AASHTO SCOPM Task Force on
MAP-21 National Performance Measures

Target-Setting Workshop

Tom Cole, Idaho DOT
Bernie Arseneau, Minnesota DOT
John Selmer, Iowa DOT

Safety Performance Measure Area

Thursday, June 13, 2013

Safety Participants

- Timothy E. Barnett, Alabama DOT
- Floyd Roehrich, Arizona DOT
- Jessie Jones, Arkansas DOT
- Scott Richrath, Colorado DOT
- Pete Capetera, Connecticut DOT
- Colleen A. Kissane, Connecticut DOT
- Tom Cole, Idaho DOT
- Priscilla Tobias, Illinois DOT
- John Selmer, Iowa DOT
- Duane Brunell, Maine DOT
- Jerry Casey, Maine DOT
- Jeanetta Hill, Massachusetts DOT
- Bernie Arseneau, Minnesota DOT
- Sue Groth, Minnesota DOT
- Leanna Depue, Missouri DOT
- Fred Zwonechek, Nebraska DOT
- Scott Zainhofsky, North Dakota DOT
- Troy Costales, Oregon DOT
- Robert Hull, Utah DOT
- John Milton, Washington State DOT

Safety Participants

- Patrick Hall, Atlanta Regional Commission
- Bala Akundi, Baltimore Metropolitan Council
- Jeff Kaufman, Houston-Galveston Area Council
- Kelly Hardy, AASHTO

Safety Issues and Recommendations

GENERAL CONCERNS

- Evaluation, analysis and diagnosis capability is key for target setting process to be effective; requires substantial resources and expertise
- States with zero-based goals shouldn't be discouraged from also setting less aggressive interim targets.
- Targets should not be linked to funding. Target achievement dependent on factors unrelated to what can be addressed via engineering fixes.
- Recognize random variation in results in evaluating target achievement – consider target in the form of a range around a report mean (e.g. +- 5 percent)

Safety Issues and Recommendations

GENERAL CONCERNS (CONTINUED)

- Performance holding steady, or in some situations declining, may be acceptable
- Targets need to be set in the context of available funding and agency funding allocation decisions
- Recognize time lag between funding/initiating countermeasures and resulting impacts
- USDOT should consider a state's current safety performance before assessing consequences of missed targets: long term progress, fatality/injury rates relative to national average, best use of available resources, etc. Contextual information including trends in VMT, population, demographics, economic changes, licensing & registration, changes to crash reporting, funding important for understanding results

Safety Issues and Recommendations

DATA AVAILABILITY

- Time lag issues in availability of final fatality and injury numbers – e.g. final FARS data for 2012 available December 2013
- Lack of complete traffic data to compute rates – especially on local roads
- Reduce "competing sets of accident data at the local, State, and Federal level"
- States need certified VMT data at least 3 months before performance report is due

Safety Issues and Recommendations

GUIDANCE AND TRAINING NEEDS

- Process guidance is needed on:
  - Building on existing well-established data-driven safety planning process – including target setting, identifying emphasis areas, evaluation and adjustment
- Technical guidance is needed on:
  - Establishing national standard definition and process to determine and report serious injuries, contributing factors, and location of accidents (using GPS)
  - Traffic & VMT prediction methodologies in high-production shale-oil/gas regions