Blueprint for Implementing the Strategic Highway Safety Plan at the Local Level
Why are we here?

- Understand and embrace the SHSP as a guiding document
- Propose a methodology for data analysis, stakeholder engagement and task implementation
- We don’t have the answers...
  - trying to empower locals to improve traffic safety in their community using statewide and local tools
Strategic Highway Safety Plan

- 3-year plan that articulates strategies for Wisconsin to address highway safety challenges
- Identifies:
  - the foremost highway safety problems in the state
  - opportunities and processes to address those problems
  - determines the appropriate approaches and countermeasures
- Requires the coordination of:
  - Local governments and state agencies
  - The private sector, community organizations, and individual citizens
- Local implementation of this plan is a major priority.
Survey (over 1000 people)
Peer Exchange
Task Forces
Writing up the document
Top 10 Issue Areas

- Reduce Driver Distraction/Improve Driver Alertness
- Reduce Alcohol & Drug-Impaired Driving
- Reduce the Incidence and Severity of Motorcycle Crashes
- Improve Driver Performance (Teens, Older, Competent)
- Improve Non Motorist Safety
- Improve Safety of Intersections
- Increase Occupant Protection
- Curb Aggressive Driving/Reduce Speed-Related Crashes
- Reduce Lane Departure Crashes
- Improve Safety Culture, Safety Data, Safety Technology
Active Work Groups

- Reduce Driver Distraction/Improve Driver Alertness
- Reduce Alcohol & Drug-Impaired Driving
- Reduce the Incidence and Severity of Motorcycle Crashes
- Increase Occupant Protection
- Improve Safety Culture, Safety Data, Safety Technology
Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

- Safety-related infrastructure improvements—data-driven and crash-based selection of projects
- The Strategic Highway Safety Plan is a requirement for WisDOT’s Division of Transportation Investment Management to apply for funds to improve highway safety through the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) HSIP.
- Funds safety projects designed to reduce the number and severity of crashes on all roadways in the state, including the local system.
- $31 million/year, 10% state or local match
- Four year project cycle, applications for SFY 2018-2021 are due 8/15/17
- Spot projects can include intersection safety improvements, straightening isolated curves or hills, improving sight distance, access modifications, constructing lanes, eliminating a roadside obstacle, installing guardrails or other barriers, or installing signs or pavement markings.
- Corridor-level projects can include signal upgrades, larger or additional signing, chevrons, pavement markings, rumble strips, eliminating encroachments, or pedestrian countdown timers.
- DTIM improves some high risk rural roads through this HSIP, focusing on local rural collectors, roads with many run-off-the-road crashes or fatal and serious injury crashes.
Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)

- Highway Safety Plan (HSP)
- Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
Highway Safety Plan

- $11.6 million annually for behavioral highway safety countermeasures
- Annual plan and application for funding from BOTS to NHTSA
- Major program areas include occupant protection, impaired driving, police traffic, traffic records improvement, EMS improvement, motorcyclist safety, pedestrian and bicyclist safety, community traffic safety, and media and outreach.
- Each major program area identifies countermeasures and projects to address behavioral highway safety problems.
Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)

Highway Safety Plan (HSP)

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

Traffic Safety Commissions (TSCs)
- Community Maps
- 511
- WisTransPortal
- County Profiles
- TSC Guidelines

Traffic and Criminal Software (TraCS)
- Mobile Architecture for Communications Handling (MACH)
Every county is “required” to have a TSC, however..

Opportunity to create grassroots traffic safety initiatives that can directly impact what is happening on roadways.

Vital component and stakeholder in the creation and implementation of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

DOT/BOTS is committed to providing support and resources towards the effectiveness of the TSC’s.
The review of crashes (fatal, serious injury, and even frequent crash areas) is a foundational component of the TSC.

One of the purposes of having stakeholders from a multitude of disciplines around the table is for them all to weigh-in on the prior quarter’s crash review from their individual area of expertise and/or personal knowledge.

The review of crashes should always include showing the crash location (and surrounding area) so participants are able to visualize what happened, where it happened, and discuss all possible factors in why the crash happened – all with the goal of determining what if any countermeasures might be used to prevent future crashes.

This can be done in multiple ways, such as Community Maps and squad video presentations.
Figure 2: Contributing Factors to Traffic Fatalities
COLLABORATION
Your Traffic Safety Partners  (≤ not ≥ or even = )
Support, tools, resources
  Potential solutions – not answers
BOTS Staff
  Analysts
  RPMs
  LELs
Welcome to the WisTransPortal

Data Services
WisTransPortal data requests and login account information.

Data Products
Traffic operations and engineering datasets and related resources.

Web Applications
WisTransPortal data retrieval and analysis tools; other applications.

Documentation
Database documentation, project architecture, and other documentation.

WisDOT Traffic Video
Live video streaming and public safety information service.

Developer Resources
Resources for TOPS and WisTransPortal system development.

Quick Links
- Crash Data
- Traffic Data
- Lane Closures
- Traffic Incidents
- Traffic Video
- Storm Report
- 511 WIS
Where do you go from here?

- Identification of local problem areas
  - No perfect county, all relative
  - Low hanging fruit
- Identify stakeholders and programs already active in your community
  - Are they at the TSC table
  - Are they aware of the SHSP > common goals
  - Are they an untapped resource
- Recognize limitations of TSCs quarterly meeting time
Starting a TSC Sub-Committee

- Grab stakeholders first

- Determine what data is available at the state level, but also at the local level.

- Research possible countermeasures that the state recommends in the SHSP.
  - Compare and contrast with local efforts
Not limited to SHSP countermeasures

Create new pilot projects that respond to local concerns.

TSC sub-committees are encouraged to view pilot projects as an opportunity to identify holes in the state traffic records system and to report back to the DOT on suggested improvements.

- Knowledge sharing with DOT and other TSCs
Building the Blueprint

1. Identify Problem - Look at Data
2. Identify Stakeholders
3. Identify Action Items (Measurable Tasks)
4. Implement
5. Measure and Evaluation

Flow: Identify Problem - Look at Data → Identify Stakeholders → Identify Action Items (Measurable Tasks) → Implement → Measure and Evaluation → Identify Problem - Look at Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Center Miles</th>
<th>14'-'16' average VMT (in 100 million)</th>
<th>TOTAL (14'-'16') Run off the Road Crashes</th>
<th>3-Year Ave Number Run off the Road Crashes (14'-'16')</th>
<th>Run off the Road Crash Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>257,897.00</td>
<td>2,336.50</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>2,585.00</td>
<td>861.67</td>
<td>37.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGLADE</td>
<td>19,995.00</td>
<td>1,159.15</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>334.00</td>
<td>111.30</td>
<td>43.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACINE</td>
<td>195,294.00</td>
<td>1,332.91</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>2,799.00</td>
<td>933.00</td>
<td>63.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALWORTH</td>
<td>102,593.00</td>
<td>1,533.23</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>1,524.00</td>
<td>508.00</td>
<td>45.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE FIGURES</td>
<td>5,775,120.00</td>
<td>115,457.02</td>
<td>605.57</td>
<td>92,837.00</td>
<td>30,945.67</td>
<td>51.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Center Miles</th>
<th>14'-'16' average VMT (in 100 million)</th>
<th>TOTAL (14'-'16') Number of Run Of the Road Fatalities</th>
<th>3-Year Average Number of Run Of the Road Fatalities</th>
<th>Run off the Road Fatality Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>257,897.00</td>
<td>2,336.50</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGLADE</td>
<td>19,995.00</td>
<td>1,159.15</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACINE</td>
<td>195,294.00</td>
<td>1,332.91</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALWORTH</td>
<td>102,593.00</td>
<td>1,533.23</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE FIGURES</td>
<td>5,775,120.00</td>
<td>115,457.02</td>
<td>605.57</td>
<td>799.00</td>
<td>266.33</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Years ROR Data

Roadway: 22%

Driver: 62%

Vehicle: 3.5%

Overlap:
- Roadway and Driver: 13%
- Roadway and Vehicle: 1%
- Driver and Vehicle: 1%

Other:
- Roadway: 0.9%
Lane Departure Tasks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Center Miles</th>
<th>14'-16' average VM</th>
<th>TOTAL (14'-16') Alcohol-Related Fatalities</th>
<th>3-Year Average of Alcohol Related Fatalities (14'-16')</th>
<th>Alcohol-Related Fatalities Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>257,897.06</td>
<td>2,336.50</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGLADE</td>
<td>19,995.00</td>
<td>1,159.15</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACINE</td>
<td>195,294.00</td>
<td>1,332.90</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALWORTH</td>
<td>102,593.00</td>
<td>1,533.23</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE FIGURES</td>
<td>5,775,120.00</td>
<td>115,457.02</td>
<td>605.57</td>
<td>495.00</td>
<td>165.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Center Miles</th>
<th>14'-16' average VM (in 100 million)</th>
<th>TOTAL (14'-16') Alcohol-Related Crashes</th>
<th>3-Year Ave of Alcohol Related Crashes (14'-16)</th>
<th>Alcohol-Related Crashes Crash Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>257,897.06</td>
<td>2,336.50</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>583.00</td>
<td>194.33</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGLADE</td>
<td>19,995.00</td>
<td>1,159.15</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACINE</td>
<td>195,294.00</td>
<td>1,332.90</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>533.00</td>
<td>177.67</td>
<td>12.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALWORTH</td>
<td>102,593.00</td>
<td>1,533.23</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>316.00</td>
<td>105.30</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE FIGURES</td>
<td>5,775,120.00</td>
<td>115,457.02</td>
<td>605.57</td>
<td>15,259.00</td>
<td>5,086.33</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Takeaways – Wrap Up

- Proactive versus reactive – with a twist
- Grassroot, local programs can be more effective than state/federal programs
  - Better data/better knowledge
  - Not impossible to receive funding for locally grown programs
- State doesn’t have all the answers
- Who has extra time to do more?
  - Working smarter - together
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 rpw@wiessinger.com  
608-516-6767