# **User Guide**

# Vermont Systemic Safety Lane Departure Risk Screening Tool

**Prepared by:** 

**Operations and Safety Bureau** 

Vermont Agency of Transportation

March 2024

# Contents

| Orien  | Page 1   |                                      |
|--------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Backg  | round  | Page 1                               |
| Road   | Safety Concepts  | Page 1                               |
|        | Three Engineering Approaches for Improving Safety  | Page 1                               |
|        | The Rural Safety Problem   | Page 2                               |
|        | Systemic Safety  | Page 2                               |
|        | What is a Focus Crash Type?<br>What is a Focus Facility Type?<br>What are Risk Factors?<br>Binary Logit Modeling | Page 2<br>Page 3<br>Page 4<br>Page 4 |
|        | Crash Severity   | Page 5                               |
|        | Lane Departure Countermeasures   | Page 5                               |
| The P  | The Project  |                                      |
|        | Data Integration   | Page 6                               |
|        | Focus Crash Types and Facility Types   | Page 7                               |
|        | Risk Analysis Models   | Page 8                               |
|        | Risk Factors   | Page 8                               |
|        | Risk Scores  | Page 10                              |
|        | Risk Maps and Route Logs   | Page 11                              |
|        | Countermeasure Packages  | Page 13                              |
|        | Prioritized Implementation Ranking   | Page 14                              |
| How t  | o Use the Screening Tool   | Page 16                              |
|        | Getting Started  | Page 16                              |
|        | Practical Usage Guide  | Page 21                              |
| Glossa | ary  | Page 39                              |

Vermont Systemic Safety Lane Departure Risk Screening Tool – User Guide

# Orientation

This user guide for the Vermont Systemic Safety Lane Departure Risk Screening Tool presents the concepts and usage of the tool in simple terms. A technical report that discusses the project in more detail is available. Within this user guide, click on green boxes for links to other websites or documents.

Read the technical report:

**Technical Report** 

Access the Screening Tool:

**Risk-Based Tool** 

# Background

The principal purpose of this project was to develop a predictive methodology to apply the systemic safety approach to lane departure crashes for proactively implementing treatments at locations with high-risk characteristics. The Vermont Agency of Transportation led the project with federal funds through the Transportation Records Coordinating Committee and with a state match from state funds. The consulting firm VHB was retained to perform the analysis work. The Operations and Safety Bureau built the screening tool to provide access to the results.

# **Road Safety Concepts**

Learn how safety measures are implemented, what the key rural safety challenges are, what systemic safety is, what KABCO means, and what the countermeasures are that can be deployed to reduce lane departure crashes.

# **Three Engineering Approaches for Improving Safety**

There are three ways to implement safety engineering countermeasures.



✓ An example is installing enhanced chevrons at curves with radii between 750 ft and 1000 ft.

# **The Rural Safety Problem**

In Vermont, lane departure crashes account for over 70% of fatal and serious injury crashes.

While they represent a large number, the locations where roadway departure crashes occur change from year to year.

Take a look at the diagram and see that the locations of the crashes are not the same in the three years shown.



Since the locations are dispersed, there are no clusters. Lane departure crash locations are not well detected by the traditional site-specific method which looks at high frequencies of crashes.

The challenge of determining where lane departure crashes are likely to take place can be resolved by using the systemic method since, while the locations may be hard to predict, the site characteristics linked to lane departure crashes are stable and identifiable.

# **Systemic Safety**

The systemic method looks at crash history to identify factors that correlate with a particular crash type. The more factors that are present at a site, the greater the likelihood of a crash happening at that site.

The systemic method aims at implementing treatments at the sites with these common factors. It is proactive, and some of the sites treated may have no observed crashes yet.

# What is a Focus Crash Type?

A crash type is a category associated with a crash. It often describes the manner of collision or what a vehicle collided with.

Focus crash types are used in systemic safety analysis. They represent crash types with large proportions of fatal and serious injury crashes.



# What is a Focus Facility?

A focus facility is where a focus crash type happens most frequently. A couple examples of focus facilities are rural two-lane roads and horizontal curves.

A crash tree diagram is a tool that can be used to identify a focus facility. The diagram starts from a broad universe of crash data and branches out into smaller groups following the categories with the most crashes.

In the example, statewide crashes are at the top of the tree and are divided up into rural and urban crashes. The crash tree continues down the rural branch because there are more rural crashes. Crashes on rural undivided roads are more numerous, and that is the next branch with the final branch being two-lane. The focus facility is thus a rural, undivided, two-lane road.



# What are Risk Factors?



Risk factors are the common site characteristics associated with the focus crash types.

They are used to identify where crashes are most likely. However, the common elements being correlated with crashes do not necessarily imply a causal relationship or that they represent an inferior aspect of the roadway.

They are identified using overrepresentation analysis (for example, considering horizontal curves, as when the percentage of crashes within a radii range is larger than the percentage of curves with that range, e.g., 10-degree curves represent 20% of the network, but 50% of the crashes, therefore this range is overrepresented) or regression analysis as described next.

### **Binary Logit Modeling**

Binary logit models are a form of regression models. They differ from linear regression in that linear regression aims at predicting the value of a variable (e.g., number of crashes) while binary logit models are used to estimate the probability that an event happens (e.g., head-on crashes will occur, yes/no). They can be used to identify risk factors.

As with linear regression, there is a dependent variable and one or more independent variables. For instance, to predict the occurrence of head-on crashes, the dependent variable, we may want to see how road width and speed limits, the independent variables, affect the likelihood of head-on crashes happening.



The association between the independent variables and an outcome is measured by the odds ratio. Odds ratios > 1 indicate a positive effect, odds ratios < 1 indicate a negative effect. The p-value measures whether there is a relationship between the dependent and an independent variable. A relationship exists when the p-value is low (often p-value <0.05). A high p-value indicates that it cannot be concluded that a relationship exists. In this case, the variable is said to be insignificant.

# **Crash Severity**

Crash severity is based on the highest level of injury suffered by any of those involved in a crash. For example, if two people were involved in a crash, and one suffered a serious injury and the other person suffered a non-serious injury, the crash is classified as a serious injury crash.

The KABCO scale is used to refer to the severity of a crash.

- K Fatal
- A Suspected Serious Injury
- B Suspected Non-Serious Injury
- C Possible Injury
- O Property Damage Only Crashes

# Lane Departure Countermeasures

Countermeasures to reduce lane departure crashes are implemented to achieve one of three objectives: keep vehicles on the road, reduce the potential for a crash to occur, and minimize crash severity.

For each objective, countermeasures are specific to certain crash types (the Lane Departure Screening Tool can assist users in selecting the appropriate treatment).

| Lane Departure Objectives        |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Keep vehicles on the road        | Edge line markings                                   |
|                                  | MUTCD compliant curve warnings                       |
|                                  | Delineators  |
|                                  | Sequential flashing beacons and speed feedback signs |
|                                  | High friction surface treatments                     |
|                                  | Rumble strips  |
| Reduce the potential for crashes | Shoulders (add or widen)                             |
|                                  | SafetyEdge <sub>SM</sub>                             |
|                                  | Center line buffer                                   |
|                                  | Remove fixed objects to widen clear zone             |
|                                  | Flatten side slopes                                  |
| Minimize crash severity          | Roadside barrier                                     |
|                                  | Implement breakaway devices                          |

#### More information is available:

FHWA Roadway Departure

# **The Project**

The key steps for realizing the systemic lane departure project included roadway and crash data integration, the identification of focus crash types and focus facility types, the identification of risk factors, the creation of risk maps and the selection of countermeasures and prioritization of sites.



### **Data Integration**

Crash, roadway characteristics, traffic volume, and asset data were processed and integrated from various VTrans databases.

#### Crash data (Years 2016-2020):

- Crash locations
- Crash severity
- Manner of collision
- Collided-with attributes
- First harmful event

#### Area Type:

• Urban Area Boundary to define urban/rural areas

#### **Roadway Attributes:**

- Cross Sectional
- Functional Class and Facility Type
- Speed Limit
- Annual Average Daily Traffic
- Curves (horizonal and vertical)
- Intersections (Nodes and Legs)
- Line Striping
- Tenth of a mile pavement condition
- Limited access highways
- Long and short structures

#### Asset Data:

- Guardrails
- Rumble strips
- Traffic signs

# Focus Crash Types and Facility Types

The emphasis of this project was on lane departure crashes.

A lane departure crash is defined as a crash that occurs after a vehicle crosses an edgeline or centerline or otherwise leaves the traveled way.

The lane departure focus crash types selected are:

- Head-on crashes
- Fixed object crashes
- Overturn or rollover crashes
- Run-off-road crashes
- Nighttime Run-off-road crashes

To identify the focus facility types, crash tree diagrams were used with these elements to identify combinations of high crash frequencies: urban vs rural, state vs local ownership, curve vs tangent, presence of an intersection, fixed object struck, and lighting.

The crash data consisted primarily of fatal and suspected serious injury crashes (KA crashes), but when KA crashes were less than 100 for a focus crash type, suspected minor injury crashes (B crashes) were included.



Crash Tree for All RwD Crashes, KA Severity

#### **Review the crash trees:**

Project Crash Trees

The focus facility types identified are:

- Rural local horizontal curves
- Rural state horizontal curves
- Rural state tangents
- Interstates

Vermont Systemic Safety Lane Departure Risk Screening Tool - User Guide

## **Risk Analysis Models**

The evaluation of the crash trees produced 14 combinations of focus crash types and focus facility types to be evaluated for the identification of risk factors.

Rural Local Curves

- 1. Head-on crashes on rural local road curves
- 2. Overturn crashes on rural local road curves
- 3. Run-off road crashes on rural local road curves
- 4. Fixed object crashes on rural local road curves
- 5. Night-time run-off road crashes on rural local road curves

#### State Rural Curves

- 6. Head-on crashes on rural state curves of minor arterials and major collectors
- 7. Overturn crashes on rural state curves of minor arterials, major collectors, and principal arterials
- 8. Run-off road crashes on rural state curves of minor arterials and major collectors
- 9. Fixed object crashes on rural state curves of minor arterials and major collectors
- 10. Night-time run-off road crashes on rural state curves of minor arterials and major collectors

#### **Interstates**

11. Overturn crashes on Interstates

#### State Rural Tangents

- 12. Head on crashes on rural state tangents of minor arterials, major collectors, and principal arterials
- 13. Overturn crashes on rural state tangents of minor arterials, major collectors, and principal arterials
- 14. Run-off road crashes on rural state tangents of minor arterials and major collectors

#### **Risk Factors**

Crash prediction models using binary logic regression were developed to identify the risk factors for each of the 14 combinations.

Variables related to AADT, degree of curvature, intersections, curve geometry, vertical geometry, and roadside features were considered as independent variables.

In the development of the models, variables with a p-value exceeding 0.400 were considered insignificant and removed from the models.

A table of sample binary logit model outputs for the overturn crash type on the interstates is shown.

| Variable  | Odds<br>Ratio | Standard<br>Error | z-value | P> z  | 95<br>Confi<br>Inte | 5%<br>dence<br>erval | Weight                                |
|---|---------------|-------------------|---------|-------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| AADT over 15000 vpd                               | 1.931         | 0.580             | 2.19    | 0.029 | 1.071               | 3.480                | 1                                     |
| Presence of guardrail                             | 0.639         | 0.234             | -1.22   | 0.222 | 0.312               | 1.312                | 1 (if guardrail<br>is not<br>present) |
| Presence of Type A<br>Warning signs               | 2.427         | 1.057             | 2.04    | 0.042 | 1.034               | 5.699                | 2                                     |
| Natural Log of length of segment                  | 2.297         | 0.298             | 6.41    | 0.000 | 1.781               | 2.961                | N/A                                   |
| Constant  | 0.035         | 0.021             | -5.49   | 0.000 | 0.010               | 0.115                | N/A                                   |
| Note: Number of obser<br>0.1852; LR chi2(4) = 108 |               |                   |         |       |                     |                      |                                       |

The risk factors listed in the sample table include traffic volume exceeding 15,000 vehicles per day, the absence of guardrail and the presence of Type A warning signs. The table shows that segment length was included in the model but that it was not assigned a weight. This is because segment length is used in all the models for the only purpose of normalizing for the length of the segment but is not used as a risk factor.

The higher odds ratio (2.427) for the presence of Type A warning signs indicates that this variable has a greater influence on the occurrence of an overturn crash. For this reason, this variable is assigned a greater weight (2).

With an odds ratio below 1 (0.639), the presence of guardrail has a negative impact on the occurrence of an overturn crash. This is the reason why the absence of guardrail is selected as the risk factor.

#### Explore the Logit Models and Risk Factors:

Project Risk Factors

### **Risk Scores**

Segments were scored for each focus crash type based on the presence of the risk factors within the segment and their assigned weights. A sample calculation is shown.

| Risk Factor            | Risk<br>Factor<br>Value              | Segment<br>Value              | Risk<br>Weight        | Risk<br>Score |  |  |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--|--|
| AADT                   | Over<br>15000<br>vehicles<br>per day | 28200                         | 1                     | 1             |  |  |
| Guardrail              | None                                 | Right<br>Guardrail<br>Present | 1 (if not<br>present) | 0             |  |  |
| Type A Warning<br>Sign | Present                              | Present                       | 2                     | 2             |  |  |
| Total Risk Score (Sum) |                                      |                               |                       |               |  |  |

Segment Risk Score Calculation Example

Each segment was assigned a percentile rank based on its total score relative to the other segments within its focus crash and facility types. The percentile ranks were then used to assign the segments a risk category. Five categories of risk were determined: Minimal Risk, Low Risk, Medium Risk, High Risk, Primary Risk. A segment classified as <u>Not a Focus Facility</u> is a segment for which a particular focus crash type facility type combination is not applicable.



Percentile Rank Example

A percentile rank may contain more segments than its percentile category. As an illustration, the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile group represents the segments with the top 5% scores for a focus crash type and facility. However, it is possible for more than one segment to have the same score and therefore a larger percentage of segments (greater than 5%) could be associated with the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile rank.

| Risk         | Percentile  |
|--------------|-------------|
| Category     | Score Range |
| Primary Risk | 95-100      |
| High Risk    | 85-94       |
| Medium Risk  | 60-84       |
| Low Risk     | 30-59       |
| Minimal Risk | 0-29        |

### **Risk Maps & Route Logs**

Risk Maps were developed for each of the fourteen focus crash – focus facility combinations. Primary risk segments are shown on the maps in black while high-risk segments are shown in red.



Lane Departure Route Logs were developed for state roads. These route logs display, for a given road, the risk levels for each of the focus crash – focus facility combinations in a stacked manner along the entire road.

| (                                 | $\mathbf{\hat{o}}                                     $       | 1 |                    |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--------------------|
| Road Widths<br>Base<br>Subbase    | <ul> <li>31 → 30 → </li> <li>31 → 30 → </li> <li>4</li> </ul> | " | 29 ► ◀<br>8° - 24* |
| Curves                            |   | 3 |                    |
| Grades                            | -5.7A<br>+4.4   |   | -5.3A              |
| Guardrails                        |   |   |                    |
| Rumblestrips                      |   |   |                    |
| Speed Zone                        |   |   |                    |
| Curves: Head-on, FTC6             |   |   |                    |
| Curves: Overturn, FTC7            |   |   |                    |
| Curves: Run-off Road, FTC8        |   |   |                    |
| Curves: Fixed Object, FTC9        |   |   |                    |
| Curves: Night Run-off Road, FTC10 |   |   |                    |
| Interstate: Overturn, FTC11       |   |   |                    |
| Tangents: Head-on, FTC12          |   |   |                    |
| Tangents: Overturn, FTC13         |   |   |                    |
| Tangents: Run-off Road, FTC14     |   |   |                    |

# **Interpreting Risk**

**Q.** "Not sure why a rollover crash is likely here. It does not seem like much of a curve".

**Ans.** Risk is relative, not a certainty. It is possible that no rollover crashes will happen, but that, on average, if a rollover were to happen, this is a particular segment for which it would be more likely to occur. This does not characterize the road as safe versus unsafe but provides a location to proactively assess in terms of treating for the possibility of a future overturn crash.

The risk maps can be viewed directly in the Tool. The lane departure route logs can be accessed in the Tool via the menu button.

View the Lane Departure Route Logs:

Lane Departure Route Logs

## **Countermeasure Packages**

|            |   | Target Crash Types and Facilities                              |                               |   |   |                                 |   |   |  |
|------------|---|--|-------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Risk Level | Countermeasure<br>(Focus Crash and Facility Type) | Head-On<br>Crashes,<br>Curves<br>and<br>Tangents<br>(1, 6, 12) | Overturn,<br>Curves<br>(2, 7) | Fixed<br>Object<br>Crashes,<br>Curves<br>(4, 9) | Run-<br>Off-<br>Road,<br>Curves<br>(3, 8) | Overturn,<br>Interstate<br>(11) | Nighttime<br>Run-Off-<br>Road<br>Crashes,<br>Curves<br>and<br>Tangents<br>(5, 10) | Overturn,<br>Run-Off<br>Road,<br>Tangents<br>(13, 14) |  |
|            | Centerline Mumble Strips                          | $\bullet$  |                               |   |   |                                 |   |   |  |
|            | Centerline Rumble Strips                          | •  |                               |   |   |                                 |   |   |  |
|            | Designate No Passing Zone                         |  |                               |   |   |                                 |   |   |  |
| High       | Address Trip Hazards <sup>2</sup>                 |  |                               |   |   |                                 |   |   |  |
|            | Paved Shoulder Widening                           |  |                               | $\bullet$                                       |   | •                               | •   | •   |  |
|            | Targeted Clear Zone<br>Widening                   |  |                               |   |   |                                 |   |   |  |
|            | Reflective Pavement<br>Markings                   |  |                               |   |   |                                 | •   |   |  |

General standard countermeasures are proposed for all sites and more targeted treatments are suggested for medium, high and primary risk sites. The countermeasure matrix is divided into four tables. The high level countermeasure table is shown here.

In these tables, the countermeasures are applicable to all sites at the applicable risk level or above. For example, medium risk level countermeasures are applicable to medium risk, high risk, and primary risk sites.

Therefore, for primary risk sites, choose countermeasures from the medium, high or primary risk level countermeasures. For high risk sites, choose from medium or high risk level countermeasures and for medium risk sites, choose from medium risk level countermeasures only.

In suggesting these countermeasures, it is assumed that the signage recommended in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices is already present.

An entity that selects sites for remedial or preventive action should perform a more detailed diagnosis of the sites before implementing a specific countermeasure.

The Lane Departure Screening Tool provides an expanded version of the matrix that includes information about crash reduction potential, cost and maintenance concerns.

Look over the countermeasure matrix:

Countermeasure Matix

Learn more about the countermeasures:



Vermont Systemic Safety Lane Departure Risk Screening Tool - User Guide

# **Prioritized Implementation Ranking**

Primary risk sites are prioritized for the implementation of the following countermeasures for each focus crash type – focus facility type combination as applicable:

- Centerline Buffer Area
- Median Barrier
- High-Friction Surface Treatment
- Roadside Barrier
- Slope Flattening
- Clear Zone Widening
- Lighting
- Dynamic Chevrons
- Flashing Beacons

The specific relationship between the prioritized countermeasures and the focus crash type – focus facility type combinations is shown below.

| Focus                |                               | Prioritized Countermeasures |                        |                     |                     |      |          |                   |                     |                      |                     |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------|----------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Facility C<br>Type # | Crash Type                    | CENTERLINE<br>BUFFER AREA   | CLEAR ZONE<br>WIDENING | DYNAMIC<br>CHEVRONS | FLASHING<br>BEACONS | HFST | LIGHTING | MEDIAN<br>BARRIER | ROADSIDE<br>BARRIER | SHOULDER<br>WIDENING | SLOPE<br>FLATTENING |
| 1                    | Head-on_Curve_Local           | Yes                         |                        |                     |                     | Yes  |          | Yes               |                     |                      |                     |
| 2                    | Overturn_Curve_Local          |                             |                        | Yes                 | Yes                 |      |          |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 3                    | Run-Off_Curve_Local           |                             | Yes                    | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes  |          |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 4                    | Fixed Object_Curve_Local      |                             | Yes                    | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes  |          |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  |                     |
| 5                    | Nighttime Run-Off_Curve_Local |                             | Yes                    | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes  | Yes      |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 6                    | Head-On_Curve_State           | Yes                         |                        |                     |                     | Yes  |          | Yes               |                     |                      |                     |
| 7                    | Overturn_Curve_State          |                             |                        | Yes                 | Yes                 |      |          |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 8                    | Run-Off_Curve_State           |                             | Yes                    | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes  |          |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 9                    | Fixed Object_Curve_State      |                             | Yes                    | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes  |          |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  |                     |
| 10                   | Night_Run_Off_Curve_State     |                             | Yes                    | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes  | Yes      |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 11                   | Overturn_Interstate           |                             |                        |                     |                     |      |          |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 12                   | Head-On_Tangent_State         | Yes                         |                        |                     |                     | Yes  |          | Yes               |                     |                      |                     |
| 13                   | Overturn_Tangent_State        |                             |                        |                     |                     |      |          |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 14                   | Run-Off_Tangent_State         |                             |                        |                     |                     |      |          |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |

The ranking criteria consider crash risk and feasibility of installation using available planning level data. For example, for the installation of a median barrier, the ranking criteria are:

- Median is present and traversable
- 1 point for every cross-median crash
- 1 point for every 5-feet narrower than 30 ft in median width

View the countermeasure ranking criteria for primary risk sites:

Countermeasure Ranking Criteria

In the Screening Tool, the rankings of primary risk sites for the implementation of countermeasures can be viewed in a table format and they can also be displayed on a map.

The table example shown illustrates the priority ranking of primary risk sites on rural state curves for the high friction surface treatment countermeasure (CM03). In these tables, the lower the rank, the higher the priority. A site ranking of 1 is of higher priority than a site ranking of 50.

| Data   |                       |                    |                |             |                                 |             | ×    |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-------------|------|
| Detailed Risk Information Mitigation Strategies Segment Geometry Priority Rank |                       |                    |                |             |                                 |             |      |
| Q Search by Town, RPC,   |                       |                    |                |             |                                 | *=          |      |
| Route ID 🔶 🚥   | FROM_MEASURE ≑ \cdots | TO_MEASURE  +•••   | Segment ID 🌲 🚥 | TOWNNAM 💠   | $RF_Code \Leftrightarrow \dots$ | CM_Code 💠 🚥 | Rank |
| V011   | 36.26459999999497     | 36.2850000000349   | 83,021         | Springfield | RF_06                           | CM03        | 1    |
| V100   | 161.785099999937      | 161.8031000000463  | 370,751        | Morristown  | RF_06                           | CM03        | 1    |
| V100   | 161.8031000000463     | 161.8087999999888  | 370,768        | Morristown  | RF_06                           | CM03        | 1    |
| V100   | 161.8087999999888     | 161.83349999999336 | 370,830        | Morristown  | RF_06                           | CM03        | 1    |
| V015   | 42.25400000000815     | 42.267300000068    | 371,600        | Morristown  | RF_06                           | CM03        | 1    |
| V015   | 42.24899999999616     | 42.25400000000815  | 371,617        | Morristown  | RF_06                           | CM03        | 1    |
| V015   | 42.22890000001886     | 42.239199999996345 | 371,676        | Morristown  | RF_06                           | CM03        | 1    |
| V011   | 36.211999999999534    | 36.22560000005215  | 82,888         | Springfield | RF_06                           | CM03        | 8    |
| V011   | 36.22560000005215     | 36.24820000001816  | 82,924         | Springfield | RF_06                           | CM03        | 8    |
| V015   | 42.22699999999895     | 42.22890000001886  | 371,680        | Morristown  | RF_06                           | CM03        | 8    |
| 4  |                       |                    |                |             |                                 |             |      |

The prioritized sites can be viewed on a map. The darker colored segments represent the high priority segments.



NOTE. Only the sites with a rank of up to 500 are available in the tool. To review sites ranked beyond 500, go to the Menu in the lefthand panel of the Screening Tool and view the complete ranked dataset in Excel format (Rankings of Priority Segments for Select Countermeasures Table).

# How to Use the Screening Tool

### **Getting Started**

The application contains a short tutorial tour that goes over the key features to navigate the site. The tutorial can be viewed by clicking **Next** in the orange box at the bottom of the opening splash screen or any time during the session by clicking on **here** next to **See tutorial** at the top right corner of the page. It can also be accessed from the resource menu in the lefthand pane of the tool.



The following visuals illustrate the features of the application as presented in the tutorial.

### Crash Type / Facility Type Selection Button



#### **Layers Selection Button**



#### **Resources Menu Button**



#### **Filter Icon**



#### **Charts Button**



#### **Detailed Information Tab**



#### **Selection Tool**



#### Search Tool



## **Practical Usage Guide**

The guidance provided in this section is intended to show users how to use the tool to answer typical questions. The examples of practical usage that are demonstrated here include the following:

| Practical Usage # | Practical Usage Name   | Question to Answer  |
|-------------------|--|---|
| Practical Usage 1 | Reviewing the Systemic Safety of a Particular Road or Road Section                     | How is the road or road section expected to perform?  |
| Practical Usage 2 | Identifying Potential Mitigation<br>Measures for a Site                                | What are the suggested countermeasures for the conditions?  |
| Practical Usage 3 | Identifying which Lane Departure Crash<br>Sub-Type to Target for Mitigation            | Which crash type is most likely to result in a crash event on this road or in a town or region?                               |
| Practical Usage 4 | Developing a List of Top Sites to Review for an Area                                   | What are the top X sites in an area, for example,<br>what are the top 25 sites where the risk of head-<br>on crashes is high? |
| Practical Usage 5 | Selecting a Countermeasure and<br>Identifying Locations for Possible<br>Implementation | What are the locations where this countermeasure could be implemented?  |
| Practical Usage 6 | Exporting Data   | How can data be exported to be used in other applications such as Excel?  |

Detailed steps on how to use the tool for each of the practical usages listed above are provided to assist users.

#### Practical Usage 1 Reviewing the Systemic Safety of a Particular Road or Road Section

Practical Usage 1 demonstrates how to use the tool to review the systemic safety of a road or road section. A typical question to answer is: Are any parts of the road at risk for lane departure crashes?

#### Case Description

A user is interested in assessing the systemic safety of VT 105 around the Woods Hill Road intersection in Sheldon. The user is specifically interested in head-on crashes but is also curious about other crash types. VT 105 at this intersection follows a horizontal curve. The intersection is located at mile point 1.04. VT 105 in Sheldon is a rural road.

#### Step 1 Select a Focus Type

Because the intersection is located on a state road and on a curve, we want to select the state road curves facility type and the head-on crash type combination. In the lefthand pane, click on **Type**. Select **Rural State Curves: Head-on Crashes**. Note that selections made from the dropdown boxes remain active for all further queries until the tool is refreshed or the individual selections are changed.



Step 2 Select the Town, the Road and the Mile Markers

Click on **Filter** in the lefthand pane and then click on **Filter by Jurisdiction**. Pick a town from the **Town** dropdown menu (in this case, Sheldon).

| Filters           |           | × |      |
|-------------------|-----------|---|------|
| ▼ ▼ Filter by Jur | isdiction |   | ent. |
| Town:             | - All -   | v | X    |
| RPC:              | Q sheld   |   | ×    |
| District:         | Sheldon   |   | -    |
| VTrans Regi       | - All -   | ~ |      |

Go to **Filter by Route** and click on **Route ID** and pick the road from the dropdown menu (in this case, V105). The Filters widget can be expanded by clicking and dragging the bottom right corner to the size of you choosing.

|        |                      | A CAR        | A RIAN         |
|--------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Menu   | Million of a Million | Q V105       | ×              |
|        | Filters              | V105         |                |
|        |                      | U105A        |                |
| Data   | ▼ 🍸 Filter by Rout   | : 📒 🚝        | 0              |
| Charts | Route ID:            | 0 Selected 🗸 | A 7            |
|        |                      |              | and the second |

Go to **Filter by Town Mile Marker** and enter the **Town Begin** and **Town End** mile markers (in this case 0.9 and 1.10).

| ▼ 🍸 Filter by Town Mile Marker: |     |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|-----|--|--|--|--|
| Town Begin                      | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Town End                        | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |
|                                 |     |  |  |  |  |

For each filter, make sure the filter is active (the bullet will be white on an orange background).

At this point, the map will pan to the area of VT 105 in Sheldon. NOTE. This may take several seconds to occur. Once this is done, zoom to the area of interest.

An alternative approach for locating the area of interest is to click on the **Search Icon** (magnifying glass symbol) in the left top corner of the map and enter the name of the intersecting roads and of the town. The map will zoom directly to the intersection.



#### Step 3 Review the Risk Levels

Visually look at the road sections on the map to determine the risk levels for the filtered crash type (in this case Head-on Crashes).

For the curve at this intersection, the curve is divided into several smaller sections. Here, all the sections are shown in black, meaning that the overall curve is classified as primary risk for head-on crashes.

If the user clicks on a section, a new table that contains how the section is classified for other crash types will appear. In this case, the curve is also classified as primary risk for the other crash types.

In addition to viewing the risk levels on the map, the user can also view, in the righthand pane, the risk levels for all applicable crash types for the filtered facility type.



(NOTE. To view results for straight sections for the same crash type, the user will have to go back to Type and select Rural State Road Tangents: Head-on Crashes).

The user could also look at the lane departure route log for this road to view the risk levels for all crash types for both curves and tangents. To do so, select Menu and click the link for "Lane Departure Route Logs".

#### Practical Usage 2 Identifying Potential Mitigation Measures for a Site

Practical Usage 2 demonstrates how to identify potential countermeasures for a road section, for a given crash type and risk level. A typical question to answer is: What are suggested countermeasures for the conditions?

#### **Case Description**

This is a continuation of the previous example for Practical Usage 1. A user was interested in assessing the systemic safety of VT 105 around the Woods Hill Road intersection in Sheldon for head-on crashes.

Vermont Systemic Safety Lane Departure Screening Tool – User Guide

The user determined that the curve at this intersection was classified as primary risk for head-on crashes. The user now wants to identify which alternatives could be considered to prevent head-on crashes on this curve.

The user has completed steps 1 through 4 from Practical Usage 1.

#### Step 1 Select a Section of Road

The user clicks on a section of the curve to activate the information shown in the righthand pane.

#### Step 2 View Detailed Information

The user goes to the righthand pane and scrolls down to **Rural State Curves** and clicks, under Head-on Crashes, on Detailed Information. A mitigation strategy matrix opens.

#### Step 3 Review the Mitigation Strategies

The risk level of the site for head-on crashes is primary. Therefore, the user can review the countermeasures from the medium, high, or primary risk level tabs as the lower-level measures are also applicable to primary risk sites. The user clicks on each tab to view the countermeasures and select a few for further consideration.

|   | Ldiff                        | E DE DIGHTUILE AUSK SI      | alererererererererererererererererererer |   |   |  | See tutorial here.   |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| Head-on Crashes on Rural State Curves<br>Risk Lawei: Primary Risk [Risk Score: 5/13   Percentile: 97<br>Segment [D: 440286<br>LRS [D: V105-0614<br>Town MM Begin: 1.045<br>Town MM End: 1.056<br>Risk Score Details:<br>Total shoulder width over 4 feet: 0/1<br>Minor arterial instead of major collector: 2/2<br>AADT over 4,000 vehicles per day: 1/1<br>Natural [on of degree of curvature between 2 and 4: 0/3 |                              |                             |  | n Strategie<br>Id be revier<br>y risk sites,<br>easures.<br>isk sites, ch<br>im risk sites<br>nitigation st<br>mitigation s<br>e with the N<br>for signage. | ES<br>weed for suitability.<br>chose form medium, high, or prima<br>ose from medium, high risk level,<br>chose from medium, risk level cou-<br>rategies apply to all risk levels.<br>trategies (countermessures) presupp<br>AUTCD is already present. If this is no | Percentile:<br>Detailed information<br>Fixed Object Crashes<br>Risk Level: Not a Focus Facility   Score: /8  <br>Percentile:<br>Detailed information<br>Night-time Run-off Road Crashes<br>Risk Level: Not a Focus Facility   Score: /9  <br>Percentile:<br>Detailed information |  |
| Primary Risk Mitigation St  | rategies High Risk Mitigatio | n Strategies Medium Risk N  | Aitigation Strategies                    | Standa  | rd Risk Mitigation Strategies   |  | RURAL STATE CURVES<br>Head-on Crashes<br>Risk Level: Primary Risk   Score: 5/13   Percentil<br>97<br>Detailed information<br>Overture Crashes  |
| CM_Description 🗘 🚥  | RiskLevel 🗢 •••              | CrashReductio 🗢 🚥           | Cost                                     |   | ServiceLife 🗘 🚥   | Maintenance 🔤 •  | Risk Level: Primary Risk   Score: 7/14   Percentil<br>96   |
| Centerline Buffer Area  | Primary                      | 35% (2ft), 64% (4ft), 90% ( | Installed via restripin                  | g costs   | 1 year  | Annual restriping  | Detailed information.  |
| HFST  | Primary                      | 57% (All), 48% (F/I);72% (R | \$35 per yd2                             |   | 10-15 years   | N/A  | Run-off Road Crashes   |
| Median Buffer   | Primary                      | όό% (cross-median F), 81    | Medium                                   |   | 20 years  | N/A  | risk Level: Primary Risk   Score: //11   Percentil<br>100<br>Detailed information<br>Fixed Object Crashes<br>Risk Level: Primary Risk   Score: 8/11   Percentil<br>100<br>Detailed information<br>Night-time Run-off Road Crashes<br>Risk Level: Primary Risk   Score: 8/10   Percentil<br>100<br>Detailed information |

The user must review the site to determine the suitability of each countermeasure that they are considering. The user can perform a desk review by clicking on the segment in the map and clicking on **Click Here** next to **Google Streetview** at the top of the box, below the name of the road. Depending on the assessment, a formal field review may be necessary.



#### Practical Usage 3 Identifying which Lane Departure Crash Sub-Type to Target for Mitigation

Practical Usage 3 demonstrates how to use the tool to identify the lane departure crash type that an entity should target for mitigation. A typical question to answer is: Which crash type is most likely to result in crash events, in a region, town or road?

#### Case Description

A town manager wants to proactively improve safety in their town on the local road system. As a starting point, the town manager wants to identify which lane departure crash sub-type poses the most risk in the town. The town of Sheldon will be used as the case town.

#### Step 1 Select a Focus Type

Click on **Type**. Select a focus crash type/facility type combination (here select **Local Rural Curves: Head-on Crashes**.

#### Step 2 Select a Location (jurisdiction and/or road)

Click on **Filter** in the lefthand pane and then click on **Filter by Jurisdiction**. Pick a town from the Town dropdown menu (in this case, Sheldon). Since the user in this example is interested in making a determination for the entire town, the filtering ends here.

#### Step 3 Compute Mileage Info

In the lefthand pane, click on **Charts**. Select the facility type that corresponds to the crash type selected in step 1 (in this case, Local Rural Curves). Two charts will appear (The top chart presents risk levels by miles, while the bottom chart displays the percentage of miles in each risk category).

Vermont Systemic Safety Lane Departure Screening Tool – User Guide

#### Step 4 View the Mileage Breakdown by Crash Type

Click on **Head-On Crashes** in the top heading to see the breakdown for head-on crashes. Review the charts and write down or export the values (for head-on crashes, 4.2% of curve miles are rated as primary risk, 7.5% as high risk and 66.5% as medium.



#### Step 5 Look at Other Crash Types

Repeat step 4 for the other crash types. To look at other facility types, update the Type filter before repeating Step 4 and opening the chart relevant to the facility type of interest.

#### Step 6 Analyze the Results

Compare the results for the applicable crash types and identify the crash type that has the highest number of miles at the highest risk level or from a combination of risk levels.

From the analysis of the results, the town manager notes that the greatest number of miles (2.093) for the primary risk category is associated with overturn crashes. Overturn crashes on rural curves could be of interest. The town manager further decides to combine the primary and high-risk categories for each crash type and now identifies nighttime run-off-the road crashes on rural local curves as another potential crash type of interest with 3.2 miles of local rural curves. At this point, the town manager can

decide to base the town improvement program on this analysis considering one or both of the crash types identified.

(A user analyzing the rural state system may want to perform the above steps for both tangents and curves).

#### Practical Usage 4 Developing a List of Top Sites to Review for an Area

Practical Usage 4 illustrates how to use the tool to create a list of potential sites to review for preventive remedial action. A typical question to answer is: What are the top sites in a geographic location where the likelihood of a certain crash type happening is high?

#### Case Description

This is a continuation of the previous example for Practical Usage 3. A user was interested in identifying which lane departure crash sub-type posed the most risk in the town. The town manager determined that this crash sub-type was nighttime run-off-the-road crashes on local rural roads. The town manager now wants to know where nighttime run-off-the-road crashes could take place in the future and where to target improvements.

#### Step 1 Select a Focus Type

Click on **Type**. Select a focus crash type/facility type combination (here select **Local Rural Curves: Night-time Run-off Road Crashes**.

#### Step 2 Select a Location (jurisdiction and/or road)

Click on **Filter** in the lefthand pane and then click on **Filter by Jurisdiction**. Pick a town from the Town dropdown menu (in this case, Sheldon). Activate the filter by sliding the black selection bullet. In this case example, the user is interested in making a determination for the entire town, therefore the filtering ends here.

#### Step 3 Review the Filtered Data

In the lefthand pane, click on **Data** and go to the **Segment Geometry** Tab. Scroll right to the **RiskScore** field and sort this field in descending order. This will produce a list of the sites with the highest scores at the top.

#### Step 4 Create a List of Sites

Examine the table and highlight as many rows as the number of desired sites to review. Generate the list by exporting the selected records. To export the data, click on the four dots in the toolbar and then on Export.

To view the selected segments on the map, click on the four dots in the toolbar and under the menu for the selected records use one of the three viewing tools (Zoom to, Pan to, Show on map)

| Detailed Risk Information | Mitigation Strategies | gment Geometry Priority Ra | ink          |               |                |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
|                           |                       |                            |              | - U C 🗟       | 88             |
| FacilityType 🍦 🚥          | FAC_CODE 👙            | CategoryFocus 💠 🚥          | CFT_Code 🍦 … | RiskLevel 🌲 … | Selected (3)   |
| Rural Local Road Curves   | FAC1                  | CategoryFocusType5         | RF05         | Primary Risk  | Zoom to        |
| Rural Local Road Curves   | FAC1                  | CategoryFocusType5         | RF05         | Primary Risk  | Pan to         |
| Rural Local Road Curves   | FAC1                  | CategoryFocusType5         | RF05         | Primary Risk  | t Export       |
| Rural Local Road Curves   | FAC1                  | CategoryFocusType5         | RF05         | Primary Risk  | All data (606) |

Another way to generate the list is, once in the **Segment Geometry** Tab, export the data to csv format and use Excel to manipulate the records. To export the data, click on the four dots in the toolbar and then on Export.

(NOTE. In general, the top sites will be ranked in order of risk (with primary first, then high, then medium, etc). A user may want to create a list of sites that contains a number of sites from the primary risk level, some from the high-risk level and some from the medium risk level. To do this, the user can go to the **Risk** *Level* field and scroll down to the risk level of interest.

The user may want to repeat these steps for one or more focus crash types and combine the data in Excel to generate a multi-crash type list).

### Practical Usage 5 Selecting a Countermeasure and Identifying Locations for Possible Implementation

Practical Usage 5 explains how to use the tool to find locations where a selected countermeasure should be constructed. A typical question to answer is: What are the locations where this countermeasure could be implemented?

#### Case A Description

Two individuals are interested in installing signage to prevent the occurrence of nighttime run-off-road crashes. The first user is a road foreman who has the list of local road sites that was generated in Practical Usage 4. The second user is a VTrans employee who reviewed the systemic safety of a state road using the steps mentioned in Practical Usage 1.

#### Step 1 Chose a Countermeasure to Implement

For this case, the users are interested in low-cost signage countermeasures.

#### Step 2 Match the Countermeasure to a Crash a Type

#### Option 1, Look up the Static "Paper" Matrix

In the lefthand pane, click on **Menu** and then on **Safety Mitigation Matrix**. A new tab will open with a link to the LD Countermeasure Matrix pdf. Open the matrix and locate the countermeasure in the countermeasure matrix (for this case, the users identify Supplemental MUTCD Curve Warning Signs and Post-Mounted Delineators as two options).

Then, identify which crash types the countermeasure is associated with (The user notes that of the two types of countermeasures, Post-Mounted Delineators are the only suggested measure for nighttime run-off-road crashes).

Finally, note the risk level (the users also note that Post-Mounted Delineators are applicable to sites that are classified as medium risk and above).

|            |  |  | Target Crash Types and Facilities |   |   |                                 |   |   |  |  |
|------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Risk Level | Countermeasure<br>(Focus Crash and Facility Type)      | Head-On<br>Crashes,<br>Curves<br>and<br>Tangents<br>(1, 6, 12) | Overturn,<br>Curves<br>(2, 7)     | Fixed<br>Object<br>Crashes,<br>Curves<br>(4, 9) | Run-<br>Off-<br>Road,<br>Curves<br>(3, 8) | Overturn,<br>Interstate<br>(11) | Nighttime<br>Run-Off-<br>Road<br>Crashes,<br>Curves<br>and<br>Tangents<br>(5, 10) | Overturn,<br>Run-Off<br>Road,<br>Tangents<br>(13, 14) |  |  |
|            | Widened Centerline<br>Markings                         | •  |                                   |   |   |                                 |   |   |  |  |
| Medium     | Supplemental MUTCD<br>Curve Warning Signs <sup>3</sup> | •  | •                                 | •   | •   |                                 |   |   |  |  |
| inculum    | Post-Mounted Delineators                               |  | •                                 | •   | •   | •                               |   | •   |  |  |
|            | Shoulder Rumble Strips                                 |  | •                                 | •   | •   |                                 | •   | •   |  |  |

### Option 2, Look up the "tool" Matrix

In the lefthand pane, click on **Data**, then click on the **Mitigation Strategies** tab.

Sort the **CM\_Description** field and look in that field for the chosen countermeasure (for this case, Supplemental MUTCD Curve Warning Signs and Post-Mounted Delineators).

Look in the **CFT\_Code** field for the corresponding crash types (The users note that of the two types of countermeasures, Post-Mounted Delineators are the only suggested measure for nighttime run-off-road crashes. In the **CFT\_Code** column, RF5 refers to nighttime run-off-road crashes on local rural roads while RF10 refers to nighttime run-off-road crashes on rural state curves.

Finally, look in the **RiskLevel** field for the applicable risk level (the users also note that Post-Mounted Delineators are applicable to sites that are classified as medium risk and above).

| Detailed Rick Informa | tion Mitigation Strategies | Segment Coometry - Brievity | Baak          |                          |                           |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Detailed Risk Informa | Mitigation Strategies      | Segment Geometry Priority   | Kank          |                          |                           |
|                       |                            | $\frown$                    |               |                          | - 0 0 5                   |
| CFT_Code • 2          | •• CM_Code 🔶 •             | ·· CM_Descripti ···         | RiskLevel • 3 | CrashReductio 🌲 🚥        | Cost 🌲                    |
| F10                   | CM18                       | Reflective Pavement Marki   | High          | N/A                      | \$0.06 lf (paint), \$0.56 |
| F02                   | CM21                       | Post-Mounted Delineators    | Medium        | Post-mounted Delineators | \$100 per delineator (i   |
| F03                   | CM21                       | Post-Mounted Delineators    | Medium        | Post-mounted Delineators | \$100 per delineator (i   |
| F04                   | CM21                       | Post-Mounted Delineators    | Medium        | Post-mounted Delineators | \$100 per delineator (i   |
| F05                   | CM21                       | Post-Mounted Delineators    | Medium        | Post-mounted Delineators | \$100 per delineator (i   |
| F07                   | CM21                       | Post-Mounted Delineators    | Medium        | Post-mounted Delineators | \$100 per delineator (i   |
| F08                   | CM21                       | Post-Mounted Delineators    | Medium        | Post-mounted Delineators | \$100 per delineator (i   |
| F09                   | CM21                       | Post-Mounted Delineators    | Medium        | Post-mounted Delineators | \$100 per delineator (i   |
| F10 🔶                 | CM21                       | Post-Mounted Delineators    | Medium        | Post-mounted Delineators | \$100 per delineator (i   |

#### Step 3 Identify and Review Locations

Identify the segments in the list of priority sites developed in Practical Usage 4 or along a specific road as in Practical Usage 1 that matches the risk level(s) isolated in Step 2.

The user must review the site to determine the suitability of the countermeasure that they are considering. The user can perform a desk review by clicking on the segment in the map and clicking on **Click Here** next to **Google Streetview** at the top of the box, below the name of the road. Depending on the assessment, a formal field review may be necessary.

(NOTE. For locations on state highways, the user can turn on the VTrans Projects layer under the Layers menu to see if a project is planned and if opportunities for harmonization exist).

#### Case B Description

A user wants to develop a project to implement high friction surface treatment at several locations. The user is aware that certain countermeasures were ranked for primary risk sites and that the results of this screening can be reviewed with the Screening Tool. The user wants to look at the screening to identify sites where to implement high friction surface treatment.

#### Step 1 Select a Countermeasure

Determine which countermeasures were prioritized for each facility type by looking in the table shown on page 13 of the User Guide (reproduced below).

| Focus              |                               |                           |                        |                     | P                   | rioritized Cou | untermeasur | es                |                     |                      |                     |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Facility<br>Type # | Crash Type                    | CENTERLINE<br>BUFFER AREA | CLEAR ZONE<br>WIDENING | DYNAMIC<br>CHEVRONS | FLASHING<br>BEACONS | HFST           | LIGHTING    | MEDIAN<br>BARRIER | ROADSIDE<br>BARRIER | SHOULDER<br>WIDENING | SLOPE<br>FLATTENING |
| 1                  | Head-on_Curve_Local           | Yes                       |                        |                     |                     | Yes            |             | Yes               |                     |                      |                     |
| 2                  | Overturn_Curve_Local          |                           |                        | Yes                 | Yes                 |                |             |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 3                  | Run-Off_Curve_Local           |                           | Yes                    | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes            |             |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 4                  | Fixed Object_Curve_Local      |                           | Yes                    | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes            |             |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  |                     |
| 5                  | Nighttime Run-Off_Curve_Local |                           | Yes                    | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes            | Yes         |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 6                  | Head-On_Curve_State           | Yes                       |                        |                     |                     | Yes            |             | Yes               |                     |                      |                     |
| 7                  | Overturn_Curve_State          |                           |                        | Yes                 | Yes                 |                |             |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 8                  | Run-Off_Curve_State           |                           | Yes                    | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes            |             |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 9                  | Fixed Object_Curve_State      |                           | Yes                    | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes            |             |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  |                     |
| 10                 | Night_Run_Off_Curve_State     |                           | Yes                    | Yes                 | Yes                 | Yes            | Yes         |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 11                 | Overturn_Interstate           |                           |                        |                     |                     |                |             |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 12                 | Head-On_Tangent_State         | Yes                       |                        |                     |                     | Yes            |             | Yes               |                     |                      |                     |
| 13                 | Overturn_Tangent_State        |                           |                        |                     |                     |                |             |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |
| 14                 | Run-Off_Tangent_State         |                           |                        |                     |                     |                |             |                   | Yes                 | Yes                  | Yes                 |

#### Step 2 Activate the Priority Rank Layer

In the lefthand pane, click on Layers and turn on the Priority Rank layer.



#### Step 3 Set Up the Priority Rank Filter

In the lefthand pane, click on **Filters**. In **Filters**, scroll down to the bottom and activate the **Filter by Priority Rank** by sliding the black bullet to the right (the bullet will turn white on an orange background). In **RF\_Code is**, select the focus crash type (for this case, select Rural State Curves: Head-on). In **CM\_Code is**, select the countermeasure (here HFST).

| Filters             |               |   |
|---------------------|---------------|---|
|                     |               |   |
| ▼ 🍸 Filter by Prior | rity Rank:    |   |
| RF_Code is          | Rural State C | ~ |
| CM_Code is          | HFST          | • |
| Rank is             |               |   |
| Rank is bet         | and           |   |
| TTOFODD             |               |   |

#### Step 4 Review the Filtered Data

In the lefthand pane, click on **Data** and go to the **Priority Rank** Tab. Scroll right to the **Rank** field and sort this field in ascending order. This will produce a list of the sites with the highest priority at the top (A priority rank of 1 is of more importance than a rank of 50).

| Data                      |                           |                         |                |                |         |             | $\rightarrow$ |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------|-------------|---------------|
| Detailed Risk Information | n Mitigation Strategies S | Segment Geometry Priori | ty Rank        |                |         |             |               |
| Q Search by Town, RPC,    |                           |                         |                |                |         | *=          |               |
| Route ID 🔶                | FROM_MEASURE  + ····      | TO_MEASURE 💠 ····       | Segment ID 🌲 🚥 | TOWNNAM 💠 ···· | RF_Code | CM_Code 💠 … | Rank          |
| V011                      | 36.26459999999497         | 36.2850000000349        | 83,021         | Springfield    | RF_06   | CM03        | 1             |
| V100                      | 161.785099999937          | 161.80310000000463      | 370,751        | Morristown     | RF_06   | CM03        | 1             |
| V100                      | 161.8031000000463         | 161.8087999999888       | 370,768        | Morristown     | RF_06   | CM03        | 1             |
| V100                      | 161.8087999999888         | 161.83349999999336      | 370,830        | Morristown     | RF_06   | CM03        | 1             |
| V015                      | 42.25400000000815         | 42.267300000068         | 371,600        | Morristown     | RF_06   | CM03        | 1             |
| V015                      | 42.24899999999616         | 42.25400000000815       | 371,617        | Morristown     | RF_06   | CM03        | 1             |
| V015                      | 42.22890000001886         | 42.239199999996345      | 371,676        | Morristown     | RF_06   | CM03        | 1             |
| V011                      | 36.211999999999534        | 36.22560000005215       | 82,888         | Springfield    | RF_06   | CM03        | 8             |
| V011                      | 36.22560000005215         | 36.24820000001816       | 82,924         | Springfield    | RF_06   | CM03        | 8             |
| V015                      | 42.22699999999895         | 42.22890000001886       | 371,680        | Morristown     | RF_06   | CM03        | 8             |
|                           |                           |                         |                | 1              | i       | i           |               |

To view one or more sites on the map, highlight the appropriate rows and click on the four dots in the toolbar and under the menu for the selected records use one of the three viewing tools (Zoom to, Pan to, Show on map).

To export the data, click on the four dots in the toolbar and then on **Export**.

(NOTE. Only sites with a rank of up to 500 are available in the tool. To see sites ranked above 500, go to the Menu in the lefthand panel of the Screening Tool and view the complete ranked dataset in Excel format (Rankings of Priority Segments for Select Countermeasures Table).

#### Practical Usage 6 Exporting Data

Practical Usage 6 demonstrates how to use export data. A typical question to answer is: How can data be exported to be used in other applications such as Excel. For any data that can be exported, the key steps for exporting data are to click on the four dots in the toolbar to see the options and then on Export.

#### Case A Description

A user reviewed the systemic safety of a road (VT 17 in Addison) as in Practical Usage 1. The user wants to save the risk level information in a table format.

#### Step 1 Open the Data Table

On the lefthand pane, click on **Data**, then on the **Project Summary** Tab.

#### Step 2 Export The Data

Click on the four dots in the toolbar and then on Export. Select Export to CSV to view the data in Excel.



To export only specific records, highlight the desired row or select the segments directly on the map with the selection tools in the top left corner of the map.

#### Step 3 Open the Exported File

In your File Explorer on your computer, go to the download folder and click on the file (Crash Risk Level) to open it.



#### Case B Description

The user from Case A now wants to download the roadway data and detailed risk-based scoring for the same segments as in Case A (The user is looking at VT 17 in Addison).

#### Step 1 Select the Segments of Interests

The data the user is looking for can be found in the **Detailed Risk Information** tab under **Data**. All records in the current map view extent are displayed by default. The user must select the segments of interest by selecting them directly on the map or by performing a query within the data table. The Detailed Risk Information table will display the risk level for ALL facility types and crash types, regardless of what focus type is selected in the Type filter.

The steps below are for selecting the segments via the map.

To select the segments of interest using the map, click the **Select** tool in the top left of the map. The tool will turn orange when it is active. Click the arrow to expand selection options if needed.





On the map, click and drag the shape over the segments of interest. Release the mouse button once all segments of interest are in the selection.

Vermont Systemic Safety Lane Departure Screening Tool – User Guide

To undo the selection, click the **Select** tool button again and then click anywhere on the map or click the **Clear Selection** button next to the Select tool.

The steps below are for selecting the segments via a query.

- <u>Step 1a</u>: On the lefthand pane, click on **Data**, then on the **Detailed Risk Information** Tab. <u>Step 1b</u>: Click on the four dots in the toolbar and then on **Set filter**.
- Step 1c: Click on Add, then on Clause.



Step 1d: Select Route ID and then enter V017 for VT 17.

| Set filter          | ×     |
|---------------------|-------|
| Segments_PopUp_noMM | 9     |
|                     | + Add |
| Aa                  |       |
| ABC Route ID 🗸 is   | ~     |
| 巴 V017              |       |
|                     |       |

<u>Step 1e</u>: Click on **Add** again, then on **Clause**.

#### <u>Step 1f</u>: Select **TOWNNAME** and then enter Addison.

| gments_PopUp_noM | M  |       |
|------------------|----|-------|
| AND OR           |    | + Add |
|                  | A  |       |
| 🔉 Route ID 🗸 🗸   | is | ~     |
| E V017           |    |       |
|                  | A  |       |
| ™ TOWNN ✓        | is | ~     |
| Addison          |    |       |

| Detailed R | isk Information | Mitigation Strategies S | Segment Geometry Priority | Rank             |    |
|------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|----|
|            |                 |                         |                           |                  |    |
| Route ID   | ÷               | FROM_MEASURE  ····      | TO_MEASURE   💠 ••••       | Through Lanes  🐽 | Me |
| /017       |                 | 0.2312999999994645      | 0.23769999999785796       | 2                | 1  |
| /017       |                 | 0.23769999999785796     | 0.2501999999949476        | 2                | 1  |
| /017       |                 | 0.2501999999949476      | 0.277900000009546         | 2                | 1  |
| /017       |                 | 0.277900000009546       | 0.280199999937834         | 2                | 1  |
| /017       |                 | 0.280199999937834       | 0.2853999999933876        | 2                | 1  |
| /017       |                 | 0.3266000000032596      | 0.3594000000118744        | 2                | 1  |
| /017       |                 | 0.3594000000118744      | 0.3659999999945285        | 2                | 1  |
| V017       |                 | 0.3659999999945285      | 0.392900000061933         | 2                | 1  |

Once a selection is made, the table will filter to the segments selected.

Steps 2 and 3 are the same as in Case A and are not repeated here.

#### Case C Description

A user wants to export the mileage breakdown data from the charts.

#### Step 1 Export the Data

Follow Steps 1 – 3 of Practical Usage 3 to select the chart.

Once the chart is displayed, click on the four dots in the toolbar and then on **Export**. Select **Export to CSV** to view the data in Excel.



# Glossary

| Term                      | Definition   |
|---------------------------|--|
| AADT                      | Annual Average Daily Traffic                         |
| FHWA                      | Federal Highway Administration                       |
| Focus Crash Type          | The crash type that represents the greatest          |
|                           | number of severe crashes across the roadway          |
|                           | system being analyzed and provides the greatest      |
|                           | potential to reduce fatalities and severe injuries   |
| Focus Facility Type       | The facility type on which the focus crash type      |
|                           | most frequently occurs                               |
| Focus Type 1              | Head-on crashes on rural local road curves           |
| Focus Type 2              | Overturn crashes on rural local road curves          |
| Focus Type 3              | Run-off road crashes on rural local road curves      |
| Focus Type 4              | Fixed object crashes on rural local road curves      |
| Focus Type 5              | Night-time run-off road crashes on rural local       |
|                           | road curves  |
| Focus Type 6              | Head-on crashes on rural state curves of minor       |
|                           | arterials and major collectors                       |
| Focus Type 7              | Overturn crashes on rural state curves of minor      |
|                           | arterials, major collectors, and principal arterials |
| Focus Type 8              | Run-off road crashes on rural state curves of        |
|                           | minor arterials and major collectors                 |
| Focus Type 9              | Fixed object crashes on rural state curves of        |
|                           | minor arterials and major collectors                 |
| Focus Type 10             | Night-time run-off road crashes on rural state       |
|                           | curves of minor arterials and major collectors       |
| Focus Type 11             | Overturn crashes on Interstates                      |
| Focus Type 12             | Head on crashes on rural state tangents of minor     |
|                           | arterials, major collectors, and principal arterials |
| Focus Type 13             | Overturn crashes on rural state tangents of minor    |
|                           | arterials, major collectors, and principal arterials |
| Focus Type 14             | Run-off road crashes on rural state tangents of      |
|                           | minor arterials and major collectors                 |
| Functional Classification | Streets and highways are grouped into one of         |
|                           | seven classes, depending on the character of the     |
|                           | roadway and the degree of land access that they      |
|                           | allow. These classifications are as follows:         |
|                           | 0 = Not part of Functional Classification System     |
|                           | 1 = Interstate                                       |
|                           | 2 = Principal Arterial – other freeways and          |
|                           | expressways  |
|                           | 3 = Principal Arterial – other                       |
|                           | 4 = Minor Arterial                                   |
|                           | 5 = Major Collector                                  |
|                           | 6 = Minor Collector                                  |

|                              | 7 = Local   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Horizontal Curve Type        | Type of horizontal alignment: Independent             |
|                              | horizontal curve, Component of compound curve         |
|                              | (i.e., one curve in compound curve), Component        |
|                              | of reverse curve (i.e., one curve in a reverse        |
|                              | curve) - MIRE Element 194                             |
| КАВСО                        | Crash Severity is coded using the KABCO scale, as     |
|                              | per the Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria          |
|                              | (MMUCC) based on the most severe injury to any        |
|                              | person involved in the crash                          |
| K (Fatality)                 | A fatality is any injury that results in death within |
|                              | 30 days after the motor vehicle crash in which the    |
|                              | injury occurred. PLEASE NOTE: The National            |
|                              | Highway Traffic and Safety Administration's           |
|                              | (NHTSA) definition under the Fatal Analysis           |
|                              | Reporting System (FARS) requirement, a "fatal         |
|                              | injury must only be used if the death occurred        |
|                              | within thirty consecutive 24-hour time periods        |
|                              | from the time of the crash". If a death happens       |
|                              | after the 30-day period, code as Injury Crash type    |
|                              | and the injury is coded as Suspected Serious          |
|                              | Injury (A)  |
| A (Suspected Serious Injury) | A suspected serious injury is any injury other than   |
|                              | fatal which results in one or more of the             |
|                              | Control locaration resulting in expective of          |
|                              | underlying tissues/muscle/organs or resulting in      |
|                              | significant loss of blood                             |
|                              | ~ Broken or distorted extremity (arm or leg)          |
|                              | ~ Crush injuries                                      |
|                              | ~ Suspected skull, chest or abdominal injury other    |
|                              | than bruises or minor lacerations                     |
|                              | ~ Significant burns (second and third degree          |
|                              | burns over 10% or more of the body)                   |
|                              | ~ Unconsciousness when taken from the crash           |
|                              | scene   |
|                              | ~ Paralysis   |
| B (Suspected Minor Injury)   | A suspected minor injury is any injury that is        |
|                              | evident at the scene of the crash, other than fatal   |
|                              | or serious injuries. Examples include lump on the     |
|                              | head, abrasions, bruises, minor lacerations (cuts     |
|                              | on the skin surface with minimal bleeding and no      |
|                              | exposure or deeper tissue/muscle)                     |
| C (Possible Serious Injury)  | A possible injury is any injury reported or claimed   |
|                              | which is not a fatal, suspected serious of            |
|                              | momentary loss of consciousness, claim of injury      |
|                              | momentally loss of consciousness, ciaim of injury,    |

| O Property Damage Only (No Apparent Injury) | limping, or complaint of pain or nausea. Possible<br>injuries are those which are reported by the<br>person or are indicated by his/her behavior, but<br>no wounds or injuries are readily evident<br>No apparent injury is a situation where there is   |
|---|--|
|   | no reason to believe that the person received<br>any bodily harm from the motor vehicle crash.<br>There is no physical evidence of injury and the<br>person does not report any change in normal<br>function   |
| Lane Departure Crash                        | FHWA defines a lane departure crash as a crash<br>which occurs after a vehicle crosses an edge line<br>or a center line, or otherwise leaves the traveled<br>way   |
| Not a Focus Facility                        | A segment for which a particular focus crash type facility type combination is not applicable  |
| Risk Factor                                 | A representation of risk in characteristics<br>associated with the locations where the type of<br>targeted crash types occurred  |
| Route Log                                   | A depiction of a given section of highway as it<br>would look if the section was straightened out.<br>This depiction method helps see the relationship<br>of various features, like road widths, curves and<br>grades, and lane departure risk levels  |
| Systemic Safety Improvement                 | An improvement that is widely implemented<br>based on high-risk roadway features that are<br>correlated with particular crash types, rather than<br>crash frequency  |
| Systemic Safety Management                  | The systemic safety management approach is<br>used to program implementation of proven safety<br>treatments across a large number of sites to<br>reduce crash potential using crash prediction<br>models or rating systems based on roadway<br>features correlated with particular severe crash<br>types |