

#### Speed Management in a Toward Zero Deaths Framework

Lifesavers - Nashville April 29, 2014

April 29, 2014

Libby Thomas Senior Research Associate

#### **Main Talking Points**

- What has happened to speed limits as a safety measure
- Different stakeholders have different needs/perspectives about Speed
- What can we learn from Toward Zero deaths jurisdictions
- Institutionalizing good practices
- Framing the Message

#### Focus on Speed Management: Best/Good Practice

- Appropriate (sometimes LOWER) speed limits *suited* to land uses, road designs, people
- Inform the driver
- Road designs and enforcement make limits credible
- Enforcement PERCEPTION
- Penalties that support enforcement consistency, more than intensity
- Publicity
- Prioritize allocation of resources













# Group wants crackdown on traffic scofflaws ur wins wingpressors endercome integration of the state of the stat



#### **Purpose of Speed Limits**

 to promote highway safety – traditionally by establishing maximum safe speed under favorable conditions

(NCHRP, 2009). Enforcement, engineering speed management strategies are both crucial to, and depend on, safety of speed limits established.

Speed Limits – Is this Paradigm still valid?







#### Planning & Design Policies and Guidelines

- Existing road engineering manuals and design guides safety implied by designing to recommendations
- Guidance urging designers to use *higher design speeds*
- Speed limits / intended operating speeds often an afterthought

White Papers from "Toward Zero Deaths: A National Strategy on Highway Safety: No. 6 – Safer Infrastructure" by Paul Jovanis and Eric Donnell

#### **Enforcement and Publicity**

- Insufficient enforcement resources
- Publicity /communications not used enough or well

#### Speed enforcement

Courts

- Operating speeds over time
- Speeding-related fatalities/fatality percentage
- Urban areas, community livability
- Residents, farmers, cyclists, drivers in rural areas

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Fatalities	11,767	10,664	10,508	10,001	10,219
VMT Rate*	0.40	0.36	0.35	0.34	0.34
Pop. Rate**	3.87	3.48	3.40	3.21	3.26
Pct of Total	31.44%	31.47%	31.84%	30.79%	30.45%
* Rate per 100 n	nillion miles of	of travel			
** Rate per 100,	000 populati	on			

#### **Purpose of Speed Limits**

- to promote highway safety traditionally by establishing maximum safe speed under favorable conditions
- Speed Limits Is this Paradigm still valid?



#### Humans are Fallible

- Safe System (Netherlands, Australia)
- Vision Zero (Sweden, NYC)
- Making Roads Safer (U.K.)
- Toward Zero Deaths (U.S. & many states)

# Safer Countries

- New allocation of responsibility
  - Designers of system are responsible
  - Users are responsible for following rules of use
- But if user fails, system must reduce harm

#### And,

Managing speed is a key principle



#### **Setting Speed Limits**

#### **Injury Minimization**

- Setting speed limits according to the tolerance of the human body to injury during a crash (managing the crash energy)
- Look to the speed of travel and the likely types of collision to determine the maximum speed
  - Pedestrian/cyclist crash  $\rightarrow$  20 mph (30 km/h)
  - Side impact crash ightarrow 30 mph (50 km/h)
  - Head-on crash  $\rightarrow$  45 mph (70 km/h)



From Gerry Forbes, INTUS Road Safety Engineering Inc. presentation for FHWA

#### If Limits Are Not Safe or Credible

- □ What needs to be changed?
- □ What can be changed (to improve safety)?
  - The limit
  - The road design
  - Enforcement
  - Vehicles
  - Drivers

#### **Fewer Different Limits**

- May be more comprehensible to drivers
- May reduce confusion
- May help with thinking about design

#### **Systematic Process**

- Network screening or
- Data Driven Approach to Crime and Traffic Safety (DDACTS)
- Diagnosis
- Identify alternate treatments
- Prioritize most cost-effective

Systematic – Screen and Rank Safety								
Issues Table 3: Prioritization Matrix								
Fragmancy	Severity of Crashes							
of Crashes	Possible/Minor Injury	Moderate Injury	Serlous Injury	Fatal				
Frequent	Moderately High	High	Highest	Highest				
Occasional	Middle	Moderately High	High	Highest				
Infrequent	Low	Middle	Moderately High	High				
Rare	Lowest	Low	Middle	High				
				BICILE ROLD SAFETT ADD BUILLISTS HID PROMPFLISTS				







#### **Proactive Process**

- Plan for desired speed
- Integrate with land use, other transport plans, user needs
- Institutionalize speed managing designs
- Institutionalize cooperation

# **Importance of Broad Perspective**

• Who gets to decide speed limits?





#### **Policies**

- Lower limits in urban areas (with ASE enforcement): - 12% casualty (F & I) crashes (Victoria, AU)
- Widely implemented road diets (NYC)
   -70% injury and fatal crashes
- Licensing study current practices & effects
- Criminal justice system approach to penalties what are effects
- Reduce exposure are there alternatives for transportation



#### **Designs that Support Limits**

- Roundabouts (instead of two-way stop or signal): - 66% to 90% Fatal and Injury
- Road diets: 19 to 47% Fatal and Injury
- Fewer lanes, narrower lanes, traffic calming elements



#### **Enforcement to Supplement**

Population-wide deterrence



http://www.miamipolice.org/traffic\_enforcement.html





#### **Enforcement Strategies**

- Automated enforcement: 25% injury crashes (dep. on environment & implementation)
- Lower speeding tolerance (Victoria, AU): 27% fatal crashes; – 10% injury crashes
- Improve regular enforcement allocation



#### **Judicial Coordination**

 Improve prosecution effectiveness; perhaps focus on target corridors (tried, not proven)

#### Publicity

- Increase the perception that speeders will be caught any where and any time
- Media publicity: 10% fatal and injury (associated with Charlotte NC ASE program)



#### Communications

- Framing the message
- Credible messengers to target audiences
- Take advantage of injury prevention

partners and communications experts



What is the Message								
<ul> <li>This</li> </ul>								
Nationwide S	Speeding-I	Related F	atalities					
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012			
Fatalities	11,767	10,664	10,508	10,001	10,219			
VMT Rate*	0.40	0.36	0.35	0.34	0.34			
Pop. Rate**	3.87	3.48	3.40	3.21	3.26			
Pct of Total	31.44%	31.47%	31.84%	30.79%	30.45%			
* Rate per 100 r	million miles	of travel						
** Rate per 100,	000 populati	on						
Source: NHTSA D	ata Handbook	s – prepared	for each Stat	e				



















# Framing the Issue

- Or This
- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eryfhMW fl1U









# What messages will be remembered?

- This is why "we"are:
- Enforcing limits
- Changing road designs
- Lowering limits
- Adding Automated Speed Enforcement

#### Can we do it here?

- Must decide value of future lives which generation will pay for major changes in system
- Value of a life versus mobility (perceived/real)
   Current costs of crashes 2.4 times > cost of congestion
- Need partners
  - High level champion is a plus
- Some strategies (ASE) can pay for themselves (\$)
- Practitioners can do a lot using evidence base
- CMFs available to help make good decisions









# **Other Promising Strategies**

- Variable speed limits
- Rewards systems (e.g. lower insurance costs)
- Intelligent speed adaptation vehicle limits speed
- Completing the Streets