tot	EPDO	
No Build						Modifie	ed Prefe	rred Alte	rnative		
Mainline (Base*)	4.3	1,382	578	1,959	58,401	4.3	1,321	599	1,919	60,415	
Ramps (Base*)	5.4	49	40	88	3,952	4.6	45	36	81	3,619	
Horizontal Curves	1.8	784	520	1,304	52,161	1.7	548	366	914	36,659	
Lane/Shoulder Widths	4.3	-17	56	39	5,470	4.3	-116	-67	-183	-6,699	
Roadside Features (to be updated)											
Ramp Lane / Shoulder Widths	5.4	10	16	25	1,549	4.6	2	3	6	337	
Congestion	5.5	359	183	542	18,425	5.5	313	159	472	16,010	
Ramp Spacing	7.9	380	106	485	10,809	6.7	192	63	255	6,412	
CD Roads	0.0	0	0	0	0	1.3	20	11	31	1,107	
Total No-Build Crashes		2,946	1,497	4,443	150,768		2,326	1,170	3,496	117,860	



Results





Guardrail vs. Clear Zone





Sideslope







Pedestrians

IMPROVE I-70 KC J4I1486D

- > Vehicle #1, operated by Driver #1 was travelling eastbound on Interstate 70.
- > Driver #1 only had a Missouri Identification card.
- > Driver #1's blood tested positive for the presence of Cannabinoids (marijuana) in her
- > Pedestrian #1 walked in front of Vehicle #1 causing the crash to occur.
- > Pedestrian #1's blood tested positive for the presence of Methamphetamines.
- > Pedestrian #1 died as a result of the collision events.
- > No outside factors were determined to have contributed to the collision.

- Vehicle #2 was disabled in the #4 lane and was being pushed by the pedestrian, who was standing at the driver's door area, onto the shoulder.
- Driver #1's blood alcohol concentration was .214% at the time of the collision.
- Vehicle #1 struck Vehicle #2 and the pedestrian.
- The pedestrian died as a result of the injuries he sustained in the collision.

Lighting? Frequency of grade-separated crossings? Ability to see across highway?

- Driver #2 was operating Vehicle #2.
- Driver #2 had a valid Nebraska Operators license.
- Vehicle #1 was driving eastbound in the innermost lane when it hit Pedestrian #1 who was walking southbound across I-70. Driver #2 then ran over Pedestrian #2.
- Jackson County Medical Examiner's Forensic Toxicology records revealed Pedestrian #1 to have Ethanol (0.186 %(w/v)), Delta-9-THC (11.1 ng/mL), and THC-COOH (301 ng/mL) in his system at time of death. The Medical Examiner's Report stated the cause of death was multiple blunt force injuries.

- 1. Vehicle 1, operated by Driver 1, was westbound on Interstate 70.
- 2. The pedestrian walking in the westbound lanes of Interstate 70.
- 3. Drive 1 struck the Pedestrian with the front right portion of her vehicle.
- 4. The Pedestrian sustained fatal injuries as a result of the collision.
- 1) An unknown vehicle was traveling westbound on Interstate 70.
- 2) The unknown vehicle struck the Pedestrian.
- 3) The Pedestrian sustained fatal injuries as a result of the collision.



Lighting





Are these results reliable

- Do we double count some crashes: Probably.
- Do we miss some crashes: Yes.
- Do we miss out on the cumulative evaluation abilities of HSM: Yes.



Questions?

IMPROVE I-70 KC J4I1486D

Project Questions: Allan Ludiker, PE MoDOT Project Director <u>Allan.Ludiker@modot.mo.gov</u> 816-607-2267

Safety Analysis Questions: Joshua Scott <u>Joshua.Scott@modot.mo.gov</u> 816-607-2263

www.modot.org/improvei70kc



