

Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan

> Volume 20: A Guide for Reducing Head-On Crashes on Freeways



Reducing Head-on Crashes on Freeways

Larry Hagen, P.E., PTOE



TrafficSafetyGuru.com

TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

## My standard disclaimer:

The following interviews and commentaries are for informational exchange only. The views and opinions expressed therein are those of the individual speakers and do not necessarily represent the views and opinions of the Florida Department of Transportation, Hagen Consulting Services or any of their respective affiliates or employees. This one hour webinar will not make you an expert in anything. It is impossible to cover all of the necessary topics related to this webinar topic within just a one hour time frame. The user assumes all responsibility for the use of any and all information contained writin. The Florida Department of Transportation and Hagen Consulting Services, LLC assume no liability for the use of any and all information contained writin. The information depicted in this presentation any or may not be firtitious. Any similarity to actual events, locations, or firms is purely coincidenta. Viewer discretion is advised.

# How big an issue are head-on crashes?









Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan

> Volume 20: A Guide for Reducing Head-On Crashes on Freeways



TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIS

#### **NCHRP Report 500**

### Volume 20: A Guide for Reducing Head-On Crashes on Freeways

Available for download in the download pod.



### AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan

Identified 22 goals to pursue in order to reduce highway crash fatalities

- Goal 15 Keep vehicles on the roadway
- Goal 16 Minimize the consequences of leaving the road
- Goal 18 Reduce head-on and across-median crashes



#### Addressed in four emphasis areas:

- •Run-off-road (ROR) crashes
- Head-on collisions
- Head-on collisions on freeways
- Crashes with trees in hazardous locations



#### Addressed in four emphasis areas:

- 6 Run-off-road (ROR) crashes
- 4 •Head-on collisions
- **20** •Head-on collisions on freeways
  - Crashes with trees in hazardous locations





Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan

> Volume 20: A Guide for Reducing Head-On Crashes on Freeways



TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

#### **NCHRP Report 500**

### Volume 20: A Guide for Reducing Head-On Crashes on Freeways

Available for download in the download pod.







💢 Links - Tr	affic Safety Gun 🗙	ງ NCHRP Report 500:	Guid ×								LERBY	3 <b>—</b> 3	ð	×
$\in \ \ni \ \mathbf{G}$	(i) www.trb.org/Mai	n/Blurbs/152868.as	хс								☆ 🔕	2	2	6
				HOME	MyTRB	CONTACT US	5 DIRECTOR	Y E-NEWSLETTER	R SUBSCRIBE	FOLLOW US	RSS			Â
	The National Academies of	SCIENCES ENGINEERING MEDICINE							TRANSPO		BOARD			
	About TRB -	Annual Meeting -	Calendar	Committees & Panels -	Programs		ublications - Re	sources & Databases -	Provide Feedback	f in 💟 🛃 🖂 (	7	_		

Transportation Research Board > Blurbs > NCHRP Report 500: Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan



#### NCHRP Report 500: Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan

In 1998, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) approved its <u>Strategic Highway Safety Plan</u>, which was developed by the AASHTO Standing Committee for Highway Traffic Safety with the assistance of the Federal Highway Administration, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and the Transportation Research Board Committee on Transportation Safety Management. The plain includes strategies in 22 key emphasis areas that affect highway safety. The plan's goal is to reduce the annual number of highway deaths by 5,000 to 7,000. Each of the 22 emphasis areas includes strategies and a outline of what is needed to implement each strategy.

The National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) has developed a series of guides to assist state and local agencies in reducing injuries and fatalities in targeted areas. The guides correspond to the emphasis areas outlined in the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan. Each guide includes a brief introduction, a general description of the problem, the strategies/countermeasures to address the problem, and a model implementation process.



#### A Guide for Reducing Speeding-Related Crashes

TRB's National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 500, Vol. 23: Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan: A Guide for Reducing Speeding-Related Crashes provides suggested guidance on strategies that can be employed to reduce crashes involving speed...



#### A Guide for Addressing Collisions Involving Motorcycles

January 24, 2009 TRB's National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 500, Vol. 22: Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan: A Guide for Addressing Collisions Involving Motorcycles provides guidance on strategies that can be employed to reduce crashes involving motor...

#### Safety Data and Analysis in Developing Emphasis Area Plans

TRB's National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 500, Vol. 21: Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan: Safety Data and Analysis in Developing Emphasis Area Plans provides guidance on data sources and analysis techniques that may be employed to a...



TRB's National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 500, Vol. 20, Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan: A Guide for Reducing Head-On Crashes on Freeways, provides strategies that can be employed to reduce head-on crashes on freeways. In 1998, the...

A Guide for Reducing Collisions Involving Young Drivers

🔄 Links - Traffic Safety G	un X 🗅 A Guide for Reducing He X	Lany	-65	٥	×
$\leftarrow$ $\rightarrow$ C $\odot$ www.tr	b.org/Publications/Public/Blurbs/A_Guide_for_Reducing_HeadOn_Crashes_on_Freeways_159999.aspx	☆ 🔕	2	G	÷
	HOME MYTRB CONTACT US DIRECTORY E-NEWSLETTER SUBSCRIBE FOLLOW US	RSS			
The Ace Abe	e National demies of MEDICINE but TRB + Annual Meeting + Calendar Committees & Panels + Programs + Projects + Publications + Resources & Databases + Provide Feedback f in V 🖸 🖙 💀	OARD			
All by Series by Subject Errata Cooperative Research Programs Series Highway (NCHRP) Transit (TCRP) Airport (ACRP) Hazardous Materials (HMCRP) Freight (NCFRP) Rail (NCRRP) Other TRB Series Policy Studies	Publications > Blurbs > A Guide for Reducing Head-On Crashes on Freeways				
Strategic Highway Research (SHRP 2)	A Guide for Reducing Head-On Crashes on Freeways				
Exploratory Analysis (IDEA) Commercial Truck and	TRB's National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 500, Vol. 20, Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan: A Guide for Reducing Head-On Crashes on strategies that can be employed to reduce head-on crashes on freeways.	Freeways, pro	vides		
Conferences and Workshops Proceedings TRR Journal Transportation Research Circulars	In 1998, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASH 10) approved its <u>Strategic Highway Safety Plan</u> , which was developed by the AASH 10 Stahling Committee for Highway assistance of the Federal Highway Administration, and Hadronal Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and the Transportation Research Board Committee on Transportation Safety Management. The plan include emphasis areas that affect highway safety. The plan's goal is to reduce the annual number of highway deaths by 5,000 to 7,000. Each of the 22 emphasis areas includes strategies and an outline of what is need strategy. Over the next few years the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) will be developing a <u>series of guides</u> , several of which are already available, to assist state and local agencies in reduci targeted areas. The guide correspond to the emphasis areas outlined in the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan. Each guide includes a brief introduction, a general description of the problem, the strategie address the problem.	y franc Saret es strategies ir led to impleme ng injuries and s/countermeas	fatalitie	e s in	
Periodicals and Other Documents TR News Magazine					
Critical Issues in Transportation Practice-Ready Papers Research Pays Off	Project: Project Information DOI: <u>10.17226/23088</u> Project Number: 17-18(03)				
State of the Art Reports Standing Committee Newsletters	E-Newsletter Type: <u>Recently Released TRB Publications</u> TRB Publication Type: <u>NCHRP Report</u>				
Millennium Papers	This Summary Last Modified On: 4/15/2016				
Miscellaneous					

How do head-on crashes occur on freeways?

- 1. A head-on crash can occur when a vehicle crosses the median and crashes with a vehicle traveling in the opposite direction
- 2. A head-on crash can also occur when a vehicle inadvertently travels the wrong way in the opposing traffic lanes



## Median Crossover Crashes

### According to the report...

"The Florida Department of Transportation found in an unpublished preliminary study that is still underway that 62 percent of all cross-median crashes occurred within 1/2-mile and 82 percent occurred within 1 mile of interchange ramp termini."



#### Urban vs Rural Head-On Fatal Crashes

Head-on Crashes on Interstates, Urban vs. Rural Source: 2003 FARS data.





#### Fatal Crossover Crashes by Gender

Fatal Crossover Crashes on Interstates by Gender Source: 2003 FARS data.





### Fatal Crossover Crashes by Light Condition

Fatal Crossover Crashes on Interstates by Light Condition Source: 2003 FARS data.





# So what do we do about these crossover crashes?



# Install guardrail in median of highway





📑 Traffic Safety Guru - Hom 🗙 🕒 A Guide for Reducing He 🗙 💟	CMF Clearinghouse >> 5 ×	Lenny	3. <b></b> 3	٥	×
← → C ① www.cmfclearinghouse.org/results.cfm		*	2	° G	:
CRASH MODIFICATION FACTORS	Skip to main content   Notice   Sign Up for our e-Newsletter   Home         About the CMF Clearinghouse   Using CMFs   Developing CMFs   Additional Resources				
Home > Search Results Search Result There were 243 CMFs Having trouble deciding b Overwhelmed by too man	<b>Its</b> returned for your search on " <b>median barrier</b> ". <u>[modify your search]</u> . etween similar CMFs? Use our <u>comparison tool</u> or <u>Check out our FAQs</u> . y results? See our <u>Search Tips</u> .				
<ul> <li>Star Quality Rating</li> <li>1 (4)</li> <li>2 (44)</li> <li>3 (104)</li> <li>4 (65)</li> <li>5 (26)</li> <li>Country</li> </ul>	Results Control: Collapse All   Expand All Click on the links below to expand individual categories. Category: Access management (13) Category: Alignment (5) Category: Roadside (200)				
<ul> <li>U.S. &amp; Canada (241)</li> <li>International (2)</li> <li>Crash Type</li> <li>Crash Severity</li> <li>Roadway Type</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Subcategory: Median barriers (122)</li> <li>Countermeasure: Install any type of median barrier</li> <li>Countermeasure: Install beam guardrails on median of divided highway</li> <li>Compare CMF CRF(%) Quality Crash Type Crash Severity Area Type Reference Comments</li> </ul>				r

Traffic Safety Guru - Hom 🗙 🖉 A Guide for Reducing He	× CMF Clearinghouse	>>5 ×								LERRy	3 <b></b> 3	٥	×
$\leftrightarrow$ $\Rightarrow$ C (1) www.cmfclearinghouse.org/results.cfm										*	2	<b>e</b> G	3
<ul> <li>2 (17)</li> <li>3 (104)</li> <li>4 (65)</li> <li>5 (26)</li> <li>Country</li> <li>U.S. &amp; Canada (</li> <li>International (2</li> <li>Crash Type</li> <li>Crash Severity</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Catego</li> <li>Catego</li> <li>Catego</li> <li>Subcate</li> <li>Countern</li> <li>Countern</li> </ul>	ry: A ry: R gory: neasure	lignme oadsid Median :: Install :: Install	ent (5) e (200) barriers (122 any type of me beam guardra	!) edian bar ils on mer	rier dian of divide	ed highway	A					
Roadway Type	Compare	CMF	CRF(%)	) Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Area Type	Reference	Comments				
Area Type		0.22	78	-	Cross median	All	Not specified	Hauer, E., 2000					
Intersection Type													
▶ Intersection Geome	etry	0.13	87	***	All	Fatal	Not specified	Hauer, E., 2000					
Traffic Control		1.4	-40	***	All	Property Damage Only (PDO)	Not specified	Hauer, E., 2000					
Filter Results		1.18	-18	<b>XXX</b> NOX	All	Serious injury,Minor injury	Not specifie	Hauer, d E., 2000					
			*NOTE: You	Comp can compare CMFs a	cross counter	set Compare measures, subcate	egories, and cat	egories.					
	Countern	neasure	: Install	cable median	barrier								
	Countern	neasure	: Install	cable median	barri <mark>er (h</mark>	igh tension)							
	Countern	neasure	: Install	cable median	barrier (lo	w or high te	nsion on c	urve)					h
			* • II	11 PS 1		12.1.7							•

Compare	CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Area Type	Reference	Comments
Ø	0.22	78	-	Cross median	All	Not specified	Hauer, E., 2000	
	0.13	87	<b>NRW</b> ICK	All	Fatal	Not specified	Hauer, E., 2000	
	1.4	-40	<b>RRR</b> ICK	All	Property Damage Only (PDO)	Not specified	Hauer, E., 2000	
0	1.18	-18	inina ana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana an	All	Serious injury,Minor injury	Not specified	Hauer, E., 2000	





## Install shoulder rumble strips



раге	CMF	CRF(%	) Quality	Crash Typ	crash Severity	Area Type	Reference	Comments
2	0.763	23.74	****	Cross median,Fix object,Ru off road,Othe	red n All er	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to all [read more]
]	0.771	22.95	*****	Other	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to hit- barrier [ <i>read more</i> ]
	0.642	35.84	****	Fixed object	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to fixed-object [ <i>read more</i> ]
	0.765	23.49	<b>NRR</b> OC	Fixed object	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to fixed-object [read more]
ĵ	0.476	52.39		Other	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to other [read
	01170	*NOTE: You	Cor	npare Rese	easures, subcatego	ries, and cat	2014	other [read

# Install concrete guardrail in median



Compare	CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Area Type	Reference	Comments
	2.2	-120	****	Single vehicle	All	Rural	Tarko, A.P. et al., 2008	
	0.8	20	NONCH	Sideswipe	All	Rural	Tarko, A.P. et al., 2008	
	0	100 🙀	***	Cross median,Frontal and opposing direction ideswipe,Head o	All	Rural	Tarko, A.P. et al., 2008	
0	1.15	-15 9	nininer	All	Serious injury,Minor injury	Not specifie	Elvik, R. and Vaa, T., 2004	
	3	*NOTE: You c	Con an compare CMF:	npare Reset	Compare	ories, and cat	egories.	\ \
								TrafficS



## Install median barrier



Counte	rmeasui	re: Ins	stall median b	arrier				
Compare	СМБ	CRF	-(%) Quali	ty Crash Typ	e Crash Severity	Area Type	Reference	Comments
	3.25	-2	225	Cross median,Fixe object,Run o road,Other	d All off	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to all [ <i>read</i> <i>more</i> ]
0	1.55	-55	<b>NKKK</b>	Cross median,Fixed object,Run off road,Other	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to all [ <i>read</i> <i>more</i> ]
0	3.77	-277	****	Cross median,Fixed object,Run off road,Other	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to all [read more]
	1,6	-60	*****	Cross median,Fixed object,Run off road,Other	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to all [ <i>read</i> more]
								<b>TrafficSafet</b>

Image: constraint of the constra	٥	0.03	97	KORONOR	Cross median	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to cross-median [ <i>read more</i> ]
Image: Construction of the con		0.04	96	*****	Cross median	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to cross-median [read more]
<ul> <li>0.08</li> <li>92</li> <li>0.08</li> <li>92</li> <li>0.08</li> <li>92</li> <li>0.08</li> <li>0.08</li> <li>0.08</li> <li>0.21</li> <li>0.31</li> <li>69</li> <li>0.31</li> <li>69</li> <li>0.33</li> <li>67</li> <li>0.33</li> <li>67</li> <li>0.33</li> <li>67</li> <li>0.33</li> <li>67</li> <li>0.33</li> <li>67</li> <li>0.33</li> <li>67</li> <li>0.34</li> <li>10</li> <li>1</li></ul>		0.04	96	*****	Cross median	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to all [ <i>read more</i> ]
0.31       69       Cross median,Other       All       Rural       Graham et al., 2014       This CMF applies to cross-median [read more]         0.33       67       Cross median,Other       Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury       Graham et al., 2014       This CMF applies to cross-median [read more]		0.08	92	*****	Cross median	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to all [read more]
0.33 67     Cross     Cross     Median,Other     Injury,Minor     Rural     Cross     Injury     Cross     Injury     Cross     Injury     Cross     Injury     Cross     Injury     Cross     Cross     Injury     Cross     Cross     Cross     Injury     Cross     Cross     Cross     Cross     Cross     Injury     Cross     Cross     Cross     Cross     Cross     Cross     Cross     Injury     Cross     Cros     Cros     Cros     Cross     Cros     Cross	0	0.31	69	WRITER	Cross median,Other	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to cross-median [read more]
		0.33	67	*****	Cross median,Other	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to n [re] re] T



# Install median bifurcation





Compare	CMF	CRF(%	o) Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Area Type	Reference	Comments
	1.284	-28.38		Other	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to the [read more]
	1.444	-44.4	<b>WRI</b> NCK	Fixed object	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to the [read more
	1.205	-20,48	<b>NNR</b> HH	Fixed object	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to the [read more
	1.319	-31.93	***	Fixed object	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to the [read more
	1.518	-51.83	<b>RRA</b> NK F	ixed object	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to the [ <i>read</i> <i>more</i> ]



Compare	CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Typ	e Crash Severity	Area Type	Reference	Comments
D	1.035	-3.47	RICORY	Cross median,Fixe object,Rur off road,Othe	ed n All r	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to a [read more]
	1.522	-52.17	****	Cross median,Fixed object,Run off road,Other	F All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to a [read more]
٥	0.819	18.14	*****	Other	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to a [ <i>read more</i> ]
	0.69	31.03	NORK C	Other	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to a [ <i>read more</i> ]
	1.415	-41.51	****	Fixed object	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to a [ <i>read more</i> ]
D	1.316	-31.63	*****	Fixed object	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to a [ <i>read more</i> ]
	1.036	-3.6	*****	Other	All	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to a [read more]
	1.151	-15.05	****	Other	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Rural	Graham et al., 2014	This CMF applies to a [read more]

#### Countermeasure: Increase median shoulder width





## Wrong Way Entry

#### Transportation Safety Council Edmund R. Ricker Award (Organization)

Florida's Wrong-Way Driving Mitigation Initiative Florida Department of Transportation



The main purpose of the Florida Wrong-Way Driving Mitigation Initiative is to approach wrongway driving (WWD) in a methodical and scientific

way to comprehensively address the WWD concern. Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has been continually exploring ways for developing and deploying countermeasures while proactively identifying areas to help mitigate WWD. The initiative is data-driven, cross-jurisdictional, multi-disciplinary, replicable, and decision-centric. The WWD evolving practice from FDOT has garnered interest from several states, with Caltrans paying a two-day visit to FDOT to see the field deployments and interact.





#### Wig-Wag Flashing Beacons



#### Internally Illuminated Raised Pavement Markers



#### **Revised Signing & Pavement Marking Standards**





#### Red RRFBs on WRONG WAY Signs





#### LEDs Around WRONG WAY Signs





#### Blank-Out WRONG WAY Signs







Guidance for Implementation of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan

> Volume 20: A Guide for Reducing Head-On Crashes on Freeways



TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

#### **NCHRP Report 500**

### Volume 20: A Guide for Reducing Head-On Crashes on Freeways



#### Objectives for Addressing Head-On Crashes on Freeways

- 18.2A Keep vehicles from departing the traveled way
- 18.2B Minimize the likelihood of head-on crashes with an oncoming vehicle
- 18.2C Reduce the severity of median barrier crashes that occur
- 18.2D Enhance enforcement and awareness of traffic regulations
- 18.2E Improve coordination of agency safety initiatives



Keep vehicles from departing the traveled way

- Install left shoulder rumble strips
- Provide enhanced pavement markings and median delineation
- Provide improved pavement surfaces



# Minimize the likelihood of head-on crashes with an oncoming vehicle

- Provide wider medians
- Improve median design for vehicle recovery
- Install median barriers for narrow-width medians
- Implement channelization, signing & striping improvements at interchanges susceptible to wrong-way movements



## Reduce the severity of median barrier crashes that occur

 Improve the design and application of barrier and attenuation systems



## Enhance enforcement and awareness of traffic regulations

- Designate "Highway Safety Corridors"
- Conduct public information & education campaigns



## Improve coordination of agency safety initiatives

Enhance agency crash data systems



#### Relative cost and time for implementation

Relative Cost to Implement and Operate	Strategy
Time Frame: Short (le	ess than a year)
Low	18.2.A1—Install Left Shoulder Rumble Strips
	18.2.A2—Provide Enhanced Pavement Markings and Median Delineation
	18.2.D1—Designate "Highway Safety Corridors"
Moderate	18.2.D2—Conduct Public Information and Education Campaigns
Moderate to High	
High	



#### Relative cost and time for implementation

Relative Cost to	
Operate	Strategy
Time Frame: Medium (1–2 years)	
Low	
Moderate	18.2.A3—Provide Improved Pavement Surfaces
	18.2.B4—Implement Channelization, Signing and Striping Improvements at Interchanges Susceptible to Wrong-Way Movements
	18.2.E1—Enhance Agency Crash Data Systems
Moderate to High	18.2.B2—Improve Median Design for Vehicle Recovery
	18.2.C1—Improve Design and Application of Barrier and Attenuation Systems
Hiah	



#### Relative cost and time for implementation

Relative Cost to Implement and Operate	Strategy
Time Frame: Long (more than 2 years)	
Low	
Moderate	18.2.B3—Install Median Barriers for Narrow-Width Medians
Moderate to High	
High	18.2.B1—Provide Wider Medians



#### **Objectives and Strategies - Description**

Objectives	Strategies
18.1 A Keep vehicles from	18.2 A1 Install left shoulder rumble strips (T)
departing the traveled way	18.2 A2 Provide enhanced pavement markings and median delineation (T)
	18.2 A3 Provide improved pavement surfaces (T)
18.1B Minimize the likelihood	18.2 B1 Provide wider medians (P)
of head-on crashes with an oncoming vehicle	18.2 B2 Improve median design for vehicle recovery (T)
	<ul> <li>—Pavement edge drop-offs</li> <li>—Install paved median shoulder (new)</li> <li>—Design for safer slopes</li> </ul>
	18.2 B3 Install median barriers for narrow-width medians (P)
	18.2 B4 Implement channelization, signing and striping improvements at interchanges susceptible to wrong-way movements (T,E)
18.1 C Reduce the severity of median barrier crashes that occur	18.2 C1 Improve design and application of barrier and attenuation systems (T)
18.1 D Enhance enforcement and	D1 Designate "Highway Safety Corridors" (T)
awareness of traffic regulations	D2 Conduct public information & education campaigns (T)
18.1 E Improve coordination of agency safety initiatives	E1 Enhance agency crash data systems (T)

P = proven; T = tried; E = experimental. Several strategies have sub-strategies with different ratings.

Attribute	Description
Technical Attributes	
Target	Drivers who unintentionally cross into the left shoulder from the travel lane. For the application here, the target population is drivers leaving the left or median side of a divided freeway or expressway.
Expected Effectiveness	On freeways, right shoulder rumble strips have proven to be a very effective way to warn drivers that they are leaving or are about to leave the road. According to FHWA, several studies have estimated that right shoulder rumble strips can reduce the rate of ROR crashes by 20 to 50 percent, but it is not known how well this number can be translated to a reduction in cross-median head-on crashes; it potentially would be lower and would also depend on the median width. <i>NCHRP Report 500, Volume 6: A Guide for Addressing Run-Off-Road Collisions</i> gives a detailed description and the statistics regarding effectiveness for specific programs applied to two-lane rural highways.



Attribute	Description
Keys to Success	To be effective, left (median) shoulder rumble strips should be installed over a continuous length of facility. See discussion below—the design should enable drainage, not create maintenance problems, and should be incorporated with other reconstruction or resurfacing of the roadway and shoulder.
Potential Difficulties	Some potential pitfalls include complications with snow removal, shoulder maintenance requirements, and noise. With respect to adverse weather, ice and snow can collect in rumble strips. When the trapped water freezes, icy conditions may occur. However, if properly designed to accommodate for drainage requirements for shoulders, as well as speed, turbulence, and vibrations from passing vehicles, such factors tend to knock the ice from the rumble strips.
	There have been reports of noise complaints where shoulder rumble strips have been installed. New installations should acknowledge this concern and make provisions where necessary. Implementing a program of left rumble strips system-wide should consider local sensitivities to maintain support for such a program.
	TrafficSafetyGuru.com

Attribute	Description
Appropriate Measures and Data	In implementation evaluations, <i>process measures</i> would include the number of road miles or number of hazardous locations where left rumble strips are installed. Process measures may include the aspect of exposure, and the number of vehicle-miles of travel exposed to left shoulder rumble strips.
Associated Needs	There have been a few reports of people who mistook the sounds produced by the rumble strips as car trouble. A public information or education campaign, as well as standard installation, should eliminate such misinterpretations. However, current moves to their standardized use on freeways may provide the most effective public training.



Attribute	Description	
Organizational and Institutional Attributes		
Organizational, Institutional and Policy Issues	Many states have established specific design and placement policies for the placement of right shoulder rumble strips. From the experience of these agencies it does not appear that significant extra coordination with other agencies is needed for the installation of left shoulder rumble strips.	
Issues Affecting Implementation Time	This low cost strategy does not involve reconstruction and would not involve an environmental process or right-of-way acquisition. Left shoulder rumble strips in many instances can be implemented quickly, certainly within 1 year once a site is selected if the existing shoulder is in good condition and the shoulder width is adequate.	
Costs Involved	Costs will vary depending on whether the strategy is implemented as a stand-alone project or incorporated as part of a reconstruction or resurfacing project already programmed.	



Attribute	Description
Training and Other Personnel Needs	There appear to be no special personnel needs for implementing this strategy. States can either use agency personnel or contractors. The need for training will depend on whether the agency has been using retrofitted rumble strips on freeways or other roadways. If not, either agency or contractor personnel will need to be trained in proper installation techniques.
Legislative Needs	None identified.



## Designate "Highway Safety Corridors"

- •More frequent and enhanced enforcement efforts
- Low-cost engineering improvements
- Educational efforts to enhance safety in the corridor



#### Other NCHRP 500 Guides that may help:

**Strategies That Are Detailed in Other Emphasis Area Guides**—Programs to improve safety related to head-on crashes for freeways should also consider applicable strategies covered in the following guides (http://www.safety.transportation.org):

- Head-On Collisions
- Horizontal Curves
- Aggressive Driving
- Speed Guide (under development)
- Run-Off-Road Collisions
- Rural Emergency Management Systems
- Unbelted Occupants
- Unlicensed Drivers
- Distracted Fatigued Drivers
- Alcohol Impaired Drivers
- Safety Data Needs (under development)



#### Is that a pretty good resemblance?











The completed form can be returned to the Local Agency Traffic Safety Academy PDH Coordinator, Larry Hagen via email (<u>Larry@HagenConsultingServices.com</u>) or via toll-free fax (866-426-5153).

CONSULTING SERVICES, LLC

