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## Background

- Highway fatal crashes 32,719 (2013) in US - FHWA
- The number of fatalities increased by $2.5 \%$
- Out of total 140,686 miles in Kansas, 90.7\% rural roads.
- 2013, rural travel accounted for $47.8 \%$ of all vehicle miles (60\% for state highways) in Kansas.


## 2001-2013 Kansas Crash Distribution



## Problem Statement

- Highway Safety Manual (2010) provides models and methodologies for prediction of crash frequency and analysis of safety
- Predictive methods in HSM developed based on national trends, statistics or using sample states throughout US.
- Limited use of methodologies.


## Objectives

- Calibration of HSM for rural multilane highways considering the Fatal and Injury crashes in Kansas.
- If the HSM methodology fails to predict crashes at rural segments and intersections accurately, new models or safety performance functions (SPFs) will be developed. (not shown in this presentation)


# Methodology \& Required Data 

## The standard HSM calibration

## Identify <br> Facility <br> Type

- Segments
- Intersections
HSM

| Predictive |
| :---: |
| Models |

- Safety Performance Functions (SPF)
- Crash Modification Factors (CMF)
- Calibration Factor (C)


## Collect Required

Data

- Crash Data
- Road Geometric Data
- Traffic Volume

Select
Locations

- Obtaining Study

Segments/Intersectio
ns


## HSM Predictive Methodology

- Safety Performance Function (SPF)
- Crash Modification Factors (CMF)
- Calibration Factor


## Safety Performance Function (SPF)

SPFs are regression equations that calculate the dependent variable, predicted crash frequency, based on independent variables.

$$
\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{spf}}=\mathrm{e}^{[\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b} \times \ln (\mathrm{AADT})+\ln (\mathrm{L})]}
$$

Where,
$\mathrm{N}_{\text {spf }}=$ Base total expected average crash frequency for
the rural segment,

AADT = AADT on the highway segment,
L = Length of highway segment (miles), and
a, b = regression coefficients.

## Crash Modification Factors (CMF)

The SPF is multiplied by CMF for each independent variable.

$$
\mathrm{N}_{\text {Predicted }}=\mathrm{N}_{\text {spf }} *\left(\mathrm{CMF}_{1} * \mathrm{CMF}_{2} * \ldots \ldots \ldots . \mathrm{CMF}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)
$$

Where,
$\mathrm{N}_{\text {Predicted }}=$ Adjusted number of predicted crash frequency,
$\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{spf}}=$ Total predicted crash frequency under base condition,
$\mathrm{CMF}_{\mathrm{i}}=$ Crash modification factors
A CMF > $1.0 \longrightarrow$ increase in crashes, countermeasure decreases safety

A CMF $<1.0 \longrightarrow$ reduction in crashes, countermeasure increases safety

## CMFs for 4D \& 4U

## For rural multi-lane highways, five CMFs for 4D segments and five CMFs for 4 U segments

| 4D |  | 4U |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | Base Condition | Variable | Base Condition |
| Lane width <br> Right shoulder <br> width | 12 feet <br> Median Width | 30 feet | Lane width <br> Shoulder width <br> and type |
| Lighting | Side-slope <br> None | Lighting feet |  |
| Automated | None | Automated | None |

$>\mathrm{CMF}=1$ indicates variable at base condition
$>$ Deviation from base condition changes the factor

## CMFs from HSM (4D)

Table 11-16. CMF for Collision Types Related to Lane Width $\left(\mathrm{CMF}_{R A}\right)$

|  | Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) (vehicles/day) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Width | $\mathbf{< 4 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 0}$ to 2000 | $\mathbf{> 2 0 0 0}$ |
| 9 ft | 1.03 | $1.03+1.38 \times 10^{-4}(\mathrm{AADT}-400)$ | 1.25 |
| 10 ft | 1.01 | $1.01+8.75 \times 10^{-5}(\mathrm{AADT}-400)$ | 1.15 |
| 11 ft | 1.01 | $1.01+1.25 \times 10^{-5}(\mathrm{AADT}-400)$ | 1.03 |
| 12 ft | 1.00 | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | 1.00 |

Table 11-17. CMF for Right Shoulder Width on Divided Roadway Segments $\left(\mathrm{CMF}_{2 n}\right)$
Average Shoulder Width (ft)

| $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ or more |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.18 | 1.13 | 1.09 | 1.04 | 1.00 |

Table 11-18. CMFs for Median Width on Divided Roadway Segments without a Median Barrier $\left(\mathrm{CMF}_{3 /<}\right)$

| Median Width (ft) | CMF |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10 | 1.04 |
| 20 | 1.02 |
| 30 | 1.00 |
| 40 | 0.99 |
| 50 | 0.97 |
| 60 | 0.96 |
| 70 | 0.96 |
| 80 | 0.95 |
| 90 | 0.94 |
| 100 | 0.94 |

## CMFs from HSM (4U)

Table 11-11. $\mathrm{CMF}_{R A}$ for Collision Types Related to Lane Width

|  | Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) (vehicles per day) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Width | $<\mathbf{4 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 0}$ to 2000 | $\mathbf{> 2 0 0 0}$ |
| 9 ft or less | $\mathbf{1 . 0 4}$ | $1.04+2.13 \times 10^{-4}(\mathrm{AADT}-\mathbf{4 0 0})$ | 1.38 |
| 10 ft | 1.02 | $1.02+1.31 \times 10^{-4}(\mathrm{AADT}-400)$ | 1.23 |
| 11 ft | 1.01 | $1.01+1.88 \times 10^{-5}(\mathrm{AADT}-400)$ | 1.04 |
| 12 ft or more | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Table 11-12. CMF for Collision Types Related to Shoulder Width $\left(\mathrm{CMF}_{\text {WRA }}\right)$

|  | Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) (vehicles per day) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoulder Width | $\mathbf{< 4 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 0}$ to 2000 | $>\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ |
| 0 ft | 1.10 | $1.10+2.5 \times 10^{-4}(\mathrm{AADT}-\mathbf{4 0 0})$ | 1.50 |
| 2 ft | 1.07 | $1.07+1.43 \times 10^{-4}(\mathrm{AADT}-\mathbf{4 0 0})$ | 1.30 |
| 4 ft | 1.02 | $1.02+8.125 \times 10^{-5}(\mathrm{AADT}-400)$ | 1.15 |
| 6 ft | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 8 ft or more | 0.98 | $0.98-6.875 \times 10^{-5}(\mathrm{AADT}-400)$ | 0.87 |

Table 11-13. CMF for Collision Types Related to Shoulder Type and Shoulder Width $\left(\mathrm{CMF}_{\text {TRA }}\right)$

| Shoulder <br> Type | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | 1.00 |
| Gravel | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | $\mathbf{1 . 0 2}$ | 1.02 |
| Composite | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 1.03 | $\mathbf{1 . 0 4}$ | 1.06 |
| Turf | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.03 | 1.04 | 1.05 | $\mathbf{1 . 0 8}$ | 1.11 |

Table 11-14. CMF for Sideslope on Undivided Roadway Segments $\left(\mathrm{CMF}_{3 \pi}\right)$

| $1: 2$ or Steeper | $1: 3$ | $1: 4$ | $1: 5$ | $1: 6$ | $1: 7$ or Flatter |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.18 | 1.15 | 1.12 | 1.09 | 1.05 | 1.00 |

## CMF for Presence of Lighting (4D/4U)

$$
\mathrm{CMF}_{\text {lighting }}=1-\left[\left(1-0.72 * \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{inr}}-0.83 * \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{pnr}}\right) * \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{nr}}\right]
$$

Where,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P_{\text {inr }}=\text { Proportion of nighttime crashes for } \\
& \text { unlighted segments that involve fatality or injury, }
\end{aligned}
$$

$\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{pnr}}=$ Proportion of nighttime crashes for unlighted segments that involve PDO crashes, and
$\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{nr}}=$ Proportion of total crashes for unlighted segments that occur at night.
Base Condition $=$ No Lighting $=1.00$

## Calibration Factor

Total predicted crashes $=\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{SPF}} *\left(\mathrm{CMF}_{1} * \mathrm{CMF}_{2} * \mathrm{CMF}_{3} \ldots.\right)$
Calibration factor (C)

$$
\mathrm{C}=\frac{\sum \text { Total observed crashes }}{\sum \text { Total predicted crashes }}
$$

$\mathrm{C}<1 \longrightarrow$ overprediction of crash frequencies. multiplying the factor lowers the predictions to match observed frequencies on average.
C > $1 \longrightarrow$ underprediction of crash frequencies, multiplying the factor increases the predictions to match the observed frequencies.

## Data

In order to obtain the SPF, data collected from:

- Highway crash data $\longrightarrow$ Kansas Crash and Analysis Reporting System (KCARS) database
- Geometric properties data $\longrightarrow$ the state’s highway inventory database Control Section Analysis System (CANSYS)
- study duration was determined to be 2011-2013


## Required Data \& Their Sources For Rural Four-lane Segments

## Data Description

## Source

| AADT | Control Section Analysis System (CANSYS) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lane Width | Control Section Analysis System (CANSYS) |
| Median Width | Control Section Analysis System (CANSYS) |
| Shoulder Width | Control Section Analysis System (CANSYS) |
| Side Slope | Control Section Analysis System (CANSYS) |
| Presence of Lighting | Google Maps |
| Number of Crashes | KCARS |
| Presence of Speed Enforcement | Not Applicable for Kansas |
| Segment locations | Control Section Analysis System (CANSYS) |

## Segment Selection

- HSM recommends minimum segment length 0.1 mile.
- Segments obtained from CANSYS database identified by beginning and ending of mile post.
- No. of 4D Segments: 283
- No. of 4U Segments: 83


## Rural Four-Lane Divided Segments and Crash Location Map



Kansas State UNIVERSITY

## Rural Four-Lane Undivided Segments and Crash Location Map



Total Crashes on Segments
= 44 / year

- Beginning of
Segment

Legends:

0
Location of
Crash


Kansas State

## Presence of Lighting

Google Maps and Google Earth ${ }^{\circledR}$ used to identify presence of lighting at segments

$\frac{\text { Kansas State }}{\text { UNIVERSITY }}$

## Analysis \& Results

## Preliminary Crash Analysis

Crash Percentages by Crash Severity Level for Rural Four-lane Highways in Kansas

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crash Severity Level | 2011 |  | 2012 |  | 2013 |  |  |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |  |
| Fatal | 27 | 1.5 | 21 | 1.4 | 17 | 1.5 |  |
| Incapacitating (disabled) <br> Injuries | 49 | 2.7 | 37 | 2.4 | 29 | 2.5 |  |
| Non-incapacitating Injuries | 157 | 8.7 | 132 | 8.5 | 119 | 9.9 |  |
| Possible Injuries | 96 | 5.3 | 80 | 5.2 | 65 | 5.4 |  |
| Property Damage Only | 1,479 | 81.7 | 1,285 | 82.5 | 969 | 80.7 |  |
| Total | 1,808 | 100.0 | 1,550 | 100.0 | 1,199 | 100.0 |  |

## Preliminary Crash Analysis

Crash Severity Level vs Collision Type for Rural Four-lane Highways in Kansas

|  | 2011 |  |  | 2012 |  |  | 2013 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Collision Type | F <br> $(\%)$ | I <br> $(\%)$ | PDO <br> $(\%)$ | F <br> $(\%)$ | I <br> $(\%)$ | PDO <br> $(\%)$ | F <br> $(\%)$ | I <br> $(\%)$ | PDO <br> $(\%)$ |
| Head-On | 20.0 | 5.4 | 3.0 | 20.0 | 3.9 | 0.5 | 23.1 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Rear End | 20.0 | 45.9 | 38.1 | 0.0 | 46.7 | 41.6 | 15.4 | 50.3 | 47.3 |
| Angle - Side | 55.0 | 38.4 | 16.8 | 70.0 | 35.6 | 16.3 | 61.5 | 28.4 | 15.9 |
| Impact |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sideswipe - |  | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.2 |
| Opposite | 5.0 | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sideswipe- | 0.0 | 8.1 | 33.0 | 10.0 | 11.7 | 32.6 | 0.0 | 13.2 | 29.8 |
| Same Direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Backed Into | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.5 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 5.5 |
| Unknown | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.2 |

## Crash Proportion by Lighting Condition over Study Period

| Roadway <br> Type | Nighttime Crash <br> Proportions | Kansas Four-lane <br> Highways | HSM Given Default |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 D | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{inr}}$ | 0.599 | 0.426 |
|  | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{pnr}}$ | 0.124 | 0.323 |
|  | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{nr}}$ | 0.876 | 0.677 |
|  | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{inr}}$ | 0.477 | 0.255 |
|  | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{pnr}}$ | 0.127 | 0.361 |
|  | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{nr}}$ | 0.873 | 0.639 |

$\mathrm{P}_{\text {inr }}=$ Proportion of nighttime crashes for unlighted segments that involve fatality or injury, $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{pnr}}=$ Proportion of nighttime crashes for unlighted segments that involve PDO crashes, $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{nr}}=$ Proportion of total crashes for unlighted segments that occur at night.

## Number of Crashes at Segments



# Descriptive Statistics for Rural Four-lane Segments 

| Roadway Type | Description | Average | Minimum | Maximum | Std. <br> Dev. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4D | Length (mile) | 1.53 | 0.1 | 8.63 | 1.55 |
|  | AADT (2013) | 8,000 | 490 | 31,000 | 4657 |
|  | Left lane width (ft) | 12.06 | 10.99 | 20.99 | 0.59 |
|  | Right lane width (ft) | 12.06 | 10.99 | 20.99 | 0.59 |
|  | Left paved shoulder width (ft) | 5.68 | 0 | 9.84 | 1.43 |
|  | Right paved shoulder width (ft) | 9.35 | 0 | 9.84 | 1.84 |
|  | Median width (ft) | 30.65 | 4.92 | 152.00 | 15.79 |
|  | Number of crashes | 9.72 | 0 | 98.0 | 11.90 |
| 4U | Length (mile) | 0.28 | 0.1 | 0.86 | 0.16 |
|  | AADT (2013) | 4,114 | 460 | 12,600 | 2919 |
|  | Left lane width (ft) | 12.45 | 10.00 | 22.51 | 1.33 |
|  | Right lane width (ft) | 12.45 | 10.00 | 22.51 | 1.33 |
|  | Left paved shoulder width (ft) | 5.05 | 0 | 10.00 | 4.68 |
|  | Right paved shoulder width (ft) | 4.83 | 0 | 10.00 | 4.66 |
|  | Side Slope | - | 1:2 | 1:6 | - |
|  | Number of crashes | 1.59 | 0 | 11.0 | 2.14 |

## Calibration Worksheet 4D

| 1 | ID | BEGIN CO <br> MP | $\begin{gathered} \text { END CO } \\ \text { MP } \end{gathered}$ | Segement <br> Length (mile) | MED <br> TYPE <br> DESCR | SHOR <br> DESC | AADT <br> SMRY <br> AADT <br> CNT | MED <br> WDTH <br> (feet) | CMF <br> (Median) | SHOR <br> SHLDR <br> WDTH | SHOR <br> SHLDR <br> WDTH <br> (feet) | CMF <br> (Shoulder) | SHLD <br> SHIN <br> SHLDR <br> WDTH | SHLD <br> SHIN <br> SHLDR <br> WDTH <br> (feet) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LN1R } \\ & \text { LN } \\ & \text { WDTH } \\ & \text { (feet) } \end{aligned}$ | CMF <br> (Lane <br> Width) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LN2R } \\ & \text { LN } \\ & \text { WDTH } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 163 | 10.357 | 11.161 | 0.804 | ) - Depres | zed, (CAC | 2275 | 7.87 | 1.04 | 3 | 9.84 | 1 | 1.2 | 3.94 | 12.01 | 1.00 | 3.66 |
| 3 | 498 | 6.009 | 6.93 | 0.921 | ) - Depres | tuminous | 2695 | 29.86 | 1.00 | 3 | 9.84 | 1 | 1.8 | 5.91 | 12.01 | 1.00 | 3.66 |
| 4 | 499 | 6.93 | 8.097 | 1.167 | ) - Depres | tuminous | 3420 | 29.86 | 1.00 | 3 | 9.84 | 1 | 1.8 | 5.91 | 12.01 | 1.00 | 3.66 |
| 5 | 500 | 8.097 | 9.067 | 0.97 | ) - Depress | tuminous | 3950 |  | 1.00 | 3 | 9.84 | 1 | 1.8 | 5.91 | 12.01 | 1.00 | 3.66 |
| 6 | 513 | 12.715 | 13.155 | 0.44 | ) - Depres | tuminous | 2830 |  | 1.00 | 3 | 9.84 | 1 | 1.8 | 5.91 | 12.01 | 1.00 | 3.66 |
| 7 | 514 | 13.155 | 15.235 | 2.08 | ) - Depres | ment cor | 2830 |  | 1.00 | 3 | 9.84 | 1 | 1.8 | 5.91 | 12.01 | 1.00 | 3.66 |
| 8 | 515 | 15.235 | 18.273 | 3.038 | ) - Depres | ment cor | 2685 |  | 1.00 | 3 | 9.84 | 1 | 1.8 | 5.91 | 12.01 | 1.00 | 3.66 |
| 9 | 516 | 18.273 | 22.323 | 4.05 | ) - Depres | ment cor | 2545 |  | 1.00 | 3 | 9.84 | 1 | 1.8 | 5.91 | 12.01 | 1.00 | 3.66 |
| 10 | 517 | 22.323 | 25.356 | 3.033 | ) - Depres | ment cor | 2420 |  | 1.00 | 3 | 9.84 | 1 | 1.8 | 5.91 | 12.01 | 1.00 | 3.66 |
|  | Sample Analysis: Segment ID: 499 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Segment Length: 1.167 mile
Median Type: Depressed
Median Width: 29.86 ft
CMF (Median): Using HSM Table 11-18 : 1.00
Shoulder Type: Bituminous
Right Shoulder Width: 9.84 ft
CMF (Shoulder): Using HSM Table 11-17 : 1.00
Lane Width: 12.01 ft
CMF (Lane): Using HSM Table 11-16 : 1.00
Kansas State
Contd....

## Calibration Worksheet 4D



## 4D Segments Calibration Factor Calculation

|  |  | 雨 |  |  | No. of Daytime Crashes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45 | 483 | 528 | 2202 | 2730 | 1087 | 1636 | 18 | 185 | 1433 | 1636 | 1901.6 | 1007.7 |

Fatal and Injury Crash, $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{r}}=\frac{\text { Total Observed Crashes }}{\text { Total Predicted Crashes }}=\frac{528}{1007.7}=\mathbf{0 . 5 2 4}$

## Calibration Worksheet 4U

| 1 | ID | BEGIN CO MP | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { END CO } \\ \mathrm{MP} \end{array}$ | Length of segment | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SHOR } \\ & \text { DESC } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { AADT } \\ 2013 \end{gathered}$ | SHLD <br> SHOR <br> FORES <br> LOPE | CMF <br> (Fore <br> slope) | TRA | Shoulde r width (ft) | WRA | CMF (Shoulde $r$ width) | Lane Width (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CMF } \\ & \text { (RA) } \end{aligned}$ | CMF <br> (Lane Width) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BEG } \\ & \text { LON } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BEG } \\ & \text { LAT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { END } \\ & \text { LON } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { END } \\ & \text { LAT } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 78 | 18.647 | 18.873 | 0.226 | uminous | 2880 | 6:01 | 1.05 | 1 | 9.84 | 0.87 | 0.96 | 12.01 | 1 | 1 | -95.24 | 38.266 | -95.238 | 38.269 |
| 3 | 151 | 7.666 | 8.171 | 0.505 | ituminou: | 7910 | 6:01 | 1.05 | 1 | 9.19 | 0.87 | 0.96 | 13.48 | 1 | 1 | -95.38 | 37.922 | -95.37 | 37.922 |
| 4 | 152 | 8.171 | 8.649 | 0.478 | jurb and | 7910 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 | 1.50 | 1.14 | 13.48 | 1 | 1 | -95.37 | 37.922 | -95.362 | 37.922 |
| 5 | 153 | 8.649 | 9.046 | 0.397 | ized, (CAI | 7910 | 6:01 | 1.05 | 1 | 9.84 | 0.87 | 0.96 | 13.48 | 1 | 1 | -95.36 | 37.922 | -95.354 | 37.922 |
| 6 | 161 | 10.004 | 10.109 | 0.105 | ized, (CAI | 4420 | 6:01 | 1.05 | 1 | 9.84 | 0.87 | 0.96 | 13.48 | 1 | 1 | -95.34 | 37.922 | -95.335 | 37.922 |
| 7 | 162 | 10.109 | 10.357 | 0.248 | ized, (CAI | 4550 | 6:01 | 1.05 | 1 | 9.84 |  | 0.96 | 13.48 | 1 | 1 | -95.33 | 37.922 | -95.33 | 37.922 |
| 8 | 164 | 11.161 | 11.415 | 0.254 | ized, (CAI | 4550 | 6:01 | 1.05 | 1 | 9.84 |  | 0.96 | 12.01 | 1 | 1 | -95.32 | 37.922 | -95.311 | 37.922 |
| 9 | 168 | 12.059 | 12.29 | 0.231 | jurb and | 2740 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 |  | 1.14 | 12.01 | 1 | 1 | -95.3 | 37.922 | -95.295 | 37.922 |
| 10 | 169 | 12.29 | 12.56 | 0.27 | ized, (CAI | 2740 | 6:01 | 1.05 | 1 | 9.84 |  | 0.96 | 12.01 | 1 | 1 | -95.29 | 37.922 | -95.29 | 37.922 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sam } \\ & \text { Segi } \end{aligned}$ | ple A <br> ment | nalysi <br> ID: 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Segment Length: 0.105 mile
Shoulder Type: Aggregate base stabilized
AADT: 4,420
Side Slope: 1:6
CMF (Side Slope): Using HSM Table 11-14 : 1.05
Shoulder Width: 9.84 ft
CMF (Shoulder): Using HSM Table 11-12 \& 11-13 : 0.96
Lane Width: 13.48 ft
CMF (Lane): Using HSM Table 11-11 : 1.00
Contd....

## Calibration Worksheet 4U



No. of Injury Crashes:0
No. of PDO Crashes: 0
Total Crashes: 0
$\mathrm{N}_{\text {spf }}$ (F/I Crash): Using HSM SPF for rural $4 U: \mathrm{N}_{\text {spf }}=\mathrm{e}^{[\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b} \times \ln (\mathrm{AADT})+\ln (\mathrm{L})]}=0.08$
Predicted F/I Crashes: $\mathrm{N}_{\text {spf }}$ (F/I Crash)*CMF(ln.)*CMF(Sh.)*CMF(Slp.)*CMF(Lt)=0.25

## 4U Segments Calibration Factor Calculation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 20 | 20 | 112 | 132 | 69 | 63 | 0 | 8 | 55 | 63 | 88.28 | 55.68 |

Fatal and Injury Crash, $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{r}}=\frac{\text { Total Observed Crashes }}{\text { Total Predicted Crashes }}=\frac{20}{55.68}=\mathbf{0 . 3 5 9}$

## Conclusion

- $\mathrm{C}=0.524$ (4D), 0.359 (4U) over predicts fatal and injury crashes combined.
- For more accurate prediction, jurisdictionspecific SPFs should be developed.


## Applications of HSM Calibration

- Facilitate private, county, state, and federal government agencies to identify possible factors that may influence rural crash occurrence.
- Finally, the calibration will assist in reducing fatalities experienced on rural roadways in Kansas.
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