# Berkelev

SAFE TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH AND EDUCATION CENTER

## A Systematic Approach for Segmentation in Highway Safety Management: Issues and Challenges

### MOTIVATION

Studies have explored the influence of segmentation on safety performance functions (SPFs) development, there are numerous implementation challenges pertaining to segmentation that are not adequately discussed in the traffic safety literature. Segmentation of highway facilities is the backbone of SPF development.



### Why segment infrastructure data?

- Identify homogenous highway segments for safety analysis
- Homogeneity is typically defined based on location and geometric characteristics
- Segmentation involves identifying continuous road segments that share the desired geometric characteristics in order to define homogeneous units of analyses.
- At state agencies location information can also be used to separate segments (i.e., route change, county, etc.)

### **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The highlights in this study are as follows:

- What will happen if the geometric characteristics change over time for a particular location during the analysis period?
- What is the impact of inconsistent frequency of updates across locations?
- What is the extent of these temporal and spatial data inconsistencies?
- How do these issues impact SPF development as well as SPF implementation?

Sample: 15,000 centerline miles (California State Highway System) **Study period**: 2013-2017 (5 years) Infrastructure data: Highway segment and Intersection Data source: Traffic Accident Surveillance and Analysis System -Transportation Systems Network (TASAS - TSN)

Information use	ed for Se
Location	
County	• 1
• Route	• L
Route Suffix	•
Postmile Prefix	• (
Postmile Suffix	• [
<ul> <li>Population group</li> </ul>	• [
<ul> <li>Begin and End PM</li> </ul>	• /

### **Segmentation Process**

1. Sort the data by location information

2. If consecutive segments share the same location & geometric characteristics:

• Combine the two segments with the postmile

• Take weighted averages of Average Daily Traffic

Otherwise, start a new segment

3. Trim segment lengths to avoid overlaps with intersection buffer



Aditya MEDURY<sup>1</sup>, Praveen VAYALAMKUZHI<sup>1</sup>, Offer GREMBEK<sup>1</sup>, Venky SHANKAR<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Safe Transportation Research and Education Center, University of California, Berkeley, USA; <sup>2</sup>Texas Tech University, Texas, USA

### **SEGMENTATION APPROACH ADOPTED**

### egmentation

#### Geometric

- Number of lanes
- \_ane width
- Inside shoulder width
- Outside shoulder width
- Median width
- Design speed
- Intersection influence area

District	County	Route	Begin PM	End PM	Right should	der width	Left should	er width	Begin date	End date	Year
1	HUM	96	12.107	12.259		6		6	1/1/2014	12/31/2015	201
1	HUM	96	12.107	12.259		4		4	12/22/2016	12/31/2016	201
1	HUM	96	12.107	12.259		4		4	1/1/2017	12/31/2020	201
1	HUM	96	12.259	12.365		4		4	1/1/2014	12/31/2015	201
1	HUM	96	12.259	12.365		4		4	12/22/2016	12/31/2016	201
1	HUM	96	12.259	12.365		4		4	1/1/2017	12/31/2020	203
District	County	r Rou	ite Begi	n PM	End PM	Right shou	ılder width	Left	shoulder width	Year	
	1 HUM		96	12.107	12.259		(	6	(	6 201	.5 🔶
	1 HUM		96	12.259	12.365			4		4 / 201	.5
								$\sim$	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	$\checkmark$	
	1 HUM		96	12.107	12.365			4		4 201	.6
	1 HUM 1 HUM		96 96	12.107 12.107	12.365 12.365			4		4 201 4 201	.6 .7
Diffe End PM	1 HUM 1 HUM erent se Merge	gmento 2013	96 96 Dation acro Merg	12.107 12.107 DSS YEAR: je 2014	12.365 12.365 S <i>is unde</i> Mer	esirable		4 4	013 -2015	4 201 4 201	.6 .7
<b>Diffe</b> End PM 12.259	1 HUM 1 HUM erent se Merge 1 HUM 96 R11	gmento 2013 40 12 12 0 0 6 0	96 96 Dation acro Merg 16 1HUM 96 R11	12.107 12.107 DSS YEAR e 2014 140 12 12 0 060	12.365 12.365 S <i>is unde</i> Mer 5 1 HUM 96 R 1	esirable rge 2015		4 4 2 Critoria	013 -2015	4 201 4 201	.6 .7
<b>Diffe</b> End PM 12.259 1 12.365 1	1 HUM 1 HUM erent se Merge 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1	<i>gmente</i> 2013 40 12 12 0 6 0 40 12 12 0 4 0	96 96 <b>Otion acro</b> Merg 6 1HUM 96 R11 4 1HUM 96 R11	12.107 12.107 DSS YEAR (e 2014 140 12 12 0 0 6 0 1 40 12 12 0 0 4 0 4	12.365 12.365 S is unde Mer 5 1 HUM 96 R 1 4 1 HUM 96 R 1	rge 2015		4 4 2 Criteria	013 -2015 a is not satisfie	4 201 4 201	.6 .7
<b>Diffe</b> End PM 12.259 1 12.365 1	1 HUM 1 HUM erent se Merge 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1	<b>gment</b> 2013 40 12 12 0 6 0 40 12 12 0 4 0	96 96 <b>Otion acro</b> Merg 6 1HUM 96 R11 4 1HUM 96 R11	12.107 12.107 DSS YEAR e 2014 140 12 12 0 600 140 12 12 0 404	12.365 12.365 S <i>is unde</i> Mer 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 HUM 96 R 1	esirable rge 2015 1 1 40 12 12 0 0 1 1 40 12 12 0 0		4 4 2 Criteria	013 -2015 a is not satisfie	4 201 4 201	.6 .7 Segment
<b>Diffe</b> End PM 12.259 1 12.365 1	1 HUM 1 HUM Erent se Merge 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1	<b>gment</b> <b>2013</b> 40 12 12 0 6 0 40 12 12 0 4 0 End PM	96 96 96 96 96 96 96 96 96 96 96 96 96 9	12.107 12.107 DSS YEAR (e 2014 140 12 12 0 600 140 12 12 0 404 (e 2016	12.365 12.365 S is unde Mer 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 Mer	esirable rge 2015 1 1 40 12 12 0 0 1 1 40 12 12 0 0 1 rge 2017		4 4 2 Criteria	013 -2015 a is not satisfie	4 201 4 201	.6 .7 Segment ot merge
<b>Diffe</b> End PM 12.259 1 12.365 1	1 HUM 1 HUM Erent se Merge 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1	<b>gment</b> <b>2013</b> 40 12 12 0 6 0 40 12 12 0 4 0 End PM 12.259	96 96 96 000000000000000000000000000000	12.107 12.107 DSS YEAR e 2014 140 12 12 0 600 140 12 12 0 404 ge 2016 140 12 12 0 404	12.365 12.365 5 <i>is unde</i> 6 1 HUM 96 R 1 4 1 HUM 96 R 1 4 1 HUM 96 R 1	esirable rge 2015 1 1 40 12 12 0 0 1 1 40 12 12 0 0 rge 2017 1 1 40 12 12 0 0	$\begin{bmatrix} 606 \\ 404 \end{bmatrix} \bigoplus \begin{bmatrix} \bullet \\ \bullet$	4 4 2 Criteria 20	013 -2015 a is not satisfie 016 - 2017	4 201 4 201	.6 .7 Segment ot merge

	County	Route	Begin PM	End PM	Right shoulde	r width   I	eft shoulder widt	th Be	gin date	End date	Year
1	HUM	96	12.107	12.259		6		6	1/1/2014	12/31/2015	201
1	HUM	96	12.107	12.259		4		4	12/22/2016	12/31/2016	201
1	HUM	96	12.107	12.259		4		4	1/1/2017	12/31/2020	201
11	HUM	96	12.259	12.365		4		4	1/1/2014	12/31/2015	201
1	HUM	96	12.259	12.365		4		4	12/22/2016	12/31/2016	201
1	HUM	96	12.259	12.365		4		4	1/1/2017	12/31/2020	201
District	County	Rout	e Begin	PM I	End PM	Right shoul	der width	Left shoul	der width	Year	
	1 HUM		96	12.107	12.259		(6)		(	5 201	5 🔶 🦯
	1 HUM		96	12.259	12.365		4			4 201	5
	1 HUM		96	12.107	12.365		4		4	4 201	6
	1 HUM 1 HUM		96	12.107 12.107	12.365 12.365		4			4 201 4 201	6 7
	1 HUM 1 HUM erent se	gmenta <sup>2013</sup>	96 96 tion acro Merge	12.107 12.107 0SS YEARS	12.365 12.365 5 <i>is undes</i> Merge	sirable 2015	4	2013	-2015	4 201 4 201	6 7
Diffe Id PM 2.259 1	1 HUM 1 HUM erent seg Merge 1 HUM 96 R 1 1	2013 40 12 12 0 0 6 0 6	96 96 <i>tion acro</i> Merge	12.107 12.107 0SS YEARS 2014 40 12 12 0 0 6 0 6	12.365 12.365 5 is undes Merge 1HUM 96 R11	sirable ≥ 2015 40 12 12 0 Ø 6		2013	-2015	4 201 4 201	6 7
<b>Diffe</b> Id PM 2.259 1 2.365 1	1 HUM 1 HUM 2 rent seg Merge 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 4 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 4	<b>2013</b> 40 12 12 0 0 6 0 6 40 12 12 0 0 4 0 4	96 96 <i>tion acro</i> Merge 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1	12.107 12.107 0SS YEARS 2014 40 12 12 0 0 6 0 6 40 12 12 0 0 4 0 4	12.365 12.365 5 is undes Merge 1HUM 96 R11 1HUM 96 R11	<b>2015</b>	$\begin{array}{c} 4 \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$	2013 - eria is n	-2015 ot satisfie	4 201 4 201	6 7
<b>Diffe</b> Id PM 2.259 1 2.365 1	1 HUM 1 HUM erent se Merge 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1	<b>2013</b> 40 12 12 0 6 0 6 40 12 12 0 4 0 4	96 96 <i>tion acro</i> Merge 1 HUM 96 R 11 1 HUM 96 R 11	12.107 12.107 0SS YEARS 2014 40 12 12 0 0 6 0 6 40 12 12 0 0 4 0 4	12.365 12.365 5 <i>is undes</i> Merge 1HUM96 R11 1HUM96 R11	Sirable ≥ 2015 40 12 12 0 0 6 40 12 12 0 0 6	$\overset{4}{4}$	2013 - eria is n	-2015 ot satisfie	4 201 4 201	6 7 Segment
<b>Diffe</b> Id PM 2.259 1 2.365 1	1 HUM 1 HUM 2 FERT SE EVENT SE Merge 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1	2013 40 12 12 0 6 0 6 40 12 12 0 4 0 4 End PM	96 96 tion acro Merge 1 HUM 96 R 11 1 HUM 96 R 11 Merge	12.107 12.107 0SS YEARS 2014 40 12 12 0 6 0 6 40 12 12 0 4 0 4 2016	12.365 12.365 5 <i>is undes</i> Merge 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 Merge	<b>Sirable 2015 40 12 12 0 66</b> 40 12 12 0 4	$\begin{array}{c} 4 \\ 4 \end{array}$	2013 - eria is n 2016 -	-2015 ot satisfie	d	Gegment ot merge
<b>Diffe</b> Id PM 2.259 1 2.365 1	1 HUM 1 HUM erent se Merge 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1 1 HUM 96 R 1 1	<b>2013</b> 40 12 12 0 0 6 0 6 40 12 12 0 4 0 4 End PM 12.259	96 96 <i>tion acro</i> Merge 1 HUM 96 R 11 1 HUM 96 R 11 Merge 1 HUM 96 R 11	12.107 12.107 0SS YEARS 2014 40 12 12 0 0 6 0 6 40 12 12 0 4 0 4 2016 40 12 12 0 0 4 0 4	12.365 12.365 5 is undes Merge 1 HUM 96 R 11 1 HUM 96 R 11 Merge 1 HUM 96 R 11	<b>5</b> irable <b>2015</b> 40 12 12 0 0 6 40 12 12 0 0 4 <b>e 2017</b> 40 12 12 0 0 4	$\begin{array}{c} 4 \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$	2013 - eria is n 2016 -	-2015 ot satisfie 2017	d	6 7 Segment ot merge

Begin Pm	End PM	Merge 2013	Merge 2014	Merge 2015
12.107	12.259	1 HUM 96 R 1 1 40 12 12 0 0 6 0 6	1 HUM 96 R 1 1 40 12 12 0 🛛 6 0 6	1 HUM 96 R 1 1 40 12 12 0 Ø 6 0 6
12.259	12.365	1 HUM 96 R 1 1 40 12 12 0 0 4 0 4	1 HUM 96 R 1 1 40 12 12 0 0 4 0 4	1 HUM 96 R 1 1 40 12 12 0 0 4 0 4

Begin Pm	End PM	Merge 2016	Merge 2017
12.107	12.259	1HUM 96 R 1 1 40 12 12 0 Ø 4 0 4	1 HUM 96 R 1 1 40 12 12 0 0 4 0 4
12.259	12.365	1 HUM 96 R 1 1 40 12 12 0 4 0 4	1 HUM 96 R 1 1 40 12 12 0 0 4 0 4

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

- > Demonstrated segmentation issues at an aggregate level illustrative case studies of corner cases which are most impacted by inconsistent data updates.
- > While the magnitude and impact of these issues may not be as significant for developing statewide SPFs, they may lead to omission of crashes/segments from the hotspot identification process which comprises the overall goal of road safety management.
- > Limitations of using linear referencing system (LRS), which limit the extent of aggregation that can be undertaken through segmentation efforts.

### CONCLUSIONS

- ✓ Case study contributes towards bridging the gap between research and implementation efforts of using SPFs, which are considered integral to several safety evaluation methods described in the Highway Safety Manual.
- ✓ The insights gained from this study can help agencies maintain more consistent data of traffic and geometric characteristics for road safety management.

### Paper No.: P20-21226

#### **Segmentation Approach**

This research project was funded by the California Department of Transportation