Terms of Reference
for
“Consultancy services for identification and supervision of potential road safety interventions and road safety inspections"

Contents

1. Background Information

1.1 Road network in Albania

About half of the regional and local network in Albania is categorized as being in poor or very poor condition. Some sections are impassable for parts of the year, thus restricting access to essential public services of health and education, as well as to economic centers. The existing condition of regional and local road networks is not able to serve the emerging tourism industry and hinders the development of the agricultural sector. Improving the poor quality of road infrastructure, among other constraints, has been identified as a priority in key strategic documents including the National Territorial Development Strategy and Coastal Management Strategy (2015–2030), and the five-year Strategy for Rural and Agriculture Development (2015-2020).

The Government of Albania (GoA) has recognized the problem and implemented a successful rural road program in the past decade, but more work is necessary. The Albanian Development Fund (ADF) implemented a Rural Road Program, during the period 2008–2016, with World Bank support which, included US$386 million in financing from international financial institutions. The program improved 1,200 km of rural roads in 12 regions and 61 municipalities, which improved the mobility of over 2 million people. The World Bank's engagement through the Secondary and Local Roads Project (SLRP), from 2008 to 2013, was evaluated as highly satisfactory. While the project exceeded its developmental and implementation outcomes, there was recognition that there is still room to consolidate network improvements in a sustainable manner to enable economic growth.

1.2 Background of the Project

The Albania RLRCP (Regional and Local Road Connectivity Project) is expected to be financed by an IBRD loan of US$50 million. The RLRCP will focus on the role that improved roads can play in enabling connectivity-driven economic gains, particularly in the agricultural and tourism sectors, both key drivers of growth and employment in Albania. More specifically, the proposed RLRCP will support tourism development through improving road access to existing and potential tourism destinations and providing quality tourism-friendly amenities (for example, parking lots for tourist buses and scenic viewpoints) and signage along the roads in the project areas. It will also support the integration of agricultural producers into agro-food value chains and market participation, particularly for women who constitute the majority of the workforce in agriculture.

More importantly, what the RLRCP seeks to accomplish is to develop an overall investment as well as a policy and implementation framework for the development, rehabilitation, and maintenance of regional and local roads. This will provide a platform not only for this project, but also for domestic and international development partners interested in finance.

Under the project a special component is foreseen for applying road safety audits (RSA) for the invested road segments. Under this component professional expertise complying with the highest international standards shall be paid to the segments improving design and implementation aspects.

A pilot zone near the road segments will also be studied and improved with high road safety measurements. This zone will serve as a model for future interventions of safety in infrastructure projects.

2. Project objective

The objective is the safety audit of the road segments under implementation of the RLRCP.

3. Detailed Description of the Assignment

The Consultant shall undertake the following tasks and he propose reasonable modifications as part of his technical recommendations.

Task 1 Familiarisation with available documents and request for additional information

The Consultant shall familiarize himself with:

- The design standards, guidelines and specifications to be applied to the project;
- Review of crash data and reports for the sections under question.
- Conduct a road safety inspection of the existing conditions
- The available feasibility studies and designs
- Applicable domestic legislation, rules and regulations relating to the infrastructure element of road safety;
- The historical safety record and any available analysis of the existing road network.
- The available Designs for Pogradec – Tushemisht, Qafe Thore – Theth and Fier – Seman road.
- The design of a fourth road segment that is not specified yet.

Once reviewed the available designs and documents, the Consultant shall report to ADF on any missing document to complete a full "stage 2" (i.e., an audit on detailed design) for all the above-mentioned roads.

The audit shall take part in two time periods. The audit for the first three available designs shall take place immediately after the Contract signature. The second part of the audit for the third road, which design is not available yet, the audit shall commence it as soon as the design is handed over.

Task 2 Methodology

The consultant shall, after due consultation with the ADF propose a relevant documented **safety audit procedure**, the "Procedure", to be applied at the detailed design stages. The Procedure shall, as a minimum, cover the criteria listed in Annex II of Directive 2008/96/EC. Such Procedure shall be an existing recognised and proven procedure developed by a competent national or international body – for example, Section 2 of Volume 5 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, UK Highways Agency et al, 2003[1].

[1] http://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/

The Consultant shall prepare an **Inception Report** covering their findings and documenting the agreed Procedure. The Consultant shall include a chapter describing the documents deemed necessary for a full stage 2 RSA(audit on the final design) on all the three segments of Pogradec Tushemisht, Qafethore – Theth, Fier – Seman and a forth road segment when decided in the Inception Report.

Task 3 Undertake audit at detailed design for Fier-Seman, Pogradec-Tushemisht, Qafethore-Theth.

- In accordance with relevant sections of the Safety Audit Procedure, the Consultant shall undertake the safety audit for the final designs for Fier-Seman, Pogradec-Tushemisht, Qafethore-Theth (37.6 km) and present in a meeting his findings and recommendations to the ADF, supervision and WB. The implications of the recommendations on cost estimation of the intervention, delivery schedule or other relevant parameters shall be identified.
- The Consultant shall comment on the road safety aspects of the design of the last road (which is not specified yet) and present in a meeting his findings and recommendations to relevant ADF, Supervision and World Bank and respective designers. This action shall be taken when the final design of the third segment is handed over.
- The Consultant shall document the acceptance/non acceptance of their recommendations by the design consultant/Supervision. In accordance with Article 4.4 of the Directive, where unsafe features identified in the audit are not adopted by the end of this phase of design, supervision shall prepare a statement of exception which shall be annexed to the Consultant's final audit report.
- The Consultant shall prepare a **final design stage audit report including the BoQ** covering all the accepted recommendations from the final/detailed design stage audit for each of the road segments.
- The Consultant shall ensure that the Road Safety Technical Standards are consistent for all the Lots.
- The consultant shall arrange meeting with the Supervision Engineer to present the Audit findings and decide on further steps to be taken.

Task 4 Study and design of a pilot area with safety standards in accordance with Technical Regulation of Road Design and EU best practices.

- The consultant in collaboration with ADF and the World Bank shall depict an urban and rural area which is in poor safety conditions. This area shall be closely studied and a detailed intervention plan and design on safety aspect shall be prepared. The intervention will request the best experience standards and design manuals specifications to be implemented. The maximum estimated value for intervention prepared by the consultant shall have ceiling amount of 1,000,000 us dollars VAT included.
- This intervention will serve as an example of road safety standard for future intervention model. The Consultant shall be responsible for the supervision of the implementation of these works.

Task 5 Dissemination of findings

- At the end of the assignment, the Consultant endorses the finding and a mutual seminar with the beneficiary, ADF, Supervision Engineer and World Bank, ARA

4. Logistics and Timing

4.1 Location

These services are expected to be delivered primarily as a field exercise.

Three meetings should be planned in ADF: the kick-off meeting to launch the mission, the follow-up meeting to be organised shortly after the inception phase (around week 2), and a third meeting to be confirmed, possibly for the Consultant to present the final results to ADF and the World Bank.

Conference calls shall be organised when needed between the Consultant and the ADF team to discuss progress.

4.2 Commencement date & period of execution

The Consultant will be expected to input 250 working days during the 10 months performance period.

The mission should start with a kick-off meeting beginning in May 2019. Intermediate results should be ready as specified above.

4.3. Deliverables (if applicable)

4.3.1 The consultant shall deliver the following outputs in English. The timeframe is proposed and would be discussed and agreed at negotiations.

Output	Due date (months from start)	Reference
Inception report	1	1 copy
Stage 3 audit report for each of the segments* 4th segment audit when the design is available Draft Final	 4 5	 1 copy 2 copies and CD
Study and design for Pilot Area	6	2 printed copies and CD
Completion Report	10	2 Printed copies, 1 soft copy in cd

* to match design preparation schedule given by ADF

4.4 Submission and approval of deliverables

Deliverables shall be submitted in English (MS-Excel, MS-Word in electronic format, ACAD) to the attention of the Assignment Manager.

Should a deliverable be rejected by the ADF, the Consultant will be required to re-submit the deliverable within 15 working days following the rejection, completed and adequately amended.

No payment will be made until such time as the deliverable has been accepted by the ADF.

4.5 Contact persons

The Consultant shall have as contact persons in ADF: ADF Contract Manager for notifications and questions relating to the contract;

4.6 Documents to be made available

The technical documents of the design shall be made available to the Consultant, in electronic form when applicable and if available.

The electronic files shall be released to a named individual within the Consultant's team. She/he shall be individually responsible for the control of the files. At the end of the assignment the named individual shall be required to confirm in writing that all copies of all files have been destroyed.

5. Input Requirements for the Assignment

5.1 Personnel

Key Expert 1 - Team Leader / Road Safety Auditor

Qualifications:

Master´s Degree in civil engineering or an equivalent field

General professional experience:

15 years´ experience in road engineering, of which 10 years should be in road safety

Specific professional experience:

10 years´ experience on road safety audits and inspections, traffic analysis, crash data analysis or road safety measures;

5 years' experience as a lead road safety auditor of road safety audits and inspections of a similar nature;

must have undertaken at least 10 road safety audit assignments on a road project within the last 5 years

Must hold a recognised certification in road safety audit procedure.

Experience in road safety audit in the region, Albania would be an asset.

Key Expert 2 - Road Safety Auditor (team member)

Qualifications

Master´s Degree in civil engineering or an equivalent field.

General professional experience:

10 years´ experience in road engineering, of which 5 years should be in road safety

Specific professional experience:

5 years´ experience on road safety audits and inspections, traffic analysis, crash data analysis or road safety measures;

must have participated in at least 5 road safety audit assignments on a road project within the last 5 years.

Experience in road safety audit in the region, Albania would be an asset.

Key Expert 3 - Road Engineer

Qualifications

Master Degree in civil engineering or an equivalent field

General professional experience:

15 years' experience in road engineering.

Specific professional experience:

10 years' experience in road design.

Experience on road safety studies, road safety audits and inspections, traffic studies or road safety measures would be an asset.

Experience in road design in the region, Albania would be an asset.

5.1.1 The Expert is free to allocate other resources as he deems best fit to meet the requirements of this Service. The Service is expected to require approximately **250 working days over a 10 months period**.

5.2. Services and Facilities to be provided by the Client and Beneficiary

5.2.1 The ADF shall not provide any technical or logistical support. An inception meeting with the ADF contact engineer will be carried out in Tirana.

5.2.2 ADF shall provide timely access to all documentation reasonably requested by the Consultant (if available).

5.2.3 ADF shall identify an Engineer to work with the audit team for the respective audited segments.

5.2.3 The Consultant shall make his own provision for transport, accommodation, equipment, translation/interpreting support if needed, secretarial support and printing.

6. Remuneration

The Assignment will be remunerated on the basis of a fixed daily rate, which shall include all expenses.

The Consultant shall submit invoices in accordance with the following schedule:

(i) **Pre-financing**: the Consultant will be entitled upon signature of the contract to a pre-financing payment of 20% of the estimated total price against a bank guarantee for the amount received and valid up until repayment with task performed.

(ii) **Payment of Invoices**: the Consultant shall issue up to three invoices for the Services performed after acceptance by the ADF up to an amount of 70% of the Contract. The remaining 10% of the contract sum shall be paid after the completion and acceptance of the Completion Report.

(iii) **Payment of 10%:** After the supervision of the implemented measures and the handing over of the Completion Report.

The payment may follow the below steps.

- 20% advance payment
- Invoice submission after preparation of Inception Report and Audit Reports for the first three segments (deducting also the value of the advance payment)- 25% of total amount
- Invoice after submission of the Pilot Area intervention plan and design (deducting also the value of the advance payment)- 30% of total amount
- Invoice after the Audit Report of the 4^{th} road (total repayment of the advance)- 15% of total amount
- Payment of the remaining 10% after supervision of the pilot area and the acceptance of the Completion Report.

Payments will be made based on the submission of invoices in accordance with the approved and verified numbers of days worked and reimbursable (invoices, boarding passes, taxi receipts and hotel invoices should be accompanied by signed time sheets).

7. Reporting Requirements

Reporting requirements for the Assignment are set out in Annex I hereto.

8. Evaluation Procedure and Criteria

Consultants will be required to submit their proposals no later than April 2019 (the "**Closure Date**").

Points of clarification may be addressed in writing to the designated contact person up to 7 days before the Closure Date.

Proposals will have to include the following information:

- Methodology and overview of the manner in which the Assignment will be implemented;
- Financial proposal, in the form of a fixed daily rate which shall include all expenses (fee based and reimbursable);
- Composition of the proposed staff who will perform the Assignment and their CV's;
- List of executed similar assignments.

The ADF will evaluate the Proposals according to the criteria as stated in RfP.

A single contractor will be selected for this Assignment. All contractors will be notified in writing of the results of the selection process.

9. Cancellation of Procurement Procedure

The ADF reserves the right to cancel the purchasing procedure at any time before the signature of a contract. Prospective bidders should only participate to the tendering process on the understanding that they would not be entitled to any form of compensation should the ADF decide to interrupt the purchasing procedure before the contract is signed

10. Jurisdiction

The Contract shall be governed by the regulation of the World Bank guidelines as procedures.

Annexes

Annex I: Reporting Requirements

1. Progress reports

At the end of each month, the Consultant will submit to the ADF a short progress report, which will contain the following:

- A summary of the services performed during the period in comparison with the Assignment Terms of Reference and more particularly the tasks/deliverables set out in the Assignment Terms of Reference;
- If any, a list of the points diverging from those fixed in the initial objectives/tasks together with a comment on the steps undertaken to remedy the situation;
- If any, a statement summarising the various difficulties encountered and an evaluation of the impact of the above-mentioned difficulties in terms of the project and the performance of the Assignment.

Each progress report prepared by the Consultant has to be sent in electronic version to the attention of the ADF Contract Manager. The ADF will have 10 working days to examine and approve the progress report. Should a progress report be rejected by the ADF, the Consultant will be required to re-submit the progress report within 5 working days following the rejection, completed and adequately amended.

2. Assignment Completion Report

Within 15 days of completion of the Assignment, the Consultant will submit to the ADF the Assignment Completion Report, which will contain the following:

- A summary of the services performed during the Assignment with reference to the tasks/deliverables set out in the Assignment Terms of Reference, including as the case may be all changes to the tasks/deliverables incurred during the course of the Assignment;
- If any, a list of the points diverging from those fixed in the initial objectives/tasks together with a comment on the steps undertaken to remedy the situation;
- If any, a statement summarising the various difficulties encountered and an evaluation of the impact of the above-mentioned difficulties in terms of the project itself, total cost for the Assignment and deadlines.

The Assignment Completion Report prepared by the Consultant has to be sent in 2 hard copies (plus a CD version) to the attention of the ADF Contract Manager. The ADF will have 10 working days to examine and approve the Assignment Completion Report. Should the Assignment Completion Report be rejected by the ADF, the Consultant will be required to re-submit the Assignment Completion Report within 5 working days following the rejection, completed and adequately amended.

Prior submission to the ADF and acceptance by the ADF of the Assignment Completion Report is a condition precedent for payment by the ADF of the final invoice of 10 % the Consultant.

1. Pogradec - Tushemisht

This contract is related to the rehabilitation and Construction Works of Pogradec Contract. This road is located in the northern part of Pogradec City and goes from the City football Stadium to the entrance of Tushemisht area. The road passes on a flat terrain and the road alignment has no geometrical particularities. The road has a length of 3.4 km and actually is in bad conditions. The asphalt layers are damaged, drainage channels re filled with silt materials and there and there is lack of signalization. There is no dedicated lane for the bicycles and there is no sidewalk, jeopardizing this way the safety of the road users.

2. Qafe Thore – Theth Road.

Rehabilitation and construction works of Qafe Thore – Theth Road. This first road is located on the northern-eastern part of Shkodra City and it connects the city to Theth village, one of the main touristic attractions located in the Albanian Alps. The road passes on a rough mountainous terrain, with elevation changes from 700m to 1600m. The road has a length of 16.5 km and actually is in very poor conditions. This is a much amortized curvy gravel road, which most of the times is impassable during the winter. There is no asphalt layer and the surface is very damaged, with clogged drainage channels from vegetation and silt materials, washed out culverts, heavy scour and erosion and areas with falling rocks. As far as safety goes the road has little to no signs, creating a hazardous trip for all road users. The road is mostly single lane with high slopes through low visibility curves.

3. Rehabilitation and construction of Fier – Seman road.

This second road starts from the western boarder of Fieri city and end in the cost of Seman. The road is in poor condition as the asphaltic layers are damaged. The road has not horizontal curves and is laid in a totally flat terrain. The road is 18.1 km long. Due to the poor subgrade bearing capacity the surface of the road presents big undulations which some time may lead to loose of alignment. Although the road is highly frequented form pedestrian and bicycles, there are not in any place sidewalks or bicycle lanes. All the road users pass in the carriageway jeopardizing their lives. There is signalization on the segment but there are no guardrails or other safety measurements implemented in urban areas. This segments transvers also the Fieri By pass and will serve as entrance to the city.

4. Rehabilitation of the third road segment.

This road is not yet specified. It is foreseen that this road will start implementation during late 2019. Taking in consideration the nature and magnitude of the other invested segment, it is prior accepted a construction period of 12 months and 24 months defect liability period. Nevertheless, the man months of the service will be recalculated after the accurate time estimation of this segment.

Information Required for the Audit

- **Site inspection**
- Audit report and decisions on earlier stage audits
- Locality plan showing road network and general topographic details in the region of the project

- Statement of the design criteria
- Relevant traffic demand information
- Horizontal and vertical alignment plans
- Cross-sections
- Grading and drainage plans showing the location and general details of drainage structures
- Bridge layout plans including cross-sections and details of barrier systems
- Interchange and/or intersection layouts
- Traffic signal layouts and design information
- Traffic signing and road marking plans
- Street lighting layouts and design information
- Landscaping and beautification plans and tree planting details
- Plans showing relevant overhead services/utilities

Audit Items

- **General Items to be Checked**

Design criteria:

- Consistency among the items relevant to road safety,
- Route planning and location,
- Aspects that have adverse safety implications, or previous decisions that have "locked in" constraints to the detailed design that may lead to unsatisfactory safety performance,
- Adequacy of reservation width to achieve a safe cross-section considering the needs of all road users,
    - Appropriateness of the proposed access control.

- **Management Strategy Proposed, Considering Such Aspects as the Following**

    - Proposed speed limit,
    - Vehicle type restrictions,
    - Proposed segregation of vulnerable road users,
    - On-street parking provisions/restrictions,
    - Turn restrictions,
    - Special provisions for pedestrians and/or bicyclists,
    - Special provisions for motorcyclists,
    - Special provisions for trucks and/or buses,
    - General speed calming measures.
    - Provision of "motorist facilities" such as rest and service areas, laybys, etc.
    - Check that climatic and weather implications have been taken into account (e.g., wet weather and flooding effects, high winds, fog-prone areas)

- **Geometric Design Elements**

  Check the horizontal alignment in respect to

    - Correct choice and application of design speed
    - Consistency of horizontal alignment along the route "Substandard" curves
    - Provision of transition curves (spirals) where appropriate

- Horizontal alignment at the "interface" between the proposed construction and the existing road network

Check the vertical alignment in respect to

- Consistency along the route
- Sight distance

Check combination of horizontal and vertical alignment for

- Adequacy of stopping sight distance
- The achievement of overtaking sight distance
- The achievement of approach sight distance at intersections
- Adequacy of sight distance at locations where there is a discontinuity in the cross-section standard
- Combination of horizontal and vertical alignment that results in unexpected areas of "hidden" pavement or areas

Check the integration of all the signalisation both vertical, horizontal, slowing zone etc in way to give the perception of the urban zone or rural as per case. Regardless of signalisation and signage, all the road users should perceive a safe travelling speed (i.e., the road should be "self-explaining" so that user operate motor vehicles at safe speeds).

- **Grades**

  Check for

  - Sections with steep downgrades
  - Sharp curves on steep downgrades, check adequacy of super elevation rate to achieve appropriate design speed
  - Sections with steep upgrades and the need for "slow vehicle" Provisions

- **Cross-Section**

  Check for

  - Number and width of traffic lanes, width of shoulders or emergency stopping lanes
  - Median and separator width (where applicable)
  - Batter heights and slopes and guardrail requirement
  - Use of correct types of kerbs (avoid barrier kerbs)
  - The provision of footpaths
  - Clearances to barriers and barrier types
  - Appropriate transitions at locations where the cross-section changes significantly
  - Special provisions needed for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, bicyclists, motorcyclists
  - Differences in level between the roadways of divided roads at intersections or access driveways
  - Sight line obstruction by batter slopes through cuttings on curves

- **Interchanges and Intersections**

  Check

  - General layout logic
  - Visibility and sight distance

    Check the following sight distance criteria applicable at intersections, and identify any situation where a deficiency is evident

    – Approach sight distance

– Entering or crossing sight distance
– Safe intersection sight distance
– Sight distance to queued vehicles
– Sight lines and visibility to traffic signals and signs

At interchanges, check the following additional sight distance criteria

– Sight distance to exit nose and "gore" area
– Sight distance to the entry and merge area

- Auxiliary lanes and lane continuity

  Protection for "turning" vehicles at important intersections
  Avoidance of "trap" lane arrangements

- Island size and shape

  Traffic islands should be large enough to be easily visible; cater adequately for any traffic signs, signals, street lights; and provide adequate refuge for pedestrians
  Shape of the islands should guide vehicles into the correct travel path
  Approach noses should be properly offset from the edge of traffic lanes
  At roundabouts, check the shape and positioning of the approach "deflection/splitter islands" to ensure control of entry speed

- Land and turning roadway widths to provide adequately for large/heavy vehicles turning at low speed
- Kerbs type and radius

  Incorrect kerb usage may constitute a hazard to road users, particularly motorcyclists

- Provisions for Pedestrians

  – Lack of provision of footpaths and kerb ramps at crossing points
  – Adequate area/width for medians and roadway separators, including pedestrian refuge islands

- Signals, signs, pavement markings, lighting, and other road furniture

  Not to be placed in vulnerable locations such as at the nose of traffic islands

Should not obstruct normal pedestrian movements.

- Vehicle parking and bus stops

  – Identify the need for parking restrictions and check that proposed bus shelters and "waiting" buses will not obstruct sight lines important for the safe and efficient operation of the intersection.
  – Check that where on-street parking is to be provided, parking manoeuvres will not interfere with traffic moving through the intersection.
  – Identify sites where stationary buses at bus stops will interfere with the movement of other traffic.

- Property access points (including all parking locations, roadside markets, schools, and bus interchanges/stops)

  Are they likely to create unexpected traffic conflicts or otherwise hazardous traffic conflicts?

- **Audit of Traffic Signal Installations**

  Check that

- Traffic signals proposed only where they are warranted
- Proposed signal phasing provides adequately for the required traffic (and pedestrian) movements
- No unexpected conflict situations arise in the signal phasing, and that special phases for right turn movements are provided where justified
- Required "intergreen time" for each phase change is sufficient to allow safe operation
- The number and location of signal heads and posts ensure that each separately controlled vehicle movement has at least two (and preferably three or four) signal heads controlling it and that minimum visibility requirements are met
- Adequate clearances are provided between the face of kerb and the signal head not located in islands and medians too small or narrow to afford the equipment adequate protection from vehicle impacts
- The correct signal size and brightness are provided and that back plates are provided
- Pedestrian signal displays and associated "call buttons" are provided at sites where it is expected that pedestrians will cross signal-controlled roadways Provision of mid-block crossing schemes where necessary.

- **Audit of Traffic Signing and Road Marking Traffic Signs**

  Check that
  - Traffic signing provides "positive" guidance rather than abstract and indefinite information
  - Necessary regulatory signs are provided and properly positioned to control, both legally and practically, the movement of traffic along or across the roadway
  - Appropriate warning signs are shown on the traffic signing plans and any unnecessary warning signs are identified and removed
  - Proposed direction and guide signing (consider "unfamiliar drivers")
  - Letter/legend size is adequate to enable drivers to read the information displayed in the time available
  - Positioning of proposed direction signs will enable drivers to take any necessary action safely
  - Appropriate reflectivity is specified or that internal or external lighting of the signs is required
  - Provision of overhead (e.g., gantry-mounted) signs where complex multilane roadway layouts require vehicles to get into specific lanes to reach particular destinations
  - Positioning of signs does not obstruct sight lines at intersections and on the inside of curves
  - Positioning of signs and selection of the type of signposts prevent these structures themselves from being a significant roadside hazard

- **Road Marking and Delineation**

  Check
  - That the correct type of longitudinal line markings, in terms of line pattern and width, is shown on the relevant plans

- That lines are properly positioned to guide vehicles in respect to the correct use of various traffic lanes and to effectively designate locations of merge and diverge situations, shoulders, and emergency stopping lanes
- For any case of discontinuity in "through" traffic lanes and any unavoidable and inadequately signed "trap" lanes or other illogical lane marking arrangements
- That all horizontal and/or vertical curves on two-lane two-way roadways, at which overtaking sight distance is not achieved, are shown to be properly marked with double (barrier) lines and identify lane marking arrangements that may confuse or be unexpected by drivers
- That double (barrier) lines are shown to be marked at any horizontal and/or vertical curves on two-lane two-way roadways at which overtaking sight distance is restricted, in accordance with appropriate guidelines
- Closely spaced short lengths of barrier lining, which may lead drivers into unsafe overtaking manoeuvres, are identified
- That approach hazard markings are shown on plans at the approach end of traffic islands, medians, and separating islands and in the exit ramp "gore" areas at expressways and other
- interchanges
- The correct positioning of all transverse lines such as "stop" lines, holding (or "give way") lines, and pedestrian crossing lines
- That road pavement marking reflectivity are specified to enhance night-time visibility
- That retro-reflective pavement markers or road studs are specified to supplement surface markings where there is a need for longer distance visibility at night and more effective pavement delineation

- **Audit of Street Lighting Design**

  Check that
  - The extent of street lighting is appropriate to traffic safety needs of road users and identify situations where unlit short lengths of roadway are mixed with lit sections
  - The standard of lighting including uniformity and possible "glare" effects is appropriate to the needs of the traffic situation
  - Lighting transitions are provided where street lighting ends
  - Lighting poles themselves do not constitute a roadside hazard
  - Lighting poles do not significantly obstruct driver sight lines

- **Audit of Roadside Safety Provisions**

  Check
  - The provision of a "clear zone"
  - The use of frangible types of road furniture
  - Guardrail provisions and design details, including appropriate end treatments
  - Minimum length of guardrail required to ensure that it functions properly
  - Guardrail positioning relative to kerbs and objects being protected
  - Bridge ends and guardrail to bridge rail transitions
  - Barriers and railings on bridges and elevated roadways
  - Landscaping and beautification
  - Other roadside hazards
  - Safety treatment of uneven rock cut batters
  - Roadways close to permanent deep water such as rivers

- Lakes or seashore slopes close to the traffic lanes
- Horizontal rails in pedestrian fencing close to roadways

- **Audit of Provisions for Special Road Users**
  For Pedestrians, Check
  - Lack of footpaths or locations where footpaths are obstructed by posts and other road furniture
  - Lack of kerb ramps or "dropped kerbs" at crossing points particularly at signalized intersections
  - Lack of specific crossing facilities such as signalized crossings, refuge island, zebra crossings, or grade separations where warranted
  - Lack of specific pedestrian signal heads and signal phasing at locations where there is significant night-time pedestrian activity
  - Insufficient space for pedestrian refuge on traffic islands, medians, etc.
  - Traffic management and devices to enable pedestrians to cross wide roadways with continuous uninterrupted traffic flows

  For bicycle users, Check
  - Lack of bicycle lane or locations where lanes are obstructed by posts and other road furniture
  - Lack of kerb ramps or "dropped kerbs" at crossing points particularly at signalized intersections,
  - Lack of signalized crossings, protection from road lane,
  - Lack of reflective signalisation,
  - Insufficient space for two bicycles to pass simultaneously

  For Motorcycles, Check
  - Horizontal and vertical alignment and sight distances, appropriate to the expected operating speed
  - Cross-section standards, which provide adequate width of lanes or roadway for motorcyclists
  - Appropriate clearances to roadside objects, merge and diverge areas
  - Clear designation of priority between conflicting streams of traffic at junctions
  - Adequate line and pavement marking to ensure an orderly flow of vehicles and good delineation of the route ahead
  - Appropriate regulatory, warning, and direction signing with legibility and sign positioning
  - Appropriate types of guardrails or barriers
  - Provisions such as fully paved shoulders or special treatments at signalized intersections

Annex II Safety Audit Guidelines references

Road Safety Audits

Practical Guide for Road Safety Auditors

(TRACECA Region)

Alan Ross

Dejan Jovanov

Rajko Brankovic

Hans Vollpracht

Filip Trajkovic

International Road Safety Centre

Document publication supported by

The authors

Brief biographical details of the authors are given at the rear of this document. The authors are very experienced road safety engineers with extensive experience of safety engineering. Between them they have worked in over 70 countries around the world on road safety issues. They have recently reviewed design standards, trained road safety auditors, developed regional road safety audit guidelines in TRACECA region.

The Document

This document has been developed to give practical guidance and examples of bad practices in safety engineering that occur most frequently in TRACECA Region to assist road safety auditors in identifying potential hazards that can occur on their networks. The good practises identified will assist local safety auditors and designers to identify potential ways and solutions to reduce risks at such potentially hazardous locations.

The Organisation

The International Road Safety Centre (IRSC) is a “not for profit” organisation based in Belgrade, Serbia to support low and middle income countries (LMICs) in their efforts to improve road safety in all 5 pillars of the UN Decade Action. It trains officials and organisations in road safety issues and in management development and implementation of National and Local Road Safety Action Plans and programmes. Trainer Courses are offered at IRSC or through partner organisations in country and training materials including textbooks, guidelines, manuals and lecture modules for universities to teach students in all 5 pillars are available from IRSC (more details from www.irscroadsafety.org).

TABLE OF CONTENT

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS TO THE PRACTICAL GUIDE FOR ROAD SAFETY AUDITORS

After almost two decades of experience with Road Safety Audit (RSA) Worldwide, this procedure is now recognized as one of the most efficient engineering tools. RSA is a highly efficient and cost effective engineering tool for improvement of safety on roads. It is much cheaper to identify road safety deficiencies in the process of design than later after construction is completed. The RSAs are among the most cost-effective investments a Road Authority can undertake.

With its EU Directive No. 2008/96 on road infrastructure safety management, published in October 2008, the European Union (EU) made a clear decision that the RSA will be mandatory for the Trans-European Road Network (TERN) in forthcoming years. This Directive contains another tool called Road Safety Inspection (RSI) on safety deficiencies of existing roads. The activity is very similar to the Road Safety Audit in the pre-opening phase of new constructed roads. RSIs are essential for the redesign and upgrading of existing roads and it is done in many countries to give the designers insights and direction for safety improvements. Within this guide Road Safety Inspections are included under the general heading of Road Safety Audits.

Unfortunately, in reality there is little systematic application of RSA at present in TRACECA Region. RSAs that are implemented are mostly pushed by IFIs and implemented by foreign consulting companies. Even when RSAs are undertaken the RSA recommendations are not always implemented by the road authorities. The latest EU funded Project has tried to develop capacity for RSA implementation in each of the countries. Therefore, in TRACECA Region some steps towards RSA implementation have been taken (each country now has several trained auditors, and a Regional Road Safety Audit manual (based on PIARC – World Road Association) has been produced, and certain Pilot road sections have been audited). In some of the countries RSA has been introduced into the legislation as a mandatory procedure).

Education and training of the auditors is the weakest point in the entire RSA chain within the TRACECA Region. The reasons for this are relatively short history of RSA, non-understanding of RSA methodology and procedures and lack of RSA literature in the Russian language. This is why the team of safety engineering specialists, who are acquainted very well with TRACECA Region, prepared this Practical Guide for Road Safety Auditors in TRACECA Region to help present and future auditors in their work.

This Practical Guide for Road Safety Auditors (PGRSA) is based on actual traffic situations identified as road safety deficiencies and best international practice and proposals for improvement (treatment). As TRACECA Region contains important transport links (corridors) connecting China and Europe, harmonization of road standards and elimination of potential risks for the road users are of utmost importance. This is why this Practical Guide for Road Safety Auditors is based on the existing RSA Manuals from the Region while also applying a common approach to RSA based on PIARC (World Road Association) guidance. This will ensure that similar approaches are applied to RSA related improvement of road infrastructure (RSA Reports) in all TRACECA Countries.

Special attention has been given to the attempt to make the PGRSA user friendly. There are plenty of illustrations from TRACECA Region which will help users to easily understand typical road safety deficiencies and to select appropriate treatments.

This document draws on the more comprehensive guidelines and manuals on Safety engineering mentioned in the acknowledgements but deliberately focuses only on these issues of direct relevance to road safety auditors and to the road safety reports that they have to write.

A number of other sister documents will be produced in due course on other aspects of safety engineering to provide guidance and advice in other specific aspects of safety engineering.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Practical Guide for road safety auditors in TRACECA Region builds to a large extent on international best practice, direct experience of the authors in TRACECA countries and draws upon detailed guidance and concepts in the 3 key publications indicated below:

1. "Towards safer roads in developing countries", a guide for planners and engineers, developed by TRL, Ross Silcock partnership and ODA in 1991,
2. "Catalogue of design safety problems and practical countermeasures", developed by World Road Association (PIARC) in 2009 and
3. "The handbook of road safety measures", written by Rune Elvik and Truls Vaa, in 2004.

The above 3 documents provide much more detailed guidance on all key aspects of safety engineering and authors recommend that road engineers should use these in planning and operation of roads to ensure safer road networks.

This particular document is aimed specially at the needs of safety auditors in TRACECA Region and has addressed only the main issues of relevance to them and their tasks in preparing safety audit reports.

The authors have drawn as necessary on these 3 documents and adapted the ideas and concepts to local circumstances.

We are grateful to the authors of the original documents for sharing their experience via these documents.

All photographs used as illustration of the problems, or as best practices are provided by authors.

Practical Guide for Road Safety Auditors in TRACECA Region has been prepared by:

Dr. Alan Ross

Dr. Dejan Jovanov

Hans-Joachim Vollpracht

Rajko Branković

Filip Trajković

Brief details about the authors is given at the back of this document

INTRODUCTION

It is a well-known fact that in almost all countries in the world road crashes are a serious social and economic problem. Different measures and programs have been developed to reduce the number of casualties on the roads. On an international level, the United Nations, World Health Organization, International financial institutions (especially IBRD, ADB, EBRD, EIB, IADB, AfDB and ISDB) and some specialized NGOs (PIARC, ETSC, PRI, SEETO, etc.) represent high quality stakeholders for global road safety improvements.

In most countries, road design guidelines are applied which in most cases include implementation of road safety issues. Despite this, crashes still occur on new roads. There are several reasons for this. Firstly, design standards often contain minimum requirements regarding road safety and sometimes a combination of these elements can lead to dangerous situations. Furthermore, it is not always possible to comply with the standards. Sometimes, especially in built-up areas or in difficult terrain, there are reasons which make the application of the standards impossible or too costly a solution.

A number of techniques and processes have been developed in the last two decades for improving road safety infrastructure. One of them is *Road Safety Audit (RSA)* which is now recognized as one of the most efficient engineering tools. With the Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council no. 2008/96 on road infrastructure safety management, published in October 2008, the European Union made a clear decision and instruction that road infrastructure should be an important part in the road safety chain. It is clear that among other Road Safety Management tools RSA will be mandatory for the Trans-European Road Network in the forthcoming years and IFIs (WB, EIB, EBRD, ADB, Islamic Bank, etc.) are already extending the application of the Directive via their Projects to the TRACECA Countries. RSAs will have to be performed not only during the design process of new roads but also ahead of major rehabilitations or upgrading of existing roads to detect existing safety deficiencies.

Undertaking of RSA is important for road safety because a formal RSA Report should identify the existing and potential road safety deficiencies and, if appropriate, make recommendations aimed at eliminating or reducing these deficiencies. With the audit process, it is possible to reduce the number and severity of traffic crashes by improving the road safety performance.

The pool of road safety specialists who prepared these guidelines were working in TRACECA countries and had an opportunity to see different road safety deficiencies on major road networks. The need for such a Practical Guide was identified during the observation of typical road safety deficiencies in TRACECA region and during attempts to implement internationally recognized and proven road safety treatments (countermeasures).

Therefore, the aim of the Practical Guide is to be strong and illustrative support for previously trained and future/prospective road safety auditors in the TRACECA region. The Practical Guide follows the PIARC (World Road Association) approach concerning classification of identified road safety deficiencies into 8 broad groups or categories:

- Road function
- Cross section
- Alignment
- Intersections
- Public and private services; service and rest areas, public transport
- Vulnerable road user needs
- Traffic signing, marking and lighting
- Roadside features and passive safety installations

Apart from typical road safety deficiencies, this Practical Guide contains three separate chapters:

- Temporary signing and marking at Work Zones
- Accident type sketches
- Potential crash reduction via various countermeasures.

Before giving a detailed presentation of typical road safety deficiencies, it is necessary to state a few basic facts about RSA.

- **WHAT IS ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA)**

RSA is a well-known internationally used term to describe an independent review of a project to identify road or traffic safety deficiencies. It is a formal examination of a road or a traffic project and can be regarded as part of a comprehensive quality management system. For new roads, RSA is a pro-active approach with the primary aim to identify potential safety problems as early as possible in the process of planning and design, so that decisions can be made about eliminating or reducing the problems, preferably before a scheme is implemented or accidents occur. However, it may also be a reactive approach for detecting safety deficiencies along existing roads as a start for rehabilitations.

The most common definition of RSA is: "*A formal road safety examination of the road or traffic project, or any other type of project which affects road users, carried out by an independent, qualified auditor or team of auditors who reports on the project accident potential and safety performance for all kinds of road users*", as stated in The Road Safety Audit Manual of the World Road Association (PIARC).

- **AREA OF APPLICATION**

RSA can be undertaken on a wide range of projects varying in size, location, type, and classification. The types of projects that can be audited are categorized under the following headings:

- function in the network (International roads, Main roads, Regional and Local roads)
- traffic (motor vehicles only or mixed traffic with non-motorized or slow agricultural traffic)
- position - location (outside or inside built-up area).

RSA is recommended to be taken for all new designs of roads and their major rehabilitation as well.

The RSA could be conducted as follows:

- on new roads, motorways, highways and other road surroundings/equipment,
- before and during reconstruction and rehabilitation,
- inside and outside built-up areas.

- **STAGES OF ROAD SAFETY AUDIT**

According to the international best practice and Regional Road Safety Audit Manual for TRACECA Countries (2014), RSA should be conducted in four different stages[1]:

Stage 1: draft (or preliminary) design,
Stage 2: detailed design,
Stage 3: pre-opening of the road and
Stage 4: early operation, when the road has been in operation for some time.

- **ROAD SAFETY AUDIT PROCESS**

[1] In some countries an additional 5th stage is introduced before stage 1 during planning to ensure that route planning, junction strategy etc. does not cause future potential road safety problems.

As a relatively new road safety procedure, RSA should have efficient organizational structure and with clear responsibilities. The general RSA procedure will include three main phases:

- ordering,
- conducting and
- completion.

The following chart (Figure I1) describes the typical RSA process.



➢ QUALIFICATION OF ROAD SAFETY AUDITORS

It is important that the auditor has extensive experience in road safety issues.

General expectation is that RSA Team Leader (TL) should have completed relevant university education preferably with Master's degree in a relevant topic such as Traffic Engineering and have significant experience in road safety engineering (design) and/or road traffic crash investigation. Minimum requirements for RSA Team Leader should be at least five years of working experience in the field of RSA and minimum 3 RSA Reports written in the last two years. In addition to this, TL should possess a certificate of competence (Licence issued by a recognised institution).

RSA Team Members (TM) should hold at least Bachelor's degree and minimum of three years of experience in road safety engineering (design) and/or road traffic crash investigation.

Auditors should possess driving licenses and have good knowledge of Road Design Standards, Traffic Safety Law and Law on Roads. The knowledge of other related standards is highly desirable.

To ensure the quality of the audit, auditors should undergo initial training, resulting in the award of a certificate of competence and should take part in further periodic training courses. The training should include site inspections of existing roads known for a high rate of accidents from police reports to get an understanding and picture of safety deficiencies in design.

In case where audits are undertaken by teams, at least one member of the team should hold a certificate of competence.

It is important to note, that this Practical Guide is not intended to be seen as a detailed design manual. It is just a collection of the most common types of design failures and suggested ways to overcome these.

1 ROAD FUNCTION:

1.1 ROADS WITH MIXED FUNCTION (LINEAR SETTLEMENTS)

Problem

Mixture of road functions (usage of the road as fast distributors for fast longer distance motorized traffic and as a route for slow local traffic) causes one of the major road safety problems especially in low and medium income countries (LMIC), such as in most of TRACECA Region.

This is one of the common problems in almost all of TRACECA countries where the rate of expansion of isolated communities along a road can rapidly reduce the effectiveness of a nationally or regionally important route as a result of the local traffic activities overwhelming the through route function of the road.

In such cases, the role of the road in the road hierarchy becomes confused. While the road is passing through settlements (without existence of by-pass) can it keep its geometry unchanged? Can it be called International/Regional/National road, or does it become a street? This, simple planning (designing) mistake of local administrations, can cause tremendous problems in road safety. Once intense development has been allowed it is very difficult to achieve improvements without major reconstruction on a new alignment. Often even when a bypass has been built, the village often over time extends out across to the new road. This is mainly an issue of access control (See Ch. 1.2).

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Armenia: 3+3 road with median	 Uzbekistan: 3+3 road with median
 Kyrgyzstan: Wide road without median	 Turkmenistan: Wide road without median

Typical accidents:

 Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction	 Pedestrian in the road	 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions	 At least two vehicles - head on collision in general	 At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning left (right) in front of other vehicle

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Separation of slow and fast traffic by small distributor roads either between the main road and house or behind those ($$) 2. Construction of by-pass Best but expensive solution with high possibility that one-day a new by-pass will be needed ($$$) If building a bypass, the opportunity should be taken down grade the old road by narrowing it, widening footpaths etc. to deter through traffic using it.	**8 - 30 %** **16 - 33 %** (these figures include accidents on old road network and on by-pass)	 Example of small distributor roads (blue) and by-pass (red) around the built up area
2. Grade separation of long distance and local traffic - Full space separation of fast moving vehicles and local transport. Fast road with access control (grade separated intersections, acceleration/ deceleration lanes, etc.) ($$) - Separation of pedestrians (pedestrian bridges or underpasses with ramps and no steps) ($$)	**20 - 57 %** **13 - 44 %** (including all accidents, with pedestrians and with vehicles)	 Armenia  Tajikistan
3. Changing character of road (from mobility to accessibility) – so it act as a street. Main task is to “kill” the speed - Building of entering/exit islands or roundabouts ($$) - Narrowing of the road ($) - Implementation of different traffic calming measures ($)	**11 - 47 %** **2 - 10%** **5 - 12 %** (including narrowing of the road)	 Example of speed reducing entering/exit island to/from the built up areas

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of road elements within the built up areas

1 ROAD FUNCTION:

1.2 ACCESS CONTROL

Problem

Along interurban roads strong access control is the basis of road safety. The clear legal regulation of developments along the road in road legislation is a must for avoiding development of liner settlements. But access control is also a safety issue for urban roads.

Limiting of the number of access points to the road/street is usually done for two reasons. The first is to limit the number of side roads joining a major route, in order to reinforce a road hierarchy and to concentrate potentially dangerous turning movements at a single junction which can be properly designed for such movements. The second reason is to reduce through traffic in a residential area, by making the route into and through an area tortuous and long. Only those requiring access will continue to enter.

These situations should be predominantly urban, but in TRACECA region there can be examples of trading posts on major regional/rural routes where a number of direct access points occurs at closely spaced intervals. Such locations are often accident black spots, due to uncontrolled turning movements and pedestrian activity. Closing most (or all but one) of the accesses, and one of the exits turning movements could be concentrated on one single point where other measures can be applied to deal with them more safely.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Armenia	 Kyrgyzstan
 Georgia	 Kyrgyzstan

Typical accidents:

 Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction	 Pedestrian on the road	 Pedestrian walking along the road	 At least two vehicles - crossing (no turning) - different	 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions
 Single vehicle accidents with animals		 At least two vehicles - opposite direction no turning - reversing		

1.2 Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Closing of direct access to road and construction of parallel service road which will collect traffic and connect to main road at only a few better designed junctions ($$$)	**8 – 30 %**	
2. Traffic signage and traffic calming measures:		
- Traffic lanes narrowing on the main road ($$)	**15 - 37%**	
- Traffic stream channelization ($$)	**15 - 37%**	
- Pedestrian crossings with refugee islands ($)	**3 – 21 %**	
- Guardrails ($)	No reliable data in this context	
- Lighting ($$)	**17 – 64 %**	Access to/from buildings prevented by a wall and only allowed at a single location
- Warning and speed limit signs (reduction in speed limit) ($)	**13 – 16 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of parallel service road and roundabout for connection to main road

(Traffic from buildings 1,2,3,4 not permitted to join the main road directly
but is controlled via the service road and brought to a better safer junction)

1 ROAD FUNCTION:

1.3 EXCESSIVE SPEED

Problem

Excessive speed and driver inattention are two of the most commonly occurring contributory factors in road accidents. Long straight road sections, especially, can increase speed (see 2. Alignment). Reducing speed, therefore, is likely to offer substantial safety benefits. In TRACECA region it can be seen that speed limits are widely abused, especially on intercity sections and police enforcement is not seen as frequently on the road. It is clear that self-enforcing physical measures are necessary to encourage, or force, drivers to slow down and obey speed limits. A number of methods have been developed to achieve this. Self-enforcing measures, such as road geometry to discourage particular movements, and speed cameras to deter speeding on intercity roads are possible and desirable treatments/measures.

In a residential area, where city by-passes or separation of long distance and local transport does not exist, through traffic strongly interacts and conflicts with local inhabitants and therefore should be treated in a different way. In this case the road acts as a local street. Therefore, the concept of speed calming devices (bumps), often called “sleeping policemen” should be considered as the cheapest and most effective measure for speed reduction. Other measures can be implemented such as: chicanes, road narrowing, median island, roundabout, etc. Most of these measures should be implemented at the entrance/exit of the settlement and drivers speed be influenced by the changed condition of the road as it passes through the settlement.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Azerbaijan	 Kazakhstan
 Moldova	 Ukraine

Typical accidents:

 At least two vehicles - head on collision in general	 Single vehicle accidents on the road	 Single vehicle accident - Leaving straight road - either side of the road	 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions	 Single vehicle accidents with obstacles - others

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. On interurban road section:		 Azerbaijan
- speed limit management (reduction in speed limits) ($)	**13 – 16 %**	
- lane width reduction (overtaking traffic lane from 3.75 to 3.50 m) (no costs, savings)	**15 – 37 %**	
- speed cameras ($$)	**16 – 19 %**	 Turkmenistan
- variable massage signs ($$)	**24 – 62 %**	
- traffic police speed control (stationary speed enforcement) ($)	**5 – 24 %**	
- traffic police patrols (mobile forms of enforcement)	**12 – 20 %**	
2. Through traffic in a residential area (where no by-passes or separation of long distance and local traffic):		 East Europe
- built-up areas entering islands ($$)	**11 – 47 %**	
- narrowing of the road $$	**2 – 10 %**	
- roundabout $$/$$$	**14 – 47 %**	
- central (refugee) island $$	**3 – 21 %**	
- rumble strips $	**25 – 40 %**	
- speed humps $	**42 – 54 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of rumble strips on an entrance to built-up area used for speed reduction.
(Rumble strips used to give advance warning before entry point or “gateway” to the urban area where the interurban road becomes a “street” as it passes through the settlement.
Speed reduction can be maintained by sped reduction measures at intermittent intervals on the road as it passes through the settlement.)

2. CROSS SECTION:

2.1 TYPES OF CROSS PROFILES (WIDTH OF THE ROAD)

Problem

A cross section will normally consist of the carriageway, shoulders or kerbs, drainage features, and earthwork profiles. It may also include facilities for pedestrians, cyclists or other special user groups. There is some evidence to suggest that widening lane or carriageway width or widening shoulders up to a certain extent is beneficial in reducing certain types of accidents. However, beyond a certain point it can have negative effects on road safety (users will start using extended width as a regular lane). Dangerous cross sections of express roads and highways are frequently being used in TRACECA region. For example, a four lane road without a crash barrier or two lane road with wide hard shoulders. A road with a wide hard shoulder can sometimes be misused by drivers as a very narrow four lane road, with disastrous results and very serious crashes.

Cross sections, particularly on roads through built up areas, are often not uniform or consistent. Local developments may encroach onto the carriageway because of the lack of effective planning control. In rural conditions cross sections may be reduced at drainage structures causing sudden changes in width.

Maintenance of the road in full profile impacts the safety situation. If a pavement width reduces due to the lack of maintenance (water on the pavement, sand, gravel, etc.) or pavement breaking at the edges effectively narrowing the road width, head on collisions or loss of control over a vehicle can occur.

Steep side slopes, introduced for drainage purposes, do not allow a driver to recover in case he leaves the carriageway, and thereby add to the likelihood of an accident. Open channel drains can also increase the probability that driver error will result in an accident.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Armenia	 Kazakhstan
 Georgia	 Azerbaijan

Typical accidents:

 At least two vehicles - head on collision in general	 Hitting parked vehicles on the right (left) side of the road	 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions	 Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction	 Pedestrian in the road

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Reconstruction of cross section - Changing into one of the safest solutions (motorway cross profile) ($$$) - Introducing of 2+1 cross section with median, where each direction periodically and alternatively given 2 lanes. This gives the opportunity of safe overtaking along 40% of the road length for traffic volumes up to 20.000 vehicles per day) ($$)	**10 – 80 %**	 
2. Road improvements (Rehabilitation) - Installation of medians ($$$) - Reducing the lane width (in built-up areas) - Improving of slopes – flattening side slopes ($$)	 **7 – 24 %** **15 – 37 %** **18 – 46 %**	
3. Better signing and marking - Improved signing – usage of warning signs, speed limit signs and VMS ($) - Improved markings – usage of central hatching, rumble strips, "ghost" islands, etc. ($)	 **10 – 62 %** **11 – 35 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



- X4ms = 4x (3,00 to 3,75) metre wide lanes + medium + 1,5 emergency lane
- X4m = 4x (3,00 to 3,75) metre wide lanes + medium
- X4 = 4x (3,00 to 3,75) metre wide lanes No medium!
- b2 = 2 x 3,50-metre wide lanes
- C2 = 2x 3,25-metre wide lanes + speed limit
- b2s = 2x 3,50-metre wide lanes + 2,5m emergency lane: used as four lane roads
- b2+1 = 2x 3,50 metre wide lanes + an overtaking lane alternatively used (regulated by markings, plastic poles or barriers)

Example of cross section influence on accident severity
(BASt – Federal Highway Research Institute in Germany with example of cross sections in TRACECA countries)

2 CROSS SECTION:

2.2 DRAINAGE

Problem

Drainage ditches are an essential part of all roads which are not on an embankment and must be incorporated into most highways. They are designed to take up the expected rainfall but can often be hazardous to vehicles that run off the road. Adequate attention must therefore be paid to the safety considerations of drainage facilities when designing and upgrading highways. Unfortunately, deep and steep-sided drainage channels can result in more damage in the case of vehicles going off the road.

Inadequate maintenance and clearing of debris from drainage channels, especially on the uphill side of the carriageway where large volumes of solid material are often washed down into the ditch, can result in water and debris overflowing onto the carriageway. This results in the potential danger of drivers colliding with debris or aquaplaning.

In many TRACECA areas, rural roads become the main pedestrian routes between adjacent communities and the absence of pedestrian footpaths forces pedestrians to walk along the road, especially if the drainage ditch is of such type (e.g. deep U or V type) which cannot be used as a pedestrian route. Unprotected U and V type ditches present a hazard to motorized vehicles particularly motorcyclists. These types of drainage should be covered as this reduces problems for vehicles, particularly motorcyclists/bicyclists.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Tajikistan	 Azerbaijan
 Armenia	 Kazakhstan

Typical accidents:

 Single vehicle accident - Leaving straight road - either side of the road	 Single vehicle accidents on the road	 Pedestrian walking along the road	 Single vehicle accidents with obstacles - others	 At least two vehicles - opposite direction no turning - others

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Road improvements - Improving of drainage system (adding of ditches with gentler slopes; adding of gutter) ($$$) - Adding of culverts where is necessary ($$$) - Closing of drainage system – piped drainage ($$$) - Usage of special asphalt types at dangerous locations – improving friction coefficient (bridges, etc.) ($$$)	No reliable data No reliable data No reliable data **5 – 55 %**	
2. Usage of traffic signage and equipment - Marking of edge lines as rumble strips (along the deep ditches, in front of culverts, etc.) ($) - Usage of protective devices (guardrails, etc.) ($$)	**11 – 45 %** **41 – 52 %**	
3. Maintenance of drainage system - Cleaning of ditches ($) - Covering of drainage system ($$)	No reliable data No reliable data	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Sleep sided slope increases risks and rollover



Gentle slope increases chances of recovery

Example of gentler slope of ditch and positive effect on traffic safety (preventing rolling over of vehicles)

3 ALIGNMENT:

3.1 VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL CURVES (CONSISTENCY)

Problem

Unexpectedly tight horizontal curves can lead to accidents as drivers try to drive through them at too high a speed. A similar situation may occur on horizontal curves in other similar hazardous situations, such as steep gradient or after a long straight section where driver is encouraged or misled (by the approach geometry) to think that he can drive at higher speed than is safe for that location. The sight distances associated with larger curve radii may also encourage driver to overtake in unsafe conditions.

It may be difficult for a driver to estimate the sight distance on a curve crest and he may overtake when he doesn't have sufficient length to do so safely. It can be extremely expensive to provide safe overtaking sight distances on crest curves. However, a complete ban on overtaking can be difficult to enforce because of the presence of very slow-moving vehicles, the lack of driver discipline in selecting stopping places, and poor maintenance of road markings and signs.

Poor co-ordination of the horizontal and vertical alignments can result in visual effects which contribute to the accidents and are detrimental to the road appearance. Unsafe combinations of horizontal and vertical curvature are likely to be misinterpreted by a driver and may result when horizontal and vertical curves of different length occur at the same location. These situations are particularly dangerous and are unfortunately frequently present in TRACECA region.

In general, interurban main roads of the higher class should have minimum radii of 500 m and the horizontal alignment of classes below should follow the tulip of radii (see below). On the other hand, for human factors the length of straight road sections should be limited to 1.500m to avoiding monotony and sleepiness of drivers combined with speeds far above of the speed limits and to make it easier to judge speeds of oncoming traffic.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Armenia	 Georgia
 Moldova	 Kazakhstan

Typical accidents:

 Single vehicle accident in a bend - going either side of the road	 At least two vehicles - head on collision in general	 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustration
1. Reconstruction of curves - increasing the radii of horizontal curve ($$$) - construction of transition curve ($$$) - reducing gradient of vertical curve ($$$) - consistency of alignment (horizontal and vertical curve) ($$$)	 **8 – 55 %** **7 – 15 %** **5 – 38 %** **17 – 28 %**	 An inconsistent alignment with a combination of large with a sudden unexpected small radius horizontal curves surprises the driver
2. Better signing and marking - Better signing (including warning signs, chevron signs, speed reduction and overtaking prohibition signs) ($) - Better marking (including lines as a rumble strip) ($) - Usage of protective devices (guardrails, etc.) ($$) - Lighting ($$/$$$)	 **13 – 16 %** **11 – 45 %** **41 – 52 %** **17 – 64 %**	
3. Improving sight distance in curves - Forward visibility at the insides of curves (open visibility) ($$) - Removing of vegetation ($)	 **6 – 38 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of consistency/inconsistency of alignment (horizontal and vertical curves)



The Tulip of radii for rural roads

3 ALIGNMENT:

3.2 SIGHT DISTANCE (VISIBILITY)

Problem

In general, the visibility offered to drivers should be sufficient to identify any necessary course of action and then to perform that action safely. A usual critical requirement is that the driver can stop safely, and this requires the understanding of speeds, reaction times and deceleration rates. Sight distance requirements are thus related to geometric design and speed controls and are inherent in all design standards. Visibility may relate to another road user, or to an object such as a road sign. Cons picuity, i.e. the ease with which the object can be seen, is the most important.

Drivers on the main road should also be able to see vehicles approaching from side roads as early as possible in order to prepare and be able to take evasive action if necessary. This is one of the reasons why recommended visibility splays usually involve the requirement for a vehicle approaching from a side road to be seen before it reaches the stop or give way line. Pedestrians also need to see and be seen and crossing movements are often concentrated at or near junctions. From our human factors research drivers need 4-6 seconds to realize a new situation; this means 300 m ahead if the speed limit is 100 km/h or 200m for 80 km/h.

A common accident problem in TRACECA countries associated with visibility is where a minor road meets a major road at a narrow angle. This encourages vehicles on the minor road to negotiate the junction at speeds higher than is compatible with the visibility available to them. Side roads must be forced by physical geometry to slow down or even to stop at the edge of the main road.
Warning and information signs may be sometimes so sited that they have poor conspicuity, and the detailing of the road may not provide sufficient additional clues as to the hazard or decision ahead.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Georgia	 Ukraine
 Kazakhstan	 Azerbaijan

Typical accidents:

 Single vehicle accidents in a bend - going either side of the road	 At least two vehicles - different roads - turning left (right) into traffic from the right (left) side	 At least two vehicles - crossing (no turning) - different	 Pedestrian crossing street at a junction	 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Reconstruction of curve, intersection, pedestrian crossings, etc. - Improved radius and visibility ($$$)	**8 – 55 %**	 Example of improved radius of horizontal curve and visibility in curve
2. Provide sufficient sight distances for adequate driver reaction - Opening of visibility (see sketch at the end of page) ($$) - Enable good orientation for drivers (e.g. adding of trees at secondary roads which clearly shows that there is intersection ahead) ($) Breaking the sightline of the driver is important to show that the road is not continuing ahead.	**20 – 38 %** **no reliable data**	
3. Improved signing and marking - improved signing (usage of high class reflectivity materials for traffic signs, adding of chevron signs in sharp curves, using of flash beacons on approach to the pedestrian crossing, etc.) ($) - improving of markings (usage of reflective glass beads, usage of nonstandard markings, etc.) ($)	**10 – 33 %** **11 – 35 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of speed and peripheral vision



Example of speed and focus point

Conclusion: The faster we drive the further we need to look ahead and vice versa in order to be able to read, understand and react in time to a hazard ahead.

4 INTERSECTIONS:

4.1 CHANNELIZATION OF TRAFFIC FLOWS

Problem

Channelization is a useful tool in traffic management. It should be applied to all junctions on high speed roads. This may require local widening but the small additional cost of this at the design stage will be offset by future safety benefits in almost every case. Consideration of the access needs of emergency and other priority vehicles is required, especially in the event of an accident or breakdown. If provision is not made for this, damage to kerbs will quickly occur. Channelization guides the driver through the conflict points, provides safe areas for him to stop while making a manoeuvre and reduces conflicts between different flows of traffic.

Channelization by means of road markings, raised kerbs, traffic islands and bollards, can be used to guide vehicles along a specific path on the approach to and/or exit from a junction and to position them at the safest location to make their manoeuvre. The benefits of this are that movements are simplified, less confusion arises and the number of conflict points is minimized.

Traffic islands have the added benefit of providing a refuge for pedestrians crossing the road. They also provide a convenient location for street furniture such as signs, street lighting and drainage covers. Urban channelization schemes can be relatively complex, dealing with large traffic volumes. In rural areas concern is usually focused on protecting turning vehicles from faster moving traffic and to position vehicles correctly on the road.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Kyrgyzstan	 Ukraine
 Moldova	 Tajikistan

Typical accidents:

 At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning left (right) in front of other vehicle	 At least two vehicles - crossing (no turning) - different	 At least two vehicles - head on collision in general	 At least two vehicles - same direction - entering traffic	 At least two vehicles - opposite direction no turning - others

Possible safe countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Construction of raised (kerb) islands - Local widening (if necessary) and clear guidance of driver with raised (kerb) islands ($$) - Narrowing of traffic lanes (if existing lines are too wide) ($$) - Additional lighting ($$) - sufficient length for left/right turning lane ($$)	**15 – 37 %** (full channelization at crossroads)	 Georgia
3. Usage of markings and traffic equipment - Clear marking of traffic lanes for better guiding of drivers ($) - Plastic markers, flex poles and other rubber elements can be used ($) - Advance information signs for lane direction ($)	**42 – 68 %** (full channelization at crossroads)	 Georgia
3. Usage of "ghost" island - Different texture of island surface could be used with edges on pavement level ($) - Markings and rumble strips for better guiding of drivers and unpleasant feeling crossing over the island ($) - Reflective studs for the delineation of lanes especially during night time condition ($)	No reliable data	 Example of "ghost" island with markings and rumble strips

Sketches (with dimensions):



①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥
3,40	3,10	3,00	3,40	3,30	3,30
(3,00)	3,20	(2,75)	(3,30)	(2,75)	(3,10)

Example of channelization of "T" junction
(Note the “protected” lane for turning traffic where it can wait in safety until a suitable gap appears to allow it to turn)

4 JUNCTIONS:

4.2 INTERSECTION TYPES ("Y" TYPE, ROUNDABOUTS, ETC.)

Problem

A junction is required wherever two or more roads cross, so that vehicles can pass through the junction in ways that are both safe and understandable for all road users. It is important that the junction is appropriate for the site and that it is clearly defined in terms of road priorities and legitimate manoeuvres. Common junction shapes are a T-junction, X-junction, staggered junction and cross roads. If an inappropriate junction type is used at a particular site, like "Y" type, significant safety problems can occur, including high accident rates, unnecessary delay and congestion.

The most obvious problem regarding the more widespread usage of roundabouts is the lack of familiarity of drivers with the proper use of this type of traffic control. In some of TRACECA countries roundabouts have one "Priority road", which is contrary to best international practice, where all approaching roads to roundabout should have to "Give Way" sign in order to give priority to the circulating traffic inside the roundabout. One of the road safety facts about roundabouts could be that the number of minor accidents can even increase, but the number of fatalities and serious injuries will decrease due to impact angle and reduced speeds of impact.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Georgia: "Y" type intersection	 Tajikistan: "Y" type intersection
 Kazakhstan: "Y" type intersection	 Azerbaijan: Huge roundabout

Typical accidents:

 At least two vehicles - head on collision in general	 At least two vehicles - turning or crossing - same road - same direction - turning left (right)	 At least two vehicles - different roads - turning left (right) into traffic from the right (left) side	 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions	 Hitting pedestrian - turning right (left)

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. For "Y" type of junction: - Full reconstruction from "Y" type into "T" ($$$) - Improving of visibility ($$/$) - Improving of signing and marking ($) - Adding of rumble stripes ($) - Clear prioritization of main traffic stream by signage and markings ($) - Additional "STOP" sign for minor road appr. ($)	**20 - 70 %** **5 - 18 %** **11 - 35 %** **25 - 40 %**	
2. For cross-roads with high traffic volume on minor road approach: - Full reconstruction to staggered junctions ($$$) - Adding of traffic signals ($) - Channelization of traffic flows (narrowing of traffic lanes) ($$) - Usage of "STOP" sign on minor roads ($) - Additional traffic lanes on the minor approaches ($$)	**21 - 43%** **25 - 35%** **15 - 37%** **25 - 44%**	 Possible forms of junction staggering
3. For roundabouts - Channelization of traffic flows (narrowing of traffic lanes) ($$) - Adding of raised (curb) islands (pedestrian refuge islands and central island of the roundabout which should be shaped as a hill) to break sight lines of approaching traffic Bus bays should be at the exits behind the pedestrian crossing($$). - Usage of "Give Way" signs at all approaching legs with priority of traffic in circle ($)	**15 - 37%** **3 - 21%** **3 - 9%**	 One circle lane roundabouts are the most safe and cost effective type of junctions up to a traffic volume of 20.000 incoming vehicles per day within and outside of built up areas as well.

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of traffic flows channelization on approaches to the roundabout
(Note how the vehicles can be positioned to safest location for manoeuvre)

4 INTERSECTIONS:

4.3 U-turns

Problem

Policies regarding the provision of gaps in medians, particularly in urban areas must balance the needs of both local and through traffic in terms of connections to local streets and enabling of U-turns. Their number should be kept to a minimum, and wherever possible overpasses/underpasses should be provided instead of allowing U turns. The main consideration which governs median opening (U-turns) is minimum turning path (that is, the length of median opening depends upon the width of median and the minimum turning path of the largest vehicle allowed on that road).

Road accidents tend to cluster at median gaps particularly on dual carriageway mainly due to the conflict between the slow manoeuvre of a wide turn and fast approaching vehicles (usually with high speed) from the other direction. This is the typical case in TRACECA countries.

There is always a conflict between serving the demands of local traffic and through traffic. The poor planning of U-turns is contrary to the interest of any wide scale area traffic control proposals for removing through traffic from the local street system. The openings are also sometimes provided at locations where due to the horizontal and vertical geometry of the road, the movements of vehicles using the facility are not clearly visible to other road users. Where local traffic dominates, the conflict between local and through traffic gets more serious. This problem is aggravated by poor design standards used for right/left turning lanes which do not offer adequate protection to the turning vehicle.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Armenia	 Azerbaijan
 Kyrgyzstan	 Moldova

Typical accidents:

 At least two vehicles - U-turn in front of the other vehicle	 At least two vehicles - same direction - U-turn in front of the other vehicle	 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Construction of "fly over" U-turns (grade separation of traffic streams) - Changing existing U-turn into safer solution with grade separation of traffic streams ($$$)	**no reliable data**	
2. Reconstruction of cross section (U-turn) - Changing existing U-turn into safer solution ($$$) - Protected deceleration lane for turning vehicle - A short crossing of opposite carriage way at right angle to minimise exposure and then an acceleration lane to join the traffic on that carriageway	**15 – 37 %**	
3. U-turn improvements (Rehabilitation) - Widening and creation of left turning lane ($$$) - Improving of U-turn radius ($$) - ITS implementation to reduce traffic speed ($$) - Additional signing and markings ($) - Where ever possible, roundabouts will offer safe U-turning manoeuvres	**4 – 27 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of U-turn for both directions
(Note the protected lane for turning traffic to wait in safety, the short exposure when crossing and acceleration lane with hatched area to run in parallel to main stream until merging can occur).

5 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SERVICES

5.1 SERVICES ALONG ROADSIDE

Problem

Roadside facilities (rest places and petrol stations) are necessary to serve the long distance traffic between regions and towns (villages). Drivers need to rest at least once every 2 or 3 hours in order to maintain their concentration when driving. It is useful to combine rest areas with petrol and/or service stations at 30 – 50 km distances. Entrances and exits to and from Service and Rest areas can cause a disruption to traffic on the main carriageway if they are not separated well, and special attention should be given to design and maintenance of deceleration and acceleration lanes. It is important that sufficient rest areas are provided at around 10 km intervals but not too many to avoid constant disruption of the main flow of traffic by constantly exiting and merging traffic. Such rest areas may be used for selling goods by local farmers to minimise such activity along the roads (see the example of Moldova below). Farmers should reach the areas from minor roads behind the service area.

In TRACECA Region there are a lot of examples where roads are encroached upon by unacceptable commercial services or there are unsuitable rest areas. This is dangerous for all road users, because of huge speed difference and mixture of different categories of road users (sudden vehicle stops and entering the traffic, as well as presence of unprotected pedestrians on high speed roads).

Master plans, land usage, urban development and restrictions in access to the public road network are key elements for preventing these types of accidents. In good planning system these types of crashes could be prevented in early stage of planning, during Road Safety Impact Assessments (RSIA). Effective access and development controls can prevent such unsafe conditions developing.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Ukraine	 Kazakhstan
 Kyrgyzstan	 Moldova

Typical accidents:

 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions	 At least two vehicles - same direction - entering traffic	 Hitting parked vehicles right (left) side of the road	 Pedestrian walking along the road	 At least two vehicles - U-turn in front of the other vehicle

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Improving of entrance/exit to services along roadside - Construction of adequate deceleration and acceleration traffic lanes ($$$-$$) - Channelization of traffic flows at entrance/exit ($$)	**15 – 37 %**	
2. Improving of parking areas - Separation from traffic ($$) - Adding and/or remarking of pedestrian walkways ($$) - Adequate position of parking with regard to objects and services ($$/$$$)	 **16 – 33 %** **10 – 32 %** **No reliable data**	
3. Improving od signing and marking of services along the roadside - Proper signing/marking (speed limit signs, directional signs, wrong way signs, parking places, pedestrian crossings, etc.) ($) - Adding of proper lighting ($$) - Additional installation of guardrails ($)	 **2 – 10 %** **25 – 74 %** **31 – 54 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of organization of Rest area with parking and design of traffic signs

5 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SERVICES

5.2 FACILITIES FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT (BUS STOPS)

Problem

TRACECA Region has a diverse range of public transport modes. Economic factors can result in many of these being unsafe, but they are the only available modes of travel for the large majority of people. In such circumstances the first priorities need to be aimed at limited regulation to ensure that the safety of passengers is adequately catered for through regular roadworthiness, screening of vehicles and by having basic minimum standards for drivers and operators providing such services. Drivers are often poorly trained and educated and road accidents involving public transport vehicles are commonplace with at times, major catastrophes occurring (e.g. deaths of 11 or more persons in overloaded and unsafe mini bus).

In rural areas, bus bays provided with a divider from the main carriageway are often not used by buses, which stop on the carriageway instead. This is because bus bays without dividers are used by different activities (trading, parking, etc.) which encroach into the bus bay. In urban areas such bus bays with dividers seem to operate better.

At those stops, conflict can exist between the bus and other vehicles and vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists. Usually pedestrian flows to and from Bus stops are not well catered for. Pedestrian crossings on routes to the Bus stop (say 100 m to each direction) are often inadequate.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Azerbaijan	 Tajikistan
 Kazakhstan	 Ukraine

Typical accidents:

 Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction	 Pedestrian walking along the road	 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions	 Hitting parked vehicles right (left) side of the road	 At least two vehicles - same direction - entering traffic

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Removing Bus stops from main traffic flow - Separation of Bus bays from main traffic flow and connection with pedestrian crossings ($$$) - Construction of pedestrian footpath to and from Bus stops ($$/$$$) * The location of bus stops at the exits of roundabouts is very useful and safe because the speed of passing vehicles is still low.	**34 – 90 %**	 Turkmenistan
2. Improving of Bus bay within existing traffic - Traffic calming measures in zone of Bus bay ($$$-$$) - Relocation of BUS bay ($$$) Note that the pedestrian crossing is located behind the bus stop bay to reduce risks. Ideally the pedestrian crossing should be raised and there should be a safe waiting area at the centre of the road to permit pedestrians to cross in 2 movements.	**25 – 54 %** **No reliable data**	
3. Improving of signing /marking and road furniture of Bus Stops - Improved signs and marking of Bus Stop ($) - Adding of proper lighting ($$) - Additional installation of guardrails ($) - Additional installation of pedestrian fence ($) - ITS installation in Bus stop location (see example from chapter 7.1 Signing) ($$)	**2 – 10 %** **25 – 74 %** **31 – 54 %** **No reliable data in this context**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Recommended and minimal values for Bus bay
(Note that pedestrian crossing is behind the bus bay so passengers coming off from Bus and crossing the road can be seen by following traffic).

6 VULNERABLE ROAD USER NEEDS:

6.1 PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

Problem

Pedestrians should not have to walk at all along interurban roads. Hard shoulders are no intended for vulnerable road users but for emergency use by vehicles only. With the exception of roundabouts, pedestrian crossings should ideally be grade separated on major roads if large numbers of vulnerable road users are expected. At-grade pedestrian crossing on dual carriageways or multi-lane roads should be forbidden unless traffic signals are provided. To enable pedestrians to cross safely crossings provided should be as underpasses or overbridges with ramps, not stairs. Any other solution significantly increases risks of with pedestrian accidents. Even though it is not in accordance with any road standards/norms in the world, including ex-soviet SNiP and GOST standards there are many such examples in TRACECA Region where pedestrian crossings are placed on the same level on an international road (see Section 1.1.)
In order to provide additional traffic capacity at junctions, local widening is sometimes carried out. This often increases the crossing distance, again creating increased risk for pedestrians.
Heavy crossing demands may sometimes occur away from junctions where vehicle speeds are very high and this is often the case in TRACECA region. The provision of underpasses or overbridges however may be too expensive and may not be well used. Designers and the road authority need to provide crossings which the pedestrians will willingly use.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Kazakhstan	 Ukraine
 Tajikistan	 Uzbekistan

Typical accidents:

				
Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction	Pedestrian crossing street at a junction	Pedestrian in the road	At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions	Single vehicle accidents - others

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Separated pedestrian crossings - Construction of underpasses or overbridges - costly and efficient solution – attention should be paid to pedestrian wiliness to use ($$$) - Underpass/overbridge lighting ($$$/$$) - Installation of pedestrian guardrail in wider zone of underpass/overbridge ($$) - Motivation of pedestrians to use bridge or underpass by installing: - Different advertisements - Signage and markings - Violation recording of offenders - Good lighting - Clean, well maintained underpasses	**13 – 44 %** **9 – 32 %** **N/A** **N/A**	 Kazakhstan  Georgia * Using ramps instead of stairs encourages use by less able persons
2. Narrowing of road and usage of refuge islands - Narrowing of the traffic lanes ($$) - Installation of refuge island with fencing to redirect pedestrians to face traffic before crossing ($$) - Adding traffic lights ($) - Lighting of pedestrian crossing ($$$/$$) - Installation of pedestrian guardrail ($)	**15 – 37 %** **3 – 21 %** **2 – 12 %** **17 – 64 %** **N/A**	 (Pedestrians at Central Island can be redirected via safety fences so they face traffic before making second crossing)
3. Connecting of pedestrian paths (walking routes) with crossings - Marking of pedestrian crossing ($) - Raised pedestrian crossing ($) - School crossing patrol ($) - Adding of speed-reducing devices (humps, rumble strips, etc.) near pedestrian crossing ($)	**10 – 58 %** **35 – 67 %** **25 – 54 %**	 Georgia

Sketches (with dimensions):



Good example of pedestrian crossing and BUS stops

6 VULNERABLE ROAD USER NEEDS:

6.2 FOOTPATHS AND FOOTWAYS

Problem

Pedestrian accidents contribute a substantial proportion of road accident deaths and injuries. Pedestrians are particularly at risk in urban surroundings. In TRACECA countries and can typically contribute to 50% of deaths. Roads are usually designed with raised pedestrian footways as part of the cross-section but on interurban roads, footways are rarely provided, although in some locations, pedestrian flows may be very high.

Footways have great implications for safety and every effort should be made to segregate pedestrians and vehicles where space allows. Separate routes make travel much safer for vulnerable road users. Special care must be taken to ensure that footways do not become obstructed, especially by street traders and/or parked vehicles, that the surfaces are easy to walk on and that they provide a continuous route.

Substantial conflict problems usually exist where roads pass through rural settlements as the main road traffic travelling very fast often passes very close to the existing buildings leaving no footpaths for pedestrians and increased risk and danger for pedestrians.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Kazakhstan	 Georgia
 Ukraine	 Tajikistan

Typical accidents:

				
Pedestrian walking along the road	Pedestrian in the road	Pedestrians on pavement or bicycle lane	At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions	At least two vehicles - head on collision in general

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Separation of motorised traffic and vulnerable road users wherever possible - Construction of separated pedestrian footways and cyclist tracks ($$$) - Building of footpaths and cyclist lanes/tracks where road passes through urban areas ($$$) - Building of wider hard shoulder outside urban areas ($$)	 **35 – 67 %** **10 – 32 %** **21 – 32 %**	 Ukraine
2. Time separation - Installation of traffic lights where footpaths (footways) and cyclist tracks/lanes cross the road ($$)	**2 – 12 %**	
3. Good signing and marking of urban and rural footpaths, footways and cyclist tracks/lanes ($) - speed limitation for vehicles ($$) - access control for specific vehicles category ($)	**2 – 10 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of marking of footpaths and cyclist tracks on crossing of the road

7 TRAFFIC SIGNING, MARKING AND LIGHTING:

7.1 SIGNING

Problem

Warning signs and warning markings are used to give advance notice of a potential hazard ahead or of any unexpected feature of the road geometry. The signs are used in specific situations when there is a change in the road, such as in a bend, on high speed road or on the approach to junction. The location of signs is very important because they should provide adequate warning or information at sufficient distance, however they should not obscure important road features. Of great importance for the visibility of the signs is that they be located in positions where overgrown vegetation cannot obscure the visibility of the sign. Signs must be visible at all times, so reflective materials should be used for night-time visibility and urban signs may require to be lit internally or externally. In TRACECA Region, it is common practice for the signs to be missing (even at dangerous locations), not properly positioned, without reflectivity, non-standardized or even not uniform to International UN Conventions.

A recurring problem with signs is of them being obscured, either by permanent features such as street furniture and vegetation or by parked vehicles and, on dual carriageways, by moving vehicles in the nearside lane (if there is no repeated sign on the other side of the road). Too many signs can detract from their objective by overloading the driver with too much information too quickly, which leads to confusion or to a situation where the driver ignores certain signs. Signs may not be visible at night time because of poor illumination, lack of routine maintenance, continuity of power supply or inappropriate positioning (too high, set back out of road or turned away from driver). If reflective signs are not regularly cleaned, they may not retain their design properties.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Tajikistan	 Georgia
 Kazakhstan	 Kyrgyzstan

Typical accidents:

				
Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction	Pedestrian crossing street at a junction	At least two vehicles - crossing (no turning) - different	At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions	At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning left (right)

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Usage of high class of reflectivity materials for traffic signs - usage of higher class of reflectivity materials for signs on motorways and highways (roads with higher speed limit) ($) - usage of higher class of reflectivity materials for traffic signs “Yield at entry”, “Stop”, “Pedestrian crossing”, etc. ($) - yellow-green border usage for highlighting of signs on dangerous places ($)	**10 – 33 %**	 Chevrons in curves should be with yellow and red arrows instead of white/red or white/black
2. Variable message signs (VMS) usage - accident warning signs ($$) - fog warning signs ($$) - queue warning signs on motorways ($$) - Average over speeding control signs ($$) - Information signs of average violations at pedestrian crossings ($$)	 **22 – 59 %** **63 – 93 %** **4 – 26 %** **24 – 62 %** **65 – 96 %**	
3. Maintenance of traffic signs - Traffic sings maintenance ($) - Displacement of traffic signs ($) - Removal and replacement of traffic signs ($) - Visibility of colours in traffic signing, Yellow – red chevrons are earlier detected than red-white (Black-white are even worse) ($)	**7 – 15 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of usage of VMS for speed limit in accordance with BUS stop detection and pedestrian crossing detection

7 TRAFFIC SIGNING, MARKING AND LIGHTING:

7.2 ROAD MARKINGS

Problem

Road markings play a very important role in guiding the driver and providing him with the information necessary to negotiate conflict points on the road network and should be of high priority for those seeking to improve road safety. Appropriate information should be given to the driver through the use of different types and colors of road marking. Stop and give-way lines at junctions help to position the driver on the road to minimize his risk. Center lines can be used to indicate locations where overtaking is dangerous while edge lines give advance warning of changes in alignment and if corrugated can be used as warning of drifting towards shoulder. Where possible, high quality paint containing small glass beads (for reflectivity at night) should be used. Centre and edge lining reinforced through the use of studs or vibrolines (corrugated) to provide rumble warning are strongly recommended.

Although most of TRACECA countries have their own national standards for road marking, many of the roads do not have good markings (without reflectivity and/or are partially missing). This is partly due to the fact that road marking paint available locally often tends to be of poor quality whilst imported road marking paint is often considered to be too expensive (although it lasts longer, reduces risk of accidents).

The poor conditions of roads (potholes, deformations, etc.) can also make road marking difficult to apply in any effective manner. Shortage of special machinery, skilled/trained technicians and the cost of imported thermoplastics makes problems in implementation of thermoplastic lines in TRACECA Region.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Kazakhstan	 Tajikistan
 Uzbekistan	 Moldova

Typical accidents:

 At least two vehicles - same direction - side collision	 At least two vehicles - same direction - others	 Single vehicle accidents in a bend - going either side of the road	 Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction	 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasures with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Improved road markings: - Reflective glass beads for road markings ($) - Durable road marking materials (cold plastic, thermoplastic, fabricated tapes) ($$/$) - Delineators ($) - Reflective road markers / studs ($) - Rumble strips, edge rib-lines, reflective road studs, etc. ($) - Non-standard markings for school zones, dangerous locations, etc. ($) - Marking of traffic signs on pavement ($) - Different colours of road markings (for highlighting of standard elements of road markings) ($) - Different pavement colour ($)	 **2 – 7 %** **8 – 21 %** **17 – 45 %**	 
3. Maintenance of road markings - Remarking ($) - Cleaning of markings ($)	**No reliable data**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of road marking of traffic sign for school zone

7 TRAFFIC SIGNING, MARKING AND LIGHTING:

7.3 LIGHTING

Problem

Night-time accidents on roads passing through urban areas or on streets in urban areas can be substantially reduced by the implementation of adequate road/street lighting. It is particularly important where there are high proportions of pedestrians, cyclists or other poorly lit road users, including animals. Lighting should provide a uniformly lit road surface in order to provide visibility of all road users (vehicles and pedestrians) and not to hide them in shadow. The design of the lighting system should be designed to the road surface reflection characteristics in order to provide the optimum quality and quantity of illumination. Light coloured surfaces give better silhouette vision than the dark ones. If only limited funds are available, efforts should be made to provide lighting on at least the most important routes and on dangerous locations along such routes such as intersections and pedestrian crossings involving large movement of pedestrians.

Lighting is expensive to install and maintain, but usage of cheaper LED lighting and solar power lighting system can reduce costs in future years. However, without proper maintenance, the resulting inconsistency in lighting can itself be a safety hazard. Maintenance could be a problem in some of TRACECA countries, because of inadequacy of the allocated funds. Careful attention needs to be paid to the siting of lamp posts as they can be hazardous for an errant vehicle and if possible frangible posts should be used. The column can be a significant visual obstruction at critical locations.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Kazakhstan	 Azerbaijan
 Uzbekistan	 Tajikistan

Typical accidents:

 At least two vehicles - head on collision in general	 Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction	 Single vehicle accidents in a bend - going either side of the road	 Pedestrian in the road	 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Adding of lighting where needed ($$$)	**25 – 74 %**	 Turkmenistan
2. Evenness of illumination (improving of existing lighting quality) ($$) - Usage of solar power and LED for energy saving system	**8 – 20 % (for up to double)** **25 – 79 % (for up to 5 times)**	 Azerbaijan
3. Maintenance of lighting - Changing of lamps/LED ($) - Cleaning of lamps/LED/solar panels ($) - Installation of guardrails for protection of lamps from traffic and vice versa ($$)	**No reliable data**	 Uzbekistan

Sketches (with dimensions):



Speed (km/h)	Lenght of transition (m)
50	80
60	110
70	140
80	170
90 and higher	200

Example of lamp placement on 4-leg intersection and roundabout with recommended length of transition zone from lighted section to unlighted one for different speeds ("tunnel effect")

8 ROADSIDE FEATURES AND PASSIVE SAFETY INSTALLATIONS

8.1 ROADSIDE OBSTACLES (PLANTS, TREES, LIGHT POLES, ADVERTISEMENTS, ETC.)

Problem

The presence of roadside obstacles, street furniture (for example, road signs and lighting columns) advertising signs and trees has two safety implications. The first is the potential danger of collision, and the second is their obstruction of visibility. Visibility is important not only for the driver, but also to other road users. Obstructions caused by trees, for example, may result in a pedestrian making an unwise decision.

Great care should be taken concerning the positioning of roadside features which may either obstruct visibility, lead to accidents or increase accident severity. Where obstructions cannot be practically removed, and contribute to hazardous situations, consideration should be given to their replacement with equipment designed to collapse on impact, re-alignment of the road, or the introduction of barriers. Once a road is completed, care must be taken to ensure that obstacles are not introduced by other institutions subsequently, such as telephone or electricity authorities. Vegetation should be trimmed regularly and planning controls should be enforced to prevent stalls and structures being too close to the road edge. In some TRACECA countries, trees are often planted adjacent to roads in order to provide shade for pedestrians, animals and parked vehicles and in other countries to prevent the wind from bringing snow onto the road.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Uzbekistan	 Tajikistan
 Azerbaijan	 Kyrgyzstan

Typical accidents:

 Single vehicle accidents with obstacles on or above the road	 Single vehicle accidents with obstacles - others	 Single vehicle accident - Leaving straight road - either side of the road	 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions	 Pedestrian walking along the road

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Removing roadside objects from road to create a "clear zone" without potential obstacles - Removing of hard (un-deformable) roadside objects from clear zone ($$$/$$) - Relocation of road layout ($$$)	 **43 – 46 %** **No reliable data**	
2. Relocation of hard roadside objects - Relocation of hard objects out of clear zone (on safe distance) ($$$-$$) - Providing better visibility in clear zone – traffic mirrors, ITS, etc. ($$) Note: There have to be obstacle free zones of 9 m for speed limits of 100 km/h, 6 m for 80 km/h and 3 m for 60 km/h	 **20 – 24 %** **20 – 38 %**	
3. Alter to reduce severity or protect roadside hazards - Frangible lighting/sign/etc. poles ($) - Grade steep slopes, 4:1 or flatter ($$) - Safe culverts ($) - Installation of guardrails ($$$-$$) - Marking of roadside object to make them more visible (usage of reflective signs, etc.) ($) - Marking edge lines in form of rumble strips ($)	 **25 – 72 %** **38 – 46 %** **No reliable data** **41 – 52 %** **11 – 45 %** **2 – 20 %**	 Barrier around/in front of a tree

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of vegetation management in cross section of highway

8 ROADSIDE FEATURES AND PASSIVE SAFETY INSTALLATIONS:

8.2 GUARDRAILS

Problem

Many accidents on high speed roads involve vehicles leaving the road and colliding with hazardous obstacles such as trees, bridge supports or simply rolling over down a high embankment. Similarly, a vehicle running off onto the lane in the opposite direction of a dual carriageway runs the risk of collision with an oncoming vehicle and like hood of death or serious injury for vehicle head on occupants.

The risk of these types of accidents can be significantly reduced by the use of guard rails or barriers. The purpose of the barrier is to absorb the impact with as little overall severity as possible and to keep the vehicle contained in its carriageway. Barriers and safety fences may also be introduced to protect roadside facilities from errant vehicle impact.

The correct design of safety fences and barriers is important to prevent accidents which otherwise can often be very severe. They should be designed to absorb kinetic energy with as little risk of injury to vehicle occupants as possible. Concrete blocks have to be connected by steel armatures like a strong chain, otherwise themselves they are dangerous obstacles. They are intended to be placed between the carriageway and the objects which cause severe accidents if hit, such as bridge abutment. They are also used to retain vehicles on high embankments or mountain roads. Their use on high speed roads is justified, but care needs to be taken concerning details, particularly at the start and end points and minimum barrier length in order to work safely. Damaged barriers must be repaired immediately as they can cause serious damage if hit by passing vehicles and if they are not in their designed condition.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Uzbekistan	 Georgia
 Azerbaijan	 Kazakhstan

Typical accidents:

				
At least two vehicles - head on collision in general	Single vehicle accidents on the road	Single vehicle accidents in a curve - going either side of the road	Single vehicle accidents with obstacles - others	Single vehicle accident - Leaving straight road - either side of the road

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Adding right type of guardrails when missing - Adding missing guardrails ($$$-$$) - Installation of proper barrier type ($$$) - Adding barriers connection elements ($)	**31 – 54 %**	 Albania
2. Improving of existing guardrail system - Closing of “open windows” ($$-$) - Adding transition elements between two different types of barriers ($$) - Using of appropriate beginning/end elements - guardrail extension in front of dangerous point ($$) - Smoother slopes ($$)	**20 – 42 %**	 

Sketches (with dimensions):



The norm EN 1317 Containment Level

9 TEMPORARY SIGNING AND MARKING AT WORK ZONES

Problem

A work zone is an area of road or roadside where construction, maintenance or other works are performed and which may affect the safety and limit the free movement of road users through and in the vicinity of the Work Zone. Work zones are zones on the road with higher risk of accidents for both road users (vehicle occupants and vulnerable categories) and workers. A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) of good quality should be made and followed so that all participants in traffic are protected against risk of a traffic accident. Such TMP should contain all elements starting from design, placement, maintenance to the removal of all elements regulating the road traffic.

To minimize the problems and increase safety, work zone layout (marking and signing) requires special consideration for the following reasons:

- Work zone is a section of road where, most often, geometrical characteristics of the road and the traffic conditions are changed to poorer conditions (less safe). The types of executed works are often road construction, rehabilitation and maintenance, but there are other types of work on the road that need the same treatment, for instance work with cables, pipes etc. located in the road area.
- Employees in work zones spend most of their working hours directly exposed to traffic. In accidents, happening in work zones, these employees are often the victims, and often at as much at risk as the road users.

The growing international transit traffic flow in TRACECA countries implies the need for main traffic corridors to be constructed according to international standards and requires European standards and a widely recognized and consistent system for road works signing and work zone safety.

Examples of unsafe designs from TRACECA Region

 Armenia	 Ukraine
 Kazakhstan	 Azerbaijan

Typical accidents:

 Single vehicle accidents with roadwork materials	 Hitting parked vehicles right (left) side of the road	 At least two vehicles - head on collision in general	 At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions	 Pedestrian walking along the road

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and accident reductions (AR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	AR	Illustrations
1. Establishing regular (best practice) of working zone, the road markings in working areas should be in yellow ($$$-$$)	5 – 65 % (for traffic accidents in work zones)	



Sketches (with dimensions):

Speed limit (km/h)	Minimum buffer area (m)	
	Lateral	Longitudinal
40	0.5	30
50	0.5	35
60	0.5	40
80	0.5	60
100	1.0	100
120	1.0	100

Recommended dimensions of lateral and longitudinal buffer areas in work zones

10 ACCIDENT TYPE SKETCHES

BASIC OF COMMON ACCIDENT DATA SET (CADaS)

Introduction

European Union countries have a long history in collecting accident data via different national collection systems. At European level, road accident data are also available since 1991 in disaggregate level in CARE (Community database on road accidents resulting in death or injury). The purpose of CARE system is to provide a powerful tool which would make it possible to identify and quantify road safety problems throughout the European roads, evaluate the efficiency of road safety measures, determine the relevance of Community actions and facilitate the exchange of experience in this field. It also allows countries to benchmark themselves against other countries to assess areas where they need to do more.

Due to differences in accident data collecting between EU countries, new recommendations have been agreed for a Common Accident Data Set (CADaS) consisting of a minimum set of standardized data elements, which will allow comparable road accident data to be available throughout Europe. In this way, more variables and values with a common definition will be added to those already contained in the previous models of the CARE database. They will maximize the potential of CARE database allowing more detailed and reliable analyses at European level.

Common Accident Type Sketches

Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction 	Single vehicle accident - Leaving straight road - either side of the road 	At least two vehicles - same direction - overtaking 	At least two vehicles - head on collision in general 	At least two vehicles - turning or crossing - same road - same direction - rear end collision 
Pedestrian crossing street at a junction 	Single vehicle accidents on the road 	At least two vehicles - turning or crossing - same road - same direction - turning left (right) 	At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning right (left) in front of other vehicle 	At least two vehicles - turning or crossing - same road - same direction - turning right (left) 
Hitting pedestrian - turning right (left) 	Single vehicle accidents in a bend - going either side of the road 	At least two vehicles - turning or crossing - same road - same direction - others 	At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning others 	At least two vehicles - different roads - turning left (right) into traffic from the right (left) side 

Hitting pedestrian - turning left (right) 	Single vehicle accidents In junctions or entrances 	At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning left (right) in front of other vehicle 	At least two vehicles - different roads - turning right (left) in front of vehicle from the left (right) 	At least two vehicles - different roads - turning left (right) into traffic from the left (right) side 
Pedestrian in the road 	Single vehicle accidents - others 	At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning into same road 	At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning into opposite roads 	At least two vehicles - different roads - turning into traffic - others 
Pedestrian walking along the road 	Single vehicle accidents with animals 	At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions 	At least two vehicles - U-turn in front of other vehicle 	At least two vehicles - different roads - turning right (left) - head on collision 
Pedestrians on pavement or bicycle lane 	Single vehicle accidents with obstacles on or above the road 	At least two vehicles - same direction - entering traffic 	At least two vehicles - opposite direction no turning - reversing 	At least two vehicles - crossing (no turning) - different 
Hitting parked vehicles right (left) side of the road 	Single vehicle accidents with roadwork materials 	At least two vehicles - same direction - side collision 	At least two vehicles - opposite direction no turning - others 	
Hitting parked vehicles left (right) side of the road 	Accidents between train and vehicle 	At least two vehicles - same direction - U-turn in front of other vehicle 	Single vehicle accidents with obstacles - others 	At least two vehicles - same direction - others 

Examples of real accidents from TRACECA Region and respective accidents and its sketches

Armenia

Kyrgyzstan

Kazakhstan

Ukraine

Moldova



Azerbaijan

Kyrgyzstan  	Uzbekistan  
Moldova  	Kazakhstan  na
Kazakhstan 	Kazakhstan 
	

11 POTENTIAL CRASH REDUCTION FROM COUNTERMEASURES/TREATMENTS

Introduction

For any kind of countermeasure proposal, it is necessary to know the crash reduction potential. Therefore, a list is proposed of the most usual low cost countermeasures with their expected effects.

The following table is collated from results of different international research projects and case studies and can be used for understanding the potential crash savings after implementation of different countermeasures.

Table 11.1 presents each different proposed countermeasure (treatment) and its range potential crash reduction effects as a percentage. (Usually, minimum and maximum effects are presented).

Table 11.1: Efficiency (crash reduction) of different countermeasures

Treatment	Potential crash reduction [%] (different sources/research)
Road Standard	
Improve to higher standard	19-33
Increase number of lanes	22-32
Lane widening 0,3 – 0,6 m	5-12
Paved shoulder widening 0,3 - 1 m	4-12
Add median strip	40
Bridge widened or modified	25
Widen shoulder	10
Overtaking lane	20
Right turn lane	40
Left turn lane	15
Pedestrian overpass	10
Side slope flattening from: 2:1	
to 4:1 ... 7:1 or flatter	6 ... 15
Side slope flattening from: 4:1	
to 5:1 ... 7:1 or flatter	3 ... 11
Service roads	20-40
Traffic calming	12-60
Speed reduction from 70 km/h to 50 km/h	10-30
Speed reduction from 90 km/h to 60 km/h	17-40
Horizontal Alignment	
Improve geometry	20-80
Curvature: improving radius	33-50
Vertical Alignment	
Gradient / removing crest	12-56
Super elevation improvement/introduction	50
Passing lane	11-43
Climbing lane	10-40
Road Structure	
Lane widening	12-47
Skid resistance improvement	18-74
Shoulder widening	10-40

Shoulder sealed	22-50
Road verge widening	13-44
Junction Design	
Staggered (from straight) crossroads	40-95
T-junctions (from Y-junctions)	15-50
Fully controlled right turn phase	45
Roundabouts (from uncontrolled)	25-81
Roundabouts (from traffic signals)	25-50
Mini roundabouts (from uncontrolled)	40-47
Turning lanes	10-60
Traffic islands	39
Sheltered turn lanes (urban)	30
Sheltered turn lanes (rural)	45
Additional lane at intersection	20
Skid resistant overlay	20
Red light camera	10
Law enforcement by the Police	7-25
Traffic Control	
Regulatory signs at junctions	22-48
Guidance/directional signs at junction	14-58
Overhead lane signs	15
Side road signs	19-24
Brighter signs and markings	24-92
Signs and delineation	29-37
Bend warning signs	20-57
Stop ahead sign	47
Speed advisory sign	23-36
Warning/advisory signs	20
Speed limit lowering - & sign	16-19
Yield/Give Way	59-80
Stop sign	33-90
Signals from uncontrolled	15-32
Signals - modified	13-85
Junction channelization	10-51
Remove parking from road side	10-25
Visibility	
Lane markings	14-19
Edge markings	8-35
Yellow bar markings	24-52
Raised reflective pavement marking	6-18
Delineator posts	2-47
Flashing beacons	5-75
Lighting installations	6-75
Sightline distance improvement	28
Channelization medians	22-50
Crash Amelioration	
Median barrier	14-27
Side barriers	15-60

Frangible signs	30
Tree removal (rural)	10
Pole removal (lighting poles, urban)	20
Embankment treatment	40
Guardrail for bridge end post	20
Impact absorber	20
Pedestrian Facilities	
Pedestrian walkways	33-44
Pedestrian zebra crossings	13-34
Raised zebra crossings	5-50
Pelican crossings	21-83
Marking at zebra crossing	-5-14
Pedestrian refuges	56-87
Footbridges	39-90
Pedestrian fencing	10-35
Cycling Facilities	
Cycle schemes	33-56
Marked cycle crossing at signals	10-15
Cyclist advanced stop line at junctions	35
Rail Crossings	
Flashing signals	73-91
Automatic gates	81-93
Traffic Calming	
30 km/h zones (inc. humps, chicanes etc.)	10-80
Rumble Strips	27-50
Rumble Strips and Bumps	20-80

NOTES:

1. Crash Reductions are NOT ADDITIVE, use highest value if multiple treatments are proposed for a particular location.
2. Reductions apply to all crashes within single intersections or single midblock that contain the treatment.

12 KEY REFERENCES

[1]. Black Spot Management and Safety Analysis of Road Network – Best Practice Guidelines and Implementation Steps, Project RIPCORD-ISEREST, WP6, 2008
[2]. Catalogue of Design Safety Problems and Practical Countermeasures, World Road Association (PIARC), Paris, 2009
[3]. Directive on Road Infrastructure Safety Management No 96/2008, European Parliament and of The Council, Brussels, 2008
[4]. Draft Manual for Black Spot Improvement, Finnroad, Azerbaijan, 2009
[5]. Draft Manual for Road Safety Audit, Azerroadservice, Baku, 2009
[6]. Draft Manual for Road Safety Audit, Kazavtozhol, Astana, 2014
[7]. Draft Road Safety Audit Manual, Kyrgyzstan, Bishkek, 2012
[8]. Elvik, R. & Vaa, T.: The Handbook of Road Safety Measures, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2004
[9]. Elvik, R.: State-Of-The-Art Approaches to Road Accident Black Spot Management and Safety Analysis of Road Networks, RIPCORD – ISEREST Report, 2008
[10]. Good-Practice Guidelines to Infrastructural Road Safety, European Union Road Federation, 2002
[11]. Guidelines for Road Safety Audits, German Road and Transportation Research Association (FGSV), Edition 2002
[12]. Low-Cost Road and Traffic Engineering Measures for Casualty Reduction, European Transport Safety Council (ETSC), Brussels, 1996
[13]. M. Belcher, S. Proctor& R. Cook: Practical Road Safety Auditing, TMS, 2nd Edition, 2008
[14]. Manual of Road Safety Audit, Road Directorate, Denmark, 1997
[15]. Road Safety Audit – Best Practice Guidelines, Qualification for Auditors and "Programming", RIPCORD-ISEREST Project – WP4, EU Project, 2008
[16]. Road Safety Audit Guide - for Use on Albanian Roads, Ministry of Transport, Albania 2008
[17]. Road Safety Audit Guideline, World Road Association (PIARC), Paris, 2007
[18]. Road Safety Audit Guidelines, National Roads Authority, Dublin, 2004
[19]. Road Safety Audit Guidelines, University of New Brunswick-Transportation Group, Canada, 1999
[20]. Road Safety Audit Manual, South East Europe Transport Observatory (SEETO), EC/SEETO, 2009
[21]. Road Safety Audit, Austroads, Australia, 1994
[22]. Road Safety Inspection – Best Practice And Implementation Plan, RIPCORD-ISEREST Project – WP5, EU Project, 2008
[23]. Road Safety Inspection Guideline, World Road Association (PIARC), Paris, 2007
[24]. Road Safety Inspection Manual, South East Europe Transport Observatory (SEETO), EC/SEETO, 2009
[25]. Road Safety Manual, World Road Association (PIARC), Paris, 2003
[26]. Safety Audit of Road Design. Guidelines for Design and Implementation, Finnish Road Administration, Helsinki, 2002
[27]. Sustainable Safe Road Design: A Practical Manual, World Bank, 2005
[28]. Towards Safer Roads in Developing Countries", A guide for Planners and Engineers, TRL, Ross Silcock Partnership and Oda, UK, 1991
[29]. World Disasters Report, WHO, Geneva, 2002

13 AUTHOR PEN PORTRAITS

Dr Alan Ross
alanross999@gmail.com

Dr Alan Ross has 4 degrees (in civil engineering, Traffic engineering, Management Sciences (traffic police enforcement) and Road Safety Action Plans) and over 35 years of experience. He has wide experience in assessing Road Safety needs and in development of Road Safety Strategies, Action Plans and projects. He is a recognized leading international expert on Road Safety issues and has advised Aid agencies, development banks, EU and governments in benchmarking and in the design, implementation and monitoring of Road Safety Strategies, Action plans and initiatives in all sectors in around **60 countries around the world**. He helped establish the Global Road Safety Partnership (GRSP) and assisted ADB and EIB to develop their internal road safety action plans and has led multidisciplinary teams on numerous projects. He is also the author of several international guidelines and manuals on Road safety, Road safety action plans, Safety engineering, Road Safety Management, Safety audit, etc. Several of these have been translated into other languages and are now in widespread use around the world. His areas of specialist expertise include:

- Road safety management coordination and funding
- Performance indicators, Monitoring and evaluation
- Impacts and outcomes delivery
- Road safety strategies and Action plans
- Road safety engineering

He was the author of the ADB road safety audit toolkit and the main author of the TRL Red Book Towards Safer Roads - guidelines for engineers and planners on safety conscious planning and operation of roads. That document was translated into several languages and has been circulated and is in use in over 120 countries. He is now President of the International Road Safety Centre (IRSC), Belgrade a “not for profit” organization established to assist LMICs address road safety issues in all 5 pillars of the UN Decade of Action on Road Safety.

Dr Dejan Jovanov
dejan.jovanov68@gmail.com

Dr Jovanov is a highly qualified road safety expert, with more than 20 years of experience in road safety. His theoretical background includes a Ph.D. in Transport and Traffic Engineering – Road Safety at state owned University of Belgrade. From the beginning of his carrier he was engaged in result oriented road safety project work. He has been employed in the Public Enterprise “Roads of Serbia” (i.e. the Roads Administration of Serbia) where he established the first Road Safety Unit and developed working procedures and activities and defined road safety strategy within the organization. In his career he has been a member of many different multidisciplinary consultancy teams undertaking international and regional road safety projects and has experience from 17 countries, mostly dealing with:

- Development of Road Safety Strategies and Action Plans,
- Improvement of laws and regulations to support new road safety tools (such as RSA, RSI, BSM, etc.) as a mandatory routine stipulated by EU Directive 96/2008,
- Road Safety Audits (including of preparations of Road Safety Audit Manuals, training curricula’s, training courses and certifications of trainers),
- Black Spot Management (including of preparations of Black Spot Management Guidelines, training curricula’s and training courses),
- Different Pilot Projects dedicated to road safety (education of children, media campaigns, local communities, RSA/RSI), etc.

Dr Jovanov is familiar with modern road safety tools and has capability of establishing a good contacts and transfer of knowledge to the Clients. He has a good overall knowledge of road traffic safety situation in the EU (SEETO)/Central Asian (TRACECA) countries. He is one of founders of IRSC.

Dipl. Ing. Hans Joachim Vollpracht
h_vollpracht@hotmail.com

Dipl. Ing. Hans-Joachim Vollpracht is a highly experience Roads Director General with 40 years of practice in road safety management. He has a Master's degree from Berlin and a Certificate in Management and Organization for leadership at the supreme technical state level. He has held leading positions in Western Berlin for roads and construction, was one of the German developers of traffic calming especially for vulnerable road users in cities. After reunification he held the position of head of the department for Roads and Traffic in the Ministry for Transport and Urban Development in the new German County of Brandenburg (around Berlin) for 13 years. Apart upgrading of 10.000 km of Motorways and Highways he initiated the first Road Safety Program in Eastern Germany, the first electronic accident investigation program and the implementation of Road Safety Audits in the design process with the result of 80% less fatalities in 20 years. He is a former Chairman of the Technical Committee for safer roads of the World Road Association (PIARC), has been a key speaker at many Road Safety events in 25 countries and has worked as Manager of several Road Safety projects in European, Asian and African countries mostly dealing with:

- Development of Road Safety Policy, Strategies and Action Plans,
- Improvement of laws and regulations to support new road safety tools (such as RSA, RSI, BSM, etc.) as a mandatory routine stipulated by EU Directive 96/2008,
- Road Safety Audits (including of preparations of Road Safety Audit Manuals, training curricula's, training courses and certifications of trainers),
- Network Safety Management (including of preparations of Black Spot Management Guidelines, training curricula's and training courses),
- Training of Traffic Police officers in accident investigations,
- Promotion of Human Factors in Road Design and operation into international road design standards by PIARC and
- Task Force member for the new PIARC Road Safety Manual.

Mr Vollpracht is familiar with the UN Global Plan for the Decade of Action for Road Safety and has established good contacts and transfer of knowledge to the different clients.

Rajko Brankovic
rajko.brankovic@gmail.com

Mr. Rajko Brankovic has fourteen years of work experience in road engineering and traffic management. He is dipl-ing in Transport and Traffic Engineering (University of Belgrade, Serbia) with specialization in traffic safety (Lund University in Sweden) and professional certificate in Road Safety Audit on European Road Network (University College of Dublin, Ireland). Throughout his professional career, he has worked in public authorities, private companies and as an international consultant. He has worked on large scale projects with different international financial organizations such as: World Bank, European Investment Bank, European Bank for Development and Reconstruction, European Union, etc. He has extensive international experience and knowledge of safety engineering issues and design standards from a range of countries including Ireland (UK), Sweden, Serbia, Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Macedonia and Qatar.
His expertise covers the following fields:

- Traffic Management on construction works,
- Traffic Design, Planning and Analysis,
- Road Safety Audit, Road Safety Inspection,
- Black Spot Management and Accident Investigation,
- Traffic safety condition surveys and
- Contracting and Procurement (World Bank, FIDIC, EU rules).

Currently, Mr Brankovic is working on the TRACECA Road Safety II in Euro-Asia Region as Safety Engineering Expert and Road Rehabilitation and Safety Project in Serbia as Head of Traffic Projects. Traffic management and traffic safety are his main areas of expertise.

Filip Trajkovic, M.Sc.
trajkovicf@gmail.com

Mr. Filip Trajkovic has five years of work experience in road engineering. He is MSc in Transport and Traffic Engineering (University of Belgrade, Serbia) with professional certificates for traffic design and supervision of Serbian Chamber of Engineers (certification no 370 and 470). Throughout his professional career, he has been working in consultancy companies and has provided inputs and gained experience of working on international projects mostly on Projects in Balkan Peninsula-SEETO organization region but also in region covered by TRACECA Road Safety II Project.
His expertise covers the following fields:

- Traffic Design, Planning and Analysis,
- Supervision in implementation of traffic signage and road equipment,
- Road Safety Audit, Road Safety Inspection,
- Black Spot Management and Accident Investigation and
- Traffic safety condition surveys.

Currently, Mr Trajkovic is working on the TRACECA Road Safety II in Euro-Asia Region as Traffic Engineer and on a major Road Rehabilitation and Safety Project in Serbia as Road Safety Engineer. Traffic designing/supervision, traffic analysis and traffic safety are his areas of specialist expertise.

IRSC is a NOT FOR PROFIT organisation which provides a platform for assisting Low and Middle Income Countries (LMICs) to address road safety issues in support of the UN Decade of Road Safety. It offers training, guidelines, manuals and training materials in all 5 pillars of road safety identified in the UN Decade of Road Safety.

- Safety management
- Safer roads
- Safer vehicles
- Safer road users
- Post crash systems

Sharing experience and expertise

www.irscroadsafety.org

PRACTICAL GUIDE FOR ROAD SAFETY AUDITORS AND INSPECTORS

With the support of PIARC

PRACTICAL GUIDE FOR
ROAD SAFETY AUDITORS AND INSPECTORS

2018.

IMPRESSUM

The publication "***PRACTICAL GUIDE FOR ROAD SAFETY AUDITORS AND INSPECTORS***" is prepared and published with the active support of:

GRSA e.V. - Association of Auditors and Experts for Safer Roads
www.safe-roads.net

SARSA - Serbian Association of Road Safety Auditors
www.sarsa.net

SoRASR - Romanian Society of Road Safety Auditors
www.sorasr.ro

International Road Safety Centre
www.irscroadsafety.org

Centre for Road Safety
www.facebook.com/CBSBanjaLuka/?ref=bookmarks

Automobile and Motorcycle Association of Serbia - Center for Motor Vehicles
www.amss-cmv.co.rs

With the support of PIARC

Publisher:

Automobile and Motorcycle Association of Serbia - Center for Motor Vehicles, Belgrade

Authors:

Mr Hans Joakim Vollpracht
Mr Lutz Pfeiffer
Mr Ralf Baumann
Dr Alan Ross
Dr Dejan Jovanov
Mr Rajko Branković
Mr Filip Trajković
Dr Cristian Calin
Mr Robert-Cristian Moraru
Dr Ilie Bricicaru
Dr Dragoslav Kukić
Mr Saša Jasnić
Mr Kosta Jovanov
Dr Nebojša Radović

Reviewer:
Dr Dragoslav Kukić

Editor:
Dr Dejan Jovanov

Number of copies:
150

Printed by:
“Štampa”, Ruma

ISBN 978-86-915169-5-6

PREFACE

After almost two decades of experience with Road Safety Audit (RSA) Worldwide, this procedure is now recognised as one of the most efficient engineering tools. RSA is a highly efficient and cost-effective engineering tool for improvement of safety on roads. It is much cheaper to identify road safety deficiencies in the process of design than later after construction is completed. RSAs are among the most cost-effective investments a Road Authority can undertake.

With its EU Directive No. 2008/96 on road infrastructure safety management, published in October 2008, the European Union (EU) made a clear decision that RSA will be mandatory for the Trans-European Road Network (TERN) in forthcoming years. This Directive contains another tool called Road Safety Inspection (RSI) on safety deficiencies of existing roads. The RSI is very similar to the process of Road Safety Audit in the pre-opening phase of newly constructed roads. RSIs are essential for the redesign and upgrading of existing roads, and these are done in many countries to give the designers insights and direction for safety improvements. Given that, the purpose of this practical guide is to provide practical guidance to those doing RSAs and RSIs, the examples of typical design deficiencies shown should be useful to both road safety inspectors and road safety auditors.

Unfortunately, there is little systematic application or acceptance of RSA at present in Low and Middle Income Countries (LMICs). RSAs that are implemented are mostly done at the insistence of IFIs funding the road projects and these are often implemented by foreign consulting companies and relate to only the 5% or so of the road network funded by IFIs. Even when such RSAs are undertaken, the resulting RSA recommendations are not always implemented by the road authorities. RSAs are usually not undertaken at all on the 95% of the network funded domestically. Some recent IFI projects have attempted to develop local capacity for RSA implementation in LMICs and have done some pilot projects but there are far too few of these.

Education and training of the road safety auditors remains the weakest point in the entire RSA chain. The reason for this is a relatively short history of RSA, lack of understanding of RSA methodology and procedures, lack of RSA literature in local languages, etc. This *Practical Guide for Road Safety Auditors and Inspectors* with visual examples of typical problems and solutions has been produced to try to overcome such constraints.

Actual traffic situations and design faults have been used to show road safety deficiencies and best international practice and proposals for improvement (treatment). The actual images used to illustrate unsafe designs are drawn mostly from road networks of Europe, Western Balkans, Caucasus and Central Asia regions. However, although the roads and traffic conditions from other regions of the world will produce different images, the underlying typical problems of design and typical solutions will be similar. Local safety auditors and inspectors in these other geographic regions can therefore still benefit from and make use of the contents of this guide. In due course, they should develop their own versions with local images relevant to road networks in their geographic areas.

Since there are many international transport routes (corridors), harmonisation of road standards and elimination of potential risks for the road users are issues of primary importance. These RSA Guidelines are based on the approach used in Road Safety Audit Manuals and apply a conventional approach to RSA/RSI based on PIARC (World Road Association) guidance. This will ensure that similar approaches are applied to RSA/RSI related improvement of road infrastructure (RSA/RSI Reports) in different parts of the World. The approach of these guidelines is to give an overview about typical deficiencies in design and in the existing roads. For a better understanding of unsafe design and its consequences, most typical crash types are dedicated to the related deficiency (see Chapter 10). Particular attention has been given to the attempt to make the RSA Guidelines user-friendly.

There are plenty of illustrations from different countries which will help users to understand common road safety deficiencies easily and to select appropriate treatments.

This document draws on the more comprehensive guidelines and manuals on Safety engineering mentioned in the acknowledgements but deliberately focuses only on these issues of direct relevance to road safety auditors/inspectors and to the road safety reports that they must prepare, including of recommendations for improvements.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This *Practical Guide for Road Safety Auditors and Inspectors* builds to a large extent on international best practice and the direct experience of the authors and draws upon detailed guidance and concepts from three sources indicated below:

1. “Towards safer roads in developing countries”, a guide for planners and engineers, developed by TRL, Ross Silcock partnership and ODA in 1991,
2. "Road Safety Audit Guideline for Safety Checks of New Road Projects", developed by World Road Association (PIARC) in 2011,
   "Road Safety Inspection Guideline for Safety Checks of Existing Roads", PIARC, 2012,
   “Catalogue of design safety problems and practical countermeasures”, PIARC, 2009 and
3. “The handbook of road safety measures”, written by Rune Elvik and Truls Vaa, in 2004.

The above three sources of documents provide much more detailed guidance on all critical aspects of safety engineering, and the authors recommend that road engineers should use these in planning and operation of roads to ensure safer road networks. We are grateful to the authors of the original documents for sharing their experience via these documents.

This document is aimed primarily at the needs of safety auditors/inspectors in LMICs and has addressed only the main issues of relevance to them and their tasks in preparing safety audit/safety inspection reports. Images and examples used in this Guide were gained within recent SEETO and TRACECA Projects.

The production of the document was coordinated by senior members of SARSA and the following specialists contributed valuable inputs and assistance in it’s development:

- Mr Hans Joakim Vollpracht, h_vollpracht@hotmail.com
- Mr Lutz Pfeiffer, grsa2005@gmail.com
- Mr Ralf Baumann, grsa2005@gmail.com
- Dr Alan Ross, alanross999@gmail.com
- Dr Dejan Jovanov, dejan.jovanov68@gmail.com
- Mr Rajko Branković, rajko.brankovic@gmail.com
- Mr Filip Trajković, trajkovicf@gmail.com
- Dr Cristian Calin, cristianncalin@yahoo.com
- Mr Robert-Cristian Moraru, office@sorasr.ro
- Dr Ilie Bricicaru, ilie.bricicaru@gmail.com
- Dr Dragoslav Kukić, kukicdragoslav@gmail.com
- Mr Saša Jasnić, sasa.jasnic.1978@gmail.com
- Mr Kosta Jovanov, kostajovanov98@gmail.com
- Dr Nebojša Radović, radovic.nebojsa62@gmail.com

Note
This document has been prepared within limited time and resources in order to offer some practical guidance to road safety auditors/inspectors as quickly as possible. When and if additional resources are available this document will be reissued in an improved version. Readers are welcome to provide comments and suggestions on how the document can be improved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CADaS	Common Accident Data Set
CARE	Community Database on Road Accident Resulting in Death or Injury
CR	Crash Reduction
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EC	Expected Cost
EFA	German Guidelines for Pedestrian Traffic
EIB	European Investment Bank
ETSC	European Transport Safety Council
EU	European Union
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
IFI	International Financial Institutions
IRF	International Road Federation
IRSC	International Road Safety Centre
LMIC	Low and Middle Income Countries
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
ODA	Official development assistance
PIARC	World Road Association
PRI	La Prévention Routière Internationale
RSA	Road Safety Audit
RSI	Road Safety Inspection
RSIA	Road Safety Impact Assessment
SEETO	South East European Transport Observatory
TERN	Trans European Road Network
TL	Team Leader
TM	Team Member
TMP	Traffic Management Plan
UN	United Nations
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization

Note
In this document where feasible and in line with international practice, we have used the term "crash" instead of "accident" in recognition that these are events which can be prevented or avoided and are not just some random acts of God or luck. In a few cases, historic use of the word accident is still used (e.g. Common Accident Data Set - CADaS).

INTRODUCTION

It is a well-known fact that in almost all countries in the world road crashes are a serious social and economic problem. Different measures and programs have been developed to reduce the number of casualties on the roads. On an international level, the United Nations, World Health Organization, International financial institutions (especially WB, EIB, IBRD, EBRD, etc.) and some specialised NGOs (PIARC, IRF, ETSC, PRI, SEETO, IRSC, etc.) represent high-quality stakeholders for global road safety improvements.

In most countries, road design guidelines are applied which in most cases include road safety issues. Despite this, crashes still occur on new roads. There are several reasons for this. Firstly, design standards often contain only minimum requirements regarding road safety, and sometimes a combination of these elements can lead to unforeseen dangerous situations. Furthermore, it is not always possible to comply with the standards. Sometimes, especially in built-up areas or in steep terrain, there are conditions which make the application of the standards impossible or too costly a solution.

Several techniques and processes have been developed in the last two decades for improving road safety infrastructure. One of them is *Road Safety Audit (RSA)* and another one is *Road Safety Inspection (RSI),* which are now recognised as some of the most efficient engineering tools. With the Directive of the European Parliament and the Council no. 2008/96 on road infrastructure safety management, published in October 2008, the European Union made a decision and instruction that road infrastructure should be an essential component of efforts to improve road safety. Among other Road Safety Management tools, RSA will be mandatory for the Trans-European Road Network in the coming years, and IFIs (WB, EIB, IBRD, EBRD, etc.) are already extending the application of the Directive via their Projects. RSAs will have to be performed not only during the design process of new roads but also ahead of major rehabilitation or upgrading of existing roads to detect existing safety deficiencies.

The undertaking of RSA and RSI is vital for road safety because a formal RSA/RSI Report should identify the existing and potential road safety deficiencies and, if appropriate, make recommendations aimed at eliminating or reducing these deficiencies. With the audit process, it is possible to reduce the number and severity of traffic crashes by improving the road safety performance.

The Project team members who prepared these guidelines have worked in over 100 different countries all around the world and had an opportunity to see different road safety deficiencies on major road networks. The need for such a *Practical Guide for Road Safety Auditors and Inspectors* was identified during the observation of common road safety deficiencies in many different countries. The guide can also be used as a resource to show potential road designers the typical problems that can occur and which they can be avoided by adopting some of the solutions presented in the guide.

Therefore, although the primary aim of the *Practical Guide for Road Safety Auditors and Inspectors* is to be strong and illustrative support for previously trained and future/prospective road safety auditors and inspectors, it can also be used to guide road designers towards better, safer design. The Guide follows the PIARC (World Road Association) approach concerning the classification of identified road safety deficiencies into eight broad groups or categories:

- Road function
- Cross section
- Alignment
- Intersections
- Public and private services; service and rest areas, public transport
- Vulnerable road user needs
- Traffic signing, marking, and lighting
- Roadside features, passive safety installations, civil engineering structures

Apart from typical road safety deficiencies, this Practical guideline contains three separate chapters:

- Temporary signing and marking at Work Zones

- Accident type sketches
- Potential crash reduction via various countermeasures.

Before giving a detailed presentation of typical road safety deficiencies, it is necessary to state a few basic facts about RSA (most of which can also be applied to RSI).

➢ **WHAT IS ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA)?**

RSA is a well-known internationally used term to describe an independent review of a project to identify road or traffic safety deficiencies. It is a formal examination of a road or a traffic project and can be regarded as part of a comprehensive quality management system. For new roads, RSA is a pro-active approach with the primary aim to identify potential safety problems as early as possible in the process of planning and design, so that decisions can be made about eliminating or reducing the problems, preferably before a scheme is implemented, or crash occur. However, it may also be a reactive approach for detecting safety deficiencies along existing roads as a start for rehabilitation.

The most common definition of RSA is: "*A formal road safety examination of the road or traffic project, or any other type of project which affects road users, carried out by an independent, qualified auditor or team of auditors who reports on the project accident potential and safety performance for all kinds of road users*", as stated in The Road Safety Audit Manual of the World Road Association (PIARC).

➢ **AREAS OF APPLICATION**

RSA can be undertaken on a wide range of projects varying in size, location, type, and classification. The types of projects that can be audited are categorised under the following headings:

- function in the network (International roads, Main roads, Regional and Local roads)
- traffic (motor vehicles only or mixed traffic with non-motorized or slow agricultural traffic)
- position - location (outside or inside built-up area).

RSA should be undertaken for all new designs of roads and for their major rehabilitation as well.
The RSA could be conducted as follows:

- on new roads, motorways, highways, and other road surroundings/equipment,
- before and during reconstruction and rehabilitation,
- inside and outside built-up areas.

➢ **STAGES OF ROAD SAFETY AUDIT**

According to international best practice (PIARC Manual), RSA should be conducted in four different stages[1]:

Stage 1: draft (or preliminary) design,
Stage 2: detailed design,
Stage 3: pre-opening of the road and
Stage 4: early operation, when the road has been in operation for some time.

Checklists are normally used (see Chapter References) and at each stage, Road Safety Auditors should provide proposals for improvements.

➢ **ROAD SAFETY AUDIT PROCESS**

As a relatively new road safety procedure, RSA requires an efficient organisational structure and with clear responsibilities. The general RSA procedure will include three main phases:
1. Ordering, 2. Conducting and 3. Completion.

[1] In some countries an additional stage is introduced - Road Safety Impact Assessment (RSIA) to enable safety checks to be done at planning stage when decisions are made about the route, junction strategy, access controls, etc. before design even starts.

The following chart (Figure I1) describes the typical RSA process.



- **QUALIFICATION OF ROAD SAFETY AUDITORS**

It is essential that the auditor has extensive experience in road safety issues.

The general expectation is that RSA Team Leader (TL) should have completed relevant university education preferably with Master's degree in a relevant topic such as Traffic Engineering and have significant experience in road safety engineering (design) and/or road traffic crash investigation. Minimum requirements for RSA Team Leader should be at least five years of working experience in the field of RSA and minimum 3 RSA Reports written in the last two years. In addition to this, TL should possess a certificate of competence in road safety audits (i.e. License issued by a recognised institution). RSA Team Members (TM) should ideally hold at least a Bachelor's degree and a minimum of three years of experience in road safety engineering (design) and road traffic crash investigation or else have had at least 10 year's experience in in working on safety engineering or related traffic safety fields such as traffic policing.

Auditors should possess driving licenses and have good knowledge of Road Design Standards, Traffic Safety Law, and Law on Roads. The knowledge of other related standards is highly desirable.

To ensure the quality of the audit, auditors should undergo initial training, resulting in the award of a Certificate of Competence (CoC) and should take part in further training at least once every 3 years. The training should include site inspections of existing roads identified as having a high rate of crashes from police reports to get an understanding and picture of safety deficiencies in design. In the case where teams undertake audits, at least one member of the team, apart from the team leader, should hold a CoC. Some variations of qualifications are expected in different parts of the World due to the scarcity of adequately qualified specialists.

It is important to note, that this Practical Guide is not intended to be seen as a detailed design manual. It is just a collection of the most common types of design failures and suggested ways to overcome these.

1 ROAD FUNCTION:

1.1 ROADS WITH MIXED FUNCTION (LINEAR SETTLEMENTS)

Background and possible problems

A mixture of road functions (usage of the road as fast distributors for fast long distance motorised traffic and as a route for slow local traffic) causes one of the major road safety problems especially in Low and Medium-Income Countries (LMICs). This is a typical problem in countries where the development of linear communities along a major road can rapidly cause unsafe conditions and reduce the effectiveness of a nationally or regionally significant route as a result of the local traffic activities and needs conflicting with the through route function of the road.

In such cases, the role of the road in the road hierarchy becomes confused. While the road is passing through settlements (without the existence of by-pass), can it keep its geometry unchanged? Can it be called International/Regional/National road, or does it become a "street" for that section? This, simple planning (designing) and access control mistake of road administrations, can cause tremendous problems in road safety. Once intense development has been allowed to occur, it is then very difficult to achieve safety improvements without major reconstruction on a new alignment.

Often even when a bypass has been built, the village, over time, may extends out across to the new road. This is mainly an issue of ensuring effective access control (See Chapter 1.2).

Examples of unsafe designs

1+1 road with mixed function

2+2 road with mixed function

Typical accidents in accordance with CADaS:



Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction



Pedestrian in the road



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions



At least two vehicles - head-on collision in general



At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning left (right) in front of another vehicle

CADaS: Common Accident Data Set (EU Protocol), presented within Chapter 10.

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Separation of slow and fast traffic by small distributor roads either between the main road and house or behind those ($$-$$$) - Construction of by-pass Best but expensive solution with the high possibility that one-day a new by-pass will be needed ($$$) If building a bypass, the opportunity should be taken to downgrade the old road by narrowing it, widening footpaths etc. to deter through traffic using it. The number of connections between the bypass and the new road should be kept low.	**8 - 30 %** **16 - 33 %** (these figures include crashes on old road network and by-pass)	 Example of small distributor roads (blue) and by-pass (red) around the built-up area
2. Grade separation of long distance and local traffic - Full space separation of fast moving vehicles and local transport. Fast road with access control (grade separated intersections, acceleration/ deceleration lanes, etc.) ($$$) - Separation of pedestrians (pedestrian bridges or underpasses with ramps and no steps) ($$)	**20 - 57 %** **13 - 44 %** (including all crashes)	
3. Changing character of road (from mobility to accessibility) – so it acts as a street. The primary task is to “kill” the speed - Building of entering/exit islands or roundabouts ($$) - Narrowing of the road ($) - Implementation of different traffic calming measures ($)	**11 - 47 %** **2 - 10 %** **5 - 12 %** (including road narrowing)	 Example of speed reducing entering/exit island to/from the built-up areas

$-Small amount of investment (mostly short-term measures);
$$-Medium amount of investment (usually midterm measures);
$$$-Significant amount of investment (mostly long-term measures)

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of road elements within the built-up areas

1.2 ACCESS CONTROL

Background and possible problems

Along interurban roads, strong access control is the basis of road safety. The precise legal regulation of developments along the road in road legislation is necessary for avoiding development of linear settlements. However, access control is also a safety issue for urban roads.

Limiting the number of access points to the road/street is usually done for two reasons. The first is to limit the number of side roads joining a major route, in order to reinforce a road hierarchy and to concentrate potentially dangerous turning movements at a single junction, which must be properly designed for such movements. The second reason is to reduce through traffic in a residential area, by making the route into and through an area tortuous and lengthy so that it deters through traffic.

These situations should be predominantly urban, but in LMICs there can be examples of trading posts on major regional/rural routes where a number of direct access points occur at closely spaced intervals. Such locations are often become black spots, due to uncontrolled turning movements and pedestrian activity. By closing most (or all but one) of the accesses, and one of the exits, turning movements could be redirected and concentrated at single points of entry and exit where other additional measures can be applied to deal with them more safely.

Examples of unsafe designs

Missing access control (Route 6)

Linear settlement along interurban road

Typical accidents:



Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction



Pedestrian on the road



Pedestrian walking along the road



At least two vehicles - crossing (no turning) - different



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions



Single vehicle accidents with animals



At least two vehicles - opposite direction no turning – reversing

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Closing of direct access to road and construction of parallel service road which will collect traffic and connect to the main road at only a few better-designed junctions ($$$)	**8 - 30 %**	
2. Traffic signage and traffic calming measures: - Traffic lanes narrowing on the main road ($$) - Traffic stream channelization ($$) - Pedestrian crossings with refugee islands ($) - Warning and speed limit signs (reduction in speed limit) ($)	 **15 - 37%** **15 - 37%** **3 - 21 %** **13 - 16 %**	 Access to/from buildings prevented by a wall and only allowed at a single location

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of parallel service road and roundabout for connection to the main road

(Traffic from buildings 1,2,3,4 not permitted to join the main road directly
but is controlled via the service road and brought to a better safer junction)

1.3 EXCESSIVE SPEED

Background and possible problems

Excessive speed and driver inattention are two of the most commonly occurring contributory factors in road crashes. Because of the different demands, the auditor should clarify if the road section is inside or outside a built-up area. There is also an urgent need to give the driver the relevant information about the situation. That means the details of design, the signing (e.g. city limit sign) or other indication to show driver is entering a different type of area should give the drive a clear picture about the speed limit.

Interurban sections: Long straight road sections, can increase speed (see Chapter 2. Alignment). Reducing speed, therefore, is likely to offer substantial safety benefits. In LMICs speed limits are widely abused, especially on intercity sections, and police enforcement is not seen as frequently on the road. Self-enforcing physical measures are necessary to encourage, or force, drivers to slow down and obey speed limits. Several methods have been developed to achieve this. Self-enforcing measures, such as road geometry to discourage particular movements and speed cameras to deter speeding on intercity roads are possible and desirable treatments/measures.

Urban areas: In a residential area, where city by-passes or separation of long distance and local transport does not exist, through traffic strongly interacts and conflicts with local inhabitants and therefore should be treated in a different way. In this case, the road acts as a local street. Therefore, the concept of speed calming devices (road humps), sometimes called “sleeping policemen”, should be considered as the cheapest and most effective physical measure for speed reduction.

Other measures can be implemented such as chicanes, road narrowing, median island, roundabout, etc. Most of these measures should be implemented at the entrance/exit of the settlement and drivers speed be influenced by the changed condition of the road as it passes through the settlement.

Examples of unsafe designs


Wide carriageway and high speed


Long stretch section and high speed

Typical accidents:


At least two vehicles - head-on collision in general


Single vehicle accidents on the road


Single vehicle accident - Leaving straight road - either side of the road


At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions


Single vehicle accidents with obstacles - others

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. On interurban road section:		 
- speed limit management (reduction in speed limits) ($)	13 – 16 %	
- lane width reduction (overtaking traffic lane from 3.75 to 3.50 m) (no costs, savings)	15 – 37 %	
- speed cameras ($)	16 – 19 %	
- variable massage signs ($$)	24 – 62 %	
- traffic police speed control (stationary speed enforcement) ($)	5 – 24 %	
- traffic police patrols (mobile forms of enforcement)	12 – 20 %	
2. Through traffic in a residential area (where no by-passes or separation of long distance and local traffic):		
- built-up areas entering islands ($$)	11 – 47 %	
- narrowing of the road ($$)	2 – 10 %	
- roundabout ($$/$$$)	14 – 47 %	
- central (refugee) island ($$)	3 – 21 %	
- rumble strips ($)	25 – 40 %	
- speed humps ($)	42 – 54 %	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of rumble strips on an entrance to the built-up area used for speed reduction.
(Rumble strips used to give advance warning before entry point or “gateway” to the urban area where the interurban road becomes a “street” as it passes through the settlement.
Speed reduction can be maintained by sped reduction measures at intermittent intervals on the road as it passes through the settlement.)

2 CROSS SECTION:

2.1 TYPES OF CROSS PROFILES (WIDTH OF THE ROAD)

Background and possible problems

A cross section will normally consist of the carriageway, shoulders or kerbs, drainage features, and earthwork profiles. It may also include in built-up areas facilities for pedestrians, cyclists, or other special road user groups. There is some evidence to suggest that widening lane or carriageway width or widening shoulders up to a certain extent (1 m) is beneficial in reducing certain types of crashes. However, beyond a certain point (1 m) it can have negative effects (users will start using extended width as a regular lane). Dangerous cross sections of express roads and highways are still used in. For example, a four lane road without a crash barrier or two lane road with wide hard shoulders. Drivers can sometimes misuse a road with a wide hard shoulder, as a very narrow four lane road, with disastrous results and severe crashes.

The road surface performance must ensure adequate grip for tires and should be a stable driving surface. In the case of a run-off the carriageway the shoulder must also be stable enough to keep the car in an acceptable position and to make it possible for the driver to guide the car back to the carriageway. That means the difference of bearing capacity of these adjacent areas should be taken into consideration. In several countries, for that reason, gravel stabilised, shoulders are in use as a cost-effective and functional solution. This stabilised shoulder strip is also stable enough to carry trucks. On the other hand, this kind of surface is not "attractive" as (illegal) driving space.

Cross sections, particularly on roads through built-up areas, are often not uniform or consistent. Local developments may encroach onto the carriageway because of the lack of effective planning control. In rural conditions, cross sections may be reduced at drainage structures causing sudden changes in width. Maintenance of the road in full profile affects the safety situation. If a pavement width reduces due to the lack of maintenance (water on the pavement, sand, gravel, debris, etc.) or pavement breaking at the edges effectively narrowing the road width, head on collisions or loss of control over a vehicle can occur.

Steep side slopes, introduced for drainage purposes, do not allow a driver time/space to recover in situations where he leaves the carriageway, and thereby add to the likelihood of a crash. Open channel drains can also increase the probability that if a driver error occurs, vehicle wheels may go into the drain and cause vehicle to crash.

Examples of unsafe designs

Too wide traffic lanes

1+1 road with wide (asphalted) hard shoulders

Typical accidents:



At least two vehicles - head-on collision in general



Hitting parked vehicles on the right (left) side of the road



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions



Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction



Pedestrian in the road

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Reconstruction of cross section - Changing into one of the safest solutions (motorway cross profile) ($$$) - Introducing of the 2+1 cross-section with the marked median area, where each direction periodically and alternatively is given two lanes. This gives the opportunity of safe overtaking along 40% of the road length for traffic volumes up to 20.000 vehicles per day) ($$) - New median barrier for 4-lane roads without barrier ($$)	**10 – 80 %**	
2. Road improvements (Rehabilitation) - Installation of medians ($$$) - Reducing the lane width (in built-up areas) - Improving slopes – flattening side slopes ($$) - Gravel stabilised shoulder	 **7 – 24 %** **15 – 37 %** **18 – 46 %**	 
3. Better signing and marking - Improved signing – usage of warning signs, speed limit signs and VMS. Use of high reflective and raised markings ($) - Improved markings – usage of central hatching, rumble strips, "ghost" islands, etc. ($)	**10 – 62 %** **11 – 35 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



X4ms = 4x (3.00 to 3.75) metre wide lanes + median + 1,5 emergency lane
X4m = 4x (3.00 to 3.75) metre wide lanes + median
X4 = 4x (3.00 to 3.75) metre wide lanes No median!
b2 = 2 x 3.50-metre wide lanes
C2 = 2x 3.25-metre wide lanes + speed limit
b2s = 2x 3.50-metre wide lanes + 2.5m emergency lane: used as four lane roads
b2+1 = 2x 3.50 metre wide lanes + an overtaking lane alternatively used (regulated by markings, plastic poles, or barriers)

Example of cross section influence on crash severity
(BASt – Federal Highway Research Institute in Germany with example of dangerous cross sections)

2.2 DRAINAGE

Background and possible problems

The safety issues of drainage can be improved in two fields:

Road surface*:* The auditor should check if the design could ensure fast and save pavement drainage. This is an urgent need to reduce the risk of aquaplaning. Critical are the so-called “transition sections”. That means in sequences of left and right horizontal curves the direction of carriageway crossfall must revolve. In fact, there will be a short area with crossfall of 0%. To ensure a sufficient drainage the long fall of the gradient should be there at least 1.5%.

Drainage provisions*:* Drainage ditches are an essential part of all roads, which are not on an embankment and must be incorporated into most highways. They are designed to take up the expected rainfall but can often be hazardous to vehicles that run off the road. Therefore, adequate attention should be paid to the safety considerations of drainage facilities when designing and upgrading highways. Unfortunately, deep and steep-sided drainage channels can result in more damage in the case of vehicles going off the road. In a case of hitting high curbstones with a sharp shape, the vehicle overturn with serious results. This requires an “error forgiving” design of such facilities. Inadequate maintenance and clearing of debris from drainage channels, especially on the uphill side of the carriageway where large volumes of solid material are often washed down into the ditch, can result in water and debris overflowing onto the carriageway. This results in the potential danger of drivers colliding with debris or aquaplaning.

In LMICs, rural roads become the main pedestrian routes between adjacent communities and the absence of pedestrian footpaths forces pedestrians to walk along the road, especially if the drainage ditch is of such type (e.g. deep U or V type) which cannot be used as a pedestrian route. Unprotected U and V type ditches present a hazard to motorised vehicles particularly motorcyclists. These types of drainage should be covered as this reduces problems for vehicles, particularly motorcyclists/bicyclists. Another possibility is to give the ditches a smooth rounded shape.

When there are culverts, there are often concrete headwalls which are rigid obstacles.

Examples of unsafe designs

Unsafe drainage system, with headwall

Unsafe drainage system, U-Type with headwall

Typical accidents:



Single vehicle accident - Leaving straight road



Single vehicle accidents on the road



Pedestrian walking along the road



Single vehicle accidents with obstacles - others



At least two vehicles - opposite direction no turning - others

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Road improvements - Improving drainage system (adding of ditches with gentler slopes; adding of the gutter) ($$$) - Adding of culverts where is necessary ($$$) - Closing of drainage system – piped drainage ($$$) - Usage of special asphalt types at dangerous locations – improving friction coefficient (bridges, etc.) ($$$)	 No reliable data No reliable data No reliable data **5 – 55 %**	 
2. Usage of traffic signage and equipment - Marking of edge lines as rumble strips (along the deep ditches, in front of culverts, etc.) ($) - Usage of protective devices (guardrails, etc.) ($$)	 **11 – 45 %** **41 – 52 %**	
3. Maintenance of drainage system - Cleaning of ditches ($) - Covering of drainage system ($$)	 No reliable data No reliable data	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Steep sided slope increases risks and rollover



Gentle slope increases chances of recovery

Example of gentler slope of ditch and positive effect on traffic safety (preventing rolling over of vehicles)

3 ALIGNMENT:

3.1 VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL CURVES (CONSISTENCY)

Background and possible problems

In the networks of most LMICs, there is a reasonable percentage of interurban roads with substandard designs, which are not compatible with our modern design principles. It is not possible to have a complete redesign and reconstruction of these road sections. However, in the case of rehabilitation projects it is necessary for the road administration and the auditor to identify the most risky situations and to demand the required improvements.

Safe design parameters consist of two components: Sight Component and Physical-dynamic component. These are usually connected.

Sight Component:
Unexpectedly tight horizontal curves can lead to crashes as drivers try to drive through them at too high a speed. A similar situation may occur on steep gradient where the driver is encouraged or misled (by the approach geometry which is too straight) to think that he can drive at a higher speed than is safe for that particular location. In both cases, drivers are not able to adapt their speed early enough for timely reactions. In addition, the sight distances associated with larger curve radii may also encourage the driver to overtake in unsafe conditions. Poor coordination of the horizontal and vertical alignments can result in misleading visual effects that contribute to crashes and are detrimental to the road appearance. In addition, the skid resistance of the surface should be checked in RSI.

Physical-dynamic component:
- Cross section in curves: The auditor should have in mind if there is a need of widening the cross section in curves. In narrow curves with a radius smaller than 200 m there is a need to have a sufficient widening.
- Steep gradients: Highway sections in mountainous regions generally have sections with steep gradients. Redesign of those sections (by reducing the long fall) is usually impossible, and auditors should think about the alternative possibilities of introducing climbing lanes and arrester beds.
- Transition areas: For transitions, the auditor should obey two safety-related issues - drainage and the usage of spiral curves. Drainage is elaborated in Chapter 2.2. Secondly, a spiral curve can introduce the main circular curve in a natural manner. The spiral transition curve supports a smooth and safe driving manoeuvre and provides a suitable location for the superelevation.

Examples of unsafe designs


Straight section with vertical curve and sharp left curve after hill


Straight section with sharp left curve

Typical accidents:


Single vehicle accident in a bend - going either side of the road


At least two vehicles - head-on collision in general


At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustration
1. Reconstruction of curves - increasing the radii of horizontal curve ($$$) - construction of transition (spiral or compound) curve with adequate skid resistance and superelevation ($$$) - reducing the gradient of vertical curve ($$$) - the consistency of alignment (horizontal and vertical curve) ($$$) - Widening of curves (if R ≤200 m) ($$) - Resurfacing of the top layer of pavement in horizontal curves (better skid resistance with a "High Frictions Surfacing Treatment") ($$) - Retexturing of pavement, e.g. with diamond grooving ($) + - if needed climbing lanes - arrester beds	 **8 – 55 %** **7 – 15 %** **5 – 38 %** **17 – 28 %** **NA** **0 – 50 %** **25-40 %** **25-40%** **NA**	 An inconsistent alignment surprises the driver 
2. Improving sight distance in curves - Forward visibility at the insides of curves (open visibility) ($$) - Removing/cutting of vegetation ($)	 **6 – 38 %** **NA**	
3. Better signing and marking - Better signing (including warning signs, chevron signs, speed reduction and overtaking prohibition signs) ($) - Better marking (including lines as a rumble strip) ($) - Usage of protective devices ($$) - Lighting ($$/$$$)	 **13 – 16 %** **11 – 45 %** **41 – 52 %** **17 – 64 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



The combination of radii for rural roads



Alignment chart straight/curve

3.2 SIGHT DISTANCE (VISIBILITY)

Background and possible problems

In general, the visibility offered to drivers should be sufficient to identify any necessary course of action and then to perform that action safely. A usual critical requirement is that the driver can stop safely, and this requires the understanding of speeds, reaction times and deceleration rates. Sight distance requirements are thus related to geometric design and speed controls and are inherent in all design standards. Visibility may relate to another road user, or to an object such as a road sign.

The following types of sight are taken into consideration:

a. **Stopping sight distance**–to be mandatory along the whole road section,
b. **Orientation sight distance** –this parameter is not included in every national design guideline. However, since decades is it well known, that the orientation sight has very good advantages for the road safety. In German interurban road design guidelines it is recommended to the designer that he should have an orientation site distance in most subsections of the amount of the stopping sight + 30 %. The auditor should advise on that direction in his report.
c. **Passing sight distance** – for two-lane roads. In the most national design guidelines, there is a demand of 20% passing possibility in each direction. Nevertheless, in the most cases, this demand is not easy to ensure, e.g. because of limited sight in curves. For important highways, an additional passing lane (alternate in both directions) could be the safe and economical solution.
d. **Sight distance at junctions**

Pedestrians also need to see and be seen, and crossing movements are often concentrated at or near junctions. From human factors research, drivers need 4-6 seconds to respond to a new situation; this means 300 m ahead if the speed limit is 100 km/h or 200m for 80 km/h.
Warning and information signs may sometimes be so sited that they have poor conspicuity, and the detailing of the road may not provide sufficient additional clues as to the hazard or decision ahead.

Examples of unsafe designs

Sharp left curve + optical illusion (secondary road in curve gives perception that road is going straight)

Insufficient site distance in curve

Typical accidents:



Single vehicle accidents in a bend - going either side of the road



At least two vehicles - different roads - turning left (right) into traffic from the right (left) side



At least two vehicles - crossing (no turning) - different



At least two vehicles - head-on collision in general



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Reconstruction of the curve, intersection, pedestrian crossings, etc. - Improved radius and visibility ($$$)	**8 – 55 %**	 Example of improved radius of horizontal curve and visibility in curve
2. Provide sufficient sight distances for adequate driver reaction - Opening of visibility (see sketch at the end of page) ($$) - Enable proper orientation for drivers (e.g. adding of trees at secondary roads which shows that there is intersection ahead) ($) - Breaking the sightline of the driver is important to show that the road is not continuing ahead.	**20 – 38 %** **no reliable data** **no reliable data**	 
3. Improved signing and marking - improved signing (usage of high-class reflectivity materials for traffic signs, adding of chevron signs in sharp and hidden curves, using of flash beacons on approach to the pedestrian crossing, etc.) ($) - improving markings (usage of reflective glass beads, usage of nonstandard markings, etc.) ($)	**10 – 33 %** **11 – 35 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of speed and peripheral vision



Example of speed and focus point

Conclusion: The faster we drive the further we need to look ahead and vice versa in order to be able to read, understand and react in time to a hazard ahead.

4 INTERSECTIONS:

4.1 CHANNELIZATION OF TRAFFIC FLOWS

Background and possible problems

The designer and auditor should have in mind some general considerations about the road safety of intersections. Golden rules for intersections are: Every intersection must be visible early enough; Traffic regulation must be understandable from the signing and marking; The design should support traffic regulations; Good sight conditions for all users; The geometry has to ensure enough space for the relevant driving manoeuvres.

The intersection should be located in a road section with good visibility conditions. The best place is often in a sag curve of vertical alignment. The minimum visibility condition should be ensured for all legs of the intersection, but this is particularly important for the secondary legs that should give way. The design must be such that the road can easily understand how he must behave. This can be done, for example, by a channelising. In built-up areas, the needs of vulnerable road users are particularly important for road safety. Traffic islands have the added benefit of providing a refuge for pedestrians crossing the road. They also provide a convenient location for street furniture such as signs, street lighting and drainage covers

Channelization guides the driver through the conflict points, provides safe areas for him to stop while making a manoeuvre and reduces conflicts between different flows of traffic. The minimum demand regarding road safety is to have at least separate central turning lanes and traffic island in the secondary leg of the junction. A raised traffic island in the secondary leg will support the need of the give way-regulation. Turning lanes can help to reduce the risks of rear-end crashes.

For high-speed roads with a high traffic volume, road safety often can be increased by grade separation.

For all other roads, the auditor should bear in mind that in the event of a crash the consequences are often severe with crash and casualty severity depending on the speed of cars. Because of that, it is recommended that the legal speed in the area of the intersection should at maximum be 70 km/h.

Examples of unsafe designs

Missing channelisation in junction

Missing channelisation in junction

Typical accidents:



At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning left (right) in front of another vehicle



At least two vehicles - crossing (no turning) - different



At least two vehicles - head-on collision in general



At least two vehicles - same direction - entering traffic



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions

Possible safe countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Construction of raised (kerb) islands - Local widening (if necessary) and clear guidance of driver with raised (kerb) islands ($$) - Narrowing of traffic lanes (if existing lines are too wide) ($$) - Additional lighting ($$) - Sufficient length for left/right turning lane ($$)	**15 – 37 %** (full channelization at crossroads)	
2. Usage of markings and traffic equipment - Clear marking of traffic lanes for better guiding of drivers ($) - Plastic markers, flex poles and other rubber elements can be used ($) - Advance information signs for lane direction ($)	**42 – 68 %** (full channelisation at crossroads)	
3. Usage of "ghost" island - Different texture of island surface could be used with edges on pavement level ($) - Markings and rumble strips for better guiding of drivers and unpleasant feeling crossing over the island ($) - Reflective studs for the delineation of lanes especially during night time condition ($)	No reliable data	 Example of "ghost" island
4. Separate left turning lanes ($) - Separate lane marked in the centre of the road to provide a safe area for turning cars	10-25%	
5. Traffic signalisation with signalised turning lanes ($$)	25-40%	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of channelisation of "T" junction in built-up areas
(Note the “protected” lane for turning traffic where it can wait in safety until a suitable gap appears to allow it to turn)

4.2 INTERSECTION TYPES (“Y” TYPE, ROUNDABOUTS, ETC.)

Background and possible problems

A junction is required wherever two or more roads cross or meet so that vehicles can pass through the junction in ways that are both safe and understandable for all road users. It is important that the junction is appropriate for the site and that it is defined regarding road priorities and legitimate manoeuvres.

Common junction shapes are a T-junction, X-junction and staggered junction and crossroads. If an inappropriate junction type is used at a particular site, such as a “Y” type junction, significant safety problems can occur, including high crash rates, unnecessary delay, and congestion.

Roundabouts are a very effective form of intersection, as they require all vehicles to reduce speed as the pass through the intersection. They are particularly useful where there are large turning flows or where there is a need to reduce speeds of traffic. The most common problem preventing more widespread use of roundabouts is the lack of familiarity of drivers with the proper use of this type of traffic control. One of the road safety facts about roundabouts is that the number of minor crashes can even increase, but the number of fatalities and serious injuries will decrease due to impact angle and reduced speeds of impact. Roundabout design should be such that approaching drivers sightline straight ahead is disrupted, he should have to deviate to go around the central island and the vehicle should not be able to drive through a roundabout without slowing down.

Examples of unsafe designs

Dangerous “Y” type intersection

Dangerous “Y” type intersection

Typical accidents:



At least two vehicles - head-on collision in general



At least two vehicles - turning or crossing - same road - same direction - turning left (right)



At least two vehicles - different roads - turning left (right) into traffic from the right (left) side



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions



Hitting pedestrian - turning right (left)

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. For "Y" type of junction: - Full reconstruction from "Y" type into "T" ($$$) - Improving visibility ($$/$) - Improving signing and marking ($) - Adding of rumble stripes ($) - Clear prioritisation of main traffic stream by signage and markings ($) - Additional "STOP" sign for minor road approaches. ($)	**20 - 70 %** **5 - 18 %** **11 - 35 %** **25 - 40 %**	
2. For cross-roads with high traffic volume on minor road approach: - Full reconstruction to staggered junctions ($$$) - Adding of traffic signals ($) - Channelization of traffic flows (narrowing of traffic lanes) ($$) - Usage of "STOP" sign on minor roads ($) - Additional traffic (turning) lanes on the minor approaches ($$)	**21 - 43%** **25 - 35%** **15 - 37%** **25 - 44%**	 Possible forms of junction staggering
3. For roundabouts - Channelization of traffic flows (narrowing of traffic lanes) ($$) - Adding of raised (curb) islands (pedestrian refuge islands and central island of the roundabout which should be shaped like a hill) to break sight lines of approaching traffic Bus bays should be at the exits behind the pedestrian crossing ($$). - Usage of "Give Way" signs at all approaching legs with the priority of traffic in a circle (this is still not a standard solution in some of the Post-Soviet states) ($)	**15 - 37%** **3 - 21%** **3 - 9%**	One-circle lane roundabouts are the safest and cost-effective type of junctions up to a traffic volume of 20.000 cars/day incoming vehicles per day within and outside of built-up areas as well.

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of traffic flows channelisation on approaches to the roundabout

4.3 U-TURNS

Background and possible problems

Policies regarding the provision of gaps in medians, particularly in urban areas must balance the needs of both local and through traffic in terms of connections to local streets and enabling of U-turns. Their number should be kept to an absolute minimum, and wherever possible roundabouts overpasses/underpasses should be provided instead of allowing U-turns. The primary consideration which governs median opening (U-turns) is minimum turning path (that is, the length of median opening depends upon the width of the median and the minimum turning the path of the most massive vehicle allowed on that road). If U-turns are to be permitted they should have protected lanes from which to make the U-turn.

Road crashes tend to cluster at median gaps particularly on dual carriageways mainly due to the conflict between the slow manoeuvre of a wide turn and fast approaching vehicles (usually with high speed) from the other direction and from behind (If there is no protected lane from which to make the U turns).

There is always a conflict between serving the demands of local traffic and through traffic. The poor planning of U-turns is contrary to the interest of any wide-scale area traffic control proposals for removing through traffic from the local street system. The openings are also sometimes provided at locations where due to the horizontal and vertical geometry of the road, the movements of vehicles using the facility are not clearly visible to other road users. Where local traffic dominates, the conflict between local and through traffic gets more serious. This problem is aggravated by poor design standards used for right/left turning lanes which do not offer adequate protection to the turning vehicle.

In the case of problems with unsafe U-Turns, one of the possibilities can be the construction of roundabout as a safe solution. Unsafe U-turns can be closed if there is a possibility to construct a roundabout nearby.

Examples of unsafe designs

U-turn at high-speed road Danger place for U-turn

Danger place for U-turn

Typical accidents:



At least two vehicles - U-turn in front of the other vehicle



At least two vehicles - same direction - U-turn in front of the other vehicle



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Construction of "flyover" U-turns (grade separation of traffic streams) - Changing existing U-turn into safer solution with grade separation of traffic streams ($$$)	**no reliable data**	
2. Reconstruction of cross section (U-turn) - Changing existing U-turn into safer solution ($$$) - Protected deceleration lane for turning vehicle -A short crossing of opposite carriageway at right angle to minimise exposure and then an acceleration lane to join the traffic on that carriageway	**15 – 37 %**	
3. U-turn improvements (Rehabilitation) - Widening and creation of left turning lane ($$$) - Improving U-turn radius ($$) - ITS implementation to reduce traffic speed ($$) - Additional signing and markings ($) - Where ever possible, roundabouts will offer safe U-turning manoeuvres	**4 – 27 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of U-turn for both directions
(Note the protected lane for turning traffic to wait in safety, the short exposure when crossing and acceleration lane with hatched area to run in parallel to mainstream until merging can occur).

4.4 RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Background and possible problems

Level, crossings can be hazardous because of the crash severity when a train hits a vehicle.

In some LMICs there are still many railway crossings operated just by warning signs. For various reasons drivers do not stop and give way to trains. Sometimes the visibility/sight conditions are not suitable, the speed of car is too high or sometimes road geometry makes crossings hidden to approaching drivers. Better safety performance can be seen when there are active warning lights and/or barriers (ramps) installed. In the case of automatic or manual ramps, it is recommended that they close the whole width of road, not just half of the road because there are many cases when rail/road crashes occur while drivers are trying to cross the road illegally by zig zagging between the barriers

Sometimes are there additional road safety deficiencies in design (e.g. risks for two-wheel riders, pedestrians, etc.).

For road and railway sections with a high amount of traffic and high operating speeds, the safest solution is grade separation.

Where large numbers of pedestrians can be expected, it is recommended that special solutions be applied such as footpath crossing barriers)

Examples of unsafe designs

Dangerous railway crossing

Dangerous double railway crossing

Typical accidents:



Accidents between train and vehicle



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Improvements to railway crossings - installing warning lights ($) - installing barriers (automatically controlled ramps) ($-$$) - grade separation ($$$)	**60 % or more**	 Railway crossing with barriers and additional warning equipment  Overpass instead of level crossing

Sketches (with dimensions):



Possible layout (Germany)

5 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SERVICES

5.1 SERVICES ALONG ROADSIDE

Background and possible problems

Roadside facilities (rest places and petrol stations) are necessary to serve the long-distance traffic between regions and towns (villages). Drivers need to rest at least once every 2 or 3 hours in order to maintain their concentration when driving. It is useful to combine rest areas with petrol and service stations at 30 – 50 km distances. Entrances and exits to and from Service and Rest areas can cause disruption to traffic on the main carriageway if they are not separated well, and particular attention must be given to design and maintenance of deceleration and acceleration lanes. It is vital that sufficient rest areas are provided at around 10 km intervals but not too many to avoid constant disruption of the main flow of traffic by continually exiting and merging traffic. Local farmers may use such rest areas for selling goods. To minimise such activity along the roads vendors should reach the areas from minor service roads behind the service area and be warned that if anyone encroaches to sell on the main road then that layby might be closed off. Local vendors must police and prevent encroachment onto the road.

In the LMICs there are many examples where roads are encroached upon by unacceptable commercial services, or where there are unsuitable rest areas. This is dangerous for all road users, because of the enormous speed difference and a mixture of different categories of road users (sudden vehicle stops and entering the traffic, as well as the presence of unprotected pedestrians on high-speed roads.

Master plans, land usage, urban development, and restrictions on access to the public road network are key elements for preventing these types of crashes. In good planning system, these types of crashes could be prevented in the early stage of planning, during Road Safety Impact Assessments (RSIA). Effective access and development controls can prevent such unsafe conditions developing.

Examples of unsafe designs

Services along road

Services along road

Typical accidents:



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions



At least two vehicles - same direction - entering traffic



Hitting parked vehicles right (left) side of the road



Pedestrian walking along the road



At least two vehicles - U-turn in front of the other vehicle

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Improving entrance/exit to services along roadside - Construction of adequate deceleration and acceleration traffic lanes also at non-divided and rural highways ($$$-$$) - Channelization of traffic flows at entrance/exit ($$)	**15 – 37 %**	
2. Improving parking areas - Separation from traffic ($$) - Adding and remarking of pedestrian walkways ($$) - Adequate position of parking regarding objects and services ($$/$$$)	 **16 – 33 %** **10 – 32 %** **No reliable data**	
3. Improving signing and marking of services along the roadside - Proper signing/marking (speed limit signs, directional signs, wrong way signs, parking places, pedestrian crossings, etc.) ($) - Adding of proper lighting ($$) - Additional installation of guardrails ($)	 **2 – 10 %** **25 – 74 %** **31 – 54 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of organisation of Rest area with parking and design of traffic signs

5.2 FACILITIES FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT (BUS STOPS)

Background and possible problems

In the most of the LMICs, there is a diverse range of public transport modes. Economic factors can result in many of these being unsafe, but often they are the only available modes of travel for the majority of people. In such circumstances, the priorities need to be aimed at limited regulation to ensure that the safety of passengers is adequately catered for through regular roadworthiness screening of vehicles and by having basic minimum standards for drivers and operators providing such services. Drivers are often poorly trained and educated, and road crashes involving public transport vehicles are sadly commonplace with at times, major catastrophes occurring.

In rural areas, bus bays provided with a divider from the main carriageway are often not used by buses, which stop on the carriageway instead. This is because bus bays without dividers are often used by different activities (trading, parking, etc.) which encroach into the bus bay. In urban areas, such bus bays with dividers seem to operate better.

At those stops, conflict can exist between the bus and other vehicles and vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists. Usually, pedestrian flows to and from Bus stops are not well catered for. Pedestrian crossings on routes to the Bus stop (say 100 m to each direction) are often inadequate.
In discussions regarding the public bus network there is a need to have the safety of potential users more in focus. For example, in some countries, bus stops are located directly on the highway and on the wrong of the villages. The passengers have to cross, in some cases 4-lane roads, under very unsafe conditions and unsafe facilities (e.g. marked pedestrian crossing where the legal speed is 100 km/h). Therefore, especially when there is a combination of a high-speed highway with a high traffic volume and a reasonable number of bus users and/or special groups of users (elder people, pupils) the bus should go directly to a bus stop in the village and before going back onto the main road to resume its journey direction.

Examples of unsafe designs

BUS stop at highway

BUS stop at highway

Typical accidents:



Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction



Pedestrian walking along the road



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions



Hitting parked vehicles right (left) side of the road



At least two vehicles - same direction - entering traffic

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Removing Bus stops from main traffic flow - Separation of Bus bays from main traffic flow and connection with pedestrian crossings ($$$) - Construction of pedestrian footpath to and from Bus stops ($$/$$$) * The locations of bus stops at the exits of roundabouts are very useful and safe because the speed of passing vehicles is still low.	**34 – 90 %**	
2. Improving Bus bay within existing traffic - Traffic calming measures in zone of Bus bay ($$$-$$) - Relocation of BUS bay ($$$) Note that the pedestrian crossing is located behind the bus, stop bay to reduce risks. Ideally, the pedestrian crossing should be raised, and there should be a safe waiting area at the centre of the road to permit pedestrians to cross in 2 movements.	**25 – 54 %** **No reliable data**	
3. Improving signing /marking and road furniture of Bus Stops - Improved signs and marking of Bus Stop ($) - Adding of proper lighting ($$) - Additional installation of guardrails ($) - Additional installation of pedestrian fence ($) - ITS installation in Bus stop location (see example from chapter 7.1 Signing) ($$)	**2 – 10 %** **25 – 74 %** **31 – 54 %** **No reliable data in this context**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



* for recommended values L=16.00 BUS, 29.00 2xBUS for minimal values L=12.00 BUS, 25.00 2xBUS	a	b	c	R1	R2	R3	R4
recom.	25,00	15,00	3,96	80	60	20	40
min.	15,00	10,00	2,94	30	20	12	20

Recommended and minimal values for Bus bay
(Note that pedestrian crossing is behind the bus bay so passengers coming off from Bus and crossing the road can be seen by the following traffic).

6 VULNERABLE ROAD USER NEEDS:

6.1 PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

Background and possible problems

There are different possibilities to increase the safety for crossing pedestrians. To define the appropriate measure the local circumstances must take into consideration: - the expected traffic volume of pedestrians (e.g. high numbers of crossing pedestrians); - the urban pattern; - the traffic volume, etc.

Serious problems can arise when we have road sections of important highways with a high traffic volume passing through towns or cities combined with a high numbers of pedestrians. The best long-term measure would be for the core network of highways to have bypasses constructed around towns. This is of course, is not possible everywhere.

The single main contributing factor regarding pedestrian safety is the speed of traffic. To increase safety, the maximum speed limit in built-up areas should be 50 km/h and reduced further to 30 km/h at areas of high risk (e.g. in front of schools ,near busy shopping streets etc.). There are many guidelines and handbooks specifically for the design of safe pedestrian crossings. The German Guidelines for Pedestrian Traffic (EFA) includes a method to choose safe and cost-effective solutions for pedestrian crossings. The solution depends on the number of lanes, road width, number of crossing pedestrians and the legal speed. On 4-lane roads, there are higher risks for those crossing the road because of sight line and visibility problems. It is recommended to construct at least median stripes as a help to crossing and to have separate pedestrian traffic lights there or to use a combination with the traffic lights at junctions.

In the case of high traffic volume or/and a character of the road like a city motorway, the at-grade pedestrian crossing should be forbidden. Heavy crossing demands may often occur away from junctions where vehicle speeds are very high. The provision of underpasses or overbridges, however, may be too expensive and may not be well used by pedestrians. It is no use just fencing off the pedestrians and making them walk excessive lengths to reach a footbridge, as they will just try to cross the busy road at grade. Designers and the road authority need to provide crossings, which the pedestrians will willingly use.

Examples of unsafe designs

Pedestrian crossing over four lane carriageway

Useless pedestrian crossing

Typical accidents:



Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction



Pedestrian crossing street at a junction



Pedestrian in the road



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions



Single vehicle accidents - others

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Separated pedestrian crossings		
- Construction of underpasses or overbridges - costly and efficient solution – attention should be paid to pedestrian wiliness to use ($$$)	**13 – 44 %**	
- Underpass/overbridge lighting ($$$/$$)	**9 – 32 %**	
- Installation of pedestrian guardrail in wider zone of underpass/overbridge ($$)	**N/A**	
- Motivation of pedestrians to use bridge or underpass by installing: - Different advertisements - Signage and markings - Violation recording of offenders - Good lighting - Clean, well-maintained underpasses	**N/A**	* Using ramps instead of stairs encourages use by less able persons
2. Narrowing of road and usage of refuge islands		
- Narrowing of the traffic lanes ($$)	**15 – 37 %**	
- Installation of refuge island with fencing to redirect pedestrians to face traffic before crossing ($$)	**3 – 21 %**	
- Adding pedestrian traffic lights ($) can be combined with medians and islands or incorporated into existing installation at intersections	**25 – 40 %**	(Pedestrians at Central Island can be redirected via safety fences, so they face traffic before making second crossing)
- Lighting of pedestrian crossing ($$$/$$)	**17 – 64 %**	
- Installation of pedestrian guardrail ($)	**25 – 40%**	
3. Connecting of pedestrian paths (walking routes) with crossings		
- Marking of pedestrian crossing ($)	**10 – 58 %**	
- Raised pedestrian crossing ($)	**35 – 67 %**	
- School crossing patrol ($)	**25 – 54 %**	
- Adding to speed-reducing devices (humps, rumble strips, etc.) near pedestrian crossing ($)	**20 – 80 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Good example of pedestrian crossing and BUS stops

6.2 FOOTPATHS AND FOOTWAYS

Background and possible problems

Pedestrians should not have to walk at all along interurban, high-speed roads. Hard shoulders are not intended for vulnerable road users but for emergency use by vehicles only. That means that on through road sections or comparable road sections along built-up areas there is a need in every case for separate footpaths. If there are building along both side of the through road, the footpaths should also be on both sides of the road. This can reduce risk because the need to cross the road is minimised.

Pedestrian accidents contribute a substantial proportion of road accident deaths and injuries. Pedestrians are particularly at risk in urban surroundings. In LMICs they typically contribute one third to one half, or even more, of total deaths. Roads in towns are usually designed with raised pedestrian footways as part of the cross-section, but on interurban roads, footways are rarely provided, although, in some locations, pedestrian flows may be very high.

Footways have great implications for safety, and every effort should be made to segregate pedestrians and vehicles where space allows. Separate routes make travel much safer for vulnerable road users. Special care must be taken to ensure that footways do not become obstructed, especially by street traders and parked vehicles, that the surfaces are comfortable to walk on and that they provide a continuous route.

Substantial conflict problems usually exist where roads pass through rural settlements as the main road traffic travelling very fast often passes very close to the existing buildings leaving no or very narrow footpaths for pedestrians resulting in increased risk and danger for pedestrians.

In the case of reconstruction of an inner urban road, the main design principle should be that, there must first be enough space for pedestrians and cyclists and the rest of the space remaining will then be used for the motorised traffic.

Examples of unsafe designs

Pedestrian "footpath."

Missing of pedestrian footpath

Typical accidents:



Pedestrian walking along the road



Pedestrian in the road



Pedestrians on pavement or bicycle lane



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions



At least two vehicles - head-on collision in general

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Separation of motorised traffic and vulnerable road users wherever possible - Construction of separated pedestrian footways and cyclist tracks ($$$) - Building of footpaths and cyclist lanes/tracks where the road passes through urban areas ($$$) - Building of wider hard shoulder outside urban areas with separation by a barrier or grass verge is needed ($$)	**35 – 67 %** **10 – 32 %** **21 – 32 %**	
2. Time separation - Installation of traffic lights where footpaths (footways) and cyclist tracks/lanes cross the road ($$)	**2 – 12 %**	
3. Good signing and marking of urban and rural footpaths, footways, and cyclist tracks/lanes ($) - speed limitation for vehicles ($) - access control for specific vehicles category ($)	**2 – 10 %**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of marking of footpaths and cyclist tracks on crossing of the road

7 TRAFFIC SIGNING, MARKING, AND LIGHTING:

7.1 SIGNING

Background and possible problems

The proper signing and marking will support road safety by establishing clear communication with road users. There are different categories of signs, which support road users. Within United Nations Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals (1968), eight categories of signs have been defined: A. Danger warning signs; B. Priority signs; C. Prohibitory or restrictive signs; D. Mandatory signs; E. Special regulation signs; F. Information, facilities, or service signs; G. Direction, position, or indication signs; H. Additional panels. Nevertheless, all signs should be located in an effective way to maximize road safety.

Warning signs and warning markings are used to give notice of a potential hazard ahead or any unexpected feature of the road geometry. The signs are used in specific situations when there is a change in the road, such as in a bend, on a high-speed road or the approach to a junction. The location of signs is critical because they should provide adequate warning or information at sufficient distance. However, they should not obscure important road features. Of great importance for the visibility of the signs is that they are located in positions where overgrown vegetation cannot obscure the visibility of the sign. Signs must be visible at all times, so reflective materials should be used for night-time visibility, and urban signs may require being lit internally or externally. In many LMICs ,Sadly it is common for signs to be missing (even at dangerous locations), not properly positioned, without reflectivity, non-standardized or even not uniform to International UN Conventions so efforts must be made to have signs installed wherever possible. Conversely, too many signs can detract from their objective by overloading the driver with too much information too quickly, which leads to confusion or to a situation where the driver ignores certain signs. If reflective signs are not regularly cleaned, they may not retain their designed visibility properties.

Special issues regarding directional signing: In the existing network, there can be requests for specific, customised direction signing which will follow the real geometry of intersections. The best practice is to use the big directional sign to inform the driver about actual road geometry.

Examples of unsafe designs

Hidden sign by tree

Hidden traffic light by sign

Typical accidents:



Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction



Pedestrian crossing street at a junction



At least two vehicles - crossing (no turning) - different



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions



At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning left (right)

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

<table>
<tr><th>Countermeasure with (EC)</th><th>CR</th><th>Illustrations</th></tr>
<tr><td>1. Usage of high class of reflectivity materials for traffic signs
- usage of the higher class of reflectivity materials for signs on motorways and highways (roads with higher speed limit) ($)
- usage of the higher class of reflectivity materials for traffic signs “Yield at entry”, “Stop”, “Pedestrian crossing”, etc. ($)
- yellow-green border usage for highlighting of signs on dangerous places ($)</td><td>10 – 33 %</td><td>

Directional sign shows shape of junction</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Variable message signs (VMS) usage
- accident warning signs ($$)
- fog warning signs ($$)
- queue warning signs on motorways ($$)
- Average over speeding control signs ($$)
- Information signs of average violations at pedestrian crossings ($$)</td><td>
22 – 59 %
63 – 93 %
4 – 26 %
24 – 62 %
65 – 96 %</td><td>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. Maintenance of traffic signs
- Traffic sign maintenance ($)
- Displacement of traffic signs ($)
- Removal and replacement of traffic signs ($)
- Visibility of colours in traffic signing, Yellow – red chevrons are earlier detected than red-white (Black-white are even worse) ($)</td><td>7 – 15 %</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of usage of VMS for speed limit in accordance with BUS stop detection and pedestrian crossing detection

7.2 ROAD MARKINGS

Background and possible problems

Road markings play a very important role in guiding the driver and providing him with the information necessary to negotiate conflict points on the road network and should be of high priority for those seeking to improve road safety. Appropriate information should be given to the driver through the use of different types and colours of road marking. Stop, and give-way lines at junctions help to position the driver on the road to minimise his risk. Center lines can be used to indicate locations where overtaking is dangerous while edge lines give warning of changes in alignment and if corrugated can be used as a warning of drifting towards the shoulder. Where possible, high-quality paint containing small glass beads (for reflectivity at night) should be used. Centre and edge lining reinforced through the use of studs or vibrolines (corrugated) to provide rumble warning are strongly recommended.

Although some of the LMICs have national standards for road marking, some of the roads often do not have good markings (e.g. without reflectivity and/or are partially missing). This is partly because road marking paint available locally often tend to be of poor quality while imported road marking paint is often considered to be too expensive (although it lasts longer and reduces the risk of crashes).

The poor conditions of roads (potholes, deformations, etc.) can also make road marking difficult to apply in any effective manner. Shortage of specialised machinery, skilled/trained technicians and the cost of imported thermoplastics prevents more widespread use.

Examples of unsafe designs

"Phantom" markings

Too narrow accelerating lane

Typical accidents:



At least two vehicles - same direction - side collision



At least two vehicles - same direction - others



Single vehicle accidents in a bend - going either side of the road



Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasures with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Improved road markings: - Reflective glass beads for road markings ($) - Durable road marking materials (cold plastic, thermoplastic, fabricated tapes) ($$/$) - Delineators ($) - Reflective road markers / studs ($) - Rumble strips, edge rib-lines, reflective road studs, etc. ($) - Non-standard markings for school zones, dangerous locations, etc. ($) - Marking of traffic signs on pavement ($) - Different colours of road markings (for highlighting of standard elements of road markings) ($) - Different pavement color ($)	**2 – 7 %** **8 – 21 %** **17 – 45 %**	 
3. Maintenance of road markings - Remarking ($) - Cleaning of markings ($)	**No reliable data**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of road marking of traffic sign for school zone

7.3 LIGHTING

Background and possible problems

Night-time crashes on roads passing through urban areas or on streets in urban areas can be substantially reduced by the implementation of adequate road/street lighting. It is particularly important where there are high proportions of pedestrians, cyclists, or other poorly lit road users, including animals. Lighting should provide a uniformly lit road surface in order to provide visibility of all road users (vehicles and pedestrians) and not to hide them in shadow. The design of the lighting system should be designed to the road surface reflection characteristics in order to provide the optimum quality and quantity of illumination. Light coloured surfaces give better silhouette vision than the dark ones. If only limited funds are available, efforts should be made to provide lighting on at least the most important routes and dangerous locations along such routes such as intersections and pedestrian crossings involving the greatest movement of pedestrians.

Lighting is expensive to install and maintain, but the usage of cheaper LED lighting and solar power lighting system can reduce costs in future years. However, without proper maintenance, the resulting inconsistency in lighting can itself be a safety hazard. Maintenance could often be a problem, because of the inadequacy of the allocated funds. Careful attention needs to be paid to the siting of lamp posts as they can be hazardous for an errant vehicle and if possible, frangible (break away) posts should be used. The column also sometimes can be a significant visual obstruction at critical locations.

For the practical audit, there are more tasks. In some cases, will lighting misguide (e.g. lighting of adjacent areas like a public service besides the highway) the driver or can lead to problems regarding the recognition/conspicuity of traffic signals (glare effects).

Examples of unsafe designs

No lights in tunnel

No street lighting + pedestrian crossing

Typical accidents:



At least two vehicles - head-on collision in general



Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction



Single vehicle accidents in a bend - going either side of the road



Pedestrian in the road



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Addition of light where needed ($$$)	**25 – 74 %**	
2. Evenness of illumination (improving existing lighting quality) ($$) - Usage of solar power and LED for energy saving system	**8 – 20 % (for up to double)** **25 – 79 % (for up to 5 times)**	
3. Maintenance of lighting - Changing of lamps/LED ($) - Cleaning of lamps/LED/solar panels ($) - Installation of guardrails for protection of lamps from traffic and vice versa ($$)	**No reliable data**	

Sketches (with dimensions):



Speed (km/h)	Lenght of transition (m)
50	80
60	110
70	140
80	170
90 and higher	200

Example of lamp placement on 4-leg intersection and roundabout with recommended length of transition zone from lighted section to unlighted one for different speeds ("tunnel effect")

8 ROADSIDE FEATURES, PASSIVE SAFETY INSTALLATIONS, CIVIL ENGINEERING STRUCTURES

8.1 ROADSIDE OBSTACLES (PLANTS, TREES, LIGHT POLES, ADVERTISEMENTS, ETC.)

Background and possible problems

The presence of roadside obstacles, street furniture (for example, road signs and lighting columns) advertising signs and trees has safety implications. The first is the potential danger of collision, and the second is their obstruction of visibility. Visibility is important not only to the driver but also to other road users. Obstructions caused by trees, for example, may result in a pedestrian making an unwise decision.

Great care should be taken concerning the positioning of roadside features which may obstruct visibility, lead to crashes, or increase crash severity. Where it is not practical to remove obstructions which contribute to hazardous situations, consideration should be given to (1) moving the hazard further from the travelled way to create a larger clear zone or recovery area, (2) modifying the hazard to make it more forgiving or (3) shielding the hazard with a properly designed and tested barrier or crash cushion. Once a road is completed, care must be taken to ensure that other institutions such as telephone or electricity authorities do not introduce obstacles subsequently. Vegetation should be trimmed regularly, and planning controls should be enforced to prevent stalls and structures being too close to the road edge.

At some roads in LMICs, trees are planted adjacent to roads to provide shade for pedestrians, animals, and parked vehicles and in other countries to prevent the wind from bringing snow onto the road. If these trees must be planted, they must be recognized as roadside hazards and efforts made to plant the trees further from the travelled way or to shield these trees with a properly designed and tested barrier or crash cushion.

Examples of unsafe designs

This drainage system as an obstacle

Other obstacles

Typical accidents:



Single vehicle accidents with obstacles on or above the road



Single vehicle accidents with obstacles - others



Single vehicle accident - Leaving straight road - either side of the road



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions



Pedestrian walking along the road

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Removing roadside objects from road to create a "clear zone" without potential obstacles - Removing of hard (un-deformable) roadside objects from clear zone ($$$/$$) - Relocation of road layout ($$$)	 **43 – 46 %** **No reliable data**	
2. Relocation of hard roadside objects - Relocation of hard objects out of clear zone (on safe distance) ($$$/$$) - Providing better visibility in clear zone – traffic mirrors, ITS, etc. ($$) Note: There must be obstacle-free zones of minimum 9 m for speed limits of 100 km/h, 6 m for 80 km/h and 3 m for 60 km/h	 **20 – 24 %** **20 – 38 %**	
3. Alter to reduce severity or protect roadside hazards - Frangible lighting/sign/etc. poles ($) - Grade steep slopes, 4:1 or flatter ($$) - Safe culverts ($) - Installation of guardrails ($$$-$$) - Marking of roadside object to make them more visible (usage of reflective signs, etc.) ($) - Marking edge lines in the form of rumble strips ($)	 **25 – 72 %** **38 – 46 %** **No reliable data** **41 – 52 %** **11 – 45 %** **2 – 20 %**	 Barrier around/in front of a tree

Sketches (with dimensions):



Example of vegetation management in cross section of highway

8.2 LONGITUDINAL BARRIERS (GUARDRAILS)

Background and possible problems

Many crashes on high-speed roads involve vehicles leaving the road and colliding with hazardous obstacles such as trees, bridge supports or simply rolling over down a high embankment. Therefore, the safest and best solution would be to ensure an obstacle-free area along the road. If this is not possible, modern, and approved vehicle restraint systems (VRS) should be installed. Similarly, a vehicle running off onto the lane in the opposite direction of a dual carriageway runs the risk of collision with an oncoming vehicle which usually has serious consequences. The risk of these types of crashes can be significantly reduced by the use of properly designed, tested, installed and maintained longitudinal barriers. The purpose of the longitudinal barrier is to provide positive protection to prevent an errant vehicle from impacting a rigid object, slope, drop off, body of water, etc. that may be located behind the barrier if impacted, the longitudinal barrier must safety redirect the errant vehicle back into the original direction of travel. Longitudinal Barriers themselves can be a danger to motorists and they should only be used if impacting the barrier will result in less severe consequences for a motorist than impacting what is behind the barrier.

Properly designed and tested reinforced concrete sections that are appropriately connected to each other may be used. Unconnected, untested concrete blocks located close to the travelled way can become a roadside rigid hazard. They are intended to be placed between the carriageway and the objects which cause severe crashes if hit, such as bridge abutment. They are also used to retain vehicles on high embankments or mountain roads. Their use on high-speed roads is justified, but care needs to be taken concerning details, particularly at the start and end points and minimum barrier length in order to work safely. Damaged barriers must be repaired immediately as they can cause severe damage if hit by passing vehicles and if they are not in their designed condition.

The auditor should check if the designed or existing systems are officially tested and approved. In the European Union, every system needs at least a "CE" – approval (exception mix-in concrete barriers). The approved systems must have defined containment level and working width. The assembling has to be done according to the demands of the producer. Otherwise the system will not work with the planned performance.

Examples of unsafe designs

Dangerous guardrails (not a system)

Dangerous "end treatment"- concrete block

Typical accidents:



At least two vehicles - head-on collision in general



Single vehicle accidents on the road



Single vehicle accidents in a curve - going either side of the road



Single vehicle accidents with obstacles - others



Single vehicle accident - Leaving straight road - either side of the road

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Adding right type of guardrails when missing - Adding missing guardrails ($$$-$$) - Installation of proper barrier type ($$$) - Adding barriers connection elements ($) - Usage of approved systems (e.g. with “CE”)	**31 – 54 %**	 
2. Improving existing guardrail system - Closing of “open windows” ($$-$) - Adding transition elements between two different types of barriers ($$) - Using of appropriate beginning/end elements - guardrail extension in front of dangerous point ($$) - Smoother slopes ($$)	**20 – 42 %**	 

Sketches (with dimensions):



The norm EN 1317 Containment Level

8.3 CIVIL ENGINEERING STRUCTURES

Background and possible problems

There are some typical problems regarding the design and existing civil engineering structures like bridges, overpasses, underpasses, etc.

A civil engineering structure can be an obstacle for road users, and there is a need to prevent cars from running off bridges with severe consequences. This means that there is a need for sufficient restraining systems. Often there is a lack of coordination in design with the adjacent road section. For example, the bridge guardrail system should have a connection to the guardrails in the adjacent road sections.

In some cases, the only pedestrian handheld fence is planned at bridges which is not an acceptable safe solution (fence is not designed to keep cars on the road and can even hurt car occupants if hit by a car).

The auditor should have in mind furthermore the geometric issues for cars and (if there are) pedestrians and bicyclists. Sometimes we can see also deficiencies regarding the drainage. In the case of overpasses, the bridge is often designed with a crest curve in the vertical alignment. The bridge designer should ensure a good drainage, e.g. with additional gutters.

Examples of unsafe designs

Unsafe headwall of a culvert

This bridge construction is a hard obstacle



Unsafe bridge design

Typical accidents:



Single vehicle accidents with obstacles – others

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Improvements in bridge design - Adding right type of guardrails - Functional connection to the adjacent guardrail system - Improved drainage solutions		 Bridge parapet and guardrail according to German guidelines

Sketches (with dimensions):



Possible solution for installing guardrail and fence on the bridge

9 TEMPORARY SIGNING AND MARKING AT WORK ZONES

Background and possible problems

A work zone is an area of road or roadside where construction, maintenance or other works are performed and which may affect the safety and limit the free movement of road users through and in the vicinity of the Work Zone. Work zones are zones on the road with a higher risk of crashes for both road users (vehicle occupants and vulnerable categories) and workers. A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) of good quality should be made and followed so that all participants in traffic are protected against the risk of a traffic crash. Such TMP should contain all elements starting from design, placement, maintenance to the removal of all elements regulating the road traffic.

To minimise the problems and increase safety, work zone layout (marking and signing) requires special consideration for the following reasons:

- Work zone is a section of road where, most often, geometrical characteristics of the road and the traffic conditions are changed to poorer conditions (less safe). The types of executed works are often road construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, but there are other types of work on the road that need the same treatment, for instance, work with cables, pipes etc. located in the road area.
- Employees in work zones spend most of their working hours directly exposed to traffic. In crashes, happening in work zones, these employees are sometimes the victims.

The growing international transit traffic flow in LMICs implies the need for main traffic corridors to be constructed according to international standards and requires European standards and a widely recognised and consistent system for roadworks signing and work zone safety.

Examples of unsafe designs

Dangerous work zone

Dangerous work zone

Typical accidents:



Single vehicle accidents with roadwork materials



Hitting parked vehicles right (left) side of the road



At least two vehicles - head-on collision in general



At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions



Pedestrian walking along the road

Possible countermeasures with expected costs (EC) and crash reductions (CR):

Countermeasure with (EC)	CR	Illustrations
1. Establishing regular (best practice) of working zone, the road markings in working areas should be in yellow ($$)	5 – 65 % (for traffic crashes in work zones)	



Sketches (with dimensions):

Speed limit (km/h)	Minimal buffer area (m) in Work Zones	
	Lateral	Longitudinal
40	0.5	30
50	0.5	35
60	0.5	40
80	0.5	60
100	1.0	100
120	1.0	100

10 ACCIDENT TYPE SKETCHES:

10.1 BASICS OF COMMON ACCIDENT DATA SET (CADaS)

Introduction

European Union countries have a long history in collecting accident data via different national collection systems. At European level, road accident data are also available since 1991 in disaggregate level in CARE (Community database on road accidents resulting in death or injury). The purpose of CARE system is to provide a powerful tool, which would make it possible to identify and quantify road safety problems throughout the European roads, evaluate the efficiency of road safety measures, determine the relevance of Community actions, and facilitate the exchange of experience in this field. It also allows countries to benchmark themselves against other countries to assess areas where they need to do more.

Due to differences in accident data collecting between EU countries, new recommendations have been agreed for a Common Accident Data Set (CADaS) consisting of a minimum set of standardised data elements, which will allow comparable road accident data to be available throughout Europe. In this way, more variables and values with a common definition will be added to those already contained in the previous models of the CARE database. They will maximise the potential of CARE database allowing more detailed and reliable analyses at European level.

Common Accident Type Sketches

Pedestrian crossing street outside a junction 	Single vehicle accident - Leaving straight road - either side of the road 	At least two vehicles - same direction - overtaking 	At least two vehicles - head-on collision in general 	At least two vehicles - turning or crossing - same road - same direction - rear end collision 
Pedestrian crossing street at a junction 	Single vehicle accidents on the road 	At least two vehicles - turning or crossing - same road - same direction - turning left (right) 	At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning right (left) in front of another vehicle 	At least two vehicles - turning or crossing - same road - same direction - turning right (left) 
Hitting pedestrian - turning right (left) 	Single vehicle accidents in a bend - going either side of the road 	At least two vehicles - turning or crossing - same road - same direction - others 	At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning others 	At least two vehicles - different roads - turning left (right) into traffic from the right (left) side 

Hitting pedestrian - turning left (right) 	Single vehicle accidents in junctions or entrances 	At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning left (right) in front of another vehicle 	At least two vehicles - different roads - turning right (left) in front of vehicle from the left (right) 	At least two vehicles - different roads - turning left (right) into traffic from the left (right) side 
Pedestrian in the road 	Single vehicle accidents - others 	At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning into the same road 	At least two vehicles - same road - opposite direction - turning into opposite roads 	At least two vehicles - different roads - turning into traffic - others 
Pedestrian walking along the road 	Single vehicle accidents with animals 	At least two vehicles - same direction - rear end collisions 	At least two vehicles - U-turn in front of another vehicle 	At least two vehicles - different roads - turning right (left) - head-on collision 
Pedestrians on pavement or bicycle lane 	Single vehicle accidents with obstacles on or above the road 	At least two vehicles - same direction - entering traffic 	At least two vehicles - opposite direction no turning - reversing 	At least two vehicles - crossing (no turning) - different 
Hitting parked vehicles right (left) side of the road 	Single vehicle accidents with roadwork materials 	At least two vehicles - same direction - side collision 	At least two vehicles - opposite direction no turning - others 	
Hitting parked vehicles left (right) side of the road 	Accidents between train and vehicle 	At least two vehicles - same direction - U-turn in front of another vehicle 	Single vehicle accidents with obstacles - others 	At least two vehicles - same direction - others 

Examples of real accidents and respective CADaS sketches




























11 POTENTIAL CRASH REDUCTION FROM COUNTERMEASURES/TREATMENTS

Introduction

For any countermeasure proposal, it is necessary to know the crash reduction potential. Therefore, a list is proposed of the most common low-cost countermeasures with their expected effects.

The following table is collated from results of different international research projects and case studies and can be used for understanding the potential crash savings after implementation of different countermeasures.

Table 11.1 presents each differently proposed countermeasure (treatment) and its range potential crash reduction effects as a percentage. (Usually, minimum, and maximum effects are presented).

Table 11.1: Efficiency (crash reduction) of different countermeasures

Treatment	Potential crash reduction [%] (different sources/research)
Road Standard	
Improve to higher standard	19-33
Increase number of lanes	22-32
Lane widening 0.3 – 0.6 m	5-12
Paved shoulder widening 0.3 - 1 m	4-12
Add median strip	40
Bridge widened or modified	25
Widen shoulder	10
Overtaking lane	20
Left turn lane	40
Right turn lane	15
Pedestrian overpass	10
Side slope flattening from 2:1	
to 4:1 ... 7:1 or flatter	6 ... 15
Side slope flattening from 4:1	
to 5:1 ... 7:1 or flatter	3 ... 11
Service roads	20-40
Traffic calming	12-60
Speed reduction from 70 km/h to 50 km/h	10-30
Speed reduction from 90 km/h to 60 km/h	17-40
Horizontal Alignment	
Improve geometry	20-80
Curvature: improving radius	33-50
Vertical Alignment	
Gradient / removing crest	12-56
Super elevation improvement/introduction	50
Passing lane	11-43
Climbing lane	10-40
Road Structure	
Lane widening	12-47
Skid resistance improvement	18-74
Shoulder widening	10-40
Shoulder sealed	22-50

Road verge widening	13-44
Junction Design	
Staggered (from straight) crossroads	40-95
T-junctions (from Y-junctions)	15-50
Fully controlled right turn phase	45
Roundabouts (from uncontrolled)	25-81
Roundabouts (from traffic signals)	25-50
Mini roundabouts (from uncontrolled)	40-47
Turning lanes	10-60
Traffic islands	39
Sheltered turn lanes (urban)	30
Sheltered turn lanes (rural)	45
Additional lane at intersection	20
Skid-resistant overlay	20
Red light camera	10
Law enforcement by the Police	7-25
Traffic Control	
Regulatory signs at junctions	22-48
Guidance/directional signs at junction	14-58
Overhead lane signs	15
Side road signs	19-24
Brighter signs and markings	24-92
Signs and delineation	29-37
Bend warning signs	20-57
Stop ahead sign	47
Speed advisory sign	23-36
Warning/advisory signs	20
Speed limit lowering - & sign	16-19
Yield/Give Way	59-80
Stop sign	33-90
Signals from uncontrolled	15-32
Signals - modified	13-85
Junction channelization	10-51
Remove parking from roadside	10-25
Visibility	
Lane markings	14-19
Edge markings	8-35
Yellow bar markings	24-52
Raised reflective pavement marking	6-18
Delineator posts	2-47
Flashing beacons	5-75
Lighting installations	6-75
Sightline distance improvement	28
Channelization medians	22-50
Crash Amelioration	
Median barrier	14-27
Side barriers	15-60
Frangible signs	30

Tree removal (rural)	10
Pole removal (lighting poles, urban)	20
Embankment treatment	40
Guardrail for bridge end post	20
Impact absorber	20
Pedestrian Facilities	
Pedestrian walkways	33-44
Pedestrian zebra crossings	13-34
Raised zebra crossings	5-50
Pelican crossings	21-83
Marking at zebra crossing	-5-14
Pedestrian refuges	56-87
Footbridges	39-90
Pedestrian fencing	10-35
Cycling Facilities	
Cycle schemes	33-56
Marked cycle crossing at signals	10-15
Cyclist advanced stop line at junctions	35
Rail Crossings	
Flashing signals	73-91
Automatic gates	81-93
Traffic Calming	
30 km/h zones (Inc. humps, chicanes etc.)	10-80
Rumble Strips	27-50
Rumble Strips and Bumps	20-80

NOTES:

1. Crash Reductions are NOT ADDITIVE, use the highest value if multiple treatments are proposed for a particular location.
2. Reductions apply to all crashes within single intersections or single midblock that contains the treatment.

KEY REFERENCES

[1]. Black Spot Management and Safety Analysis of Road Network – Best Practice Guidelines and Implementation Steps, Project RIPCORD-ISEREST, WP6, 2008
[2]. Catalogue of Design Safety Problems and Practical Countermeasures, World Road Association (PIARC), Paris, 2009
[3]. Directive on Road Infrastructure Safety Management No 96/2008, European Parliament and of The Council, Brussels, 2008
[4]. Draft Manual for Black Spot Improvement, Finnroad, Azerbaijan, 2009
[5]. Draft Manual for Road Safety Audit, Azerroadservice, Baku, 2009
[6]. Draft Manual for Road Safety Audit, Kazavtozhol, Astana, 2014
[7]. Draft Road Safety Audit Manual, Kyrgyzstan, Bishkek, 2012
[8]. Elvik, R. &Vaa, T.: The Handbook of Road Safety Measures, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2004
[9]. Elvik, R.: State-Of-The-Art Approaches to Road Accident Black Spot Management and Safety Analysis of Road Networks, RIPCORD – ISEREST Report, 2008
[10]. Good-Practice Guidelines to Infrastructural Road Safety, European Union Road Federation, 2002
[11]. Guidelines for Road Safety Audits, German Road and Transportation Research Association (FGSV), Edition 2002
[12]. Katalog „Kostengünstige Maßnahmen gegen Unfallhäufungen“, Accident Research Institute of the German Insurance Company Association, 2017
[13]. Low-Cost Road and Traffic Engineering Measures for Casualty Reduction, European Transport Safety Council (ETSC), Brussels, 1996
[14]. M. Belcher, S. Proctor& R. Cook: Practical Road Safety Auditing, TMS, 2nd Edition, 2008
[15]. Manual of Road Safety Audit, Road Directorate, Denmark, 1997
[16]. Maßnahmenkatalog gegen Unfallhäufungen (MaKaU), German Federal Highway Research Institute, 2015
[17]. Richtlinie für die Anlage von Straßen (RAL), German Road and Transportation Research Association, 2012
[18]. Road Safety Toolkit published the International Road Assessment Programme (iRAP), the Global Transport Knowledge Partnership (gTKP) and the World Bank Global Road Safety Facility, 2010
[19]. Road Safety Audit – Best Practice Guidelines, Qualification for Auditors and “Programming”, RIPCORD-ISEREST Project – WP4, EU Project, 2008
[20]. Road Safety Audit, Austroads, Australia, 1994
[21]. Road Safety Audit Guide - for Use on Albanian Roads, Ministry of Transport, Albania 2008
[22]. Road Safety Audit Guideline, World Road Association (PIARC), Paris, 2007
[23]. Road Safety Audit Guidelines, National Roads Authority, Dublin, 2004
[24]. Road Safety Audit Guidelines, University of New Brunswick-Transportation Group, Canada, 1999
[25]. Road Safety Audit Manual, South East Europe Transport Observatory (SEETO), EC/SEETO, 2009
[26]. Road Safety Inspection – Best Practice and Implementation Plan, RIPCORD-ISEREST Project – WP5, EU Project, 2008
[27]. Road Safety Inspection Guideline, World Road Association (PIARC), Paris, 2007
[28]. Road Safety Inspection Manual, South East Europe Transport Observatory (SEETO), EC/SEETO, 2009 and revised version in 2016
[29]. Road Safety Manual, World Road Association (PIARC), Paris, 2003
[30]. Safety Audi of Road Design. Guidelines for Design and Implementation, Finnish Road Administration, Helsinki, 2002
[31]. Sustainable Safe Road Design: A Practical Manual, World Bank, 2005
[32]. Towards Safer Roads in Developing Countries, A guide for Planners and Engineers, TRL, Ross Silcock Partnership and Oda, UK, 1991
[33]. World Disasters Report, WHO, Geneva, 2002

GRSA e.V.

The GRSA association was founded in the town Königs Wusterhausen near Berlin in April 2005. Our interdisciplinary team includes experienced road safety experts, road safety auditors and traffic psychologists. However, our main principle is "accident prevention instead of reaction" is independent of our profession. Because after the accident is before the accident!
As road safety auditors trained and certified by the Bauhaus University of Weimar or the University of Wuppertal, we bring our experience to our clients. No project is too small for the execution of a Road Safety Audit. We particularly want to encourage administrations and communities to use this method as a quality-assurance system with a focus on the safety. If you want to install such an audit system, we would be happy to help you. We want to share experiences with all colleagues from foreign countries. In fact, two of our members currently are working in the "Road Safety"-committee of the World Road Association (PIARC).
The primary emphases of our actions are the support of the Road Safety Audit as a component of the accident prevention. The development of measures for improving the safety of existing traffic facilities, the preparation of concepts for eliminating accident black spots, a technical and scientific exchange of national and international experiences including the training and further education of members and interested colleagues.

Contacts: **German Road Safety Audit e.V.**
Association of auditors and experts for safer roads
c/o. Dipl. Ing. Lutz Pfeiffer
Zum Alten Windmühlenberg 7a
D - 12524 Berlin, Germany
Phone: +49 (0)177 2768853
E-mail: grsa2005@gmail.com

SARSA

Serbian Association of Road Safety Auditors - SARSA is a non-governmental, non-partisan and non-profit association established for an indefinite period in order to achieve goals in the field of improvement of various scientific and professional aspects of the road safety audit, in particular the exchange and transfer of knowledge, as well as the experience of international experts through projects of road safety audit and development and distribution of publication in this field.
Goals of SARSA are:

- improvement of scientific and professional work in the area of RSA in the country and abroad,
- support the strengthening of the audit and improvement of road safety,
- preserving the reputation and dignity of the road safety auditors,
- providing protection to members when their professional rights are violated or threatened,
- improvement of professionalism and education of the road safety auditors,
- exchange and dissemination of experiences,
- exchange and transfer of knowledge and experience of international experts,
- development and distribution of publications,
- development and distribution of accompanying learning materials,
- establishing cooperation with other similar associations and organisations,
- encouraging the exchange of scientific and technical information between experts and
- implementation of other measures and activities that promote and strengthen the RSA

The SARSA achieves the goals independently or in cooperation with institutions, associations and organisations dealing with the improvement of road safety.

Contacts: Filip Trajković
Phone: + 381 (0)66 644 37 88
E-mail: info@sarsa.net

Romanian Society of Road Safety Auditors - **SoRASR** represents an exciting initiative in providing a home for the development of professional highways and other type of the roads safety auditing best practice. **SoRASR** was established in 2015 as a response to a growing call for professionals operating in the field of safety auditing and safety engineering practice in Romania, for a forum to exchange best practice and, importantly, to provide advice and ultimately routes to professional recognition for safety auditing practitioners. The members of SoRASR are specialists in road safety engineering & design, road transport and road construction. **SoRASR** develops and sustains the strategic guidelines consistent and uniform policies in the field of road safety through specialised auditors in identifying and solving problems in the road transport sector. Its aim is:

- Promoting the general interest over Road Safety Audit in order to increase safety of road infrastructure in Romania and to reduce the number and severity of traffic accidents, thus emphasising, the need to expand its importance and influence in the road safety field,
- Functioning as a concentrator pole for inspectors and auditors of road safety in Romania,
- Providing a network of experts to promote and provide training and consultancy in the field of RSA,
- Conducting professional road safety audit training courses,
- Promoting specific activities to support the professional development of members and
- To boost the factors directly involved in the issue of road safety on the roads in Romania.

SoRASR is based on the principles of the concept of the continuous professional training system in the field of road safety, in order to create the framework in which we can solve the industry's requests related to training of the staff involved in road safety activities.

Contacts:
Dr Ing. Cristian Calin & Ing. Robert-Cristian Moraru
TPhones: +40722404036 / +40729890704
E-mail: office@sorasr.ro

The Centre for Road Safety ''CBS'' Banja Luka was established on January 12th, 2015. and it was registered in the unified register under the number F-1-14 / 15 at the Court in Banja Luka. The primary mission of the Center is to raise the level of road safety through various activities and in cooperation with all interested stakeholders and legal entities and individuals.

The fundamental goals of the association related to the improvement of the Road Safety Audit and Road Safety Inspection process are to support the strengthening of the RSA and RSI procedures, to preserve the reputation and dignity of road safety auditors and road safety inspectors, to provide protection to members when their professional rights are violated, to raise the professionalism and professionalism of road safety auditors and road safety inspectors, to exchange and disseminate the experiences of countries that have implemented measures and programs for RSA and RSI, to exchange and transfer the knowledge and experience of international experts through projects of auditing and inspections of traffic and case studies, to develop and distribute various publications in the field of RSA and RSI, to develop and distribute various accompanying learning materials (presentations, presentation instructions) in relation to publications, to establishing cooperation with other similar associations and organizations in the country and abroad.

Contacts:
Aleksandra Jasnić, Chairman of the Centre for Road Safety
Phone: +387 65 733 660
E-mail: cbs.rs.bih@gmail.com

International Road Safety Center - IRSC is a not-for-profit organisation, established by a number of international road safety advocates, Belgrade University, and other key local and international road safety organisations specifically to meet the needs of development banks, aid agencies and governments of Low and Middle Income Countries (LMICs). **It assists Governments to do capacity building in road safety.** It trains LMICs officials and organisations in road safety issues related to the 5 UN Decade pillars of road safety and in management development and implementation of national road safety programs. Training can be delivered at IRSC or its local partner organisations (e.g. University, police academy, road safety agency, driver training centre, Centre for Motor vehicles) in Belgrade or at partner organisations in client countries. Course leaders and trainers are drawn from a pool of international experts who all have practical experience of implementing major reforms and successful safety improvement programs. Some of them are government officials who were or still are responsible for road safety activities in their countries, and many are former senior staff from specialist Consultants, Development banks, aid agencies and international organisations dealing with road safety at Global level. Between them, our pool of expert trainers has advised on road safety issues, programs, and Action plans in over 120 countries (more details from www.irscroadsafety.org).

Contacts:

Dr Alan Ross
Phone: + 44 7801 428 082 / +380 50 30 30 233
alan.ross@irscroadsafety.org
alanross999@gmail.com

Prof Krsto Lipovac
Phone: + 381 646356114 / + 387 65671832
E-mail: k.lipovac@gmail.com

AMSS – Centre for motor vehicles Ltd. (AMSS – CMV) is a company specialised in technical services in the field of road safety and other related areas. Nowadays, AMSS – CMV is also designated as Research and Development Centre (IRC). The scientific research team of AMSS – CMV is comprised of very experienced researchers led by 5 PhDs level experts with international references in the field of transport, especially in road safety, as well as numerous associates with the specialist knowledge and experience in transport and road safety issues. The scope of AMSS – CMV activities includes areas of vehicle safety, road and road environment safety, and a wide range of research and development projects in the field of road safety.

AMSS – CMV is one of the leading companies in the field of vehicle safety, covering almost 80% of the Serbian market in the field of testing and inspection of vehicles. The company has a long history in implementing road safety projects, with a focus on recording and assessment of road safety in accordance with EuroRAP/iRAP methodology and has a considerable experience at the national and global level. AMSS – CMV implements different development projects and researches that contribute to road traffic safety improvement, in line with current scientific achievements and international best practices in this field. Some of the projects are aimed at: evaluation of the state of road safety, risk analysis and risk assessment on roads, development and establishment of road safety portals and road safety databases for national and local level administrations, using cutting-edge software solutions in GIS environments; development of the methodology for identification of potential black spots on the basis of road accidents locations, including the software solution; development of the methodology for benchmarking road safety in the closed systems; preparation of road safety strategies and action plans; analysis of children's safety in road traffic, etc.

Contacts:

Milan Božić, Director
Phone: + 381 (0)65 987 10 60; E-mail: milan@cmv.rs


RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
R&D Department of AMSS-CMV is registered as "Research and Development Center" sertificate by Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of Republic of Serbia, num. 391-00-12/2016-16 since July 2016.
Projects, studies and analyzes in the field of Road Safety
Road Safety Strategy and Action plan
Road Safety Portal
RDC CMV
irc@cmv.rs
AMSS (The Automobile and Motorcycle Association of Serbia) - Center for Motor Vehicles
iRAP
International Road Assessment Programme
AMCC
AMSS CMV
AMS
WORLD BANK GLOBAL ROAD SAFETY FACILITY
www.cmv.rs
AMSS CMV

ROAD SAFETY PORTAL FOR CITIES AND MUNICIPALITIES

Roads and road safety characteristics of roads

www.cmv.rs

PRACTICAL GUIDE FOR ROAD SAFETY AUDITORS AND INSPECTORS