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## INTRODUCTION

Horizontal curves make up a small percentage of total road miles, yet account for one-quarter of all highway fatalities. The majority of curve-related crashes is attributed to speeding and driver error and involves lane departures. There are a number of low-cost countermeasures traditionally used to help keep vehicles on the road and in their lane; however, the impacts of their application can be limited, which leads to the need for additional research and testing on more dynamic devices to assist traffic engineers in managing speed and safety across their diverse roadway network.

## Project Scope

More than 25 percent of fatal crashes are associated with a horizontal curve, and the vast majority of these crashes involve a roadway departure. The average crash rate for horizontal curves is about three times that of other highways segments. About three-quarters of curverelated fatal crashes involve a single vehicle leaving the roadway and striking trees, utility poles, rocks, or other fixed objects, or overturning. The majority of these crashes are speed related.

Implementing safety countermeasures on rural horizontal curves to address speeding can improve the safety performance for those locations. State safety and traffic engineers are faced with making decisions on what type of technology to use and which sites to use the technology on in a fiscally constrained environment. The research conducted for this project will evaluate a Sequential Dynamic Curve Warning System (SDCWS) that could be an additional tool for these engineers to use either separately or in combination with other countermeasures to address horizontal curve locations with a history of safety concerns.

## Project Objectives

The objective of this project is to test and evaluate the effectiveness of TAPCO's SDCWS in reducing vehicle speed as well as the frequency and severity of speed-related crashes on horizontal curves on rural roadways. With 12 treatment sites and 24 control sites having been identified in Missouri, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin, speed data will be collected before and immediately after the installation, as well as at 12 months, 18 months and 24 months post installation.

## Report Overview

The information in this first year report includes a summary of the literature on speed-activated display practices, details on the locations of existing treatments, site selection methodology, a list of potential and final new treatment sites, the type and amount of data to be collected, data collection procedures and equipment, and the schedule for analyses to be performed. The report also includes a summary of baseline data including roadway, traffic, and crash data as well as data analysis and results from the 1-month and 12-month post installation data collection effort. The preliminary crash data from 5 years before and 1 year after also is included in this report. Guidelines and recommendations for implementing SDCWS displays for curves will be included in the final report.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

This section discusses the relationship between roadway geometry, vehicle speeds, and crashes on horizontal curves and reviews the effectiveness of various applications of Dynamic Speed Feedback Sign (DSFS) systems installed to date. This research effort will test the effectiveness of the SDCWS and its impact on safety. Even though several dynamic curve sign systems have been tested in the past, this system is unique in terms of including guidance not just before or at the curve, but also throughout the curve with the blinking chevrons. The results from this research will add to the body of knowledge and provide safety engineers with another tool to address curve crashes.

## Relationship between Curve Crash Rate and Geometry

Curves have about three times the crash rate of tangent sections. ${ }^{(1)}$ Preston and Schoenecker reported that 25 to 50 percent of the severe road departure crashes in Minnesota occurred on curves, even though curves account for only 10 percent of the total system mileage. ${ }^{(2)}$ Shankar et al. evaluated divided State highways without median barriers in Washington State and found a relationship between the number of horizontal curves per kilometer and median crossover crashes. ${ }^{(3)}$ Farmer and Lund evaluated single-vehicle fatal and injury rollover crashes using Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) data and data from Florida, Pennsylvania, and Texas. ${ }^{(4)}$ Using logistic regression, they found that the odds of having a rollover on a curved section were 1.42 to 2.15 times the odds of having a rollover on a straight section.

The majority of crashes on curves involve lane departures. A total of 76 percent of curve-related fatal crashes are single vehicles leaving the roadway and striking a fixed object or overturning. Another 11 percent of curve-related crashes are head-on collisions. ${ }^{(5)}$

The frequency and severity of curve-related crashes have been correlated to a number of geometric factors, including radius, degree of curve, length of curve, type of curve transition, lane and shoulder widths, preceding tangent length, and required speed reduction.
Luediger et al. found that crash rates increase as the degree of curve increases, even when traffic warning devices are used to warn drivers of the curve. ${ }^{(6)}$ Miaou and Lum found that truck crash involvement increases as horizontal curvature increases, depending on the length of curve. ${ }^{(7)}$ Council found that the presence of spirals on horizontal curves reduced crash probability on level terrain but did not find the same effect for hilly or mountainous terrain. ${ }^{(8)}$ Vogt and Bared evaluated two-lane rural road segments in Minnesota and Washington State using Highway Safety Information System (HSIS) data and found a positive correlation between injury crashes and degree of horizontal curve. ${ }^{(9)}$

Zegeer et al. evaluated curves on two-lane roads in Washington State using a linear regression model. ${ }^{(10)}$ The researchers found that the degree of curve was positively correlated with crashes, while total surface width and presence of spirals were negatively correlated. They also evaluated 10,900 horizontal curves on two-lane roads in Washington State using a weighted linear regression model and found that crash likelihood increases as the degree and length of curve increases. ${ }^{(10)}$ Mohamedshah et al., however, found a negative correlation between crashes and degree of curve for two-lane roadways. ${ }^{(11)}$

Preston and Schoenecker examined severe roadway departure crashes and found that 90 percent of fatal crashes and 75 percent of injury crashes occurred on curves with a radius of less than $1,500 \mathrm{ft} .{ }^{(2)}$ Milton and Mannering evaluated 2,725 miles of highway in Washington State using a negative binomial model and reported that an increase in radius was associated with decreases in crash frequency. ${ }^{(12)}$ They also found that a shorter tangent length between horizontal curves was associated with decreases in crash frequency. They speculated that drivers may be traveling at lower speeds and are therefore more likely to be paying attention when tangent lengths between curves are short.

In contrast, Deng et al. evaluated head-on crashes on 729 segments of two-lane roads in Connecticut using an ordered probit model. ${ }^{(13)}$ They included geometric characteristics in the analysis but did not find that the presence of horizontal or vertical curves was significant.

Taylor et al. evaluated the relationship between speed and crashes on rural single-carriageway roads in England. ${ }^{(14)}$ The authors collected data from 174 road sections with 60 mph speed limits with a wide range of conditions. Data collected included injury crash data, traffic volume, speed data, and roadway geometry. Speed and flow were measured at each site for 1 or 2 days, and various speed metrics were calculated, including mean speed, 85th percentile speed, and standard deviation of speed. The authors found that crashes were more highly correlated with mean speed than any other speed metric. They also found that crash frequency increased with mean speed. In general, a 10 percent increase in mean speed resulted in a 26 percent increase in the frequency of injury crashes.
More recently, Khan et al. analyzed curves in Wisconsin to determine the relationship between safety, horizontal curve signs, and geometry. ${ }^{(15)}$ Compared to previous research, a larger data set with greater detail was used to develop a model showing the relationship of the horizontal curves. The data showed that crashes increased with an increase in annual average daily traffic (AADT), posted speed, and curve length; they also increased with a decrease in curve radius. In addition, an analysis of traffic control signs indicated that sites with curve signs (W1-2) had fewer crashes than sites with turn signs (W1-1). Sharper curves, however, showed no significant correlation to sign type in reducing crashes because of other, more substantial influencing factors.

## Relationship between Curve Crash Rate and Speed of Curve Negotiation

Although curve-related crashes are correlated to geometric factors, driver factors such as speed selection also contribute to curve-crash frequency and outcome. Driver factors include driver workload, driver expectancy, and speed selection.

Speeding, defined by FHWA as "exceeding the posted speed limit or driving too fast for conditions," is generally problematic. Council et al. evaluated FARS, General Estimates System (GES), and HSIS data to assess the impact of speeding on fatal crashes. ${ }^{(16)}$ Using 2005 FARS data, they found that 29.5 percent of fatal crashes were speed-related. They conducted several different types of analyses and found the single-vehicle run-off-road crashes are more likely to be speed-related than are multi-vehicle crashes. Crashes on curves were more likely to be speedrelated as compared to tangent sections and nighttime crashes. Additionally, FARS data indicated that 54 percent of speed-related rollover/overturn, jackknife, or fixed object crashes were on curves. ${ }^{(16)}$

FHWA estimates that approximately 56 percent of run-off-road fatal crashes on curves are speed-related. ${ }^{(6)}$ The vehicle speed reduction from the tangent section required for traversing a curve has an impact on the frequency and severity of crashes in curves. Abrupt changes in operating speed resulting from changes in horizontal alignment are suggested to be a major cause of crashes on rural two-lane roadways. ${ }^{(6)}$
Anderson and Krammes developed a model comparing mean speed reduction and mean crash rate for 1,126 horizontal curves on rural two-lane roadways. ${ }^{(17)}$ They reported that the relationship between mean crash rate and required speed reduction to negotiate the curve is roughly linear. This finding is also supported by Fink and Krammes, who indicated that curves requiring no speed reduction did not have significantly different mean crash rates than their preceding roadway tangent. ${ }^{(18)}$

Driver errors on horizontal curves are often due to the inappropriate selection of speed and the inability to maintain lane position. Drivers' speed selection at curves depends on both explicit attentional cues and implicit perceptual cues. ${ }^{(19)}$ A driver's speed prior to entering a curve has a significant effect on his or her ability to negotiate the curve successfully. ${ }^{(2)}$ Inappropriate speed selection and lane positioning can be a result of a driver failing to notice an upcoming curve or misperceiving the roadway curvature.
Driver workload plays an important role in driver speed maintenance. Distracting tasks such as radio-tuning or cell phone conversations can draw a driver's attention away from speed monitoring, detection of headway changes, lane keeping, and detection of potential hazards. ${ }^{(19)}$ Other factors include sight distance issues, fatigue, or complexity of the driving situation. ${ }^{(19,20)}$

Preston and Shoenecker evaluated vehicle paths through a curve on a two-lane rural roadway as part of an evaluation of a dynamic curve message sign. ${ }^{(2)}$ The roadway had a posted speed limit of 55 mph and AADT of 3,250 vehicles per day (vpd). The researchers collected data over a 4-day period and randomly selected and evaluated 589 vehicles. A total of 340 of the vehicles ( 58 percent) were traveling over 55 mph , and the rest were traveling at or below the speed limit. The authors evaluated whether each vehicle successfully negotiated the curve. Vehicles that crossed a left or right lane line on one or more occasions were defined as "not successfully navigating the curve."
A logistic regression model was developed to determine the relationship between initial speed and the probability of a vehicle unsuccessfully navigating the curve. The researchers found that there was a 20 percent better chance for vehicles that were traveling at or below the speed limit to successfully navigate the curve than for vehicles that were traveling over the speed limit, with the difference being statistically significant at 99 percent. They found that 45 percent of vehicles traveling at or above 65 mph were unable to negotiate the curve compared to 30 percent for vehicles that were traveling under 65 mph , with the difference being statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence interval.

Hassan and Easa found that driver misperception of curvature was greatest when vertical curvature was combined with horizontal curvature. ${ }^{(21)}$ This was particularly a problem when a crest vertical curve was superimposed on a severe horizontal curve, or when a sag vertical curve was combined with a horizontal curve, causing the horizontal curve to appear less severe and resulting in drivers underestimating the curve.

Charlton conducted a simulator study and evaluated driver speed adjustments on several types of curves with several types of signing. ${ }^{(20)}$ Charlton found that, in general, drivers approached and entered curves at higher speeds when engaged in cell phone tasks than when in non-distraction scenarios.

## Effectiveness of DSFS Systems

DSFS systems have been used in only a few cases to reduce speeds and warn drivers of upcoming curves. They have been used more extensively for a number of other related applications. A summary of information about the application of DSFS on curves and in related situations is provided below.
Bertini et al. studied the effectiveness of a DSFS system on Interstate 5 near Myrtle Creek, Oregon. ${ }^{(22)}$ The system consisted of two displays that provided different messages to drivers based on the speed detected, as shown in table 1.

Table 1. Advisory message for Interstate 5 dynamic speed-activated feedback sign system.

| Sign <br> Panel | Sign Messages |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Detected Vehicle Speeds <br> Less than $\mathbf{5 0} \mathbf{~ m p h}$ | Detected Vehicle Speeds <br> $\mathbf{5 0 - 7 0} \mathbf{~ m p h}$ | Detected Vehicle Speeds <br> over 70 mph |
| 1 | CAUTION | SLOW DOWN | SLOW DOWN |
| 2 | SHARP CURVES AHEAD | YOUR SPEED IS <br> XX MPH | YOUR SPEED IS OVER 70 MPH |

The curve has an advisory speed of 45 mph with an AADT of $16,750 \mathrm{vpd}$. Before the DSFS system was in place, there was what the authors termed "dual overhead horizontal alignment/advisory speed combination sign assemblies with 4 flashing beacons." The DSFS system was put in place alongside one of the existing signs in both the northbound and southbound directions. Each system consisted of the actual dynamic message sign, a radar unit, a controller unit, and computer software. Figures 1 and 2 show the system.

The researchers collected speed data using a laser gun. Results indicated that, after installation of the DSFS system, passenger vehicle speeds were reduced by 2.6 mph and commercial truck speeds were reduced by 1.9 mph , with the results being statistically significant at the 95 percent confidence level. The distribution of speeds shifted to the left after installation of the signs, and the differences were found to be statistically significant based on a 95 percent confidence level using the chi-square test.

Results of a driver survey indicated that 95 percent of drivers surveyed noticed the DSFS system, and 76 percent said they slowed down due to the system.


Figure 1. Photo. Northbound Interstate 5 DSFS systems in Oregon. ${ }^{(22)}$


Figure 2. Photo. Southbound Interstate 5 DSFS systems in Oregon. ${ }^{(22)}$
Another type of DSFS system, a vehicle-activated curve warning sign, was tested on curves in the United Kingdom. ${ }^{(23)}$ Three curve warning signs were placed on two-lane roads in Norfolk, Wiltshire, and West Sussex. The signs, shown in figure 3, were placed 165 to 330 feet before the apex of a curve.


Figure 3. Photo. DSFS system in Norfolk. ${ }^{(23)}$
The signs were blank when the driver was under a specified speed threshold and displayed the curve sign when a driver exceeded the threshold. The speed threshold was set at the 50th percentile speed for the sign location because the researchers wanted to target the upper half of driver speeds. Once activated, the bend warning display was shown for 4 seconds. Based on previous research, the researchers had calculated this time as being sufficient for drivers to register and understand the message.
Speed data were collected for a minimum of 7 days before the signs were installed, and again 1 month and 1 year after installation. Data were collected at the 1-year period to determine if habituation occurs-in other words, whether drivers become immune to treatments and stop responding. Data were collected using pneumatic tubes at two sites and a radar gun at the third. Mean speeds were reduced by 2.1 mph at West Sussex, 3.0 mph at Wiltshire, and 6.9 mph at Norfolk.

Crash data were available for two sites, and the researchers found that crashes decreased 54 percent at the Norfolk bend site and 100 percent at the Wiltshire bend site. A public survey found that drivers approved of the signs.
The City of Bellevue Washington installed and evaluated 31 DSFS systems, including two used as curve advisory warnings (see figure 4). Both were on urban arterials with 35 mph speed limits and 25 mph advisory speeds. Speeds were collected before and between 18 months and 2 years after installation of the signs. One sign showed a 3.3 mph reduction in 85 th percentile speed and the other showed a 3.5 mph reduction.


Figure 4. Photo. DSFS system in Bellevue, Washington. ${ }^{(24)}$
Preston and Shoenecker also evaluated the safety effect of a DSFS system on County Highway 54 in Minnesota, which is a two-lane rural roadway with a speed limit of 55 mph and an AADT of $3,250 \mathrm{vpd} .{ }^{(2)}$ The curve has an advisory speed of 40 mph . The DSFS system had a changeable message sign and radar unit. A field test was conducted over a 4-day period with a unit that consisted of a closed circuit TV camera, a VCR, and a personal computer. A portable trailer housed the entire system.
The sign displayed the following:

- From 6 a.m. to 10 a.m., 11 a.m. to 2 p.m., and 4 to 7 p.m.: CURVE AHEAD.
- No message during other times of the day unless activated.

During all times of the day, when the radar unit detected a vehicle traveling 53 or more mph, the camera would activate and record the vehicle for 18 seconds. Using a random number generator and depending on the time of day, the computer would either continue displaying the CURVE AHEAD message, display the CURVE AHEAD - REDUCE SPEED message, or display no message.

The team randomly selected 589 of the vehicles captured during data collection and evaluated whether each vehicle successfully negotiated the curve. Successful negotiation was defined as a vehicle remaining within the lane lines as it traversed the curve. Vehicles that crossed a left or right lane line on one or more occasions were defined as "not successfully navigating the curve."
The team found that approximately 35 percent of the drivers who received the message were unable to successfully negotiate the curve. Vehicles that received the CURVE AHEAD sign were more likely to negotiate the curve successfully, but the difference was not statistically significant. Only 26 percent of vehicles that received the CURVE AHEAD - REDUCE SPEED sign were unable to negotiate the curve successfully, and the difference was statistically significant at the 90 percent level of confidence.

Mattox et al. looked at the effectiveness of a DSFS system on secondary highways in South Carolina. ${ }^{(25)}$ This system consisted of a radar device and a 4 -ft by 4 -ft yellow sign with 6 -inch lettering reading YOU ARE SPEEDING IF FLASHING. In addition, there were two $1-\mathrm{ft}$ by $1-\mathrm{ft}$ orange flags and a type B flashing beacon light. Teams collected data in a before-and-after study upstream of the sign, at the sign, and then downstream of the sign. Results showed a significant reduction in speed at the sign and downstream of the sign. Overall mean speed and 85th percentile speeds were reduced by approximately 3 mph .

A report by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) provided a summary of the effectiveness of safety treatments in one California district. ${ }^{(26)}$ A changeable message sign was installed at five locations along Interstate 5 to reduce truck collisions. Caltrans reported that truck crashes decreased from 71 percent to 91 percent at four of the sites, while truck crashes increased by 140 percent at one site.
A study by the 3M Company evaluated driver speed feedback signs, which display the approaching drivers' speeds, in the United Kingdom. Signs were tested at various locations in Doncaster, including semi-rural roadways. The sites had speed limits of 40 mph , and reductions up to 7 mph in 85 th percentile speeds were noted. ${ }^{(27)}$
Tribbett et al. evaluated dynamic curve warning systems for advance notification of alignment changes and speed advisories at five sites in the Sacramento River Canyon on Interstate 5. ${ }^{(28)}$ The roadway has high traffic volumes ( 7,650 to $9,300 \mathrm{vpd}$ ), mountainous terrain, and a number of heavy vehicle crashes. The signs were a $10-\mathrm{ft}$ by 7 -ft full matrix LED panel that could be programmed to display a variety of messages. Messages used by the researchers included curve warning (shown in figure 5) and driver speed feedback.


Figure 5. Photo. Speed warning sign in the Sacramento River Canyon. ${ }^{(26)}$
The researchers collected speed data using stopwatches. Data were collected before installation of the signs and at several points after the signs were installed; the researchers did not indicate when these after periods were, however. Speed results at the point of curvature (PC) include the following:

- Site 1: statistically significant decreases in mean truck speeds from 2.4 to 5.4 mph and decreases in mean passenger car speeds from 3.0 to 4.5 mph .
- Site 2: no statistically significant changes in truck or passenger car speeds for any time
periods.
- $\quad$ Site 3: statistically significant decreases in mean truck speeds from 1.9 to 3.7 mph and increases in passenger cars from 5.2 to 7.8 mph .
- Site 4: no statistically significant change in mean truck speed and a 1.4 mph decrease for passenger cars for one time period that was statistically significant.
- Site 5: a statistically significant change in mean truck speed of 4.5 for one time period and decrease in mean passenger car speeds from 2 to 3 mph .
The researchers also compared 5 years of crash data before installation of the signs and 6 months after. However, due to the very short after period, the results were determined to be unreliable.

The Texas Transportation Institute evaluated the use of a portable speed display trailer in work zones. ${ }^{(29)}$ They found that passenger vehicle speeds were reduced by 7 to 9 mph at one site and 2 to 3 mph at another. Truck speeds were reduced 3 to 10 mph at both sites.

Hallmark et al. also analyzed the installation of DSFS on curves throughout the country to determine the safety benefits. ${ }^{(30)}$ Seven States participated, installing curve warning signs as well as speed feedback signs, which can be seen in figure 6 . For the analysis, the mean speed, 85th percentile speed, and the percentage of vehicles going over the speed limit were compared.


Figure 6. Photo. Comparison of curve warning sign (left) and speed feedback sign (right). ${ }^{(30)}$
The average for all of the sites showed a 1.8 mph reduction in mean speed at 1 month, a 2.6 mph reduction in mean speed at 1 year, and a 2.0 mph reduction in speed at 2 years; all of these reductions occurred at the PC. The 85th percentile speed at the PC was reduced by 2.2 mph at both the 1-month and 2-year data collection period and was reduced by 2.9 mph at the 1 -year data collection period. Similar decreases were seen in the percentage of vehicles going over the speed limit. The mean speed and 85th percentile speed were also lower at the center of curve, with the largest speed reductions occurring at the 1-month data collection period.

Between the two types of signs, larger decreases were seen with the speed feedback signs than with the curve warning signs. The signs were proven to be effective over time as well. A crash
analysis was also performed for the direction of travel for the DSFS and for both directions combined. The analysis showed that, compared to control sites, crashes were reduced 2 to 4 times more for both directions and in the direction of travel by 1.7 to 6.0 times per quarter. Crash modification factors developed using a full Bayes model were .85 for both directions and .97 for the direction of the DSFS.

Sun et al. researched the effectiveness of sequential warning lights as a method to better define the beginning and taper into nighttime work zones. ${ }^{(31)}$ The sequential lights were evaluated in Missouri along Interstate 70 with a right lane closure. Vehicle speeds at the closure were compared in addition to speeds at the point where the vehicle merged and at the lateral position in the taper. Decreases were seen in the mean speed of 2.2 mph and by 1 mph in the 85th percentile speeds, both of which were statistically significant. The lateral position of vehicles in the closed lane increased from 6.2 percent without sequential lights to 7.8 percent with sequential lights. The sequential lights had a negative effect, which could be due to drivers being more aggressive because the taper is illuminated better. The location where vehicles merged was split into eight zones with zone 8 being the zone closest to the taper. With the sequential lights, the total vehicles merging in zones 5 through 7 decreased while the vehicles merging in zones 1 through 4 increased. The exception that occurred was an increase in vehicles merging in zone 8 , which further supports the aggressive driver assumption given the lateral position of the driver. Overall, vehicles were merging 20 ft earlier with the sequential lights.

Santiago-Chaparro et al. evaluated the spatial effectiveness of speed feedback signs at a single location along State Highway 164 in Wisconsin. ${ }^{(32)}$ Vehicles were tracked while approaching and receding from the speed feedback signs, and the speeds were monitored to determine when vehicles were slowing down and whether the speed reductions were sustained. The research found that vehicles were reducing their speed the most between 1,200 and 1,400 ft upstream of the speed feedback sign. Speeds began to increase again between 300 to 500 ft downstream of the speed feedback sign, and some vehicles increased speed before even passing the speed feedback sign. The results of the study showed that the speed feedback signs are not adequate for speed reductions at a corridor level but only at the location where the desired speed reduction should occur.

## Tracking Vehicles for Data Reduction

Tracking involves monitoring individual vehicles as they traverse multiple data collection points. Limited research has been completed in this area; the literature search revealed only one study that used tracking to reduce data down to only affected vehicles. ${ }^{(33)}$ In this study, tracking was used to determine how much vehicles were slowing down when approaching the sign. This aligns very well with curves, as the speeds of vehicles can be tracked while approaching and through the curve. Vehicles were tracked so that only free-flow passenger vehicles would be analyzed, eliminating vehicles that were influenced by a turning movement. To track the vehicles, the vehicle speed, vehicle length, and time headway were compared at each data collection location.

The standard method was used by determining the mean speed, 85th percentile speed, and percentage of vehicles exceeding the posted speed first in their analysis, but it was not used in determining the effectiveness. Instead, a true effect (TE) was calculated by tracking vehicles and
then determining the speed reduction for each vehicle before and after implementation. TE was calculated as shown in figure 7.

$$
\text { True Effect }=\Delta \mathrm{V}_{1-2, \text { during }}-\Delta \mathrm{V}_{1-2, \text {, before }}
$$

Figure 7. Equation. True effect.
The tracked data were used to determine the statistics $\Delta \mathrm{V}_{1-2 \text {, during, which is the mean speed }}$ reduction between sensors 1 and 2 during the study and $\Delta \mathrm{V}_{1-2 \text {, before }}$, which is the mean speed reduction between sensors 1 and 2 before implementation. Cruzado and Donnell briefly discussed that, depending on the upstream data collection, the data may be over- or underestimated by using only the mean speed reduction at the treatment location. ${ }^{(34)}$ TE better reflects any changes in speeds while approaching the curve.

Another form of tracking was performed by McFadden and Elefteriadou, who determined whether calculating the difference of 85th percentile speeds between two points was significantly different than calculating the 85th percentile of speed reduction between the two points. ${ }^{(33)}$ The 85th percentile of the speed reduction requires that individual vehicles be tracked to determine the speed reduction between the two points. This was achieved using light detection and a light detection and ranging (LIDAR) gun. With the tracked data, the 85th percentile speed reduction was significantly different than the change in 85th percentile speed. The change in the 85th percentile speed underestimated the speed reduction of the vehicles traversing the curve. Hirsh (1987) accounted for this with the differences of the distributions of the two locations. ${ }^{(35)}$

Misaghi and Hassan expanded on this research in Canada, but instead of using LIDAR guns they used counters. ${ }^{(36)}$ The counters were tracked successfully if three criteria were met at both locations: number of axles, wheel base, and the expected time gap between the two locations. Tolerances were used in the tracking because of variance with the counter clock and inconsistencies with the data collected. Once complete, the speed reduction could be calculated between the points and the 85th percentile speed.

## SELECTION OF TEST SITES FOR SDCWS

The intent of this project was to evaluate the TAPCO SDCWS in five participant States (Iowa, Missouri, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin). The research team developed site selection criteria for each and worked with each State to develop a list of candidate locations. The site selection criteria included the following:

- Two-lane rural paved roads.
- Posted speed limit of 50 mph or above.
- Existing chevrons.
- No unusual conditions within the curve (e.g., railroad crossing or major access).
- High crash location (10 or more crashes in the last 5 years, not including animal collisions); speed-related crashes preferred.
- No major rehabilitation/changes in alignment/operations in the last 3 years.
- No major rehabilitation/changes in alignment/operations planned for the next 2 years.

Specific information requested for each candidate site included:

- Curve location (Google map, latitude/longitude, etc.).
- Crash data including the location, direction, type, date, causation, etc.
- Posted speed limit (mph).
- Advisory curve speed, if present (mph).
- AADT.
- Truck traffic data, if available.
- Presence of passing lanes.

After reviewing the information from each State, the team developed a finalized list of potential sites and then conducted site visits. Final test sites were then selected in each State. The general methodology used to select sites in each State is described in the following sections.

## Initial Review

A request for initial data was made to each State. The States were asked to provide data on multiple high-crash curve sites on rural two-lane roadways. It was left up to the discretion of each agency to determine what they thought were high-crash locations. Rural was defined as being at least 1 mile outside an incorporated area. Each curve was required to meet the following criteria:

- No rehabilitation or reconstruction activities that change the geometry of the roadway scheduled during the 2-year assessment.
- No geometric or cross-section changes made for 3 years prior to the study.
- Posted speed limit on tangent section 50 mph or greater.

Each State was also asked to provide the following information about the potential sites:

- Crash frequency.
- Traffic volume (AADT and percent trucks).
- Geometry (lane width, shoulder width, and type).
- Speed limit (posted or advisory) in mph.

The research team spatially located each site using Google Earth or the aerial images provided by the agency. The suitability of each curve location was evaluated, and locations that had major developments, railroads, or major points of access, including intersections other than low-volume intersections, were eliminated. Following this, additional information about the remaining sites was requested from each State, including:

- Presence of posted speed advisory on curve.
- Information about crashes (speed-related, severity, etc.).
- Expert opinion about safety and speed problems.
- Existence of unusual traffic or other conditions.

Based on the information received, the sites were ranked in terms of number of crashes with a threshold of at least 5 crashes over a 5-year period being used to define a high-crash location.
Figure 8 shows the 10 candidate curve locations identified by the Washington State Department of Transportation (DOT) for which the team conducted site visits. A similar site visit map of candidate test locations was developed for each State. In this map, the green locations were the sites that were selected after the site visits.


Figure 8. Map. Washington State DOT candidate sites.

## Site Visits

The research team conducted site visits to all candidate locations. These field observations identified roadway characteristics including curve layout, operational conditions, presence of speed and advisory signs, and relevant roadway conditions (see the example photo in figure 9).

In addition, a speed study was conducted using a radar gun to verify whether a speeding problem exists. (An example of the site visit data collection form is shown in figure 10.) At least 25 speed observations were collected for both directions of traffic unless physically prohibited due to site conditions or topography. Mean speed, by direction, was calculated for each location. When sample size was sufficient, 85th percentile speeds were calculated. A speeding problem was identified if at least one of the following conditions existed:

- Mean speed exceeded the advisory speed limit by 5 mph or more, or, if an advisory speed was not posted, exceeded the posted speed limit by 5 mph or more.
- 85th percentile speed exceeded the advisory speed limit by 5 mph or more, or exceeded the posted speed limit by 5 mph or more, if an advisory speed was not present.

A field report was prepared which included all of the field information collected for each site visited; see the example shown in figure 11.


Figure 9. Photo. Candidate curve site in Washington State.

| $\begin{aligned} & 1: 30 p m \\ & \operatorname{Aug} 22,2011 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 4:10 pm Aue 22,2011 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 58 \mathrm{pm} \\ & \text { sexp } 22,2011 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 8:03 cm |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site 10"SR 302 MP.7 |  |  | Site io a 109 mp 4 |  |  | Stee 10: 507 HP 41.7 |  |  | site it 510 MP 8 |  |  |
| Posted Targent Speed. 40 |  |  | Posted Tangent Speed: 50 |  |  | Posted Targeent Spoed: |  |  | Posteo Targeent Speed: |  |  |
| adosoor Speed: 30 |  |  | Advisory Speed 25 |  |  | anvisory speed: 40 * |  |  | Advisery Speed: 40 |  |  |
| Ball zank inoptiorc Good |  |  | Ball Bank indicator: Good |  |  | Ball Bank Indicator: |  |  | Bal Bank haticator in |  |  |
| vehice | $\begin{gathered} \text { insidiec cune } \\ \text { spooded } \end{gathered}$ | outside curve <br> spooed | vehide | $\begin{aligned} & \text { inside Curve } \\ & \text { speedWB } \end{aligned}$ |  | Vehicle | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Inside curen } \\ \text { Speed } S B \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Outsice cume } \\ & \text { Speced } N / 2 \end{aligned}$ | vehicle | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { msidee CuNTO } \\ \text { Speed } \end{array}$ | Outside Curve Speed |
| 1 | 37 | 37 | 1 | 37 | 32 | 1 | 54 | 42 | 1 | 52 |  |
| 2 | 38 | 33 | 2 | 32 | 28 | 2 | 45 | 45 | 2 | 45 |  |
| 3 | 414 | 炀35 | 3 | 29 | 32 | 3 | 48 | 47 | 3 | 43 |  |
| 4 | 40 | 34 | 4 | 35 | 31 | 4 | 50 | 43 | 4 | 45 |  |
| 5 | 37 | 38 | 5 | 30 | 33 | 5 | 48 | 50 | 5 | 48 |  |
| 6 | 39 | 39 | 6 | 36 | 32 | 6 | 51 | 54 | 6 | 42 |  |
| 7 | 39 | 34 | 7 | 39 | 33 | 7 | 52 | 47 | 7 | 47 |  |
| 8 | 38 | 39 | 8 | 35 | 29 | 8 | 48 | 46 | 8 | 45 |  |
| 9 | 39 | 43 | 9 | 31 | 37 | 9 | 59 | 48 | 9 | 41 |  |
| 10 | 38 | 36 | 10 | 34 | 33 | 10 | 49 | 45 | 10 | 47 |  |
| 11 | 38 | 36 | 11 | 38 | 26 Trax | 11 | 49 | 46 | 11 | 49 |  |
| 12 | 37 | 37 | 12 | 34 | 34 | 12 | 49 | 46 | 12 | 47 |  |
| 13 | 39 | 38 | 13 | 37 | 31 | 13 | T 42 | 46 | 13 | 46 |  |
| 14 | 36 | 39 | 14 | 32 | 32 | 14 | 55 | 54 | 14 | 49 |  |
| 15 | 33 | 37 | 15 | 35 | 37 | 15 | 51 | 52 | 15 | 53 |  |
| 16 | 44 | 38 | 16 | RV 27 | 33 | 16 | 49 | 50 | 16 | 41 |  |
| 17 | 41 | 36 | 17 | 31 | 27 | 17 | 48 | $T 40$ | 17 | 47 |  |
| 18 | 37 | 39 | 18 | 31 | 36 | 18 | 46 | 48 | 18 | 47 |  |
| 19 | 35 | 37 | 19 | 35 | 37 | 5 | 48 | 56 | 19 | 43 |  |
| 20 | 40 | 40 | 20 | 32 | 36 | 20. | 45 | 48 | 20 | 46 |  |
| 21 | 38 | 38 | 21 | 33 | 34 Tm | 21 | 50 | 47 | 21 | 49 |  |
| 22 | 38 | 39 | 22 | 27 | 34 | 22 | 44 | 34 | 22 | 49 |  |
| 23 | 34 | 35 | 23 | 25 | 38 | 23 | 48 | 46 | 23 | 49 |  |
| 24 | 37 | 46 | 24 | 38 | 36 | 24 | 42 | 52 | 24 | 47 |  |
| 25 | 37 | 39 | 25 | 29 | 31 | 25 | 44 | 50 | 25 | 43 |  |
| 25 | 37 | 36 | ${ }_{2}{ }^{26}$ | 34 | 35 | 25 | 48 | 51 | 26 | 47 |  |
| 27 | 35 | 35 | 27 | 33 | 35 | 27 | 49 | 52 | 27 | 43 |  |
| 28 | 38 | 35 | 28 | 34 | 33 | 28 | 47 | 42 | 28 | 45 |  |
| 29 | 36 | 30 | 29 | 29 | 32 | 29 | 50 | 45 | 29 | 48 |  |
| 30 | 37 | 40 | 30 | 30 | 28 | 30 | 51 | T 40 | 30 | 53 |  |
| 31 | 43 | 34 | 31 | RV 31 | 33 | 31 | 57 | 45 | 31 | 44 |  |
| 32 | 33 | 34 | 32 | 32 | 33 | 32 | 48 | 45 | 32 | 47 |  |
| 33 | 38 | 33 | 33 | 35 | 31 | 33 | T 36 | 42 | 33 | 48 |  |
| 34 | 40 | 37 | 34 | 34 | 37 | 34 | 51 | 50 | 3 | 45 |  |
| 35 | 39 | 34 | 35 | 33 | 31 | 35 | 62 | 48 | 35 | 46 |  |

Figure 10. Chart. Example site visit speed data collection form.


Figure 11. Photo. Example field report from initial visit.

## Selection of Final Sites

Following the site visits, the research team selected the final test curve locations for installation of the TAPCO SDCWS, as shown in table 2 and figure 12.

Table 2. Final test sites by State.

| State | Number of Test Sites |
| :--- | :---: |
| Iowa | 1 |
| Missouri | 1 |
| Texas | 4 |
| Washington | 3 |
| Wisconsin | 3 |



Figure 12. Map. Final test site locations.

## Selection of Study Direction

Since only one SDCWS was installed per curve location, it was necessary to determine in which direction of travel the system would be installed (e.g., eastbound versus westbound). If one direction had a higher percentage of speed-related and/or single-vehicle run-off-road crashes than the other direction, the SDCWS was placed for this direction. It should be noted that direction information was not available for all crashes. If no predominant crash direction was noted, the SDCWS was assigned to whichever direction of travel had the highest speeds based on the initial speed study.

## Final Site Information by State

Table 3 provides a summary of curve site characteristics for each final test site location. Appendix A includes a summary of the baseline data for each test location.

Table 3. Curve characteristics.


## INSTALLATION

Once the test sites were established, the research team provided the chevron quantity and sign curve warning sign details to the manufacturer. All installations were completed by the SDCWS manufacturer with support from each State DOT. Table 4 provides a summary of installation dates by location. The manufacturer calibrated the sign and radar operational settings specific to each location. Figure 13 shows several photos from a typical installation.

Table 4. Installation dates.

| State | Installation Date |
| :--- | ---: |
| Iowa | September 2012 |
| Missouri | June 2012 |
| Texas | July 2012 |
| Washington | August 2012 |
| Wisconsin | June 2012 |



Figure 13. Photos. Installation of the SDCWS.

## Technology Description

TAPCO's SDCWS utilizes Day-Viz ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ LED enhanced solar powered signs and BlinkerBeam ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ wireless controllers along with ultra-low power radar to detect and flash a series of chevron signs along with the advance warning sign in a horizontal curve. This system both warns and guides drivers through any upcoming horizontal curves.

The SDCWS is meant to replace existing W1-8 and advance warning signage or be used in the design of a new curve as a low-cost warning system. Chapter 2C of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and engineering judgment should be applied when determining appropriate sign layouts and locations.

Using the length and speed of the curve, the user can set each of the W1-8 chevron signs to flash in a specific sequence or time interval. Each curve design will have different sign placement and geometry for consideration when determining the appropriate flash sequence.

Typically, each sign will flash at least once per second according to MUTCD guidelines, with a flash "ON" time of 100 milliseconds. When the quantity of chevrons exceeds nine, chevrons are commonly divided into two separate sequentially flashing systems in which the first and fifth sign will start flashing at the same time, followed by the second and sixth, and so on. This gives the effect of the system guiding or pulling the driver through the curve and highlights the geometry while still meeting the MUTCD guidelines.

The speed of the sequence and flash duration are determined based on the quantity of signs and speed of the curve. For example, when the speed of the curve is 45 mph and the curve distance from the start of the advance warning sign to the last chevron is $1,000 \mathrm{ft}$, the flash duration can be set to 15 seconds ( $1,000 \mathrm{ft} \div 66 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}=15$ seconds). This time will vary based on existing sign locations, driver speed, and other factors noticed during installation.

The radar can detect up to 300 ft in advance of the curve sign and will commonly be set to flash at or just below the advisory speed of the curve. Once this speed threshold is exceeded, the radar will trigger the flash of the advance warning sign and sequential chevron signs using TAPCO's 900-Mhz BlinkerBeam ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ wireless network. This wireless network is constantly communicating with each sign and providing a synchronization pulse throughout the network. This synchronization pulse is what each sign controller will use to keep the proper flash time and sequence.

During setup, the user can program when the sign LEDs should turn on (called "Beacon Start") and the duration they should stay on (called "Beacon Stop"). The Beacon Stop will become the duty cycle, which is typically no less than 100 milliseconds. This allows many options for configuring the flash sequence and speed of the flash for each horizontal curve. An example of the system in its entirety can be seen in figure 14.


Figure 14. Photo. Example SDCWS activation sequence.(Source:TAPCO)

## METHODOLOGY FOR SPEED DATA COLLECTION

The collection of traffic speed and volume data was integral to this project because these data provide the before-and-after contrast necessary to assess the effectiveness of the SDCWS.

## Equipment

Pneumatic road tubes and counters were used to collect speed and volume data. The advantage of the road tubes is that they are reasonably accurate, can collect individual vehicle speeds (allowing for spot-checking of the data), are low-cost, and are nondestructive to the existing roadway surface. The counters used were Trax I automatic traffic recorders manufactured by JAMAR Technologies, Inc. The units can collect individual vehicle speeds, headways, vehicle class, and volume.

For each data collection period, the counters were set up to record time, vehicle speed, and vehicle class for individual vehicles. Other metrics such as volume, headway, average speed, etc., can be calculated from these data. Since time on the counter can drift the counters, clocks were checked and reset each time they were used.

## Data Collection Periods

Speed and volume data were collected at each test location using the pneumatic road tubes. Data collected about 1 month before installation are referred to as "before" data. Data collected about 1 month after installation are referred to as " 1 month after" data. In all States, data will be collected again at about 12 months, 18 months and 24 months after installation (referred to as " 1 year", "18 months" and " 2 years" data).

## Data Collection Protocol and Quality Assurance

Speed and volume data were collected at three locations per test site. The goal was to understand driver speed selection in advance, at the beginning of the curve, and within the curve. These three locations are described below and shown in figure 15:

- Upstream - Road tubes were placed approximately 500 ft before the advanced curve warning sign (just in advance of being detected by the radar within the advance curve warning sign).
- PC - These tubes were placed at the point of curvature or beginning point of the curve.
- CC - Tubes placed within the center of the curve.


Figure 15. Diagram. Typical traffic counter placement.
In most cases, data were collected for at least 1 day (24 hours) during the week (Monday through Friday). During data collection, the equipment was spot checked to determine whether any problems had occurred. Common problems included the pneumatic tubes getting pulled up from the pavement, the tubes being damaged in some way, or the counters malfunctioning. Any of the problems would be addressed and noted in the data.
Data were checked in the field during data collection to spot problems early, and the full data sets were checked when data collection was complete. Data were checked for the following situations that, based on the team's experience, indicate problems with the counters:

- Large number of low speeds ( $\leq 5 \mathrm{mph}$ ).
- Large number of high speeds ( 90 mph and higher) (this usually indicates a problem with road tube layout).
- Large number of vehicles with vehicle classification $=14$ (class $=14$ are vehicles that the counter cannot identify).


## SPEED ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the speed metrics used to assess the effectiveness of the SDCWS. Since data were collected at three locations per curve, results for individual sites are summarized.

## Speed Metrics

The change in speed from the before period was compared to each after period. A negative result indicates that speeds were reduced from the before period to the after period. A positive value indicates that speed increased from the before period to the after period. Mean and 85th percentile speeds are shown using a trend line. This is shown for graphical purposes only and should not be interpreted to indicate that speeds can be interpolated between data collection periods.

The change in mean and 85th percentile speed from the before period speed to specific after period speed are shown in miles per hour ( mph ). The percentage change in the fraction of vehicles exceeding the posted and advisory speed is also presented. A number of speed metrics were calculated for the direction of travel towards the signs. They include average speed, standard deviation (SD) of speed, 50th percentile speed, 85th percentile speed, and number of vehicles traveling $5,10,15$, or 20 mph over the posted and advisory speed limit. For simplicity in setting up the pneumatic road tubes, the traffic counters were set up to record both directions of traffic on the two-way roadway. Results were reduced by lane and are only presented for traffic traveling in the direction of the SDCWS.

## Results to Date

This first year report does not provide a commentary on the results to date. Tables 5 and 6 provide a summary of speed statistics across all sites at the PC for 1 month and 12 months after data collection. Table 7 and 8 provide a summary of the speed statistics at the CC across all sites for the 1 month and 12 month after data collection periods. The tables shows the changes from before to designated after period, with a negative sign showing a reduction in speed or percentage. Appendix B contains the full data set collected before installation, 1 month after installation and 12 month after installation, in both tabular and graphic formats. The schedule of the data collection for each State is provided in table 9. This shows both data that have been collected and what will be collected in the future.

The upstream data is not reported since it was used only to gauge whether major speed changes have occurred in the vicinity of the site.

Table 5. Summary of results at point of curvature after 1 month.

|  | State |  | IA | MO | TX |  |  |  | WA |  |  | WI |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Road |  | Hwy <br> 144 | $\begin{aligned} & H w y \\ & 221 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FM } \\ & 109 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FM } \\ & 407 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FM } \\ & 530 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FM } \\ 1488 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SR } \\ 203 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hwy } \\ 20 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} H w y \\ 67 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hwy } \\ 213 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Posted Speed |  | 55 | 55 | 60 | 55 | 60 | 55 | 50 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
|  | Curve Advisory Speed |  | 45 | 40 | 35 | 40 | 35 | 40 | 20 | 40 | 50 | 30 | 25 | 50 |
|  | Change in mean speed (mph) |  | -1.5 | -1.5 | -0.8 | -1.8 | -2 | -2.4 | -2.8 | -1.4 | -2 | -1.8 | -1.6 | -0.7 |
|  | Change in 85th percentile speed(mph) |  | -1 | -1 | -1 | -2 | -2.6 | -3 | -2 | -1 | -2 | -2 | -1 | 0 |
|  | Change in fraction of vehicles exceeding advisory speed by | 5 mph | -19.7\% | -6.4\% | -2.2\% | -6.7\% | -20.3\% | -8.5\% | -7.3\% | -30.4\% | -46.5\% | -9.1\% | 0.0\% | -9.5\% |
|  |  | 10 mph | -33.3\% | -17.1\% | -8.8\% | -20.9\% | -36.4\% | -27.1\% | -30.0\% | -50.0\% | -62.5\% | -19.0\% | -3.1\% | -25.0\% |
|  |  | 15 mph | 0.0\% | -32.0\% | -23.3\% | -41.9\% | -63.6\% | -53.6\% | -51.4\% | -100.0\% | -100.0\% | -40.7\% | -8.0\% | 0.0\% |
|  |  | 20 mph | 0.0\% | -50.0\% | -42.9\% | -50.0\% | 0.0\% | -66.7\% | -77.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -57.1\% | -21.5\% | 0.0\% |
| $\underset{\infty}{N}$ | Change in fraction of vehicles exceeding posted speed by | 5 mph | 0.0\% | -50.0\% | 0.0\% | -50.0\% | -100.0\% | -66.7\% | 0.0\% | -100.0\% | -62.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -25.0\% |
|  |  | 10 mph | 0.0\% | -100.0\% | 0.0\% | -100.0\% | 0.0\% | -100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
|  |  | 15 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
|  |  | 20 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |

Table 6. Summary of results at center of curve after 1 month.

| State |  | IA | MO | TX |  |  |  | WA |  |  | WI |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road |  | Hwy <br> 144 | $\begin{aligned} & H w y \\ & 221 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FM } \\ & 109 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FM } \\ & 407 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FM } \\ & 530 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { FM } \\ 1488 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{SR} \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{SR} \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SR } \\ 203 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hwy } \\ 20 \end{gathered}$ | Hwy 67 | Hwy |
| Posted Speed |  | 55 | 55 | 60 | 55 | 60 | 55 | 50 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
| Curve Advisory Speed |  | 45 | 40 | 35 | 40 | 35 | 40 | 20 | 40 | 50 | 30 | 25 | 50 |
| Change in mean speed (mph) |  | -2.1 | 0.3 | -1.4 | -1.1 | -2 | -0.1 | -1.4 | -0.9 | -0.1 | -1.8 | -1.8 | -1 |
| Change in 85th percentile speed(mph) |  | -2 | 0 | -2 | -2 | -2.6 | 0 | -1 | -1 | 0 | -2 | -2 | -1 |
| Change in fraction of vehicles exceeding advisory speed by | 5 mph | -38.1\% | 0.0\% | -5.7\% | -8.2\% | -20.3\% | -4.8\% | -19.0\% | -26.3\% | -4.0\% | -18.2\% | -2.1\% | -11.9\% |
|  | 10 mph | -58.3\% | 10.5\% | -27.7\% | -29.7\% | -36.4\% | 2.5\% | -45.0\% | -33.3\% | 0.0\% | -45.5\% | -11.6\% | -20.0\% |
|  | 15 mph | 0.0\% | 28.6\% | -51.4\% | -60.0\% | -63.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -66.7\% | -28.3\% | 50.0\% |
|  | 20 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -46.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -100.0\% | -46.7\% | 0.0\% |
| Change in fraction of vehicles exceeding posted speed by | 5 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -20.0\% |
|  | 10 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% |
|  | 15 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
|  | 20 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |

Table 7. Summary of results at point of curvature after 12 months.

| State |  | IA | MO | TX |  |  |  | WA |  |  | WI |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road |  | Hwy <br> 144 | Hwy $221$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FM } \\ & 109 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FM } \\ & 407 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FM } \\ & 530 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FM } \\ 1488 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SR } \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SR } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SR } \\ 203 \end{gathered}$ | Hwy $20$ | Hwy 67 | $\begin{aligned} & H w y \\ & 213 \end{aligned}$ |
| Posted Speed |  | 55 | 55 | 60 | 55 | 60 | 55 | 50 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
| Curve Advisory Speed |  | 45 | 40 | 35 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 20 | 40 | 50 | 30 | 25 | 50 |
| Change in mean speed (mph) |  | -2.2 | -1.0 | 0 | -1.9 | -0.9 | -2.2 | -1.7 | -1.5 | -0.7 | -2.2 | -1.3 | 0.2 |
| Change in 85th percentile speed(mph) |  | -2 | -1 | 0 | -2 | -3 | -2 | -1 | -1 | -1 | -2 | -2 | 0 |
| Change in fraction of vehicles exceeding advisory speed by | 5 mph | -29.5\% | -3.2\% | 0.0\% | -5.6\% | 0.0\% | -8.5\% | -2.1\% | -30.4\% | -16.3\% | -10.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
|  | 10 mph | -50.0\% | -12.9\% | 0.0\% | -19.4\% | -13.0\% | -24.3\% | -15.0\% | -50.0\% | -12.5\% | -20.7\% | -1.0\% | -3.6\% |
|  | 15 mph | -75.0\% | -20.0\% | -3.3\% | -48.4\% | -10.5\% | -39.3\% | -37.8\% | -100.0\% | 0.0\% | -40.7\% | -4.6\% | 33.3\% |
|  | 20 mph | 0.0\% | -25.0\% | -28.6\% | -66.7\% | -70.0\% | -50.0\% | -55.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -71.4\% | -15.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Change in fraction of vehicles exceeding posted speed by | 5 mph | -75.2\% | -25.0\% | 0.0\% | -66.7\% | -100.0\% | -50.0\% | 0.0\% | -100.0\% | -12.5\% | 0.0\% | -100.0\% | -3.6\% |
|  | 10 mph | 0.0\% | -100.0\% | 0.0\% | -100.0\% | 0.0\% | -100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 33.3\% |
|  | 15 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
|  | 20 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |

Table 8. Summary of results at center of curve after 12 months.

| State |  | IA | MO | TX |  |  |  | WA |  |  | WI |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road |  | Hwy <br> 144 | Hwy $221$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FM } \\ & 109 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FM } \\ & 407 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FM } \\ & 530 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FM } \\ 1488 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{SR} \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{SR} \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SR } \\ 203 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hwy } \\ 20 \end{gathered}$ | Hwy $67$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Hwy } \\ 213 \end{gathered}$ |
| Posted Speed |  | 55 | 55 | 60 | 55 | 60 | 55 | 50 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
| Curve Advisory Speed |  | 45 | 40 | 35 | 40 | 35 | 40 | 20 | 40 | 50 | 30 | 25 | 50 |
| Change in mean speed (mph) |  | -1.2 | 0.2 | -0.5 | -2 | -2.1 | -1.3 | -0.7 | -1.7 | -1.3 | -0.9 | -0.8 | 0.6 |
| Change in 85th percentile speed(mph) |  | -1 | 0 | -1 | -3 | -2.6 | -1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 1 |
| Change in fraction of vehicles exceeding advisory speed by | 5 mph | -28.6\% | -1.2\% | -2.2\% | -17.8\% | -12.7\% | -9.6\% | -7.1\% | -42.1\% | -40.0\% | -11.7\% | 0.0\% | 1.7\% |
|  | 10 mph | -33.3\% | 5.3\% | -10.0\% | -43.2\% | -38.6\% | -25.0\% | -40.0\% | -33.3\% | -33.3\% | -15.2\% | -2.3\% | 8.0\% |
|  | 15 mph | 0.0\% | 28.6\% | -22.2\% | -70.0\% | -72.7\% | -37.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -16.7\% | -13.2\% | 100.0\% |
|  | 20 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -50.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -26.7\% | 0.0\% |
| Change in fraction of vehicles exceeding posted speed by | 5 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -33.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 8.0\% |
|  | 10 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
|  | 15 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
|  | 20 mph | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |

## CRASH ANALYSIS

The crash analysis will be conducted in addition to the speed analysis to determine the safety benefits. The crash analysis of the sites will be analyzed from 5 years before installation of the SDCWS and the after period consisting of up to two years. Included in the crash analysis will be the test sites where the SDCWS signs were installed and the selected control sites. The state or county agencies have been contacted for the crash information, the dates when the data would be available can be seen in the remaining schedule in Table 10.

Once all the data has been obtained the crash analysis will be conducted in a similar fashion as described. It is expected that the crashes will be split into quarters since a limited amount of after data will be available. This also provides the ability to observe crashes based on seasons as well. The variables acquired from the various agencies are: crash type, crash severity, direction of travel, time of day, number of vehicles involved, and whether the crash was speed related. Additional variables may be available once the data has been obtained.
With the crash data obtained a simple analysis will be used. The crash rates will be found for each quarter at the locations to determine if any trends occurred. The crash rate was calculated using equation below:

$$
C R_{i j}=\frac{\text { Crash }_{i j}}{Q t r_{i j}}
$$

Figure 16. Equation. Crash Rate.
Where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{CR}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\text { crash rate per quarter for period } j \text { for state } i \\
& \mathrm{Crash}_{\mathrm{i}}=\text { number of crashes for period } j \\
& \mathrm{Qtr}_{j}=\text { number of quarters for period } j
\end{aligned}
$$

With the crash rates a comparison can be made at each location as well as between the test and control sites. Since crash rates may be trending downwards due to other outside factors the comparison with the control sites can determine additional benefits in relation to the SDCWS.

Table 9 shows a summary of the crash data that has been received from the state or county agencies. The 1 year after data is only preliminary and will be finalized at the beginning on 2014. This data includes both directions of travel and all severity types. There may also be crashes included that occurred outside of the study area. The crashes are being reviewed and verified they occurred on the study curve.

Table 9. Summary of crash data received for SDCWS curves.

| State | Route | 5 Years Before <br> $(2007-2012)$ | 1 Year After <br> $(2012-2013)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hwy 144 | 8 | 0 |
|  | Hwy 221 | 31 | 0 |
| WASHINGTON | SR 7 | 19 | 0 |
|  | SR 9 | 6 | 1 |
|  | SR 203 | 5 | 1 |
| WISCONSIN | Hwy 20 | 20 | 11 |
|  | Hwy 67 | 52 | 16 |
|  | Hwy 213 | 26 | 14 |

*All Sites installed in 2012. Part of 2012 is then included in 5 years before and 1 year after.

Table 10. Schedule of activities, all sites.

| Activity Description | Schedule (Week) | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Before data collection <br> Washington <br> Wisconsin <br> Missouri <br> Texas <br> lowa | $\begin{aligned} & 7 / 17 / 2012 \\ & 5 / 212012 \\ & 6 / 132012 \\ & 6 / 25 \text { and } 7 / 92012 \\ & 8 / 29 \text { 2013 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Complete |
| Installation <br> Washington <br> Wisconsin <br> Missouri <br> Texas <br> lowa | $\begin{aligned} & 8 / 1 / 2012 \\ & 6 / 112012 \\ & 6 / 252012 \\ & 7 / 16 / 2012 \\ & 9 / 102012 \end{aligned}$ | Complete |
| 1-month after data collection <br> Washington <br> Wisconsin <br> Missouri <br> Texas <br> lowa | $\begin{aligned} & 9 / 12 / 2012 \\ & 7 / 92012 \\ & 8 / 12012 \\ & 9 / 3,9 / 10, / 9 / 242012 \\ & 10 / 102012 \end{aligned}$ | Complete |
| 12-month after data collection <br> Washington <br> Wisconsin <br> Missouri <br> Texas <br> lowa | $\begin{aligned} & 7 / 15 / 2013 \\ & 6 / 11 / 2013 \\ & 6 / 26 / 2013 \\ & 6 / 24,6 / 26,7 / 12013 \\ & 9 / 11 / 2013 \end{aligned}$ | Complete |
| 18-month after data collection <br> Washington Wisconsin Missouri Texas lowa | February 2014 $10 / 14 / 2013$ <br> January 2014 <br> December 2013/January 2014 <br> March 2014 |  |
| 24-month after data collection <br> Washington <br> Wisconsin <br> Missouri <br> Texas <br> lowa | July 2014 <br> June 2014 <br> June 2014 <br> July 2014 <br> September 2014 |  |
| Before Crash data collection <br> Washington <br> Wisconsin <br> Missouri <br> Texas <br> lowa | April 2013 <br> May 2013 <br> February 2013 <br> TBD <br> February 2013 | Complete |
| After Crash data collection <br> Washington <br> Wisconsin <br> Missouri <br> Texas <br> lowa | $\begin{aligned} & \text { October } 2014 \\ & \text { November } 2014 \\ & \text { October } 2014 \\ & \text { December } 2014 \\ & \text { December } 2014 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| First Year Evaluation | 12/31/2013 |  |
| Final Report | 4/30/2015 |  |
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## Hwy 144(IA)-Eastbound

 Before| Upstream |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Counter Number | 20335 |
| AB Direction | EB |
| Start Time | $19: 09: 38$ |
| End Time | $19: 58: 28$ |
| Duration Stopwatch | $24: 48: 45$ |



Figure 17. Photo. Iowa Highway 144 before data collection.

## Hwy 144(IA)-Eastbound

1 Month After

| Upstream |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Counter Number | 20330 |
| AB Direction | EB |
| Start Time | $13: 06: 50$ |
| End Time | $9: 02: 50$ |
| Duration Stopwatch | $115: 55: 35$ |



Figure 18. Photo. Iowa Highway 1441 month after data collection.

## Hwy 144(IA)-Eastbound

## 12 Month After

| Upstream |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Counter Number | 21569 |
| AB Direction | EB |
| Start Time | $1: 23: 21$ |
| End Time(two days) | $4: 22: 52$ |
| Duration Stopwatch | $50: 59: 42$ |
|  |  |



Figure 19. Photo. Iowa Highway 14412 month after data collection.

## Hwy 144(IA)-Eastbound



Figure 20. Photo. Iowa Highway 144 site layout.

| Iowa 144 |
| :--- |
| Date:8/29-8/30 2012 |
| Period: Before |
|  location (gps at center of curve) <br> 2 Lanes, $12^{\prime}$ lanes \# lanes and width <br> Left curve direction (left or right) <br> Gravel 4' shoulder type and width <br> 45 posted speed of curve in each direction <br> 55 tangent speed in each direction <br> 55 advisory speed in each direction <br> See below grade (average of 3 readings and list if positive or negative) <br> See below super elevation <br> See Layout location and type of signing before and in the <br> Asphalt pavement type and condition <br> None presence and location of street lighting |


| Grade | Begin S-N |  |  |  | Center W-E |  |  |  | End W-E |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { EB } \\ -.4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Center -. 1 | WB | Average $\text { -. } 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & -0 \end{aligned}$ | Center $-.9$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { WB } \\ -.4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Average $-.43$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { EB } \\ -.6 \end{array}$ | Center -. 5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { WB } \\ -.8 \end{gathered}$ | Average $\text { -. } 63$ |
|  | Begin W-E |  |  |  | Center S-N |  |  |  | End S-N |  |  |  |
| Super Elevation | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ -5.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -3.7 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { WB } \\ -4.9 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Average } \\ -4.63 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { EB } \\ -8.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -7.1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & -7.4 \end{aligned}$ | Average $-7.67$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ -1.2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Center $+1$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { WB } \\ -1.4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Average $-.53$ |

Figure 21. Chart. Iowa Highway 144 site information.

## Hwy 221(MO)-Northbound

 Before| Point of Curvature |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Counter Number | 20333 |
| AB Direction | NB |
| Start Time | $16: 41: 50$ |
| End Time | $19: 18: 36$ |
| Duration Stopwatch | $26: 36: 40$ |



Figure 22. Photo. Missouri Highway 221 before data collection.

Hwy 221(MO)-Northbound 1 Month After

| Point of Curvature |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Counter Number | 21610 |
| AB Direction | NB |
| Start Time | $7: 51: 02$ |
| End Time | $9: 04: 16$ |
| Duration Stopwatch | $25: 12: 10$ |

44


Figure 23. Photo. Missouri Highway 2211 month after data collection.

## Hwy 221(MO)-Northbound

 12 Month AfterPoint of Curvature
Counter Number 20335

| AB Direction | NB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Time | $6: 59: 28$ |
| End Time | $10: 32: 50$ |
| Duration Stopwatch | $00: 1: 50$ |



Figure 24. Photo. Missouri Highway 22112 month after data collection.

## Hwy 221(MO)-Northbound



Figure 25. Photo. Missouri Highway 221 site layout.

## Missouri 221

Date:6/13-6/14 2012
Period: Before

| N42*31.432' W08858.944' |  |  |  | location (gps at center of curve) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 Lanes, 22' Asphalt |  |  |  | \# lanes and width |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right |  |  |  | curve direction (left or right) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4'Asphalt Right 4' +3 ' Asphalt Left sharp drop |  |  |  | shoulder type and width |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 |  |  |  | posted speed of curve in each direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 |  |  |  | tangent speed in each direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 |  |  |  | advisory speed in each direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| See Below |  |  |  | grade (average of 3 readings and list if positive or negative) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| See Below |  |  |  | super elevation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| See Layout |  |  |  | location and type of signing before and in the |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asphalt, Good |  |  |  | pavement type and condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None |  |  |  | presence and location of street lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | Begin S-N |  |  |  | Center S-N |  |  |  | End W-E |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NB } \\ -3.6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -3.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SB } \\ -2.9 \end{gathered}$ | Average -3.27 | $\begin{gathered} \text { NB } \\ -4.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -4.4 \end{gathered}$ |  | Average -4.53 |  | Center -9.1 |  | Average -9.23 |
|  |  | Begin | W-E |  |  | Cent |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Super Elevation | NB -4.2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -2.6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | SB -1.2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Average } \\ -2.67 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | NB -8.6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -8.0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | SB -6.0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Average } \\ -7.53 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB } \\ & 2.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -0.7 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SB } \\ -1.4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Average $\text { -. } 03$ |

Figure 26. Chart. Missouri Highway 221 site information.


Figure 27. Map. Washington State Route 9 before data collection.


Figure 28. Map. Washington State Route 91 month after data collection.

## Washington SR9

Date: 7/15-7/16, 2013 Period: 12 Month After

| PC |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Counter Number | 20335 |
| AB Direction | SB |
| Start Time | $4: 55$ |
| End Time | $5: 45$ |

Note: Counter did not record data so counter was relaid and data was collected from 7/16-7/17


Figure 29. Map. Washington State Route 912 month after data collection.


Figure 30. Map. Washington State Route 9 site layout.

## Washington SR9

Date: 7/17-7/18, 2012
Period: 12

|  | location (gps at center of curve) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 Lanes, 10' Each <br> CL Rumble 12" Wide | \# lanes and width |
| Left | curve direction (left or right) |
| $2^{\prime}$ Asphalt Shoulder Both | shoulder type and width |
| 50 | posted speed of curve in each direction |
| 50 | tangent speed in each direction |
| 40 | advisory speed in each direction |
| See Below | grade (average of 3 readings and list if positive or negative) |
| See Below | super elevation |
| See Layout | location and type of signing before and in the |
| Asphalt | pavement type and condition |
| None | presence and location of street lighting |

Grade $\quad$| Begin W-E |  |  |  | Center W-E |  |  | End W-E |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SB Center NB Average | SB | Center NB Average | SB Center NB Average |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 31. Chart. Washington State Route 9 site information.

## Washington SR203

Date: 7/17-7/18, 2012
Period: Before

| PC |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Counter Number | 21610 |
| AB Direction | SB |
| Start Time | $5: 08$ |
| End Time | $6: 45$ |



Figure 32. Map. Washington State Route 203 before data collection.


Figure 33. Map. Washington State Route 2031 month after data collection.

## Washington SR203

Date: 7/15-7/16, 2013
Period: 12 Month After

| PC |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Counter Number | 21610 |
| AB Direction | SB |
| Start Time | $12: 15$ |
| End Time | $16: 52: 01$ |
| Stopwatch Duration | $52: 37: 01$ |


| Center of Curve |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Counter Number | 16542 |
| AB Direction | SB |
| Start Time | $12: 23$ |
| End Time | $16: 52: 47$ |
| Stopwatch Duration | $52: 30: 37$ |



Figure 34. Map. Washington State Route 20312 month after data collection.


Figure 35. Map. Washington State Route 203 site layout.

## Washington SR203

Date: 7/17-7/18, 2012
Period: Before


Figure 36. Chart. Washington State Route 203 site information.


Figure 37. Map. Washington State Route 7 before data collection.


Figure 38. Photo. Washington State Route 71 month after data collection.


Figure 39. Photo. Washington State Route 712 month after data collection.

## Washington SR7



Figure 40. Map. Washington State Route 7 site layout.

## Washington SR7

Date:7/17-7/18, 2012
Period: Before

|  | location (gps at center of curve) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 Lane with 12" Rumble |  |
| NB 11' Lane; SB 10' Lane | \# lanes and width |
| Right | curve direction (left or right) |
| Paved | shoulder type and width |
| 50 | posted speed of curve in each direction |
| 50 | tangent speed in each direction |
| 20 | advisory speed in each direction |
| See Below | grade (average of 3 readings and list if positive or negative) |
| See Below | super elevation |
| See Layout | location and type of signing before and in the |
| Asphalt, Good | pavement type and condition |
| None | presence and location of street lighting |


|  | Grade | Begin W-E |  | Center W-E | End W-E |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SB | Center | NB | Average | SB | Center | NB | Average | SB | Center | NB | Average |


|  | Begin S-N |  |  |  | Center S-N |  |  |  | End S-N |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Super Elevation | SB | Center | NB | Average | SB | Center | NB | Average | SB | Center | NB | Average |

Figure 41. Chart. Washington State Route 7 site information.

Wisconsin 213


Figure 42. Map. Wisconsin Highway 213 before data collection.

Wisconsin 213


Figure 43. Map. Wisconsin Highway 2131 month after data collection.

Wisconsin 213


Figure 44. Map. Wisconsin Highway 21312 month after data collection.

## Wisconsin 213



Figure 45. Map. Wisconsin Highway 213 site layout.

| Wisconsin 213 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date:5/21-5/22 2012 <br> Period: Before |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N42*35.977' W089¹2.570'location (gps at center of curve) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 Lanes, 24' |  |  | \# lanes and width |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Left |  |  | curve direction (left or right) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3'Asphalt with varying gravel edge |  |  | shoulder type and width |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 p |  |  |  | posted speed of curve in each direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 tan |  |  |  | tangent speed in each direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 a |  |  |  | advisory speed in each direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Below gra |  |  |  | grade (average of 3 readings and list if positive or negative) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Below sur |  |  |  | super elevation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Previous Slide(5 Chevrons) |  |  |  | location and type of signing before and in the |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asphalt, Good |  |  |  | pavement type and condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None |  |  |  | presence and location of street lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | Begin W-E |  |  |  | Center W-E |  |  |  | End W-E |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SB } \\ -4.9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Center -4.9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { NB } \\ -4.8 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Average -4.87 | $\begin{gathered} \text { SB } \\ -5.6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -5.4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Average } \\ -5.57 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SB } \\ -3.8 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -3.2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NB } \\ -3.1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Average } \\ -3.37 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | Begin | S-N |  |  | Cente |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Super Elevation | SB <br> -3.8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -3.5 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | NB -4.7 | Average $\qquad$ $-4.00$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SB } \\ -6.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -7.1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | NB -8.6 | Average $-7.40$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SB } \\ -4.6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -4.8 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NB } \\ -5.4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Average } \\ -4.93 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

Figure 46. Chart. Wisconsin Highway 213 site information.

## Wisconsin 20

Date:5/21-5/22 2012
Period: Before


Figure 47. Map. Wisconsin Highway 20 before data collection.

## Wisconsin 20

Date:7/9-7/10 2012
Period: 1 Month After


Figure 48. Map. Wisconsin Highway 201 month after data collection.

## Wisconsin 20 <br> Date:6/11-6/12 2013 <br> Period: 12 Month After



Figure 49. Map. Wisconsin Highway 2012 month after data collection.

## Wisconsin 20



Figure 50. Map. Wisconsin Highway 20 site layout.

Wisconsin 20
Date:5/21-5/22 2012
Period: Before

| N42 ${ }^{\circ} 46.212^{\prime}$ W088¹8.078' | location (gps at center of curve) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 Lanes, $\mathbf{2 5}^{\prime}$ | \# lanes and width |
| Right | curve direction (left or right) |
| South(2'Asphalt, 6'gravel) <br> North(14'Asphalt w/Drainage | shoulder type and width |
| 55 | posted speed of curve in each direction |
| 55 | tangent speed in each direction |
| 30 | advisory speed in each direction |
| See Below | grade (average of 3 readings and list if positive or negative) |
| See Below | super elevation |
| See Layout (9 Chevrons) | location and type of signing before and in the curve |
| Asphalt, Good | pavement type and condition |
| None | presence and location of street lighting |


| Grade | Begin W-E |  |  |  | Center W-E |  |  |  | End S-N |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SB 3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ 3 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB } \\ & 2.5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Average $2.83$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SB } \\ & 7.3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Center $7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB } \\ & 7.2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Average $7.17$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SB } \\ -5.9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -6.4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NB } \\ -6.5 \end{gathered}$ | Average $-6.27$ |
|  | Begin S-N |  |  |  | Center S-N |  |  |  | End W-E |  |  |  |
| Super Elevation | SB -4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -5.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB } \\ & -3 \end{aligned}$ | Average <br> -4.10 | $\begin{gathered} \text { SB } \\ -7.7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -8.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NB } \\ -8.2 \end{gathered}$ | Average -8.07 | $\begin{gathered} \text { SB } \\ -3.4 \end{gathered}$ | Center -5.6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB } \end{aligned}$ | Average -4.33 |

Figure 51. Chart. Wisconsin Highway 20 site information.

Wisconsin 67
Date:5/21-5/22 2012


Figure 52. Map. Wisconsin Highway 67 before data collection.


Figure 53. Map. Wisconsin Highway 671 month after data collection.

## Wisconsin 67

Date:6/11-6/12 2013


Figure 54. Map. Wisconsin Highway 6712 month after data collection.

## Wisconsin 67



Figure 55. Map. Wisconsin Highway 67 site layout.

| Wisconsin 67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\text { Date:5/21-5/22 } 2012$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N4256.244' W088²8.056' |  |  |  | location (gps at center of curve) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 Lanes, 24' \# |  |  |  | \# lanes and width |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right |  |  |  | curve direction (left or right) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South(3.5'asphalt w/4' Gravel then guardrail through curve) North(1.5' asphalt w/ 3' gravel) |  |  |  | shoulder type and width |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 pos |  |  |  | posted speed of curve in each direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 tan |  |  |  | tangent speed in each direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 ad |  |  |  | advisory speed in each direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| See Below gra |  |  |  | grade (average of 3 readings and list if positive or negative) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| See Below Sup |  |  |  | super elevation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| See Layout(5 Chevrons) |  |  |  | location and type of signing before and in the curve |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asphalt, good |  |  |  | pavement type and condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None |  |  |  | presence and location of street lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | Begin W-E |  |  |  | Center W-E |  |  |  | End S-N |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SB } \\ -1.6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -1.7 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NB } \\ -1.9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Average $-1.73$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SB } \\ -0.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ -0.12 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NB } \\ -0.2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Average $-0.14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SB } \\ & 0.7 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ 0.6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NB } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | Average 0.77 |
|  |  | Begin |  |  |  | Cente | S-N |  |  | End |  |  |
| Super Elevation | $\begin{gathered} \text { SB } \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ 1.1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NB } \\ -0.4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Average 0.90 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SB } \\ & 5.8 \end{aligned}$ | Center $5.2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB } \\ & 5.1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Average 5.37 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SB } \\ & 3.6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Center } \\ 3.2 \end{gathered}$ | NB 3.1 | Average 3.30 |

Figure 56. Chart. Wisconsin Highway 67 site information.

## APPENDIX B. SITE DATA TABLES AND FIGURES

In this appendix are the data tables and figures for each site. Each curve has three tables and two figures representing the data collected during the "before" and " 1 month after" periods. The first two tables are the speed statistics collected at the PC and CC. The statistics compare the before data to 1 month after, with a negative change representing a reduction. The fraction of vehicles exceeding the speed limit change shows a percentage change in the vehicles exceeding the speed limit between the data collection periods. Also in those tables are speed statistics using the tracking methodology described in the literature review. The third table contains the statistics collected from the tracking methodology and shows the speed reductions that occurred from upstream to the respective point in the curve.

The figures are graphical representations of the data shown in the tables. One figure shows the vehicles mean and 85th percentile speeds at the data collection points, while the other figure shows the change in vehicles exceeding the speed limit at the data collection points.

Table 11. Results for Iowa - Hwy 144 at PC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month Change | 12 Month | 12 Month Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 1435 | 1408 | -27 | 1334 | -101 |
| Sample | 717 | 708 |  | 656 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 60.0 | 58.9 | -1.1 | 58.7 | -1.3 |
| Mean Speed | 50.7 | 49.2 | -1.5 | 48.5 | -2.2 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.2 | 5.8 |  | 5.1 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 56 | 55 | -1 | 54 | -2 |
| percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | 61\% | 49\% | -19.7\% | 43\% | -29.5\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | 24\% | 16\% | -33.3\% | 12\% | -50.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | 4\% | 4\% | 0.0\% | 1\% | -75.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | 0\% | 1\% | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $-75.2 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | 705 | 700 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 60.0 | 59.1 | -0.9 |  | -60 |  |  |  |
| Mean Speed | 50.7 | 49.3 | -1.4 |  | -50.7 |  |  |  |
| Standard Deviation | 5.2 | 5.5 |  |  | -56 |  |  |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 56 | 55 | -1 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 12. Results for Iowa - Hwy 144 at CC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month* | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 1468 | 1428 | -40 | 1370 | -98 |
| Sample | 718 | 713 |  | 656 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 60.0 | 58.9 | -1.1 | 58.7 | -1.3 |
| Mean Speed | 48 | 45.9 | -2.1 | 46.8 | -1.2 |
| Standard Deviation | 6.2 | 6.3 |  | 5.6 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 53 | 51 | -2 | 52 | -1 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $42 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $-38.1 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $-28.6 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $12 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $-58.3 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $-33.3 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample $\quad$ Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 705 | 700 |  |  |  |  |
| Mean Speed | 60.0 | 59.1 | -0.9 |  | -60 |  |
| Standard Deviation | 48.3 | 46.0 | -2.3 |  | -48.3 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 5.6 | 6 |  |  |  |  |

Note: *8\% of data had Class 14 readings that were removed

Table 13. Speed Reduction for Iowa - Hwy 144.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 1 Year | 1 Year <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 9 | 9.7 | 0.5 |  | NC |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 11.7 | 13.0 | 1.3 |  | NC |
| Mean Speed Reduction PC to CC | 2.5 | 3.3 | 0.8 |  | NC |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 14 | 15 | 1 |  | NC |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 17 | 18 | 1 |  | NC |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction PC to CC | 5 | 5 | 0 |  | NC |

## Iowa (Hwy 144)

Speed Limit: 55 mph
Curve Advisory Speed: 45 mph
Installed: September 2012


Impact on Vehicle Speeds


Figure 57. Graph. Impact on vehicle speed - Iowa Hwy 144.

## lowa ( Hwy 144)



Figure 58. Map and graphs. Location and change in percentile (compared to before) vehicle speed - Iowa Hwy 144.

Table 14. Results for Missouri - Hwy 221 at PC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month Change | 12 Month | 12 Month Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 5277 | 5158 | -119 | 5076 | -201 |
| Sample | 2566 | 2523 |  | 2484 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 52.2 | 52.8 | 0.6 | 53 | 0.8 |
| Mean Speed | 51.7 | 50.2 | -1.5 | 50.7 | -1.0 |
| Standard Deviation | 4.7 | 4.8 |  | 4.7 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 56 | 55 | -1 | 55 | -1 |
| percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | 94\% | 88\% | -6.4\% | 91\% | -3.2\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | 70\% | 58\% | -17.1\% | 61\% | -12.9\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | 25\% | 17\% | -32.0\% | 20\% | -20.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | 4\% | 2\% | -50.0\% | 3\% | -25.0\% |
| percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | 4\% | 2\% | -50.0\% | 3\% | -25.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | 1\% | 0\% | -100.0\% | 0\% | -100.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | 0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | 0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% |
| Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | 2501 | 2459 |  | 2392 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 52.2 | 52.8 | 0.6 | 53.1 | 0.9 |
| Mean Speed | 51.7 | 50.2 | -1.5 | 50.8 | -0.9 |
| Standard Deviation | 4.7 | 4.8 |  | 4.7 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 57 | 55 | -2 | 55 | -2 |

Table 15. Results for Missouri - Hwy 221 at CC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 5274 | 5169 | -105 | 5040 | -234 |
| Sample | 2559 | 2522 |  | 2460 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 52.2 | 52.8 | 0.6 | 53 | 0.8 |
| Mean Speed | 48.3 | 48.6 | 0.3 | 48.5 | 0.2 |
| Standard Deviation | 4.4 | 4.6 |  | 4.5 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 53 | 53 | 0 | 53 | 0 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $82 \%$ | $82 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $-1.2 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $38 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $7 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $28.6 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $28.6 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | 2501 | 2459 |  | 2392 |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 52.2 | 52.8 | 0.6 | 53.1 | 0.9 |  |
| Mean Speed | 48.3 | 48.6 | 0.3 | 48.6 | 0.3 |  |
| Standard Deviation | 4.4 | 4.6 |  | 4.5 |  |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 53 | 53 | 0 | 53 | 0 |  |

Table 16. Speed reduction for Missouri - Hwy 221.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 1 Year | 1 Year <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 0.6 | 2.6 | 2 | 2.3 | 1.7 |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 3.9 | 4.3 | 0.4 | 4.5 | 0.6 |
| Mean Speed Reduction PC to CC | 3.4 | 1.7 | -1.7 | 2.2 | -1.2 |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 3 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 7 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 1 |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction PC to CC | 5 | 3 | -2 | 4 | -1 |

## Missouri (Hwy 221)

## Speed Limit: 55 mph

Curve Advisory Speed: 40 mph
Installed: July 2012


Impact on Vehicle Speeds


Figure 59. Graph. Impact on vehicle speed - Missouri Hwy 221.

Missouri (Hwy 221)
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Figure 60. Map and graphs. Location and change in percentile (compared to before) vehicle speed - Missouri Hwy 221.

Table 17. Results for Washington - SR 7 at PC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 1408 | 1413 | 5 | 1710 | 302 |
| Sample | 763 | 766 |  | 926 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 42.5 | 40.5 | -2.0 | 42.1 | -0.4 |
| Mean Speed | 33.1 | 30.3 | -2.8 | 31.4 | -1.7 |
| Standard Deviation | 4.7 | 4.6 |  | 4.3 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 37 | 35 | -2 | 36 | -1 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $96 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $-7.3 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $-2.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $80 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $-30.0 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $-15.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $37 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $-51.4 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $-37.8 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $9 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $-77.8 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $-55.6 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | 716 | 733 |  |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 42.6 | 40.8 | -1.8 |  | -42.6 |
| Mean Speed | 33.3 | 30.5 | -2.8 |  | -33.3 |
| Standard Deviation | 4.6 | 4.4 |  |  |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 38 | 35 | -3 |  | -38 |

Table 18. Results for Washington - SR 7 at CC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month* | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 1420 | 1444 | 24 | 1965 | 545 |
| Sample | 750 | 770 |  | 867 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 42.5 | 40.5 | -2.0 | 42.1 | -0.4 |
| Mean Speed | 27.2 | 25.8 | -1.4 | 26.5 | -0.7 |
| Standard Deviation | 2.9 | 3.3 |  | 2.9 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 30 | 29 | -1 | 29 | -1 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $84 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $-19.0 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $-7.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $20 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $-45.0 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $-40.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | 716 | 733 |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 42.6 | 40.8 | -1.8 |  | -42.6 |  |
| Mean Speed | 27.2 | 26.0 | -1.2 |  | -27.2 |  |
| Standard Deviation | 2.8 | 3.1 |  |  | -30 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 30 | 29 | -1 |  |  |  |

Note: *25\% of data in direction 1 was class 14 and removed.

Table 19. Speed reduction for Washington - SR 7.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 1 Year | 1 Year <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 9.3 | 10.3 | 1 |  | NC |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 15.4 | 14.8 | -0.6 |  | NC |
| Mean Speed Reduction PC to CC | 6.1 | 4.5 | -1.6 |  | NC |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 14 | 15.2 | 1.2 |  | NC |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 20 | 21 | 1 |  | NC |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction PC to CC | 9 | 7 | -2 |  | NC |

## Washington (SR 7)

Speed Limit: 50 mph Curve Advisory Speed: 20 mph Installed: August 2012

Impact on Vehicle Speeds


Figure 61. Graph. Impact on vehicle speed - Washington SR 7.

## Washington (SR 7)



Figure 62. Map and graphs. Location and change in percentile (compared to before) vehicle speed - Washington SR 7.

Table 20. Results for Washington - SR 9 at PC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month Change | 12 Month | 12 Month Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 5533 | 6212 | 679 | 5889 | 356 |
| Sample | 2702 | 3062 |  | 2842 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 46.9 | 48.7 | 1.8 | 47.6 | 0.7 |
| Mean Speed | 41.0 | 39.6 | -1.4 | 39.5 | -1.5 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.2 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 46 | 45 | -1 | 45 | -1 |
| percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | 23\% | 16\% | -30.4\% | 16\% | -30.4\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | 4\% | 2\% | -50.0\% | 2\% | -50.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | 1\% | 0\% | -100.0\% | 0\% | -100.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | 0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% |
| percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | 1\% | 0\% | -100.0\% | 0\% | -100.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | 0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | 0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | 0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% |
| Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | 2598 | 2957 |  |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 47.1 | 48.8 | 1.7 |  | -47.1 |
| Mean Speed | 41.1 | 39.7 | -1.4 |  | -41.1 |
| Standard Deviation | 4.9 | 4.9 |  |  |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 46 | 44 | -2 |  | -46 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

Table 21. Results for Washington - SR 9 at CC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month* | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 5523 | 6227 | 704 | 6091 | 568 |
| Sample | 2688 | 3081 |  | 2931 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 46.9 | 48.7 | 1.8 | 47.6 | 0.7 |
| Mean Speed | 40.2 | 39.3 | -0.9 | 38.5 | -1.7 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.3 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 45 | 44 | -1 | 44 | -1 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $19 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $-26.3 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $-42.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $-33.3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $-33.3 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | 2598 | 2957 |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 47.1 | 48.8 | 1.7 |  | -47.1 |  |
| Mean Speed | 40.3 | 39.3 | -1 |  | -40.3 |  |
| Standard Deviation | 5.0 | 4.9 |  |  | -45 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 45 | 44 | -1 |  |  |  |

Note: ${ }^{*} 11 \%$ of data was class 14 and removed

Table 22. Speed reduction for Washington - SR 9.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 1 Year | 1 Year <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 6.0 | 9.1 | 3.1 |  | NC |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 6.8 | 9.5 | 2.7 |  | NC |
| Mean Speed Reduction PC to CC | 0.8 | 0.4 | -0.4 |  | NC |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 9 | 13 | 4 |  | NC |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 10 | 13 | 3 |  | NC |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction PC to CC | 2 | 1 | -1 |  | NC |

## Washington (SR 9)

## Speed Limit: 55 mph

Curve Advisory Speed: 40 mph
Installed: August 2012

Impact on Vehicle Speeds


Figure 63. Graph. Impact on vehicle speed - Washington SR 9.

## Washington (SR 9)



Figure 64. Map and graphs. Location and change in percentile (compared to before) vehicle speed - Washington SR 9.

Table 23. Results for Washington - SR 203 at PC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 10088 | 10761 | 673 | 10718 | 630 |
| Sample | 4901 | 5190 |  | 5097 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 53.8 | 54.2 | 0.4 | 53.2 | -0.6 |
| Mean Speed | 53.5 | 51.5 | -2.0 | 52.8 | -0.7 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.0 | 4.5 |  | 4.7 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 58 | 56 | -2 | 57 | -1 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $43 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $-46.5 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $-16.3 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $8 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $-62.5 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $-12.5 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $-100.0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $8 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $-62.5 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $-12.5 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $-100.0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 4637 | 4902 |  |  | -54.1 |  |
| Mean Speed | 54.1 | 54.4 | 0.3 |  | -53.6 |  |
| Standard Deviation | 53.6 | 51.6 | -2 |  |  |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 4.7 | 4.5 |  |  | -58 |  |

Table 24. Results for Washington - SR 203 at CC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 10120 | 10756 | 636 | 10839 | 719 |
| Sample | 4921 | 5148 |  | 5089 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 53.8 | 54.2 | 0.4 | 53.2 | -0.6 |
| Mean Speed | 51.6 | 51.5 | -0.1 | 50.3 | -1.3 |
| Standard Deviation | 4.6 | 4.6 |  | 4.4 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 56 | 56 | 0 | 55 | -1 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $25 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $-4.0 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $-40.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $-33.3 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $-33.3 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | 4637 | 4902 |  |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 54.1 | 54.4 | 0.3 |  | -54.1 |
| Mean Speed | 51.8 | 51.6 | -0.2 |  | -51.8 |
| Standard Deviation | 4.5 | 4.6 |  |  |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 56 | 56 | 0 |  | -56 |

Table 25. Speed reduction for Washington - SR 203.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 1 Year | 1 Year <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 0.5 | 2.8 | 2.3 |  | NC |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 2.4 | 2.8 | 0.4 |  | NC |
| Mean Speed Reduction PC to CC | 1.8 | 0 | -1.8 |  | NC |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 3 | 6 | 3 |  | NC |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 6 | 7 | 1 |  | NC |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction PC to CC | 3 | 2 | -1 |  | NC |

## Washington (SR 203)

## Speed Limit: 55 mph

Curve Advisory Speed: 50 mph
Installed: August 2012


Impact on Vehicle Speeds


Figure 65. Graph. Impact on vehicle speed - Washington SR 203.

## Washington (SR 203)



Figure 66. Map and graphs. Location and change in percentile (compared to before) vehicle speed - Washington SR 203.

Table 26. Results for Wisconsin - Hwy 20 at PC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 3583 | 3250 | -333 | 3371 | -212 |
| Sample | 1692 | 1556 |  | 1674 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 53.7 | 55.2 | 1.5 | 55 | 1.3 |
| Mean Speed | 39.6 | 37.8 | -1.8 | 37.4 | -2.2 |
| Standard Deviation | 7.6 | 7.1 |  | 7.3 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 47 | 45 | -2 | 45 | -2 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $77 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $-9.1 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $-10.4 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $58 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $-19.0 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $-20.7 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $27 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $-40.7 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $-40.7 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $7 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $-57.1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $-71.4 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 1318 | 1251 |  | 1332 |  |  |
| Mean Speed | 54.1 | 55.7 | 1.6 | 55.7 | 1.6 |  |
| Standard Deviation | 42.1 | 40.1 | -2 | 39.8 | -2.3 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 5.7 | 5.4 |  | 5.6 |  |  |

Table 27. Results for Wisconsin - Hwy 20 at CC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 3128 | 2823 | -305 | 2883 | -245 |
| Sample | 1456 | 1350 |  | 1425 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 53.7 | 55.2 | 1.5 | 55 | 1.3 |
| Mean Speed | 37.4 | 35.6 | -1.8 | 36.5 | -0.9 |
| Standard Deviation | 4.8 | 4.6 |  | 5.1 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 42 | 40 | -2 | 41 | -1 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $77 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $-18.2 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $-11.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $33 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $-45.5 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $-15.2 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $6 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $-66.7 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $-16.7 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $-100.0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | 1318 | 1251 |  | 1332 |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 54.1 | 55.7 | 1.6 | 55.7 | 1.6 |  |
| Mean Speed | 37.8 | 36.1 | -1.7 | 36.9 | -0.9 |  |
| Standard Deviation | 4.4 | 4.1 |  | 4.7 |  |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 42 | 40 | -2 | 41 | -1 |  |

Table 28. Speed reduction for Wisconsin - Hwy 20.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 1 Year | 1 Year <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 12.0 | 15.6 | 3.6 | 15.9 | 3.9 |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 16.2 | 19.5 | 3.3 | 18.8 | 2.6 |
| Mean Speed Reduction PC to CC | 4.3 | 4.0 | -0.3 | 2.9 | -1.4 |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 18 | 20 | 2 | 21 | 3 |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 23 | 25 | 2 | 24 | 1 |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction PC to CC | 8 | 7 | -1 | 6 | -2 |

## Wisconsin (Hwy 20)

Speed Limit: 55 mph
Curve Advisory Speed: 30 mph
Installed: June 2012


Impact on Vehicle Speeds


Figure 67. Graph. Impact on vehicle speed - Wisconsin Hwy 20.

## Wisconsin (Hwy 20)




Figure 68. Map and graphs. Location and change in percentile (compared to before) vehicle speed - Wisconsin Hwy 20.

Table 29. Results for Wisconsin - Hwy 67 at PC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month Change | 12 Month | 12 Month Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 3494 | 4018 | 524 | 3842 | 348 |
| Sample | 1726 | 1992 |  | 1912 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 50.0 | 48.9 | -1.1 | 49.2 | -0.8 |
| Mean Speed | 46.1 | 44.5 | -1.6 | 44.8 | -1.3 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.9 | 6.0 |  | 5.6 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 52 | 51 | -1 | 50 | -2 |
| percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | 99\% | 99\% | 0.0\% | 99\% | 0.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | 97\% | 94\% | -3.1\% | 96\% | -1.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | 87\% | 80\% | -8.0\% | 83\% | -4.6\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | 65\% | 51\% | -21.5\% | 55\% | -15.4\% |
| percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | 1\% | 1\% | 0.0\% | 0\% | -100.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | 0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | 0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | 0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% | 0\% | 0.0\% |
| Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | 1668 | 1931 |  | 1845 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 50.0 | 48.9 | -1.1 | 49.2 | -0.8 |
| Mean Speed | 46.1 | 44.5 | -1.6 | 44.8 | -1.3 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.8 | 6.0 |  | 5.5 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 52 | 51 | -1 | 50 | -2 |

Table 30. Results for Wisconsin - Hwy 67 at CC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 3496 | 4004 | 508 | 3821 | 325 |
| Sample | 1713 | 1979 |  | 1899 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 50.0 | 48.9 | -1.1 | 49.2 | -0.8 |
| Mean Speed | 39.7 | 37.9 | -1.8 | 38.9 | -0.8 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.7 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 45 | 43 | -2 | 44 | -1 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $97 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $-2.1 \%$ | $97 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $86 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $-11.6 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $-2.3 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $53 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $-28.3 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $-13.2 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $15 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $-46.7 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $-26.7 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | 1668 | 1931 |  | 1845 |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 50.0 | 48.9 | -1.1 | 49.2 | -0.8 |  |
| Mean Speed | 39.7 | 37.9 | -1.8 | 38.9 | -0.8 |  |
| Standard Deviation | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.7 |  |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 45 | 43 | -2 | 44 | -1 |  |

Table 31. Speed Reduction for Wisconsin - Hwy 67.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 1 Year | 1 Year <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 3.9 | 4.40 | 0.5 | 4.5 | 0.6 |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 10.2 | 11.0 | 0.8 | 10.3 | 0.1 |
| Mean Speed Reduction PC to CC | 6.4 | 6.6 | 0.2 | 5.8 | -0.6 |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 11 | 13 | 2 | 12 | 1 |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 19 | 20 | 1 | 18 | -1 |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction PC to CC | 9 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 |

## Wisconsin (Hwy 67)

## Speed Limit: 55mph

Curve Advisory Speed: 25 mph
Installed: June 2012

Impact on Vehicle Speeds


Figure 69. Graph. Impact on vehicle speed - Wisconsin Hwy 67.

## Wisconsin (Hwy 67)



Figure 70. Map and graphs. Location and change in percentile (compared to before) vehicle speed - Wisconsin Hwy 67.

Table 32. Results for Wisconsin - Hwy 213 at PC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 2369 | 2249 | -120 | 2445 | 76 |
| Sample | 1156 | 1119 |  | 1214 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 58.8 | 59.8 | 1.0 | 60.5 | 1.7 |
| Mean Speed | 55.3 | 54.6 | -0.7 | 55.5 | 0.2 |
| Standard Deviation | 7.0 | 6.6 |  | 6.2 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 61 | 61 | 0 | 61 | 0 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $63 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $-9.5 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $28 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $-25.0 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $-3.6 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

## percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $28 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $-25.0 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $-3.6 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | 1134 | 1098 |  | 1188 |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 58.9 | 59.9 | 1 | 60.6 | 1.7 |  |
| Mean Speed | 55.5 | 54.8 | -0.7 | 55.6 | 0.1 |  |
| Standard Deviation | 6.5 | 6.2 |  | 6.1 |  |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 61 | 61 | 0 | 61 | 0 |  |

Table 33. Results for Wisconsin - Hwy 213 at CC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 2552 | 2428 | -124 | 2596 | 44 |
| Sample | 1220 | 1193 |  | 1278 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 58.8 | 59.8 | 1.0 | 60.5 | 1.7 |
| Mean Speed | 53.2 | 52.2 | -1.0 | 53.8 | 0.6 |
| Standard Deviation | 9.7 | 9.8 |  | 9.4 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 61 | 60 | -1 | 62 | 1 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $59 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $-11.9 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $25 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $-20.0 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $25 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $-20.0 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Tracking Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | 1134 | 1098 |  | 1188 |  |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 58.9 | 59.9 | 1 | 60.6 | 1.7 |  |
| Mean Speed | 54.7 | 54.0 | -0.7 | 55.3 | 0.6 |  |
| Standard Deviation | 7.7 | 7.5 |  | 7.2 |  |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 61 | 61 | 0 | 62 | 1 |  |

Table 34. Speed reduction for Wisconsin - Hwy 213.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 1 Year | 1 Year <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 3.4 | 5.1 | 1.7 | 5 | 1.6 |
| Mean Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 4.2 | 5.9 | 1.7 | 5.3 | 1.1 |
| Mean Speed Reduction PC to CC | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.3 | -0.5 |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to PC | 9 | 10 | 1 | 10 | 1 |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction Upstream to CC | 10 | 11.5 | 1.5 | 11 | 1 |
| 85th Percentile Speed Reduction PC to CC | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | -1 |

## Wisconsin (Hwy 213)

Speed Limit: 55 mph
Curve Advisory Speed: 50 mph
Installed: June 2012


Impact on Vehicle Speeds


Figure 71. Graph. Impact on vehicle speed - Wisconsin Hwy 213.

## Wisconsin (Hwy 213)



Figure 72. Map and graphs. Location and change in percentile (compared to before) vehicle speed - Wisconsin Hwy 213.

Table 35. Results for Texas - FM 109 at PC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 2187 | 2031 | -156 | 2191 | 4 |
| Sample | 1036 | 954 |  | 1079 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 58.2 | 59.6 | 1.4 | 59.9 | 1.7 |
| Mean Speed | 46.6 | 45.8 | -0.8 | 46.6 | 0.0 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.7 | 5.4 |  | 5.3 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 52 | 51 | -1 | 52 | 0 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $92 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $-2.2 \%$ | $92 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $68 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $-8.8 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $30 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $-23.3 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $-3.3 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $7 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $-42.9 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $-28.6 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

Table 36. Results for Texas - FM 109 at CC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 2129 | 1991 | -138 | 2153 | 24 |
| Sample | 1017 | 938 |  | 1063 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 58.2 | 59.6 | 1.4 | 59.9 | 1.7 |
| Mean Speed | 45.2 | 43.8 | -1.4 | 44.7 | -0.5 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.2 | 4.7 |  | 4.7 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 50 | 48 | -2 | 49 | -1 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $90 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $-5.7 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $-2.2 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $60 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $-27.7 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $-10.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $18 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $-51.4 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $-22.2 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $-46.5 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $-50.0 \%$ |
| percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

## Texas (FM 109)

Speed Limit: 60 mph Curve Advisory Speed: 35 mph Installed: July 2012

Impact on Vehicle Speeds


Figure 73. Graph. Impact on vehicle speed - Texas FM 109.

## Texas (FM 109)



Figure 74. Map and graphs. Location and change in (compared to before) percentile vehicle speed - Texas FM 109.

Table 37. Results for Texas - FM 407 at PC.

|  | Before * | 1 Month | 1 Month Change | 12 Month | 12 Month Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 2480 | 2883 | 403 | 2689 | 209 |
| Sample | 856 | 1443 |  | 1305 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 61.3 | 60.1 | -1.2 | 60.4 | -0.9 |
| Mean Speed | 51.5 | 49.7 | -1.8 | 49.6 | -1.9 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.6 | 5.3 |  | 5.3 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 57 | 55 | -2 | 55 | -2 |
| percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | 89\% | 83\% | -6.7\% | 84\% | -5.6\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | 67\% | 53\% | -20.9\% | 54\% | -19.4\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | 31\% | 18\% | -41.9\% | 16\% | -48.4\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | 6\% | 3\% | -50.0\% | 2\% | -66.7\% |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $6 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $-50.0 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $-66.7 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $-100.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $-100.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

*Note: Only 18 hours of data collected from puncture in the tube

Table 38. Results for Texas - FM 407 at CC.

|  | Before * | 1 Month | 1 Month Change | 12 Month | 12 Month Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 2238 | 2885 | 647 | 2686 | 448 |
| Sample | 579 | 1446 |  | 1306 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 61.3 | 60.1 | -1.2 | 60.4 | -0.9 |
| Mean Speed | 47.3 | 46.2 | -1.1 | 45.3 | -2.0 |
| Standard Deviation | 6.3 | 5.6 |  | 5.6 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 53 | 51 | -2 | 50 | -3 |
| percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | 73\% | 67\% | -8.2\% | 60\% | -17.8\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | 37\% | 26\% | -29.7\% | 21\% | -43.2\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles $15+$ Over Limit | 10\% | 4\% | -60.0\% | 3\% | -70.0\% |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | 1\% | 1\% | 0.0\% | 1\% | 0.0\% |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $-100.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

*Note: Only 16 hours of data collected from puncture in the tube

## Texas (FM 407)

Speed Limit: 55 mph
Curve Advisory Speed: 40 mph
Installed: July 2012


Impact on Vehicle Speeds


Figure 75. Graph. Impact on vehicle speed - Texas FM 407.

## Texas (FM 407)




Figure 76. Map and graphs. Location and change in percentile (compared to before) vehicle speed - Texas FM 407.

Table 39. Results for Texas - FM 530 at PC.

|  | Before $^{*}$ | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month** | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 675 | 418 | -257 | 499 | -176 |
| Sample | 71 | 200 |  | 256 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 62.1 | 60.0 | -2.1 | 61.3 | -0.8 |
| Mean Speed | 47.1 | 46.2 | -0.9 | 46.2 | -0.9 |
| Standard Deviation | 9.3 | 6.3 |  | 6.8 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 55 | 53 | -2 | 52 | -3 |


| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $86 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $77 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $-19.5 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $-13.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $38 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $-13.2 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $-10.5 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $20 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $-55.0 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $-70.0 \%$ |
| percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $-100.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $-100.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

*Note:Before count had many unknown counts leading to less counts for 24 hour period
**There were $38 \%$ Class 14 but only in direction 2 which was not apart of analysis

Table 40. Results for Texas - FM 530 at CC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 488 | 430 | -58 | 501 | 13 |
| Sample | 237 | 204 |  | 256 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 62.1 | 60.0 | -2.1 | 61.3 | -0.8 |
| Mean Speed | 43.2 | 41.2 | -2.0 | 41.1 | -2.1 |
| Standard Deviation | 6.1 | 5.2 |  | 5.3 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 48.6 | 46 | -2.6 | 46 | -2.6 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $79 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $-20.3 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $-12.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $44 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $-36.4 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $-38.6 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $11 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $-63.6 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $-72.7 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

## Texas (FM 530)

Speed Limit: 60 mph
Curve Advisory Speed: 35 mph
Installed: July 2012


Figure 77. Graph. Impact on vehicle speed - Texas FM 530.

## Texas (FM 530)



Figure 78. Map and graphs. Location and change in percentile (compared to before) vehicle speed - Texas FM 530.

Table 41. Results for Texas - FM 1148 at PC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 3549 | 3742 | 193 | 4070 | 521 |
| Sample | 1746 | 1832 |  | 1981 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 59.3 | 58.9 | -0.4 | 60.7 | 1.4 |
| Mean Speed | 51.9 | 49.5 | -2.4 | 49.7 | -2.2 |
| Standard Deviation | 5 | 4.8 |  | 5.3 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 57 | 54 | -3 | 55 | -2 |

## percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $6 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $-66.7 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $-50.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $-100.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $-100.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

Table 42. Results for Texas - FM 1148 at CC.

|  | Before | 1 Month | 1 Month <br> Change | 12 Month | 12 Month <br> Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Day Count | 3538 | 3708 | 170 | 4048 | 510 |
| Sample | 1748 | 1831 |  | 1978 |  |
| Upstream Mean Speed | 59.3 | 58.9 | -0.4 | 60.7 | 1.4 |
| Mean Speed | 48.5 | 48.4 | -0.1 | 47.2 | -1.3 |
| Standard Deviation | 4.5 | 4.9 |  | 4.7 |  |
| 85th Percentile Speed | 53 | 53 | 0 | 52 | -1 |

percentage of vehicles exceeding advisory speed

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $83 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $-4.8 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $-9.6 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $40 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $-25.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $-37.5 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

percentage of vehicles exceeding speed limit

| Percentage of Vehicles 5+ Over Limit | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Percentage of Vehicles 10+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 15+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Percentage of Vehicles 20+ Over Limit | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |

## Texas (FM 1148)

Speed Limit: 55 mph
Curve Advisory Speed: 40 mph
Installed: July 2012


Figure 79. Graph. Impact on vehicle speed - Texas FM 1148.

## Texas (FM 1148)




Figure 80. Map and graphs. Location and change in percentile (compared to before) vehicle speed - Texas FM 1148.

APPENDIX C. NORMAL DISTRIBUTION CHARTS


Figure 81. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Iowa 144 at upstream


Figure 82. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Iowa 144 at point of curvature


Figure 83. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Iowa 144 at center of curve


Figure 84. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Missouri Hwy 221 at upstream


Figure 85. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Missouri Hwy 221 at point of curvature


Figure 86. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Missouri Hwy 221 at center of curve


Figure 87. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Texas FM 109 at upstream


Figure 88. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Texas FM 109 at point of curvature


Figure 89. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Texas FM 109 at center of curve


Figure 90. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Texas FM 407 at upstream


Figure 91. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Texas FM 407 at point of curvature


Figure 92. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Texas FM 407 at center of curve


Figure 93. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Texas FM 530 at upstream


Figure 94. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Texas FM 530 at point of curvature


Figure 95. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Texas FM 530 at center of curve


Figure 96. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Texas FM 1488 at upstream


Figure 97. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Texas FM 1488 at point of curvature


Figure 98. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Texas FM 1488 at center of curve


Figure 99. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Washington SR 7 at upstream


Figure 100. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Washington SR 7 at point of curvature


Figure 101. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Washington SR 7 at center of curve


Figure 102. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Washington SR 9 at upstream


Figure 103. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Washington SR 9 at point of curvature


Figure 104. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Washington SR 9 at center of curve


Figure 105. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Washington SR 203 at upstream


Figure 106. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Washington SR 203 at point of curvature


Figure 107. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Washington SR 203 at center of curve


Figure 108. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Wisconsin Hwy 20 at upstream


Figure 109. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Wisconsin Hwy 20 at point of curvature


Figure 110. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Wisconsin Hwy 20 at center of curve


Figure 111. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Wisconsin Hwy 67 at upstream


Figure 112. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Wisconsin Hwy 67 at point of curvature


Figure 113. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Wisconsin Hwy 67 at center of curve


Figure 114. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Wisconsin Hwy 213 at upstream

Wisconsin Hwy 213 Point of Curvature
Normal Probability Distribution

—Before, Mean=55.3mph STD=7.0 1 Month, Mean=54.6mph STD=6.6 12 Month, Mean=55.5mph STD=6.2

Figure 115. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Wisconsin Hwy 213 at point of curvature


Figure 116. Chart. Normal distribution chart for Wisconsin Hwy 213 at center of curve
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[^0]:    *SI is the symbol for the International System of Units. Appropriate rounding should be made to comply with Section 4 of ASTM E380.

