# Improving Safety Performance Function Model Fit Using Exploratory Regression Techniques

June 8, 2022

University of Kentucky Riana Tanzen, Ph.D. Candidate Eric Green, Ph.D. Reginald Souleyrette, Ph.D. Arnold Stromberg, Ph.D.



# **Presentation Outline**

- ✓ Background
- ✓ Motivation of the research
- ✓ Data Preparation
- ✓ Model Development and Results
- ✓ Recommendations

# Background



#### The Highway Safety Manual Approach



\* In Kentucky, Potential for Safety Improvement (PSI) is referred to as Excess Expected Crashes (EEC)

*EEC* = *SPF Predicted Crashes* – *EB Estimated Crashes* 

#### Safety Performance Functions

• Negative Binomial Regression

SPF predicted crashes  $(N_{SPF}) = e^{\alpha} * Length * AADT^{\beta}$ 

$$Variance = N_{SPF} + \frac{N_{SPF}^2}{\theta}$$

Here,

 $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  = Regression parameters

 $\theta$  = Inverse overdispersion parameter (1/k)

## **Base Conditions and Adjustment Factors**

- **Base conditions:** Typically, the most frequently encountered geometric attributes
- Adjustment Factors: Used to adjust SPF crashes when any segment's geometric attributes are different from the SPF's base conditions.
- Sources:
  - The Highway Safety ManualCMF Clearinghouse

#### Adjusted SPF Crashes =

SPF Crashes for base condition  $*AF_1 * AF_2 * AF_3 * \cdots$ 

#### Empirical Bayes (EB) Estimate

- Accounts for the regression-to-the-mean bias.
- EB Expected Crashes =

weight \* SPF predicted crashes +(1 - weight) \* observed on that site

$$weight = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{N_{SPF}/Length}{\theta}}$$

## Motivation of the research



#### **Problem Statement**

More Base Conditions Less OVB Better GOFs No Base Conditions Less OVB Worse GOFs



OVB = Omitted Variable Bias GOF = Goodness-of-fit measures

# Goal of the research



Explores the tradeoffs between SPF quality and network coverage by

Expanding the range of base conditionsExploring alternate form of SPF

# Data Preparation





#### Roadway Data (**Rural two-lane**)

• Source: Highway Information System (HIS)

#### Crash Data (KABCO)

- Source: Kentucky State Police (KSP)
- Base year: 2013-2017



# CriteriaConditions• AADT• Lane Width• Shoulder Width• Vertical Curve



# SPF Development and Results



# **SPF Development**

#### SPF crash estimate = $e^{\alpha} * Length * AADT^{\beta}$

Used an automation tool named "SPF-R", a script in RStudio: <u>http://github.com/irkgreen/SPF-R</u>

# **Assessing SPFs using CURE Plots**

- Plots cumulative residual vs explanatory variable (e.g. AADT).
- Expected to oscillate around X-axis.
- Expected to stay within two standard deviations.
- Free of large vertical jumps
- Minimum upward or downward drifting.



Example CURE Plot with  $\pm 2\sigma$  confidence limits\*

\* Source: Hauer, E., Bamfo, J., 1997. Two tools for finding what function links the dependent variable to the explanatory variables, in: Proceedings of the ICTCT 1997 Conference, Lund, Sweden

### Goodness-of-Fit Measures



## Generic vs. Specific SPF

#### No base conditions



Lane Width = 9 ft Shoulder Width = 3 ft Grade Class = A



GR = A (0-0.4% grade)

#### **Proposed Improvements**

# Expanding the range of base conditions

Exploring SPFs with additional explanatory variables

# **Expanding the range of base conditions**

Models	Base Conditions			
	Lane Width	Shoulder Width	Curve	
<b>R1</b>	9	0-3	A, B	
<b>R2</b>	9	3-6	A, B	
<b>R3</b>	9-13	3	A, B	
<b>R4</b>	8-10	3	A, B	
<b>R5</b>	9-12	3	А	

#### **CURE Plots**



## Goodness-of-fit Measures

Models	CDP	MACD	Modified R <sup>2</sup>	Theta
Generic	86.0	5582.9	0.26	1.163
Specific	0.6	101.0	0.65	2.230
<b>R1</b>	4.5	112.9	0.59	1.950
<b>R2</b>	2.0	141.9	0.60	2.094
<b>R3</b>	6.0	635.8	0.35	1.607
<b>R4</b>	12.0	254.7	0.55	1.873
<b>R5</b>	37.8	297.1	0.52	1.800

## SPFs with additional explanatory variables

Model	Variable added	Model form
<b>V1</b>	Lane Width (LW)	$Y = L * e^a AADT^{b1} * e^{LW * b2}$
<b>V2</b>	Shoulder Width (SW)	$Y = L * e^a AADT^{b1} * e^{SW * b2}$
<b>V3</b>	Roadway Width (LW+SW)	$Y = L * e^a AADT^{b1} * e^{(LW+SW)*b2}$
<b>V4</b>	LW, SW	$Y = L * e^a AADT^{b1} * e^{LW * b2} * e^{SW * b3}$
<b>V</b> 5	LW, SW, LW*SW (Interaction term)	$Y = L * e^{a} AADT^{b1} * e^{LW * b2} * e^{SW * b3} * e^{LW * SW * b4}$

# SPFs with additional explanatory variables (cont.)

Model	Variable added	Model form
V6*	Degree of Curvature (CUDEG)	$Y = L * e^{a} * AADT^{b1} * (2 * CUDEG)^{b_{2}} * (\frac{CUDEG}{5730 * L})^{b_{3}}$
V7*	LW, SW, CUDEG	$Y = L * e^{a} * AADT^{b1} * e^{LW * b2} * e^{SW * b3} * (2 * CUDEG)^{b_{4}} * (\frac{CUDEG}{5730 * L})^{b5}$

\* **Reference:** Bauer, K. M., and D. W. Harwood. Safety Effects of Horizontal Curve and Grade Combinations on Rural Two-Lane Highways. *Transportation Research Record*, Vol. 2398, No. 1, 2013, pp. 37–49. <u>https://doi.org/10.3141/2398-05</u>





# Goodness-of-fit Measures

Models	CDP	MACD	Modified R <sup>2</sup>	Theta
Generic	86.0	5582.9	0.26	1.163
Specific	0.6	101.0	0.65	2.230
<b>V1</b>	76.6	4583.8	0.30	1.206
<b>V</b> 2	64.7	3148.8	0.35	1.279
<b>V3</b>	65.1	3177.5	0.35	1.278
<b>V4</b>	64.9	3136.5	0.35	1.281
<b>V5</b>	65.6	3128.4	0.35	1.284
<b>V6</b>	90.0	3687.5	0.29	1.239
<b>V7</b>	63.4	1628.1	0.37	1.358

#### **Cross Validation**



#### **Cross Validation Metric: Root Mean Square Error**

Models	RMSE
Generic	1.27
Specific	0.94
<b>R2</b>	1.1
<b>V7</b>	1.15

#### Recommendation



#### Recommendations



SPFs with Base Conditions (specific/Range)

- Better fit and predictive power
- Still dependent on the availability of AFs

SPFs with explanatory variables

- Shows improvement in model fit and predictions compared to the generic model
- Independent of any need for adjustments



# **Contact Information**

#### Riana Tanzen, Ph.D. Candidate

University of Kentucky

riana.tanzen@uky.edu

Eric Green, PhD, PE Kentucky Transportation Center eric.green@uky.edu

**Reg Souleyrette, PhD, PE, F. ASCE** Kentucky Transportation Center <u>souleyrette@uky.edu</u>

