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Background

- Federal Highway Initiative
  - Changed national safety performance measure
    - Fatalities (severe crashes) as opposed to All crashes
    - Safety goals for every State
  - Data driven process
  - More effective safety investments
    - Better link between crash causation and implementation of safety strategies
- Four Safety E’s
- All roads
Background

Critical Emphasis Areas

- All Others
- Driver Safety Awareness
- Ran-Off the Road
- Head-On & Across Median
- Aggressive Drivers
- Young Drivers
- Signalized Intersections
- Unsignalized Intersections
- Alcohol Related
- Unbelted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>657</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Safety Goal
A 5% Reduction in the Number of Traffic Fatalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimated</th>
<th>2010 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## Roadway Segment Crash and Fatality Rates by Jurisdictional Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Jurisdiction Classification</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Crashes</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>Crash Rate*</th>
<th>Fatality Rate**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>9,689</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk Highway</td>
<td>10,956</td>
<td>22,583</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH / County Roads</td>
<td>44,997</td>
<td>22,768</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Streets</td>
<td>19,105</td>
<td>21,423</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Township, etc.)</td>
<td>59,387</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>135,359</td>
<td>78,745</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* per million vehicle miles (MVM)
** per 100 million vehicle miles (100 MVM)


### Highlights

- As a class, interstates had lower crash and fatality rates than conventional roadways. This is likely due to three factors:
  - Interstates only serve a mobility function
  - Interstates tend to have a consistently high standard of design
  - Interstates have very strict control of access

- Of the conventional roadways, Trunk Highways had the lowest crash rate and the second lowest fatality rate.

- City streets had the highest crash rate and a low fatality rate.

- County and township roads had moderately high crash rates and the highest fatality rates.

- This distribution of crashes generally supports the idea that greater numbers of crashes occur in urban areas and greater numbers of fatal crashes occur in rural areas.

- Crash rates and fatality rates by roadway jurisdiction (and for the state as a whole) are interesting, however, there is a great deal of evidence to suggest that crash rates are more a function of roadway design than who owns the road.
Background

- Sponsored by…
  - Funding provided by the Minnesota Department of Transportation
  - Almost $3.5 million made available to prepare County Safety Plans for 87 counties over three years
Goal and Objectives

- Development of County Safety Plans
  - Create county crash goal
  - Establish safety emphasis areas
  - High priority safety strategies
  - At-risk locations
  - Safety investment options

- Identify high priority safety projects, both proactive and reactive.

- Position counties to compete for safety funds
  - Highway Safety Improvement Program
  - High Risk Rural Roads Program
  - Minnesota Central Safety Funds

- Foster safety culture among county stakeholders
## Schedule of Delivery

- **Phase I** - October 15, 2009 to mid July 2010
- **Phase II** - July 2010 to April 2011
- **Phase III** - April 2011 to January 2012
- **Phase IV** - January 2012 to September 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATP 6 &amp; ATP 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATP 8, ATP 4, &amp; Hennepin County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATP 7, ATP 1, Steele &amp; Chisago Counties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATP 2 &amp; Ramsey, Scott, Anoka, Washington, Dakota, &amp; Carver Counties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Participating Counties

- **ATP 3**
  - Benton – Robert Kozel
  - Cass – David Enblom
  - Crow Wing – Tim Bray
  - Isanti – Richard Heilman
  - Kanabec – Gregory Nikodym
  - Mille Lacs – Bruce Cochran
  - Morrison – Steve Backowski
  - Sherburne – Rhonda Lewis
  - Stearns – Mitch Anderson
  - Todd – Loren Fellbaum
  - Wadena – Joel Ulring
  - Wright – Wayne Fingalson

- **ATP 6**
  - Dodge – Guy Kohlnhofer
  - Fillmore – John Grindeland
  - Freeborn – Sue Miller
  - Goodhue – Gregory Isakson
  - Houston – Brian Pogodzinski
  - Mower – Mike Hanson
  - Rice – Dennis Luebbe
  - Wabasha – Dietrich Flesch
  - Winona – David Kramer
Project Approach – Phase I

- Crash Analysis
- Select Safety Emphasis Areas
- Identify Short List of Critical Strategies
- Develop Comprehensive List of Safety Strategies
- Safety Workshop
- Identify Safety Projects
- Project Programming
  - Project Development
  - Implementation
  - Evaluation
  - Refinement & Update SHSP
- Review Mtg w/ Counties
- Identify Short List of Critical Strategies
- Safety Workshop
- Safety Plan
- Kick-off Video Conference

Timeline:
- Oct 2009
- Feb 2010
- Mar 2010
- Apr 2010
- May 2010
- July 2010
## Minnesota’s Safety Emphasis Areas

### Top 10 Emphasis Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related Fatal Crashes or Fatalities</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Related Fatalities</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Related Fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Increasing Seat Belt Usage and Improving Airbag Effectiveness</td>
<td>1,351 fatalities</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,271 fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Improving the Design and Operation of Highway Intersections</td>
<td>1,013 fatal crashes</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,004 fatal crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Reducing Impaired Driving</td>
<td>1,020 fatal crashes</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,068 fatal crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Keeping Vehicles on the Roadway (combined with Minimizing the Consequences of Leaving the Road)</td>
<td>959 fatal crashes</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>965 fatal crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Curbing Aggressive Driving</td>
<td>675 fatal crashes</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>850 fatal crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Instituting Graduated Licensing for Young Drivers</td>
<td>705 fatal crashes</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>718 fatal crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Reducing Head-On and Across-Median Crashes</td>
<td>505 fatal crashes</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>611 fatal crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Sustaining Proficiency in Older Drivers</td>
<td>594 fatal crashes</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>533 fatal crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Making Truck Travel Safer</td>
<td>681 fatal crashes</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>568 fatal crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Increasing Driver Safety Awareness</td>
<td>379 fatal crashes</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>447 fatal crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Improving Information and Decision Support Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Minnesota Crash Records; not including fatalities due to the I-35W Bridge collapse.

1998-2002: 2,797 fatal crashes; 3,126 fatalities; 2,572 vehicle occupant fatalities

2001-2005: 2,701 fatal crashes; 3,008 fatalities; 2,429 vehicle occupant fatalities

2004-2008: 2,701 fatal crashes; 3,008 fatalities; 2,429 vehicle occupant fatalities
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## Safety Emphasis Areas—Greater Minnesota vs. Metro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Driver Behavior Based Emphasis Areas</th>
<th>Infrastructure Based Emphasis Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Fatalities</td>
<td>Unbelted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>1,271 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greater Minnesota Districts (2001-2005 Fatalities)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Trunk Highway</td>
<td>1,089 (53%)</td>
<td>476 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Roads</td>
<td>974 (47%)</td>
<td>492 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Minnesota Districts Total</td>
<td>2,063 (55%)</td>
<td>968 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro District (2001-2005 Fatalities)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Trunk Highway</td>
<td>465 (49%)</td>
<td>162 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Roads</td>
<td>480 (51%)</td>
<td>141 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro District Total</td>
<td>945 (45%)</td>
<td>303 (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Minnesota Strategic Highway Safety Plan

Represents at least 3% greater than statewide average

### Highlights

- Almost 70% of the fatalities in Minnesota are in the 79 counties outside of the 8 county Minneapolis – St. Paul Metropolitan Area.
- Fatal crashes are split almost evenly between the state and local roadway systems – which results in higher fatality rates on the local system.
- In Urban areas, the primary factors associated with fatal crashes are intersections and speeding.
- In Rural areas, the primary factors associated with fatal crashes are not using safety belts, alcohol, and road departure crashes.
Statewide Emphasis Areas

Fatalities by Emphasis Area for Part 1: Driver

- Involving Young Driver
- Involving Driver with an Invalid License
- Involving Older Driver
- Involving Aggressive or Speeding Driver
- Drug and Alcohol-related crashes
- Involving Inattentive or Distracted Driver
- Unbelted Vehicle Occupant

Annual Fatalities in Emphasis Area

2003: 239, 178, 152
2004: 224, 161, 151
2005: 193, 166, 193
2006: 193, 178, 193
2007: 163, 150
2008: 125
2009: 81
Statewide Emphasis Areas

Fatalities by Emphasis Area for Part 4: Highways
## Critical Emphasis Areas

### Winona County Emphasis Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis Area</th>
<th>Statewide Percentage</th>
<th>Interstate, US &amp; TH</th>
<th>City, Township &amp; Other</th>
<th>ATP 6</th>
<th>City, Township &amp; Other</th>
<th>Group 7</th>
<th>Interstate, US &amp; TH</th>
<th>City, Township &amp; Other</th>
<th>Winona County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes</td>
<td>10,172</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young drivers (under 21)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24% (116)</td>
<td>28% (121)</td>
<td>34% (92)</td>
<td>27% (23)</td>
<td>26% (17)</td>
<td>32% (12)</td>
<td>43% (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed drivers</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5% (25)</td>
<td>6% (25)</td>
<td>7% (18)</td>
<td>6% (5)</td>
<td>9% (6)</td>
<td>8% (3)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older drivers (over 64)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20% (96)</td>
<td>13% (56)</td>
<td>13% (34)</td>
<td>8% (7)</td>
<td>18% (12)</td>
<td>11% (4)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive driving and speeding-related</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23% (108)</td>
<td>25% (107)</td>
<td>20% (54)</td>
<td>26% (24)</td>
<td>22% (14)</td>
<td>29% (11)</td>
<td>13% (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and alcohol-related</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15% (73)</td>
<td>29% (125)</td>
<td>21% (57)</td>
<td>31% (27)</td>
<td>20% (13)</td>
<td>34% (13)</td>
<td>17% (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentive, distracted, asleep drivers</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27% (130)</td>
<td>15% (63)</td>
<td>14% (38)</td>
<td>9% (8)</td>
<td>26% (17)</td>
<td>11% (4)</td>
<td>13% (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety awareness</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbelted vehicle occupants</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28% (133)</td>
<td>31% (135)</td>
<td>25% (69)</td>
<td>30% (26)</td>
<td>29% (19)</td>
<td>29% (11)</td>
<td>13% (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians crashes</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4% (17)</td>
<td>3% (12)</td>
<td>10% (27)</td>
<td>5% (4)</td>
<td>3% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>13% (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle crashes</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1% (6)</td>
<td>1% (6)</td>
<td>7% (18)</td>
<td>3% (3)</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>8% (3)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles crashes</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16% (74)</td>
<td>18% (76)</td>
<td>8% (22)</td>
<td>21% (18)</td>
<td>12% (8)</td>
<td>21% (8)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy vehicle crashes</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14% (68)</td>
<td>5% (23)</td>
<td>7% (20)</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
<td>23% (15)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety enhancements</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences of leaving road</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection crashes</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37% (177)</td>
<td>26% (112)</td>
<td>50% (136)</td>
<td>17% (15)</td>
<td>29% (19)</td>
<td>26% (10)</td>
<td>43% (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head-On and Sideswipe (opposite) crashes</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17% (83)</td>
<td>19% (83)</td>
<td>12% (32)</td>
<td>26% (22)</td>
<td>22% (14)</td>
<td>13% (5)</td>
<td>10% (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work zone crashes</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2% (8)</td>
<td>1% (4)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS Enhancing Emergency Capabilities</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and decision support systems</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DPS Crash Data Records, 2004 to 2008

Winona County Critical Emphasis Areas (based on top 5 ATP numbers)

Note: Numbers are not additive, as one crash may involve a young driver at an intersection.

- **Five Critical Emphasis Areas selected**
  - Young Drivers (under 21)
  - Drug and alcohol-related
  - Unbelted vehicle occupants
  - Road departure crashes
  - Intersection Crashes
Safety Strategies Overview NCHRP Report 500

- A series of guides to assist state and local agencies in reducing injuries and fatalities in targeted emphasis areas.
- The guides correspond to the emphasis areas outlined in the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan.
- Each guide includes a brief introduction, a general description of the problem, the strategies/countermeasures to address the problem, and a model implementation process.
Screening - Initial Strategies


The strategies will be screened using:
- Crash data,
- Effectiveness,
- Cost, and
- Input from Safety Workshop.

The Critical Strategies should have the greatest potential to significantly reduce the number of traffic fatalities in Winona County.
# List of Road Departure Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Relative Cost to Implement and Operate</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Typical Timeframe for Implementation</th>
<th>Workshop Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1 A1 -- Install shoulder rumble strips</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Proven</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1 A2 -- Install edgelines, edgeline rumble strips or modified shoulder rumble strips on section with narrow or no paved shoulders</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1 A3 -- Install centerline rumble strips</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1 A4 -- Provide enhanced shoulder or delineation and marking for sharp curves</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Tried / Proven</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1 A5 -- Provide improved highway geometry for horizontal curves</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Proven</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1 A6 -- Provide enhanced pavement markings</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Tried</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1 A7 -- Provide skid-resistance pavement surfaces</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Proven</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1 A8 -- Apply shoulder treatments</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Proven</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Eliminate shoulder drop-offs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Shoulder wedge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Widen and/or pave shoulders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1 B1 -- Design safer slopes and ditches to prevent rollovers</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Proven</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1 B2 -- Remove/relocate objects in hazardous locations</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>Proven</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1 B3 -- Delineate trees or utility poles with retroreflective tape</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1 B</td>
<td>15.1 C1 -- Improve design of roadside hardware</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>Tried</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.1 C2 -- Improve design and application of barrier and attenuation systems</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>Tried</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NCHRP 500 Series

Short (<1 year)
Medium (1-2 years)
Long (>2 years)
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Safety Workshop

- Date/Time: March 10th, 8:30AM to 3PM
- Location: Rushford Village Hall
- Agenda
  - 8:30 – Coffee and Registration
  - 9AM - Introductions
  - Background Information/Desired Outcomes
  - Breakout Sessions – Prioritize Strategies
  - 12PM – 1PM - Lunch
  - Report Back/Final Presentation
  - 2:45 – 3PM - Wrap-up
## Strategy Voting Results

### Priority List of **Signalized Intersection** Safety Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Voting Results</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.2 A4 -- Employ signal coordination along a corridor or route</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2 E2 -- Supplement conventional enforcement of red-light running with confirmation lights</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority List of **Unsignalized Intersection** Safety Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Voting Results</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.1 B -- Reduce the frequency and severity of intersection conflicts through geometric design improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.1 E -- Improve driver awareness of intersections as viewed from the intersection approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority List of **Road Departure** Safety Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Voting Results</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1 A -- Keep vehicles from encroaching on the roadside</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1 A2 -- Install edgeline &quot;profile marking&quot;, edgeline rumble strips or modified shoulder rumble strips on section with narrow or no paved shoulders</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1 A4 -- Provide enhanced shoulder or delineation and marking for sharp curves</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1 A6 -- Provide enhanced pavement markings</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority List of **Seat Belt Usage** Safety Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Voting Results</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 A4 -- Support Legislation to change seat belt usage from a secondary to a primary offense</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 B -- Insure that restraints, especially child and infant restraints, are properly used</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority List of **Impaired/Aggressive/Young Drivers and Bicyclist** Safety Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Voting Results</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase bicycle helmet usage</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support diversion programs to impaired driving offenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support legislation to require ignition interlocks as a condition for license reinstatement</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority List of **Bicycle** Safety Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Voting Results</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct educational and public information campaigns against aggressive driving</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop parent-teen driver's education presentations and handbook aimed at educating individuals on the risk of teen driving</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategies Receiving Highest Votes

- Install shoulder rumble strips
- Conducting educational campaigns and develop parent-teen driver’s education aimed at teen driving
- Improving driver awareness of intersections
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Example – Typical Intersection Strategies

Included Strategies:

Change Intersection Type

Full Access

3/4 Access

Right In/Out Access

Street Lighting

Dynamic Warning Signs

Enhanced Signing and Delineation

Improve Sight Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Access</th>
<th>Full Access 3/4</th>
<th>Right In/Out Access</th>
<th>Percental Crash Rate Reduction per Change of Intersection Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36” wide, reserve 40” for intersections with documented deficiencies and where there are R1 grade crossing or cuts in the CTA approach. 3% distance between Stop Ahead and Sign. 5% distance between Stop Ahead and Intersection. 45’ in length, 5’ width Larger than Stop (up to 48’).
Example – Typical Run-Off Road Strategies

Lane Departure Crashes

Key Objectives:
Keep Vehicles in Their Lane

Key Strategies:
- Improved curve delineation
- Improved lane markings

Key Objectives:
Improve Shoulders

Key Strategies:
- Safety edge
- Paved shoulders
- Shoulder rumble strips

Rumble Strip
Without Safety Edge
With Safety Edge
ATP 6 County Crash Data Overview

Source: MnCMAT Crash Data, 2003-2007
Severe is fatal and serious injury crashes (K+A).

5 Year Crashes ATP 6
35,890
1,258

State System
16,571 – 46%
481 – 38%

CSAH/CR
7,509 – 21%
493 – 39%

City, Twnshp, Other
11,810 – 33%
284 – 23%

Urban
3,109 – 41%
98 – 20%

Rural
4,400 – 59%

Not Inters-Related
999 – 32%
52 – 53%

Unknown/Other
495 – 16%
9 – 9%

Inters-Related
1,615 – 52%
37 – 38%

Run Off Road – 235 (24%), 24 (46%)
Rear End – 307 (31%), 5 (10%)
Head On – 57 (6%), 9 (17%)
Right Angle – 98 (10%), 4 (8%)

Animal
640 – 15%
12 – 3%

Not Animal
3,760 – 85%
383 – 97%

Inters-Related
1,035 – 28%
97 – 25%

Unknown/Other
302 – 8%
52 – 53%

Not Inters-Related
2,423 – 64%
266 – 70%

Other/Unknown
358 – 22%
6 – 16%

Run Off Road – 183 (38%), 16 (34%)
Right Angle – 48 (10%), 7 (15%)
Rear End – 66 (14%), 2 (4%)
Left Turn – 37 (8%), 8 (17%)

Signalized
627 – 39%
11 – 30%

All Way Stop
567 – 35%
15 – 41%

Thru-Stop
567 – 35%
15 – 41%

Other/Unknown
358 – 22%
6 – 16%

Right Angle – 221 (35%), 8 (73%)
Rear End – 241 (38%), 2 (18%)
Left Turn – 86 (14%), 0 (0%)
Right Turn – 3 (<1%), 1 (9%)

Right Angle – 285 (50%), 11 (73%)
Rear End – 74 (13%), 2 (13%)
Left Turn – 61 (11%), 0 (0%)

Thru-Stop
446 – 43%
47 – 49%

Run Off Road – 183 (38%), 16 (34%)
Right Angle – 48 (10%), 7 (15%)
Rear End – 66 (14%), 2 (4%)
Left Turn – 37 (8%), 8 (17%)

Signalized
97 – 9%
2 – 1%

All Way Stop
10 – 1%
1 – 1%

Thru-Stop
446 – 43%
47 – 49%

Run Off Road – 183 (38%), 16 (34%)
Right Angle – 48 (10%), 7 (15%)
Rear End – 66 (14%), 2 (4%)
Left Turn – 37 (8%), 8 (17%)

On Curve
59 – 39%
13 – 46%

On Curve
59 – 39%
13 – 46%
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Houston County Crash Data Overview

Source: MnCMAT Crash Data, 2003-2007
Severe is fatal and serious injury crashes (K+A).

5 Year Crashes Houston County
1,516
63

State System
762 – 50%
33 – 52%

CSAH/CR
426 – 28%
22 – 35%

Rural
319 – 75%
21 – 95%

City, Twnshp, Other
328 – 22%
8 – 13%

Urban
107 – 25%
1 – 5%

Not Inters-Related
48 – 45%
1 – 100%

Unknown/Other
16 – 15%
0 – 0%

Inters-Related
43 – 40%
0 – 0%

Run Off Road – 13 (27%), 1 (100%)
Rear End – 13 (27%), 0 (0%)
SS Same – 8 (17%), 0 (0%)
Other – 6 (13%), 0 (0%)

Signalized
3 – 7%
0 – 0%

All Way Stop
2 – 5%
0 – 0%

Thru-Stop
23 – 53%
0 – 0%

Other/Unknown
15 – 35%
0 – 0%

Run Off Road – 5 (38%), 0 (0%)
SS Same – 3 (23%), 1 (100%)
Rear End – 3 (23%), 0 (0%)

Rear End – 4 (27%), 0 (0%)
Run Off Road – 4 (27%), 0 (0%)
SS Same – 3 (20%), 0 (0%)

Right Angle – 8 (35%), 0 (0%)
Left Turn – 5 (22%), 0 (0%)
Rear End – 3 (13%), 0 (0%)

Animal
87 – 27%
1 – 5%

Not Animal
232 – 73%
20 – 95%

Inters-Related
17 – 7%
1 – 5%

Unknown/Other
27 – 12%
2 – 10%

Not Inters-Related
188 – 81%
17 – 85%

Other/Unknown
13 – 76%
1 – 100%

Thru-Stop
4 – 0%
0 – 0%

Run Off Road
16 – 60%
1 – 50%

On Curve
9 – 75%
0 – 0%

Run off Road
152 – 81%
16 – 94%

Head On, SS Opp
12 – 6%
0 – 0%

Animal
87 – 27%
1 – 5%

Not Animal
232 – 73%
20 – 95%

Inters-Related
17 – 7%
1 – 5%

Unknown/Other
27 – 12%
2 – 10%

Not Inters-Related
188 – 81%
17 – 85%

Other/Unknown
13 – 76%
1 – 100%

Thru-Stop
4 – 0%
0 – 0%

Run Off Road
16 – 60%
1 – 50%

On Curve
9 – 75%
0 – 0%

Run off Road
152 – 81%
16 – 94%
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Stearns County - Crash Data Overview

Source: MnCMAT Crash Data, 2003-2007
Severe is fatal and serious injury crashes (K+A).

5 Year Crashes Stearns County
11,152
386

State System
4,038 – 36%
111 – 29%

CSAH/CR
3,213 – 29%
111 – 29%

Rural
1,327 – 41%
97 – 64%

Urban
1,886 – 59%
55 – 36%

Example
All – %
Severe – %

Not Inters-Related
531 – 28%
19 – 35%

Unknown/Other
276 – 15%
4 – 7%

Inters-Related
1,079 – 57%
32 – 58%

Rear End – 155 (29%), 4 (21%)
Run Off Road – 122 (23%), 8 (42%)
Right Angle – 43 (8%), 1 (5%)
Other – 38 (7%), 4 (21%)
Sideswipe (Opposing) – 18 (3%), 1 (5%)

Animal
177 – 13%
3 – 3%

Not Animal
1,150 – 87%
94 – 97%

Inters-Related
373 – 33%
25 – 27%

Unknown/Other
97 – 8%
5 – 5%

Not Inters-Related
680 – 59%
64 – 68%

Other/Unknown
160 – 43%
11 – 44%

Signalized
35 – 9%
1 – 4%

Run Off Road – 63 (39%), 7 (64%)
Sideswipe (Same) – 11 (7%), 1 (9%)
Other – 8 (5%), 2 (18%)
Head On – 4 (3%), 1 (9%)

All Way Stop
8 – 2%
1 – 4%

Thru-Stop
170 – 46%
12 – 48%

Head On, SS Opp
46 – 7%
6 – 9%

Signalized
1 – 4%

Thru-Stop
19 – 41%
3 – 50%

Run off Road
462 – 68%
43 – 67%

Unknown/Other
160 – 43%
11 – 44%

Not Animal
680 – 59%
64 – 68%

Right Angle
60 (35%), 9 (75%)
Run Off Road – 24 (14%), 2 (17%)
Left Turn – 21 (12%), 0 (0%)
Head On – 7 (4%), 1 (8%)

Other/Unknown
261 – 24%
7 – 22%

Run Off Road – 24 (8%), 1 (8%)
Left Turn – 42 (15%), 1 (8%)
Rear End – 42 (15%), 1 (8%)
Right Angle – 153 (53%), 9 (75%)
Left Turn – 81 (16%), 2 (17%)
Other – 10 (2%), 2 (17%)

All Way Stop
1 – 3%

Thru-Stop
12 – 37%

On Curve
196 – 42%
23 – 53%

Right Angle
60 (35%), 9 (75%)
Run Off Road – 24 (14%), 2 (17%)
Left Turn – 21 (12%), 0 (0%)
Head On – 7 (4%), 1 (8%)

On Curve
19 – 41%
3 – 50%

Run off Road
462 – 68%
43 – 67%

Not Animal
680 – 59%
64 – 68%

Signalized
35 – 9%
1 – 4%

Run Off Road – 63 (39%), 7 (64%)
Sideswipe (Same) – 11 (7%), 1 (9%)
Other – 8 (5%), 2 (18%)
Head On – 4 (3%), 1 (9%)

Unknown/Other
97 – 8%
5 – 5%

Not Inters-Related
680 – 59%
64 – 68%

Right Angle
141 (28%), 6 (50%)
Left Turn – 81 (16%), 2 (17%)
Other – 10 (2%), 2 (17%)

Head On, SS Opp
46 – 7%
6 – 9%

App. 18 – 36%
18 – 36%
Rural Roadway Departure

- Are all 325 miles of rural roads equally at risk?

- Find volume categories where road departure crashes are overrepresented when compared to VMT
  - 500 to 2,500 ADT categories
Horizontal Curves

Highlights

- A number of previously published research reports have identified horizontal curves as at-risk elements of rural road systems, however, the degree of risk was not quantified.

- A recent report prepared by the Texas Transportation Institute (FHWA/ TX-07/0-5439-1) related actual crash rates on rural roads to the radius of curvature. The results of this research indicates that the crash rate on curves with radii greater then 2,500 feet is approximately equal to the crash rate on tangent sections.

- On curves with radii of 1,000 feet, the crash rate is twice the rate on tangents and curves; curves with radii of 500 feet have crash rates eight times higher than on tangents.

- A number of safety studies that were focused on local, rural systems in Minnesota have found road departure crashes are overrepresented on horizontal curves – 40 to 50% of the road departure crashes in the selected counties occurred on curves, and curves made up less than 10% of the county’s system.

- The same studies also documented that over 60% of the horizontal curves on the county system have radii less than 1,000 feet – from a system perspective, these curves are more at risk.

Source: Texas Transportation Institute (FHWA/ TX-07/0-5439-1)
Roadside Safety Strategies (3 of 6)
**Curve-Related Roadway Departure**

- Approximately 40% of roadway departure crashes are curve related
- 240 curves along rural corridors
- Are all curves equally at-risk? No

- **Ranked based on Checkmark system**
  - 5 Checks
  - ADT Range – 1,000-2,500
  - Radius Range - 750-1,250 ft
  - Severe Crash on curve
  - Intersection on curve
  - Visual Trap on curve
Curve-Related Roadway Departure

- Crash Rate increases as Radius decreases, with a sharp rise near 1,500’.
- Severe Crashes are overrepresented in mid-range radii, specifically between 750’ and 1,250’
- Curves with a radius between 750’ and 1,250’ received a checkmark.
## Curve-Related Roadway Departure

### Summary of the high priority curves prioritization includes:
- 23 curves received 3, 4 or 5 checkmarks (240 total)
  - 1 received 5 checkmarks
  - 6 received 4 checkmarks
  - 16 received 3 checkmarks
- 10% of all curves
- 18 different corridor segments across the county

### Table: Curve Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Curve</th>
<th>Corridor Weighted ADT</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>PDO</th>
<th>Severe RoR</th>
<th>Radius</th>
<th>Length Curve</th>
<th>Intersection on Curve</th>
<th>Chevrons</th>
<th>Visual Trap</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CSAH 3</td>
<td>Mower Co - CSAH 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CSAH 4</td>
<td>CSAH 5 - CSAH 22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CSAH 6</td>
<td>CSAH 6 - CSAH 35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CSAH 11</td>
<td>CSAH 36 - CSAH 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>CSAH 2</td>
<td>36th Ave NE - TH 42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>CR 133</td>
<td>55th St NW - CSAH 14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>CSAH 3</td>
<td>CSAH 14 - CSAH 13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>CSAH 12</td>
<td>US 52 - US 63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>CSAH 5</td>
<td>Byron City Limits - Dodge Co (CSAH 17)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>CSAH 34</td>
<td>US 14 - CSAH 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>CSAH 3</td>
<td>CSAH 6 - CSAH 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxxxxxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>CSAH 6</td>
<td>CSAH 3 - US 63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>CSAH 10</td>
<td>Chatfield City Limits - I-90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>CSAH 25</td>
<td>CSAH 3 - CSAH 22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>CSAH 23</td>
<td>CSAH 19 - TH 42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>CR 143</td>
<td>CSAH 11 - CSAH 19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>CSAH 16</td>
<td>CSAH 1 - US 52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>CSAH 18</td>
<td>CSAH 12 - Wabasha Co</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comprehensive Safety Improvement Process

**Highlights**

- For the past 30 years, most safety programs have been focused on identifying locations with a high frequency or rate of crashes – Black Spots – and then reactively implementing safety improvement strategies.

- The result of making Black Spots the highest priority in the safety program was to focus safety investments primarily on urban and suburban signalized intersections—the locations with the highest number of crashes. However, these Black Spot intersections were found to account for fewer than 10% of fatal crashes.

- A new, more systematic based analysis of Minnesota’s crash data combined with the adoption of a goal to reduce fatal crashes has led to a more comprehensive approach to safety programming—a focus on Black Spots in urban areas where there are intersections with high frequencies of crashes and a systems-based approach for rural areas where the total number of severe crashes is high but the actual number of crashes at any given location is very low.
Examples of Projects

- Edgeline and/or centerline rumblestrips
- Enhanced pavement markings (6” or 4” wet reflective)
- Enhanced delineation for curves
- Median access management
- Confirmation light for enhanced enforcement
- Street lights and enhanced signs and markings
- Dynamic Mainline Intersection Warning

Indirect Turns
Project Summary

**Infrastructure Based**

- Edge line rumble stripE’s  164 Miles  $400,000
- Enhanced (6”) edge lines  84 Miles  $25,000
- Enhanced curve delineation  22 Curves  $22,000
- Median/channelization  6 Intersections  $450,000
- Signs, St. Lights & Dynamic Warning  25 Intersections  $451,000
- Enhanced Red Light Enforcement  28 Intersections  $100,000
- Total  $1,447,000

Note: The value of this list of potential safety projects is greater than what Olmsted County can undertake in a single year based on funding limitations. The actual schedule for implementation will be a function of securing funding from the State’s Highway Safety Improvement Program.

**Driver Behavior Based**

- Continued participation with SE Minnesota TZD and Safe Community Coalitions, including working on the Countywide Fatal Review Committee
- Continued coordination with the County Public Health Department and local law enforcement
Next Steps

* Phase I
  * March – Safety Workshops
  * May - Identify Safety Projects in each county
  * July – Deliver Safety Plans

* Phase II
  * July 2010 thru April 2011

* Phase III
  * April 2011 thru January 2012

* Phase IV
  * January 2012 thru September 2012
Questions?