

June 2014

# North Dakota Local Road Safety Program



**CODE FOR THE ROAD**

PARTNERING TO SAVE LIVES.

---

# North Dakota Local Road Safety Program

**Prepared by**

CH2M HILL

SRF Consulting Group, Inc.

**On behalf of**

North Dakota Department of Transportation

Grant Levi, P.E., Director

June 2014

23 USC 409

NDDOT Reserves All Objections

# Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>ES-1</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 Background.....	1-1
1.2 Traffic Safety – A National Perspective .....	1-2
1.2.1 AASHTO’s <i>Strategic Highway Safety Plan</i> and Safety Emphasis Areas .....	1-3
1.3 North Dakota’s Statewide Safety Planning Efforts .....	1-3
1.4 Local Road Safety Program Overview.....	1-5
<b>2.0 Eastern Region Safety Emphasis Areas and Crash Overview.....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 Eastern Region Crash Overview.....	2-1
2.1.1 North Dakota Crash Mapping .....	2-1
2.1.2 Facilities Analyzed.....	2-1
2.1.3 Crash Data Sets .....	2-2
2.2 Eastern Region Safety Emphasis Areas .....	2-7
2.3 Crash Risk Factors .....	2-8
2.3.1 Rural Roadway Segments – Crashes on Paved Roads .....	2-9
2.3.2 Rural Curves – Crashes on Paved Roads in Curves .....	2-13
2.3.3 Rural Intersections – Crashes at Thru-STOP Intersections .....	2-16
2.3.4 Urban Roadway Segments – Cities with Populations Greater than 5,000 (Cities of Valley City and Wahpeton) .....	2-20
2.3.5 Urban Intersections – Right-Angle Crashes, Cities with Populations Greater than 5,000 (Cities of Valley City and Wahpeton).....	2-23
2.3.6 Urban Intersections – Pedestrian/Bicycle Crashes, Cities with Populations Greater than 5,000 (Cities of Valley City and Wahpeton).....	2-26
2.4 Eastern Region Risk Summary.....	2-30
<b>3.0 Eastern Region Priority Safety Strategies .....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Background.....	3-1
3.2 Initial/Comprehensive List of Potential Strategies.....	3-1
3.3 Safety Strategies Workshop.....	3-11
3.4 Priority Safety Strategies.....	3-11
<b>4.0 Eastern Region Infrastructure Safety Projects.....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1 Eastern Region Proactive Project Decision Process.....	4-1
Barnes County .....	4-8
City of Valley City .....	4-10
Eddy County.....	4-12
Foster County .....	4-13
Griggs County .....	4-14
Ransom County.....	4-15
Richland County .....	4-16
City of Wahpeton.....	4-18
Sargent County.....	4-20
Steele County.....	4-21
Traill County.....	4-22



---

<b>5.0</b>	<b>Behavioral Safety Strategies .....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
5.1	Purpose of Driver Behavior Safety Strategies.....	5-1
5.2	Overview of Behavioral Crash Data for North Dakota’s Eastern Region.....	5-1
5.3	Importance of Traffic Safety Culture Change.....	5-2
5.3.1	Influence of Traffic Safety Culture .....	5-2
5.3.2	Social Norms Inhibiting a Strong Traffic Safety Culture .....	5-2
5.3.3	Social Levels Influencing Safety Culture.....	5-2
5.4	Behavioral Safety Strategies .....	5-4
5.4.1	Role of Policy, Education, and Enforcement.....	5-4
5.4.2	Effective Use of Public Information Strategies .....	5-4
5.4.3	LRSP Phase 2 Priority Strategies.....	5-5
5.4.4	Impaired Driving .....	5-6
5.4.5	Speeding and Aggressive Driving.....	5-12
5.4.6	Young Drivers .....	5-15
5.4.7	Unbelted Occupants .....	5-17
5.5	Traffic Safety Office Supporting Resources .....	5-22
5.5.1	TSO Grant Program Application Process.....	5-22
5.5.2	Technical Assistance.....	5-22
5.5.3	Traffic Records/Crash Data .....	5-22
	References .....	5-24

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

---

4Es	education, enforcement, engineering, and emergency medical services
100MVMT	100 million vehicle miles traveled
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
ADT	average daily traffic
CMC	county major collector
CMF	crash modification factor
CRS	Crash Reporting System (North Dakota Department of Transportation)
DUI	driving under the influence
EMS	emergency medical services
ERA	edge risk assessment
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
GDL	graduated driver's license
GHSA	Governors Highway Safety Association
HSIP	Highway Safety Improvement Program
<i>LEAD</i>	Listen, Educate, Ask, Discuss
LRSP	Local Road Safety Program
MUTCD	<i>Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices</i>
NCHRP	National Cooperative Highway Research Program
NDDOT	North Dakota Department of Transportation
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Plan	LRSP Safety Plan
PSA	public service announcement
SHSP	Strategic Highway Safety Plan
TSO	Traffic Safety Office

## Executive Summary

---

This Local Road Safety Program (LRSP) was prepared for the nine counties (Barnes, Eddy, Foster, Griggs, Ransom, Richland, Sargent, Steele, and Traill) and two cities (Valley City and Wahpeton) in the eastern region. The LRSP was prepared as part of North Dakota's statewide highway safety planning process. The contents are the result of a data-driven process, with a goal to reduce serious crashes (defined as those crashes resulting in at least one fatality or incapacitating injury) by documenting at-risk locations, identifying effective low-cost safety improvement strategies, and better position the eastern region to compete for available safety funds. The LRSP includes a description of the connection to safety planning efforts at the national, state (through North Dakota's *Strategic Highway Safety Plan* and the Highway Safety Improvement Program), and regional levels.

This LRSP was commissioned by the North Dakota Department of Transportation (NDDOT) to provide a tool to assist counties in submitting proactive low-cost systemic safety projects for the NDDOT to fund as part of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). The LRSP is not intended to be a complete safety plan for the eastern region, because there may be other safety improvement strategies that are considered high-cost or low-cost that are also effective, but cannot be systematically applied across a county or local road system. While this LRSP addresses many of the safety concerns at high-risk locations within the region, other equally important projects may be identified after this safety planning effort is complete.

Specifically, this LRSP includes the following:

- Description of the safety emphasis areas.
- Identification of a short list of high-priority, low-cost safety strategies.
- Documentation of at-risk locations along the county/local road systems that are considered candidates for safety investment. At-risk locations include roadway segments, horizontal curves, and intersections with multiple serious crashes or with roadway geometry and traffic characteristics similar to other locations in North Dakota where serious crashes have occurred.
- Development of approximately \$6.7 million of suggested safety projects across the eastern region (Table ES-1), including the filled out forms suitable for submittal to the NDDOT for their consideration for HSIP funding. These projects represent the application of high-priority safety strategies at the at-risk locations.
- Discussion of behavioral crash statistics, potential safety strategies, and current statewide resources available for implementation of behavioral safety strategies.

TABLE ES-1  
Eastern Region Total Safety Project Costs

Rural Projects	Roadway Segments	Intersections	Curves	Total
Barnes County	\$239,909	\$304,320	\$391,719	\$935,948
Eddy County	\$72,468	\$21,840	\$101,272	\$195,580
Foster County	\$144,240	\$104,400	\$72,246	\$320,886
Griggs County	\$36,762	\$160,320	\$53,640	\$250,722
Ransom County	\$150,936	\$141,240	\$29,520	\$321,696
Richland County	\$447,912	\$441,480	\$89,541	\$978,933
Sargent County	\$168,156	\$342,360	\$37,800	\$548,316
Steele County	\$134,683	\$54,000	\$65,172	\$253,855
Traill County	\$140,147	\$238,920	\$129,369	\$508,436
Urban Projects	Roadway Segments	Intersections – Right-Angle	Intersections – Pedestrians and Bicyclists	Total
Valley City	\$171,000	\$7,200	\$1,584,000	\$1,762,200
Wahpeton	\$175,850	\$374,400	\$84,000	\$634,250

The information in this LRSP is consistent with best practices in safety planning as presented in guidance prepared by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP). This information is provided to the eastern region in an effort to reduce the number of serious crashes on the county/local road systems. It is understood that the final decision to implement any of the suggested projects resides with the respective county or city officials.

It should also be noted that the rankings of county/local roadway facilities are based on a comparison with documented risk factors. There is no expectation or requirement that the eastern region pursue safety projects in the exact ranking order. The ranking suggests a general priority, and it is understood that actual project development decisions will be made by county or city staff based on consideration of economic, social, and political issues, as well as in coordination with other projects already in each agency’s Capital Improvement Program.

It should also be noted that some of the at-risk locations and suggested safety projects involve the intersection of a county roadway and a state route. It is acknowledged that the county does not have the authority to implement projects on the state’s right-of-way. The county is encouraged to coordinate with the NDDOT to pursue a partnership that identifies a path toward implementation. This LRSP (1) does **not** set requirements or mandates; (2) is **not** a standard; and (3) is neither intended to be nor does it establish a legal standard of care.

To help reduce the potential exposure to claims of negligence associated with motor vehicle crashes on the county/local road system, the following key point should be considered:

- Federal law (23 USC Section 409) established that information generated as part of the statewide safety planning process is considered privileged and unavailable to the public. The privileged status includes crash data where value/detail has been added by analysts during the safety planning process (for example, computation of crash rates, disaggregation of crashes by type or severity, and documentation of contributing factors), the lists of at-risk locations, and information supporting the development and evaluation of potential safety projects. The federal law and the privileged status of the safety information was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Pierce County (Washington) v. Guillen*. North Dakota interprets Section 409 to mean that basic crash data are available to the public on request, but that the data cannot be used in legal proceedings associated with claims of negligence.

Regarding the expected life of this LRSP, the shelf life of this document is limited (as with any transportation plan). This is because the distribution of crashes can change over time, just as roadway and traffic conditions change, contributing to the occurrence of crashes. This LRSP contains \$6.7 million of potential safety projects, which could provide the eastern region with a sufficient backlog of projects for up to 5 years. As a result, the counties and cities are encouraged to periodically update this LRSP.

The counties and cities are encouraged to apply for these projects through the NDDOT’s HSIP process. The anticipated annual HSIP process is shown in Table ES-2.

TABLE ES-2  
HSIP Solicitation Schedule

Month	Task Description
October/November	Solicitation for HSIP is sent out to all counties, districts, MPOs, cities, and tribes. The counties, districts, MPOs, cities, and tribes will have about <b>6 weeks to respond</b> .
January through March	NDDOT reviews the requests and conducts additional studies if required.
Following Fall	HSIP approval notices are sent after program concurrence from the FHWA. Funding for an approved project will be provided as funding is available.



# 1.0 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

To fulfill a commitment in the 2013 North Dakota Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), the North Dakota Department of Transportation (NDDOT) began the Local Road Safety Program (LRSP). The purpose of the LRSP is to better engage local roadway agencies in the statewide safety planning process. The NDDOT’s commitment is based on two pieces of information:

- Based on 2007-to-2011 crash records, the SHSP identified that 56 percent of serious crashes (those crashes resulting in at least one fatality or incapacitating injury) in North Dakota occurred on roads operated by local agencies.
- The NDDOT had historically focused federal safety funds on interstates, U.S. highways, and state highways, even though approximately half of serious crashes occurred on those facilities.

The NDDOT set out to increase the level of participation of local agencies in safety planning and the amount of safety funds directed toward projects on local systems. To do this, the NDDOT first partnered with local agencies (including all 53 counties and 12 major cities in the state) to prepare safety plans for every region of North Dakota.

Representatives from the NDDOT, Barnes, Eddy, Foster, Griggs, Ransom, Richland, Sargent, Steele, and Traill counties; and the cities of Wahpeton and Valley City prepared this LRSP Safety Plan (Plan) as Phase 2 of a

comprehensive effort to reduce the number of fatal and incapacitating injury crashes (referred collectively as serious crashes) that occur on North Dakota’s local road system in the eastern region. The area covered by the Plan includes portions of NDDOT District 2 – Valley City, District 3 – Devils Lake, District 6 – Grand Forks, and District 8 – Fargo (Figure 1-1).

Additionally, Cass and Grand Forks counties and the cities of Fargo, West Fargo, and Grand Forks participated in Phase 2 of the study; however, their information is provided in separate reports.

The purpose of this LRSP is to identify and implement specific safety strategies at specific locations and to link these projects directly with the contributing factors associated with the majority of serious crashes on the local roads. These safety projects are intended to be comprehensive by addressing both infrastructure- and driver-behavior-related crashes by including proactive projects developed through a system-wide risk assessment process. These projects are intended to compliment reactive projects developed through a site analysis approach focused on high-crash locations.

*The Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) development process was key in helping us identify the importance of local roads to achieve our long-term safety goals. This data-driven process helped us to transition to a systemic identification of crash types on all roads in addition to our traditional crash location (or hot spot) approach on the state system. As a result, the NDDOT has partnered with local stakeholder to prepare road safety plans that will identify potential safety projects consistent with the SHSP.*

— Grant Levi, P.E., Director  
North Dakota Department of Transportation

The traffic safety priorities identified in this Plan are the result of a data-driven analysis of nearly 88,450 crashes (including 2,231 serious crashes) on all roads in North Dakota. Of these crashes, 5,709 total crashes and 194 serious crashes occurred in the eastern region over the 5-year period from 2008 to 2012.




FIGURE 1-1  
North Dakota Department of Transportation's Eight Districts

## 1.2 Traffic Safety – A National Perspective

According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), 32,310 people were killed in traffic crashes in 2011 – an average of 89 people killed every day – and an additional 2.2 million people were injured. The number of fatalities nationally decreased significantly and steadily in the 1970s and 1980s. Beginning in the early 1990s and continuing through the early 2000s, traffic fatalities began to increase. However, since 2005, traffic fatalities have decreased dramatically to the lowest number of fatalities in recent history – 32,310 fatalities in 2011.

Like the national trend, the North Dakota traffic fatality rate also decreased in the 1970s and 1980s. Likewise, North Dakota's traffic fatalities slowly increased through the 1990s and early 2000s, and began to decrease again in 2005. However, unlike the national trend, North Dakota's traffic fatality rate has increased since 2008. The 2013 North Dakota Strategic Highway Safety Plan recognizes the following issues likely account for much of the increase:

- Shifts in the age of the driving population.
- Steady increase in the number of vehicle miles traveled in North Dakota, which is counter to the flat or decreasing national trend in travel.

- Other states have a longer history using a systemic investment approach to focus on locations with risk factors for serious crashes.
- The growing challenges of providing emergency medical response and quick access to advanced health care in rural areas.

### 1.2.1 AASHTO's *Strategic Highway Safety Plan* and Safety Emphasis Areas

In the late 1990s, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) supported a comprehensive and data-driven approach to reduce the number of traffic-related fatalities. Both AASHTO and the FHWA concluded that up to that point, states' efforts had not been effective in lowering the number of serious crashes because: (1) efforts were not focused on serious crashes nor the primary factors resulting in serious crashes; and (2) safety project selection was not part of a data-driven process that implemented effective strategies at locations most at risk for a serious crash.

AASHTO and the FHWA recommended a safety program development process that included 22 categories (or safety emphasis areas) in the areas of drivers, special users, vehicles, highways, emergency services, and management. The objective of this first step is to help agencies consider the 4Es of safety – education, enforcement, engineering, and emergency medical services (EMS) – when identifying safety priorities for their roads. In addition, selecting safety emphasis areas focuses agencies on safety strategies linked to the issue.

In 2007, AASHTO set a goal to reduce the number of traffic fatalities nationally by 1,000 each year for the next 20 years, which is an integral first step in a national *Toward Zero Deaths* safety vision. FHWA has determined that this goal will be reached only by partnering with individual states. This partnering will lead to more successful project implementation and will result in programs that target the factors contributing to the greatest number of fatal and serious injury crashes.

## 1.3 North Dakota's Statewide Safety Planning Efforts

Through 2004, North Dakota had a fatality rate (1.34 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled [100MVMT] in 2004) that was less than the national average (1.44 fatalities per 100MVMT). However, in recent years, the North Dakota fatality rate (1.61 fatalities per 100MVMT in 2011) has risen to above the national average (1.10 fatalities per 100MVMT) and the overall number of traffic fatalities has crept upward (see Figure 1-2). In 2011, there were 148 fatalities on North Dakota roads: the most traffic fatalities reported in the state since 1982.




FIGURE 1-2  
Fatality Rate – National and North Dakota (2000 to 2012)

In 2013, the NDDOT updated the state’s SHSP. Based on serious crashes (Table 1-1), the 2013 SHSP identified the following safety emphasis areas, as well as priority safety strategies in each area:

- Young drivers (under age 21)
- Speeding or aggressive driving
- Alcohol-related
- Unbelted vehicle occupants
- Lane departure
- Intersections

North Dakota also adopted a long-term vision of zero fatalities on its roadways. Achieving this vision will require many years and dramatic shifts in the safety culture for North Dakota residents. An aggressive intermediate goal was set to reduce the 3-year average of traffic fatalities to 100 or fewer by 2020.

TABLE 1-1  
North Dakota Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes by AASHTO Safety Emphasis Area

Safety Emphasis Area		Statewide Crashes (All Roads)	
		Percent	Number
Drivers	<b>Involving Driver under Age 21</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>501</b>
	Involving drivers over the age of 64	13%	280
	<b>Speeding or Aggressive Driving</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>576</b>
	<b>Alcohol-Related</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>667</b>
	Distracted, asleep, or fatigued drivers	9%	206
	<b>Unbelted Vehicle Occupants</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>1,067</b>

TABLE 1-1  
North Dakota Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes by AASHTO Safety Emphasis Area

Safety Emphasis Area		Statewide Crashes (All Roads)	
		Percent	Number
<b>Special Users</b>	Pedestrians crashes	5%	117
	Bicycle crashes	2%	46
<b>Vehicles</b>	Motorcycles crashes	12%	265
	Heavy vehicle crashes	15%	342
<b>Highways</b>	Train-vehicle collisions	1%	13
	<b>Lane-Departure</b> Including both lane-departure (898 serious crashes) and head-on/ sideswipe-opposing crashes (150 serious crashes)	<b>47%</b>	<b>1,048</b>
	<b>Intersections</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>513</b>
	Work zone crashes	2%	36
<b>Total Serious (Fatal and Incapacitating Injury) Crashes</b>		<b>2,231</b>	

Notes:

Information is from the 2008-to-2012 North Dakota crash data records, which is an update to the information in the 2013 North Dakota SHSP that used 2007-to-2011 crash records.

Numbers in this table do not add up to the statewide crash numbers because one crash may be categorized into multiple emphasis areas. For example, one crash may involve a young driver at an intersection and, therefore, be included in both of these emphasis areas.

## 1.4 Local Road Safety Program Overview

North Dakota’s local road system encompasses more than 97,500 miles of roadway out of approximately 106,000 miles statewide. Although, historically, more than 50 percent of serious crashes in North Dakota occurred on local roads, the density of these crashes was very low (approximately 0.002 serious crash per mile per year). As a result, local agencies were unable to identify high-crash locations to nominate for funding through the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). Therefore, using stand-in data for the serious crashes, safety projects were identified using a systemic process to evaluate at-risk locations. The use of the systemic process was necessary due to the low crash density. Based on revised FHWA policy, the NDDOT expanded the HSIP to include projects identified through the systemic analysis of local roads.

The focus areas of the systemic risk assessment are rural, paved county and tribal highways,<sup>1</sup> and urban arterials and collectors in North Dakota’s larger cities (cities with a population greater than 5,000). Paved, rural county highways were selected based on an analysis of statewide crash data that indicated that approximately 61 percent of serious local road crashes occurred on rural county roads. Of these crashes, approximately half occurred on paved roads, which account for less than 10 percent of county roads (approximately 6,200 miles). Further analysis indicated that on these rural highways, the most at-risk elements were roadway

<sup>1</sup> Does not include all paved roads outside municipal limits, but focuses on routes that serve regional travel. For example, a loop road that is paved and yet only provides access to a residential neighborhood was considered to be a local road given the type of traffic served by the facility.



segments (60 percent of serious crashes), horizontal curves (32 percent of serious crashes), and intersections (32 percent of serious crashes).

Major cities were selected as a focus because approximately 90 percent of the serious local-road crashes occurred within the city boundaries of the 12 cities in this category. Furthermore, 40 percent of the serious crashes occurred on urban arterials and collectors. In addition, because these 12 cities are responsible for operation and maintenance of U.S. highway and state highway routes within the municipal limits (not including fully access-managed facilities, such as freeways), the U.S. and state highways were included in the review.

Figure 1-3 shows the approach used to develop this Plan for the eastern counties. The process began with the crash analysis and concluded with this LRSP Safety Plan, the culmination of the NDDOT and concerned local agencies working together for nearly half a year.



FIGURE 1-3  
Local Road Safety Program Safety Plan Approach

## 2.0 Eastern Region Safety Emphasis Areas and Crash Overview

---

The first step in the process to prepare Safety Plans for the eastern region was to conduct a crash analysis overview statewide for North Dakota and then for the eastern region as a whole.

### 2.1 Eastern Region Crash Overview

#### 2.1.1 North Dakota Crash Mapping

Crash data was taken from NDDOT Crash Reporting System (CRS) and placed into ArcGIS for data exportation based on specific locations relative to local roads. The most recent five-year period of crash data (from 2008 to 2012) was analyzed and used to determine risk factors specific to the local roads in the eastern region, which includes Barnes, Eddy, Foster, Griggs, Ransom, Richland, Sargent, Steele, and Traill counties, as well as the cities of Wahpeton and Valley City. Consistent with the NDDOT's SHSP, the analysis focused on serious (fatal and incapacitating injury) crashes.

#### 2.1.2 Facilities Analyzed

The crash analysis was broken into three main facility types: roadway segments, curves, and intersections:

- Paved rural local roadway segments were analyzed and local county major collector (CMC) gravel roads were analyzed for multiple crash locations. Other local gravel roads were removed from the analysis because of the relatively low percentage of serious crashes and due to the lack of infrastructure-based strategies that can be applied to this roadway type.
- Local rural road intersections with state highways or other local roads were included in the analysis. Local non-CMC gravel roads intersecting with other local roads were removed from the analysis due to the very low number of crashes at these intersections.
- Horizontal curves on paved rural local roads were included in analysis.
- Urban roadway segments and intersections were analyzed in Valley City and Wahpeton. Urban roadway types analyzed within the city limits included:
  - State routes
  - Urban principal arterials
  - Urban minor arterials
  - Urban collector roads
- All other local roadway segments and intersections, including gravel roads, were reviewed for locations with multiple serious crashes or "hot spots."

### 2.1.3 Crash Data Sets

Crash data for the 5 years from 2008 to 2012 was used for the eastern region crash analysis. In safety analysis, it is recommended that more than 1 year of data be studied to reduce the possibility of examining an unusual year. It is also important to include as many years as necessary to produce a data set that will provide statistically reliable results but not too long so that changed conditions are a concern (for example, reconstructed roads, addition of STOP signs, and changed speed limits). For the eastern region, there were not enough crashes to be statistically reliable; therefore, decisions were based on the crashes for all Phase 1 and Phase 2 cities and counties combined (Figure 2-1), statewide data (Figure 2-2), or national research.

The eastern region data set includes 2,627 crashes on local roads; of these, 92 were fatal or incapacitating injury crashes. Disaggregating the serious crashes by road type (paved, gravel, or local), area (urban versus rural), and crash type category (intersection versus roadway segment crashes) resulted in the distribution shown in Table 2-1, Figure 2-1, and Figure 2-2.

TABLE 2-1  
 Crash Distribution (2008 to 2012)

Location	Eastern Region (Percent/Number)	Statewide (Percent/Number)
Rural Roads	87% (80 crashes)	71% (789 crashes)
Paved Rural Roads	49% (39 crashes)	50% (394 crashes)
CMC Gravel Roads	10% (8 crashes)	9% (73 crashes)
Paved Rural Road Segments	72% (26 crashes)	59% (225 crashes)
Single Vehicle, Lane-Departure Crashes on Paved Rural Road Segments	88% (23 crashes)	76% (170 crashes)
Paved Rural Road Intersections	28% (10 crashes)	36% (137 crashes)
Paved Rural Road Thru-STOP Intersections	60% (6 crashes)	44% (60 crashes)

This review shows that, on the local system, serious lane-departure crashes on paved roads and angle crashes at Thru-STOP intersections were overrepresented. Based on statewide traffic safety data, serious lane-departure crashes along curves are also overrepresented.




FIGURE 2-1  
 Eastern Region Crash Data Overview – Rural and Urban Local Road Systems (2008 to 2012)




FIGURE 2-1 (Continued)  
 Eastern Region Crash Data Overview – Rural and Urban Local Road Systems (2008 to 2012)






FIGURE 2-2  
 North Dakota Crash Data Overview – Rural and Urban Local Road Systems (2008 to 2012)




FIGURE 2-2 (Continued)  
 North Dakota Crash Data Overview – Rural and Urban Local Road Systems (2008 to 2012)

## 2.2 Eastern Region Safety Emphasis Areas

The total number of serious crashes (those crashes resulting in a fatality or incapacitating injury) in each county over the 5-year period from 2008 to 2012 was so few that the crash data was analyzed at regional, statewide, and national levels for various risk factors.

Section 1.2 described the development of AASHTO’s emphasis areas, and how this process was applied to the State of North Dakota to identify statewide safety emphasis areas (Table 1-1). An identical process was followed for the eastern region, resulting in the distribution of serious crashes among AASHTO’s 22 emphasis areas (Table 2-2). The safety emphasis areas for the eastern region are consistent with the state’s emphasis areas. This process revealed where crashes were overrepresented based on a comparison to statewide averages or where a large enough number of crashes represented an opportunity to substantially reduce crashes. As a result, the following safety emphasis areas were identified as priorities for safety investments:

- Driver Behavior – Young drivers, aggressive drivers, alcohol-related, and unbelted vehicle occupants
- Highways – Lane departure and intersection crashes

TABLE 2-2  
Eastern Region Serious Crashes by Safety Emphasis Areas (2008 to 2012)

Safety Emphasis Areas	Statewide (% of Total)	2008 to 2012 Serious Crashes					
		Eastern Region		State Roads		Local System	
		%	#	%	#	%	#
<b>Total Serious Crashes</b>	<b>2,231</b>	<b>194</b>		<b>91</b>		<b>103</b>	
Involving Drivers Under Age 21	22%	22%	43	18%	16	26%	27
Involving Drivers Over Age 64	13%	12%	24	15%	14	10%	10
Excessive Speed or Aggressive Driving	26%	35%	67	33%	30	36%	37
Alcohol-Related	30%	34%	66	23%	21	44%	45
Distracted, Asleep, or Fatigued Drivers	9%	11%	21	8%	7	14%	14
Unbelted Vehicle Occupants	48%	53%	102	45%	41	59%	61
Pedestrian Crashes	5%	2%	4	1%	1	3%	3
Bicycle Crashes	2%	1%	1	0%	0	1%	1
Motorcycle Crashes	12%	10%	20	10%	9	11%	11
Heavy Vehicle Crashes	15%	16%	31	25%	23	17%	18
Train-Vehicle Collisions	1%	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Lane-Departure (Run-Off-the-Road and Head-On) Crashes	47%	53%	102	47%	43	57%	59
<i>Head-On</i>	<i>7%</i>	<i>4%</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>4%</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>4%</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Run-off-the-Road Crashes</i>	<i>40%</i>	<i>48%</i>	<i>94</i>	<i>43%</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>53%</i>	<i>55</i>
Intersection Crashes	23%	20%	39	14%	13	25%	26

**TABLE 2-2**  
 Eastern Region Serious Crashes by Safety Emphasis Areas (2008 to 2012)

Safety Emphasis Areas	Statewide (% of Total)	2008 to 2012 Serious Crashes					
		Eastern Region		State Roads		Local System	
		%	#	%	#	%	#
Work Zone Crashes	2%	2%	3	2%	2	1%	1
Deer Collisions	1%	2%	4	1%	1	3%	3
Adverse (Winter) Weather Related	16%	23%	44	36%	33	11%	11
Note: Serious crashes are those crashes that result in at least one fatality or incapacitating injury.							

Strategies to reduce crashes depend on whether a safety emphasis area is infrastructure-based or driver-behavior-based. Infrastructure-based emphasis areas refer to characteristics of the location (for example, a roadway segment, curve, or intersection) where crashes occurred. Driver-behavior-based emphasis areas refer to motorist characteristics or actions that contribute to crashes. Because driver behavior is tied to laws made at the national and state levels, roadway agencies generally have less ability to address driver-behavior-based emphasis areas. The most effective approach for road authorities to addressing driver-behavior-based emphasis areas is to focus on public education and law enforcement through cooperation and collaboration with other county departments, agencies, and schools. Generally, more opportunities exist for county and city road authorities to address infrastructure-based emphasis areas, because many of the associated strategies can be implemented as separate roadway improvement projects, or along with other planned improvements. Specific infrastructure- and driver-behavior-based strategies presented to the participants of the safety workshop held for the eastern region are provided in Section 3.2.

## 2.3 Crash Risk Factors

The objective of the analytical process is to identify candidates for safety investment based on two criteria: high-crash locations and at-risk locations. A more detailed crash analysis was performed for each priority crash type to identify (1) locations where these priority crash types occur at a rate of one or more serious crashes per year, and (2) basic roadway and traffic characteristics of locations with serious crashes. These characteristics are not considered to be the cause of crashes, but instead are used to determine the risk that a future serious crash would occur at a particular location. Information from historic crashes was used to evaluate the remainder of the region’s local road system and prioritize locations for safety investment based on similar characteristics.

Three additional urban areas and two additional counties were studied as a part of Phase 2 in the LRSP: the cities of Fargo, West Fargo, Grand Forks, in addition to Cass County and Grand Forks County. Urban-rural counties are designated as those containing a city with a population greater than 5,000, while rural-rural counties are those without cities exceeding this population. Valley City and Wahpeton are the subjects of the urban portion of this Plan, but for analysis purposes, the data were combined for all of Phase 2 urban areas.

### 2.3.1 Rural Roadway Segments – Crashes on Paved Roads


Of the more than 97,500 miles of local road system in North Dakota, only 7 percent of the roads are paved. However, 52 percent of crashes occurred on paved roads. Therefore, the focus of the LRSP is on rural paved roadway segments.

There are 1,020 miles of rural paved county roads in the eastern region. From 2008 to 2012, 39 serious crashes were reported on these roads. The predominant crash type on these roads was single-vehicle lane-departure (Figure 2-3). The following five risk factors were identified for rural lane departure crashes on paved roads in the counties:


1. **Average Daily Traffic (ADT)** - Of the rural paved roads, 46 percent have an ADT greater than 225 vehicles per day. However, 72 percent of the serious lane departure crashes occurred above this ADT (Figure 2-4). Therefore, any segment with an ADT greater than 225 vehicles per day received a star.
2. **Access Density** - Nationally, research has shown that an access density of eight or more access points per mile (including field entrances, commercial entrances, roadway access, etc.) increased the likelihood of a serious crash occurring. North Dakota's review of serious crashes on their rural county roads (shown in Figure 2-5) demonstrates a similar relationship with a slightly lower threshold of six access points per mile. Therefore, any roadway segment with an access density greater than or equal to six access points per mile received a star.
3. **Lane-Departure Crash Density** - The average lane-departure crash density was 0.040 crash per mile. Due to limited number of crashes in each county, any roadway segment where the lane-departure crash density was greater than the average for the county received a star.
4. **Critical Radius Curve Crash Density** - Nationally, lane-departure crashes frequently occur within curves. Curves with radii between 500 and 1,200 feet (that is, critical radius curves) have a higher serious crash rate than other curves and roadway segments with more curves in this range are considered to have greater risk. The risk factor is determined by the number of critical radius curves divided by the length of the segment. The average critical curve radius crash density for these types of curves along roadway segments was 0.111 crash per mile. Any segment with a curve critical radius crash density greater than or equal to these respective values received a star.
5. **Edge Risk Assessment (ERA)** - A rating system was developed to categorize the risk level of vehicles leaving the travel lane. Roads with a usable shoulder and reasonable clear zone received a rating of 1. Roads with little or no usable shoulder but with a reasonable clear zone received a rating of 2, as did roads with a usable shoulder but with fixed objects in the clear zone. Roads with no usable shoulder and fixed objects in the clear zone received a rating of 3. Examples of these edge risks are shown in Figure 2-6. Roads were evaluated using photos taken in the autumn of 2013 to determine the rating. Roads with a rating of 2 or 3 received a star.

Detailed segment analyses and results for the counties are provided in Chapter 4. A prioritization process for each roadway segment was put into place using the five risk factors by giving stars to each risk factor present. The highest priority roadway segments received the most stars. In cases where roadway segments received the same number of stars, the ERA, and ADT were used to break the tie.







**FIGURE 2-3**  
 Serious Crash Types on Rural Paved Roads (2008 to 2012)



**FIGURE 2-4**  
 Rural Roadway Segment Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Crash Data (2008 to 2012)



**FIGURE 2-5**  
Serious Crashes by Access Density on North Dakota Rural County Roads (2008 to 2012)



**FIGURE 2-6**  
Sample Edge Risk Assessment Ratings and Descriptions


## 2.3.2 Rural Curves – Crashes on Paved Roads in Curves

Detailed crash analysis included horizontal curves on rural paved local roads. Research indicates horizontal curves with certain characteristics contribute to the overall frequency of lane-departure crashes. The 1,020 miles of rural paved roads in the eastern region contain 281 curves totaling approximately 42 miles in length (4 percent of the road system mileage).


With only 10 serious crashes along curves reported from 2008 to 2012, too few crashes occurred on these curves to serve as a reliable indicator of the relative degree of risk. However, data for all counties show the importance of safety improvements on curves to reduce serious crashes since many serious lane-departure crashes occur in curves. As a result, the LRSP team used characteristics of curves in the county where crashes had occurred, as well as available information from similar analysis of national and statewide data. Results from *Cost-Benefit Analysis of In-Vehicle Technologies and Infrastructure Changes to Avoid Crashes Along Curves and Shoulders* (compiled by the University of Minnesota and CH2M HILL in June 2009) were also used in curve analysis and prioritization.

Based on a review of these sources, the following five risk factors were identified for crashes within curves in the county:

1. **Curve Radius** – The eastern region and all counties in Phase 1 and Phase 2 did not have enough serious curve crashes to provide insight into North Dakota’s characteristics (Figure 2-7). National data shows that curves with mid-range radii had higher crash densities. An upper limit of 1,200 feet was used for at-risk curves, because 1,200 feet is a 60-mile-per-hour design speed based on AASHTO’s *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets* (commonly referred to as the “Green Book;” 6th edition, 2011). A lower limit of 500 feet was used to represent the serious lane-departure crashes that were reported in the county from 2008 to 2012. Any curve with a radius between 500 and 1,200 feet received a star.
2. **Average Daily Traffic (ADT)** – Traffic volumes over 300 vehicles per day represent a higher risk for crashes (Figure 2-8). Sixty-four percent of serious lane-departure crashes occurred along curves with this ADT, while only 31 percent of curves are represented in this range. Therefore, curves with an ADT over 300 vehicles per day received a star.
3. **Intersection within the Curve** – In the eastern region, the presence of an intersection within a curve increased the risk for a serious crash. Curves with at least one intersection within the curve received a star.
4. **Visual Trap** – A visual trap exists when the crest of a vertical curve is located before a horizontal curve or where a minor road, tree line, or line of utility poles continues on a tangent to the curve, thereby creating the illusion that the road continues straight ahead (Figure 2-9). The presence of a visual trap increased the risk of crashes in the eastern region and, therefore, received a star.
5. **Serious Crashes** – If a serious crash occurred on a curve between 2008 and 2012, the curve received a star.



**FIGURE 2-7**  
 Phase 1 and Phase 2 Curve Crashes by Radii – 500 to 1,200 feet (2008 to 2012)



**FIGURE 2-8**  
 Rural Curve Crashes by Average Daily Traffic (ADT) – Greater than 300 Vehicles per Day (2008 to 2012)





**FIGURE 2-9**  
Example of a Visual Trap – Minor Road Intersects Roadway on a Curve

Based on 53 total crashes and 7 serious lane-departure crashes along the eastern region rural roads, those with intersections and visual traps have a higher crash density (are more at risk) than those without such features. These risk factors have also been observed nationally.

Detailed curve analyses and results for the counties are provided in Chapter 4. The five risk factors were used to prioritize curves in the county, with the highest-priority curves receiving the most stars. Curves were reviewed for proximity to high-priority curves and existing conditions as well.

Curves in the eastern region were screened for compliance with the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD; 2009) requirement regarding traffic signs at horizontal curves. Under this requirement, a curve must have an advance horizontal alignment warning sign if the daily traffic is greater than 1,000 vehicles per day and if speed differentials (the difference between the speed limit and the advisory speed) meet certain thresholds. A horizontal alignment sign and advisory speed plaque are recommended when the speed differential is 5 mph, and they are required if the speed differential is 10 mph or greater. Curve radius was used to estimate whether individual curves meet the speed differential requirements for advance warning signs and advisory speed plaques. The estimated advisory speeds (assuming a 55-mph speed limit, 6-percent superelevation, and friction factor that are consistent with the AASHTO Green Book) based on the curve radius are as follows:

- 900 to 1,100 feet – 50 mph
- 700 to 900 feet – 45 mph
- 500 to 700 feet – 40 mph
- 300 to 500 feet – 35 mph
- Under 300 feet – 30 mph or slower

For this analysis, no suggested advisory speed is provided for curves with a radius under 300 feet; these curves should be investigated further by the county to determine the appropriate advisory speed. Additionally, it is recommended that the county complete its own ball-bank indicator assessment of all curves to determine whether the curves on their road system meet the MUTCD requirement and to verify suggested advisory speeds.

If a curve was not selected as a project candidate through the LRSP risk assessment process (although the curve has an ADT greater than 1,000 vehicles per day and a radius under 1,100 feet), the curve was flagged for the county to determine the need for additional signs based on MUTCD guidance.

### 2.3.3 Rural Intersections – Crashes at Thru-STOP Intersections

On the eastern region’s rural local roads, a serious crash is most common at Thru-STOP intersections,<sup>1</sup> where 95 percent of serious intersection crashes (18 of 19 serious crashes) occurred from 2008 to 2012. Serious right-angle and angle crashes are the most common types of crashes at these intersections (Figure 2-10 and Figure 2-11).




FIGURE 2-10  
 Phase 2 Rural Serious Crashes by Crash Type (2008 to 2012)




FIGURE 2-11  
 Phase II Rural Serious Crashes by Traffic Control Device (2008 to 2012)

<sup>1</sup> Those intersections where traffic on the more heavily used road may proceed through the intersection without stopping, while traffic on the less-used crossroad must stop at the STOP sign before proceeding through the intersection.

In the eastern region, 369 rural intersections with 284 Thru-STOP locations were reviewed. The average serious crash density at rural Thru-STOP locations is 0.01 serious crash per intersection per year. This low density supports assessing an intersection risk based on the characteristics of the locations where serious crashes occurred. The following seven rural Thru-STOP risk factors were identified for serious right-angle crashes in the counties:

1. **ADT Cross Product** – 94 percent of the serious right angle crashes at rural Thru-STOP intersections occurred at intersections with an ADT Cross Product<sup>2</sup> of major and minor entering vehicles greater than 60,000 (Figure 2-12). An intersection was considered to have a higher risk of serious right angle crashes if the ADT Cross Product was greater than 60,000. These intersections received a star.
2. **Skew** – As the intersection skew (the angle at which one road intersects another) increases, the crash risk also increases (Figure 2-13). At a 20-degree skew, the crash risk compared to that of a 90-degree intersection is increased by approximately 10 percent. While the region’s serious right-angle crash data set was too small to determine if skew plays a role in crashes, it has been proven nationally that the greater the skew, the greater the likelihood for a crash (Figure 2-14). Intersections with a skew greater than 20 degrees received a star.
3. **Within or Near a Curve** – Research has shown that intersections located within or near a horizontal curve are subject to a higher level of risk. This risk factor was supported by the analysis (Figure 2-14). In this analysis, intersections located within or near a horizontal curve received a star.
4. **Development Present** – Research has shown that intersections with commercial development in one or more quadrants have a higher level of risk, possibly due to vehicles entering or exiting the development. Private residences or farms were not included as development. Intersections with development present had more serious crash rates (Figure 2-14) and therefore received a star.
5. **Railroad Crossing** – Intersections on or near a railroad crossing are subject to increased risk because drivers must navigate the railroad tracks while approaching the intersection. The rural analysis supported this risk factor (Figure 2-14). An intersection with a railroad crossing on one of the approaches received a star.
6. **Previous STOP More than 5 Miles Before the Intersection** – When traveling longer distances without encountering a STOP sign, drivers lose attention, and research has shown those intersections to be at higher risk (Figure 2-14). National data were used to confirm this risk factor. Intersections at which either of the stopped approaches do not encounter a STOP sign within 5 miles received a star.
7. **Total Crashes** – If an intersection had any type of crash from 2008 to 2012, the intersection received a star.

---

<sup>2</sup> The ADT Cross Product is the major-street entering volume multiplied by the minor-street entering volume.






FIGURE 2-12  
Phase 1 and Phase 2 Rural ADT Cross Product (2008 to 2012)



Source: Highway Safety Manual, Volume III (Figure 14-6)

FIGURE 2-13  
Intersection Skew Risk



**FIGURE 2-14**  
 Rural Intersection Risk Factors for the Phase I & Phase II (2008 to 2012)

The eastern region had 87 total rural intersection crashes from 2008 to 2012, and only 10 of those crashes are serious. Due to the small number of serious crashes, some of the data and risk factors may be misleading based on the county data alone. National data were used to confirm intersection risk factors.

Detailed intersection analyses and results for the counties and cities are provided in Chapter 4. Due to the large number of intersections, each intersection was prioritized using the seven risk factors by giving stars to each risk factor present. The highest-priority intersections received the most stars. In cases where two or more intersections received the same number of stars, crash costs were used to break the tie and determine priority.

### 2.3.4 Urban Roadway Segments – Cities with Populations Greater than 5,000 (Cities of Valley City and Wahpeton)


Approximately 500 miles of urban local roads were reviewed, where 23,603 total and 281 serious crashes occurred from 2008 to 2012. Nationally, research has shown that rear-end and head-on crashes are most common on urban local roads. In the cities of Valley City and Wahpeton, 143 rear-end crashes and 26 head-on and sideswipe-opposing crashes occurred from 2008 to 2012.

Although a variety of data was collected for each local roadway segment, only the following four risk factors were identified for the cities of Valley City and Wahpeton:


1. **Average Daily Traffic (ADT)** – Both rear-end and head-on crashes were overrepresented in road corridors with ADT volumes greater than 6,000 vehicles per day (Figure 2-15). (Note: This ADT volume includes data from the cities of Fargo, West Fargo, Grand Forks, Devils Lake, Bismarck, and Minot.) Corridors with an ADT greater than 6,000 vehicles per day received a star.
2. **Access Density** – Rear-end and head-on crashes are overrepresented along corridors with access densities greater than or equal to 30 access points per mile (Figure 2-16), and therefore received a star.
3. **Road Geometry** – Crashes are overrepresented per corridor mile on roadways with three or more lanes (Figure 2-17), and therefore multilane roadways were given a star.
4. **Speed Limit** – Serious rear-end and head-on crashes were overrepresented in low-speed corridors (40 mph or less) (Figure 2-18), and therefore received a star.

Detailed urban segment analyses and results for Valley City and Wahpeton are provided in Chapter 4. The four risk factors were used to prioritize roadway segments, with the highest priority segments receiving the most stars. High-priority roadway segments were also reviewed from a corridor perspective so that suggested safety improvement projects create a consistent corridor throughout the urban area.







**FIGURE 2-15**  
 Phase 1 and Phase 2 Urban Roadway Segment Average Daily Traffic (ADT) (2008 to 2012)



**FIGURE 2-16**  
 Phase 1 and Phase 2 Urban Roadway Segment Access Density (2008 to 2012)



**FIGURE 2-17**  
Phase 1 and Phase 2 Urban Road Geometry (2008 to 2012)




**FIGURE 2-18**  
Phase 1 and Phase 2 Urban Roadway Segment Crashes by Speed (2008 to 2012)

### 2.3.5 Urban Intersections – Right-Angle Crashes, Cities with Populations Greater than 5,000 (Cities of Valley City and Wahpeton)


In the cities of Valley City and Wahpeton, 94 intersections including 12 signalized intersections were analyzed. Of the over 319 total crashes, only 4 serious crashes occurred at the Valley City and Wahpeton urban intersections analyzed. These data support assessing an intersection's risk based on the characteristics of locations with serious crashes. A variety of information was collected on each intersection and from that, the following six risk factors for right angle crashes were chosen:

1. **Traffic Control Device** – Serious crashes are overrepresented at signalized intersections versus other intersection control types in urban areas (Figure 2-19). Therefore, signalized intersections received a star.
2. **Entering ADT** – Higher volumes of vehicles entering intersections was considered a risk factor. Approximately 40 percent of right angle crashes at signalized intersections in Phase 1 and Phase 2 urban areas occurred at intersections with an entering vehicles ADT greater than 18,000 vehicles per day (Figure 2-20). Therefore, any intersection with an entering vehicles ADT greater than 18,000 vehicles per day received a star.
3. **Road Geometry** – Serious and right-angle crashes were overrepresented on divided roadways with signalized intersections (Figure 2-17). Therefore, intersections on divided roadways received a star.
4. **Major Corridor Speeds** – Low-speed corridors were found to act as a surrogate for serious angle crashes (Figure 2-21). Therefore, intersections with low speed limits (40 mph or less) received a star.
5. **Serious Crashes** – Any intersection where one or more serious crashes had occurred received a star.
6. **Total Lanes on Major Approach** -- Serious and serious angle crashes were overrepresented at intersections containing six or more approach lanes (Figure 2-22). Therefore, intersections with six or more approach lanes received a star.


Detailed urban intersection right angle analyses and results for the Valley City and Wahpeton are in Chapter 4. The risk factors previously listed were used to help prioritize intersections with the highest priority intersections receiving the most stars. Right angle crash intersections were reviewed as urban corridors to create a consistent corridor throughout the urban area and to discourage implementing strategies at just one or two high priority intersections along a corridor if the remaining intersections have the same characteristics.




**FIGURE 2-19**  
 Phase 1 and Phase 2 Urban Serious Crashes by Intersection Traffic Control Device (2008 to 2012)



**FIGURE 2-20**  
 Phase 1 and Phase 2 Urban Crashes by Intersection Entering Vehicles Average Daily Traffic (ADT)



**FIGURE 2-21**  
 Phase 1 and Phase 2 Urban Crashes by Intersection Configuration



**FIGURE 2-22**  
 Phase 1 and Phase 2 Urban Signalized Intersection Crashes by Major Lanes Distribution (ADT)


### 2.3.6 Urban Intersections – Pedestrian/Bicycle Crashes, Cities with Populations Greater than 5,000 (Cities of Valley City and Wahpeton)

Similar analysis was completed for pedestrian and bicycle crashes at intersections. No serious pedestrian and bicycle crashes occurred at Valley City and Wahpeton intersections from 2008 to 2012, therefore the data were combined with all of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 urban intersection analysis. The following seven risk factors were identified based on the analysis:


1. **Traffic Control Device** - Serious pedestrian and bicycle crashes are overrepresented at signalized intersections versus other intersection control types in urban areas (Figure 2-23). Therefore, signalized intersections received a star.
2. **Entering Vehicles ADT** - A high volume of vehicles entering an intersection was considered a risk factor. A majority of the serious pedestrian and bicycle crashes occurred at intersections with an entering vehicles ADT greater than 18,000 vehicles per day (Figure 2-24). Therefore, any intersection with an entering vehicles ADT greater than 18,000 vehicles per day or greater received a star.
3. **Pedestrian Generator** - Intersections with adjacent land uses likely to generate pedestrian traffic (such as a school, playground, bar or gas station) had a higher pedestrian and bicycle crash risk than other intersections (Figure 2-25). Therefore, an intersection with a pedestrian generator present received a star.
4. **Major Corridor Speeds** - Low-speed corridors were found to act as a surrogate for serious pedestrian and bicyclist crashes (Figure 2-26). Therefore, intersections with low speed limits (40 mph or less) received a star.
5. **Marked Crosswalk** - The presence of marked crosswalks was found to be a surrogate for serious pedestrian and bicyclist crashes (Figure 2-27). Therefore, intersections with a marked crosswalk received a star.
6. **Bus Stop** - The presence of a bus stop was associated with increased rate of pedestrian and bicyclist crashes (Figure 2-28). Therefore, intersections with a bus stop received a star.
7. **Pedestrian and Bicycle Crashes** - Any intersections that had any bicycle or pedestrian crash from 2008 to 2012 received a star.

Detailed urban intersection pedestrian and bicycle analysis and results for the cities of Valley City and Wahpeton are provided in Chapter 4. The seven risk factors were used to prioritize intersections with the highest-priority intersections receiving the most stars. Pedestrian and bicycle crash intersections were reviewed as urban corridors to create a consistent corridor throughout the urban area.







**FIGURE 2-23**  
 Phase 1 and Phase 2 Urban Pedestrian/Bicycle Crashes by Intersection Traffic Control Devices




**FIGURE 2-24**  
 Phase 1 and Phase 2 Urban Pedestrian/Bicycle Crashes by ADT




**FIGURE 2-25**  
 Phase 1 and Phase 2 Pedestrian and Bicycle Crashes at Urban Intersection with a Pedestrian Generator



**FIGURE 2-26**  
 Phase 1 and Phase 2 Urban Pedestrian/Bicycle Crashes by Speed Limit



**FIGURE 2-27**  
 Phase 1 and Phase 2 Urban Pedestrian/Bicycle Crashes by Crosswalk Presence



**FIGURE 2-28**  
 Phase 1 and Phase 2 Urban Pedestrian/Bicycle Crashes by Bus Stop Presence (Grand Forks, Fargo, and West Fargo only)

## 2.4 Eastern Region Risk Summary

Table 2-3 summarizes the risk factors, ranges, and sources used in the eastern region’s systemic analysis.

TABLE 2-3  
Eastern Region Risk Summary

Risk Factors	Eastern Region		
	Minimum	Maximum	Source
<b>Rural Roadway Segments</b>			
ADT Range	225	Unlimited	Phases 1 and 2
Lane Departure Density	0.040	Unlimited	Phases 1 and 2
Access Density	6	Unlimited	Phases 1 and 2
Curve Critical Radius Density	0.111	Unlimited	Phases 1 and 2
ERA	2	3	Phases 1 and 2
<b>Rural Curves</b>			
Radius	500	1,200	National
ADT Range	500	Unlimited	Phases 1 and 2
Intersection on Curve	Present		Phases 1 and 2
Visual Trap	Present		Phases 1 and 2
Serious Crashes	1	Unlimited	Phases 1 and 2
<b>Rural Intersections</b>			
ADT Cross Product	60000	Unlimited	Phases 1 and 2
Skew	Present		National
On/Near Curve	Present		Phases 1 and 2
Development	Present		Phases 1 and 2
Railroad Crossing	Present		Phases 1 and 2
Previous STOP >5 Miles	Present		National
Total Crashes	1	Unlimited	Phases 1 and 2
<b>Urban Roadway Segments</b>			
ADT	6,000	Unlimited	All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Road Geometry	Multilane		All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Access Density	30	Unlimited	All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Corridor Speeds	Low (≤40 mph)		All Urban Phases 1 and 2
<b>Urban Right-Angle Crash Corridors</b>			
Entering ADT	18,000	Unlimited	All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Traffic Control	Signal		All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Major Corridor Speeds	Low (≤40 mph)		All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Road Geometry	Divided		All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Total Lanes on Major Approach	≤6 Approach Lanes		All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Serious Crashes	1	Unlimited	All Urban Phases 1 and 2

**TABLE 2-3**  
 Eastern Region Risk Summary

Risk Factors	Eastern Region		
	Minimum	Maximum	Source
<b>Urban Pedestrian and Bicycle Crash Corridors</b>			
Traffic Control	Signal		All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Entering ADT	18,000	Unlimited	All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Major Corridor Speeds	Low ( $\leq 40$ mph)		All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Pedestrian Generator	Yes		All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Marked Crosswalk	Yes		All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Pedestrian/Bicycle Crashes	1	Unlimited	All Urban Phases 1 and 2
Bus Stop	Yes		Cities of Grand Forks, Fargo, and West Fargo only

## 3.0 Eastern Region Priority Safety Strategies

---

### 3.1 Background

A variety of strategies are available to address each safety emphasis area. The implementation of high-priority strategies will assist state and local agencies in reducing traffic-related fatalities and incapacitating injuries. The primary sources for these strategies are the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) *Report 500* series and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) *Countermeasures That Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices*, (Seventh Edition, 2013). Each guide includes a description of the problem, strategies, and model implementation processes. In addition, to assist practitioners in assessing the safety strategies, the guides document the expected effectiveness of each strategy. NCHRP *Report 500* series assigns strategies to one of the following categories:

- **Proven:** These strategies have been used in multiple locations with multiple studies, and have been demonstrated to be effective.
- **Tried:** These strategies have been implemented in many locations; however, no rigorous evaluations have been completed to determine their effectiveness.
- **Experimental:** These strategies represent ideas that are considered to be effective; however, the ideas have not been widely implemented or evaluated.

### 3.2 Initial/Comprehensive List of Potential Strategies

NCHRP safety strategies were the basis for identifying safety strategies for the LRSP. For the LRSP process, NDDOT team members sought to identify viable safety strategies for the top safety emphasis areas (see Tables 3-1 through 3-10). The LRSP team reviewed the full range of safety strategies, and did an initial screening based on cost and effectiveness. For example, the NCHRP report lists over 70 potential strategies to address intersection safety. The screening conducted by the LRSP team narrowed the list of strategies for all safety emphasis areas down to strategies considered to be the most applicable in North Dakota.

Behavioral strategies include information on the expected effectiveness of the strategy to influence driver behavior based on current best practice and evaluation research results when available.

Each infrastructure strategy includes information on the relative cost to implement or operate, along with the typical timeframe for implementation. Relative costs were separated into three categories:

- Low = less than \$10,000 per mile or location
- Medium = between \$10,000 and \$100,000 per mile or location
- High = more than \$100,000 per mile or location

The typical timeframe to implement the strategy was also separated into three categories:

- Short = less than 1 year to implement
- Medium = between 1 and 2 years to implement
- Long = more than 2 years to implement



**TABLE 3-1**  
Impaired Driving Strategies (Behavioral Strategies)

Objectives	Strategies	Effectiveness	Programs and Tactics
<b>A – Eliminate Drinking and Driving</b>	<b>A1</b> – Promote Responsible Beverage Service Policies for Alcohol Servers and Retailers	Moderate	Advocate for responsible alcohol server and retailer training and compliance checks.
	<b>A2</b> – Employ Alcohol Screening and Brief Interventions	Proven	Implement health care provider interventions with crash victim after an alcohol-related crash (traumatic event) to screen for alcohol use problems, educate on risks of impaired driving, and treatment referral. Develop fact sheets and materials to be used.
	<b>A3</b> – Support Community Programs for Alternative Transportation	Moderate	Employ “Safe Cab” initiatives via partnership among beer distributors, bar owners and/or county/city community programs. Conduct public outreach on accessible safe-ride alternatives.
	<b>A4</b> – Promote ND “No Refusal” Law	Moderate	Educate high-risk populations/communities on North Dakota’s new “No Refusal” law where consequences of DUI test refusal are greater than test failure.
	<b>A5</b> – Promote Sobriety Initiatives for DUI offenders	Proven	Promote 24/7, DUI courts, and ignition interlock programs through educating local judicial and legal counsel members, probation officers, counseling and treatment providers as well as the general public.
<b>B – Enforce DWI Laws</b>	<b>B1</b> – Conduct Regular High-Visibility DUI Enforcement Saturations	Proven	Conduct a multi-agency, multi-squad car enforcement effort. Agencies work in collaboration to provide data-driven, high-visibility education/media outreach and enforcement for high-risk roadways.
	<b>B2</b> – Expand Use of DUI Sobriety Checkpoints	Proven	Local law enforcement to expand the use of multi-jurisdictional sobriety checkpoints that include public outreach/media campaigns about the checkpoints.
	<b>B3</b> – Educate and Enforce Zero Tolerance Laws for Drivers Under Age 21	Tried	Conduct education and high-visibility enforcement through community events including local media and public outreach about underage drinking and driving.
	<b>B4</b> – Monitor Prosecution and Sentencing of DUI Offenders	Moderate	Monitor prosecution and judicial sentencing of DUI cases Courts or Intensive Supervision Programs
	<b>B5</b> – Strengthen Alcohol Compliance	Tried	Promote judicial monitoring of “last place of drink” for bar-related DUI offenders and notify establishments of their over-serving.

**TABLE 3-2**  
 Seat Belt Use Strategies (Behavioral Strategies)

Objectives	Strategies	Effectiveness	Programs and Tactics
<b>A – Enforce Seat Belt use laws</b>	<b>A1 – Conduct High-Visibility Enforcement to Maximize Restraint Use</b>	Proven	Conduct a multi-agency, multi-squad car enforcement effort. Agencies work in collaboration to provide data-driven, saturated, high-visibility enforcement coupled with media outreach targeted toward high-risk populations. Conduct enhanced enforcement on North Dakota's secondary roads. Incorporate enhanced nighttime enforcement including multi-agency (when possible) and multiple squad cars in well-lit areas where slow-moving vehicles are passing and conducting seat belt observations for a limited time.
	<b>A2 – Enforce Secondary Belt Use Law</b>	Proven	Reinforce officers issuing second belt use ticket during traffic stops.
	<b>A3 – Pursue Tribal Ordinances for Primary Enforcement of Seat Belt Laws.</b>	Proven	Under tribal ordinance, pursue primary seat belt enforcement for occupants in all seating positions.
<b>B – Maximize use of occupant restraints by all vehicle occupants</b>	<b>B1 – Encourage Employer Traffic Safety Programs and Policies</b>	Tried	Encourage employers to offer traffic safety education programs to employees and to enact traffic safety policies with clear consequences for failure to comply. Utilize materials and policy statements designed for employers by Network of Employers for Traffic Safety.
	<b>B2 – Brief intervention regarding unbelted risks</b>	Experimental	Health care provider conducts brief intervention with crash victim after an unbelted crash (traumatic event) on unbelted risks and consequences. Develop fact sheets and materials to be used.
	<b>B3 – Provide Insurance Incentives</b>	Experimental	Promote local insurance provider incentives (for example, reduced premium rates) for safe driving practices including belt use at the time of traffic crash.

**TABLE 3-3**  
 Speed and Aggressive Driving Strategies (Behavioral Strategies)

Objectives	Strategies	Effectiveness	Programs and Tactics
<b>A – Deter aggressive driving for high-risk populations and locations</b>	<b>A1 – Identify High-Risk Speed Locations/Corridors for Enforcement.</b>	Proven	Analyze crash data to define high-risk speed locations for enhanced enforcement and public outreach efforts.
	<b>A2 – Conduct High-Visibility Enforcement of Speeding and Aggressive Driving</b>	Proven	Conduct a multi-agency, multi-squad car enforcement effort. Agencies work in collaboration to provide data-driven, saturated, high-visibility enforcement at high-risk speed corridors/roadways coupled with media outreach to high-risk populations.
	<b>A3 – Pursue Local/Tribal Use of Automated Enforcement in High-Risk Areas</b>	Proven	Pursue the use of automated enforcement in high-risk highway work zones and school crossing zones through the use of local/tribal safety ordinances.
	<b>A4 – Conduct Enhanced Enforcement of Red Light Running</b>	Proven	Provide enhanced enforcement for red-light-running violators using officer enforcement support for intersection RLR confirmation lights.
<b>B – Maximize driver compliance and awareness</b>	<b>B1 – Conduct Brief Interventions for Speed-Related Injuries</b>	Tried	Implement health care provider brief intervention with crash victim after crash (traumatic event) due to excessive speed on speed risks and consequences. Develop fact sheets and materials to be used.
	<b>B2 – Increase Driver Awareness of Speed Using Speed Reader Boards</b>	Proven	Expand use of speed reader boards providing feedback to drivers on their actual speed (for example, flash warnings when speeds exceeds limit). Most effective in slowing traffic on residential streets, near school zones and around playgrounds.

TABLE 3-4  
Young Driver Strategies (Behavioral Strategies)

Objectives	Strategies	Effectiveness	Programs and Tactics
<b>A – Publicize, enforce, and adjudicate laws pertaining to young drivers</b>	<b>A1 –</b> Conduct high visibility enforcement of GDL, no cell and texting laws, underage drinking and driving, and seatbelt use laws	Proven	Conduct enhanced enforcement and public outreach for young driver safety. Publicizing is best done through community events to attract local media and a community public education campaign about young driver laws, enhanced enforcement, and the necessary parental involvement.
<b>B – Actively engage parents in managing teen driving skill development</b>	<b>B1 –</b> Encourage driver education providers (local schools and private providers) to require parent education component	Tried	Promote required parent education component of local driver education programs (private and public school providers) to educate parents about teen driving risks, Graduated Driving License (GDL) provisions and their protections, parental role in supervising teen driving skill development, encourage selection of safer vehicles for teen driver, and to facilitate parent/teen driving agreements.
	<b>B2 –</b> Promote use of in-vehicle teen safety technology	Experimental	To help reduce and eliminate teen driving distractions and high-risk driving maneuvers (excessive speed, hard acceleration, deceleration, and swerves) promote the use of in-vehicle monitoring devices for parental monitoring and coaching.
	<b>B3 –</b> Promote Safe Teen Driving Outreach	Tried	Encourage driver education, local insurance, and public health organizations to provide teens and their parents with brochures, guides, and web resources to help parents understand risks, GDL provisions, their role, and how to develop a Parent/Teen Driving Agreement, and on-line driving logs.
	<b>B4 –</b> Provide information on insurance provider parent-teen safe driving programs	Tried	Inform parents of local insurance programs providing policy discounts for parents and their teen enrolling in parent-teen safe driving programs.
<b>C – Educate Young Drivers</b>	<b>C1 –</b> Brief interventions regarding driving risks and consequences	Experimental	When teen driver receives a moving violation or is involved in a crash, health care provider conducts brief intervention with crash victim after crash (traumatic event) on driving risks and consequences
	<b>C2 –</b> Conduct Peer-to-Peer safety outreach	Moderate	Promote peer education of traffic safety through peer-to-peer outreach campaigns and contests to engage teens on teen driving risks and socially reinforced safe driving behaviors.

TABLE 3-5  
Cross-Cutting Safety Strategy (Behavioral Strategy)

Objectives	Strategies	Effectiveness	Programs and Tactics
<b>A – Improved Quality and Timeliness of Crash Data</b>	<b>A1 – Local and Tribal Enforcement use of Traffic and Criminal Software (TraCS)</b>	Proven	Promote local and tribal enforcement full deployment of TraCS for in-the-field incident reporting and electronic submission of crash reports to the NDDOT.

TABLE 3-6  
Speeding Strategies (Infrastructure Strategies)

Objectives	Strategies	Effectiveness	Cost to Implement and Operate <sup>1</sup>	Timeframe for Implementation <sup>2</sup>
<b>A – Set appropriate speed limits</b>	<b>A1 – Install speed signage using variable message signs</b> in school zones	Tried	Low	Medium
<b>B – Communicate appropriate speeds through use of traffic control devices</b>	<b>B1 – Implement dynamic speed feedback signs</b> , including dynamic message boards at rural to urban transitions	Tried	Low	Medium
	<b>B2 – Use in-pavement</b> measures to communicate the need to reduce speeds	Tried	Moderate	Short
<b>C – Ensure that roadway supports appropriate and safe speeds</b>	<b>C1 – Effect safe speed transitions</b> through design elements and on approaches to lower-speed areas	Tried	High	Long

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Cost: Low = <\$100,000 per intersection; Moderate = \$100,000 to \$500,000 per intersection; High = >\$500,000 per intersection

<sup>2</sup> Implementation: Short = <1 year; Medium = 1 to 2 years; Long = >2 years

Source: NCHRP *Report 500* Series, 2004

TABLE 3-7  
Lane Departure Strategies (Infrastructure Strategies)

Objectives	Strategies	Effectiveness	Cost to Implement and Operate <sup>1</sup>	Timeframe for Implementation <sup>2</sup>
<b>A – Keep vehicles from encroaching on the roadside</b>	<b>A1 – Install edge rumble strips</b> (shoulder or edge line)	Proven	Low	Short
	<b>A2 – Install enhanced pavement markings</b> , 6-inch edge line, or embedded wet-reflective pavement markings on section with narrow or no paved shoulders	Experimental/ Tried	Low	Short
	<b>A3 – Provide enhanced shoulders</b> , lighting, delineation (for example, <b>Chevrons</b> ), or pavement markings for sharp horizontal curves	Tried / Proven	Low	Short
	<b>A4 – Provide skid-resistance</b> pavement surfaces	Proven	Moderate	Medium
	<b>A5 – Apply shoulder treatments</b> *Eliminate shoulder drop-offs *Safety edge *Widen and/or pave shoulders	Experimental/ Proven	Moderate	Medium
<b>B – Minimize the likelihood of crashing into an object or overturning if the vehicle travels off the shoulder</b>	<b>B1 – Design safer slopes and ditches</b> to prevent rollovers	Proven	Moderate to High	Medium
	<b>B2 – Remove/relocate objects</b> in hazardous locations	Proven	Moderate to High	Medium
<b>C – Reduce the severity of the crash</b>	<b>C1 – Improve design and application of barrier and attenuation systems</b>	Tried	Moderate to High	Medium
<b>D – Keep vehicles from encroaching into opposite lane</b>	<b>D1 – Install centerline rumble strips</b> for two-lane roads	Tried	Low	Short
	<b>D2 – Reallocate total two-lane roadway width</b> (lane and shoulder) to include a “ <b>buffer median</b> ”	Tried	Low	Medium
<b>E – Minimize the likelihood of crashing into an oncoming vehicle</b>	<b>E1 – Use alternating passing lanes</b> or four-lane sections at key locations ( <b>Swedish "2+1"</b> )	Tried	Moderate to High	Medium
<p>Notes:  <sup>1</sup> Cost: Low = &lt;\$10,000 per mile; Moderate = \$10,000 to \$100,000 per mile; High = &gt;\$100,000 per mile  <sup>2</sup> Implementation: Short = &lt;1 year; Medium = 1 to 2 years; Long = &gt;2 years                      Source: NCHRP Report 500 Series, 2003</p>				



TABLE 3-8  
Signalized Intersection Strategies (Infrastructure Strategies)

Objectives	Strategies	Effectiveness	Cost to Implement and Operate <sup>1</sup>	Timeframe for Implementation <sup>2</sup>
<b>A – Reduce frequency and severity of intersection conflicts through traffic control and operational improvements</b>	<b>A1 – Optimize signal operation</b> (phasing/timing, etc.)	Tried / Proven	Low	Short
	<b>A2 – Optimize clearance intervals</b>	Proven	Low	Short
	<b>A3 – Employ signal coordination</b> along a corridor or route	Proven	Low	Medium
	<b>A4 – Employ emergency vehicle preemption</b>	Proven	Moderate	Medium
<b>B – Reduce intersection conflicts through geometrics</b>	<b>B1 – Provide/improve left-turn channelization</b>	Proven	Moderate	Long
<b>C – Improve pedestrian safety with signal improvements</b>	<b>C1 – Install countdown timers</b>	Tried	Low	Short
	<b>C2 – Re-time signals</b> to provide a leading pedestrian interval ( <b>advanced walk</b> )	Tried	Low	Short
<b>D – Improve driver awareness of intersections and signal control</b>	<b>D2 – Improve visibility of signals</b> (overhead indications, 12-inch lenses, background shields, LED's) and signs (mast arm mounted street names) and signs (mast arm mounted street names) at intersections	Tried	Low	Short
<b>E – Improve driver compliance with traffic control devices</b>	<b>E1 – Supplement conventional enforcement</b> of red-light running with <b>confirmation lights</b> ; include a public information campaign to increase awareness and compliance	Tried	Low	Short
<b>F – Improve safety through other infrastructure treatments</b>	<b>F1 – Restrict or eliminate parking</b> on intersection approaches	Proven	Low	Short
<p>Notes:  <sup>1</sup> Cost: Low = &lt;\$100,000 per intersection; Moderate = \$100,000 to \$500,000 per intersection; High = &gt;\$500,000 per intersection  <sup>2</sup> Implementation: Short = &lt;1 year; Medium = 1 to 2 years; Long = &gt;2 years                      Source: NCHRP <i>Report 500</i> Series, 2004</p>				

TABLE 3-9  
Unsignalized Intersection Strategies (Infrastructure Strategies)

Objectives	Strategies	Effectiveness	Cost to Implement and Operate <sup>1</sup>	Timeframe for Implementation <sup>2</sup>
<b>A – Reduce the frequency and severity of intersection conflicts through geometric design improvements</b>	<b>A1 – Provide left-turn lanes</b> at intersections	Tried	Moderate	Medium
	<b>A2 – Provide offset turn lanes</b> at intersections	Proven	Moderate	Medium
	<b>A3 – Realign intersection approaches to reduce or eliminate intersection skew</b>	Tried	Moderate to High	Medium
	<b>A4 – Improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities</b> to reduce conflicts between motorists and nonmotorists	Proven	High	Medium
	<b>A5 – Use indirect left-turn treatments</b> to minimize conflicts at divided highway intersections	Varies	Moderate	Medium
<b>B – Improve sight distance at unsignalized intersections</b>	<b>B1 – Clear sight triangle</b> on approaches and in medians by clearing grub, eliminating parking, etc	Tried	Moderate	Medium
<b>C – Improve driver awareness of intersections as viewed from the intersection approach</b>	<b>C1 – Improve visibility of intersections by providing enhanced signing, delineation or pavement markings/messages</b> (stop bar, larger regulatory signs, LED stop signs, etc)	Tried	Low	Short
	<b>C2 – Improve visibility of intersections by providing appropriate street lighting</b>	Tried	Low	Short
	<b>C3 – Install larger regulatory and warning signs</b> at intersections, including the use of <b>dynamic warning signs</b> at appropriate intersections	Proven	Low to Moderate	Medium
	<b>C4 – Call attention to the intersection by installing rumble strips or splitter islands</b> on intersection approaches	Tried	Low	Short
<b>D – Appropriate intersection traffic control to minimize crash frequency and severity</b>	<b>D1 – Construct roundabouts</b> at appropriate locations	Tried	Low to Moderate	Medium
<p>Notes:  <sup>1</sup> Cost: Low = &lt;\$50,000 per intersection; Moderate = \$50,000 to \$500,000 per intersection; High = &gt;\$500,000 per intersection  <sup>2</sup> Implementation: Short = &lt;1 year; Medium = 1 to 2 years; Long = &gt;2 years                      Source: NCHRP Report 500 Series, 2003</p>				

TABLE 3-10  
Urban Segment Strategies (Infrastructure Strategies)

Objectives	Strategies	Effectiveness	Cost to Implement and Operate <sup>1</sup>	Timeframe for Implementation <sup>2</sup>
<b>A – Include pedestrian and bicycle accommodations</b>	<b>A1 – Install sidewalks</b> in appropriate locations	Proven	Moderate to High	Medium
	<b>A2 – Minimize pedestrian crossing distances using curb extensions or median islands</b>	Proven	Low	Medium
<b>B – Improve roadway configuration to accommodate left turns</b>	<b>B1 – Restripe roadway to a three-lane (road diet) or five-lane cross-section.</b>	Proven	Low	Medium
<b>C – Improve access management near intersections</b>	<b>C1 – Restrict or eliminate turning maneuvers</b> by providing channelization or closing median openings	Tried	Low	Short
	<b>C2 – Restrict access to properties using driveway closures or turn restrictions</b>	Tried	Low	Medium
	<b>C3 – Restrict cross-median access</b> near intersections	Tried	Low	Medium
<p>Notes:  <sup>1</sup> Cost: Low = &lt;\$50,000 per intersection; Moderate = \$50,000 to \$500,000 per intersection; High = &gt;\$500,000 per intersection  <sup>2</sup> Implementation: Short = &lt;1 year; Medium = 1 to 2 years; Long = &gt;2 years                      Source: NCHRP <i>Report 500</i> Series, 2003</p>				

### 3.3 Safety Strategies Workshop

A Safety Planning Workshop was held with representatives from the nine eastern counties in Valley City on December 4, 2013. Two additional workshops were held in the Grand Forks and Fargo as part of the LRSP Phase 2 analysis. The primary focus of the safety workshop was to discuss and prioritize the safety strategies.

The basic workshop structure included introductions and an overview of the current NDDOT safety program. This was followed by local speakers Kasey Skalicky (City-County Health District), Sgt. Luke Hendrickson (North Dakota Highway Patrol), Chief Fred Thompson (Valley City Police Department), and Kerry Johnson (Barnes County Highway Department), who shared information on local safety initiatives and programs. The morning was concluded with a review of the latest crash data on the local roadway system. In the afternoon, the workshop participants discussed potential safety strategies and began the process of prioritizing the strategies. The group reviewed and discussed driver-behavior and roadway infrastructure strategies. The final agenda item was a voting exercise where each participant voted for their preferred strategies to focus efforts on in the future local roadway program in their regions.

Workshop participants included county and city representatives, county commissioners, enforcement representatives, and NDDOT staff in order to include a variety of backgrounds and experiences to enable valuable interaction and discussions during the workshop.

### 3.4 Prioritizing Safety Strategies

Through the group (infrastructure and driver behavior) discussion and voting exercise, the top safety strategies for the eastern region are:

- **Behavioral strategies**
  - Support community programs for alternative transportation
  - Promote sobriety initiatives for DUI offenders
  - Educate and enforce zero tolerance laws for drivers under age 21
  - Conduct high-visibility targeted enforcement of speeding and aggressive driving
  - Encourage driver education providers to require parent education component
  - Enforce secondary belt use law
  - Pursue local support for primary seat belt law
- **Infrastructure strategies**
  - Provide enhanced shoulders, lighting, delineation, or pavement markings for sharp horizontal curves
  - Implement dynamic speed feedback signs, including dynamic message boards at rural to urban transitions
  - Install countdown timers
  - Improve visibility of intersections by providing appropriate street lighting
  - Restripe roadway to a three-lane or five-lane cross-section

Infrastructure safety projects that are developed as part of this LRSP are considered eligible for funding through the state’s Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). The managers of this program have identified implementation cost and effectiveness as priorities in their evaluation process of selecting projects for funding. Low-cost projects allow the limited funding to support a wider deployment and the use of proven-effective strategies provides the highest level of confidence that a given project will result in an overall crash reduction.

The ability of the selected strategies to reduce crashes is based on information in the FHWA’s CMF [Crash Modification Factors] Clearinghouse and other published research. Table 3-11 provides a summary for driver behavior strategies reviewed in Chapter 5 of this report. In addition, Table 3-11 provides a summary of the crash reduction factors that were found in the CMF Clearinghouse for infrastructure safety strategies considered and/or suggested for the eastern region, along with an estimated unit cost for each strategy. Most factors reported are based on research that was assigned with higher-quality ratings.

TABLE 3-11  
Proposed Strategies, Crash Reduction Factors, and Typical Installation Costs

Strategy	Crash Reduction Factor <sup>a</sup>	Typical Installation Costs
<b>Impaired Driving</b>		
Support community programs for alternative transportation	Up to 15% reduction in alcohol-related crashes	Low to moderate, depending on fares and tavern contributions
Promote sobriety initiatives for DUI offenders	Varies, depending on the program structure	
Educate and enforce zero tolerance laws for drivers under age 21	Up to 30% reduction when highly publicized	Up to \$50 per hour of officer overtime
<b>Speeding and Aggressive Driving</b>		
Conduct high-visibility targeted enforcement of speeding and aggressive driving	3%	Up to \$50 per hour of officer overtime
<b>Young Drivers</b>		
Encourage driver education providers to require parent education component	2%	\$1,500 per school district
<b>Seat Belt Use</b>		
Enforce secondary belt use law	3% to 5% increase in belt use; depending on intensity of enforcement	Up to \$50 per hour of officer overtime
Pursue local support for primary seat belt law	Up to a 9% increase in belt use after a state law is passed	Low to Moderate
<b>Rural Segments</b>		
4-inch latex edge line		\$1,320 per mile
4-inch latex centerline		\$660 per mile
6-inch latex edge line	10% to 45% all rural serious crashes	\$1,980 per mile
Shoulder or edge line rumble strips	20% run off road crashes	\$4,200 per mile
Ground in wet-reflective markings		\$36,000 per mile
Centerline rumble strips	40% head-on/sideswipe-crashes	\$3,600 per mile
6-inch centerline		\$1,020 per mile

**TABLE 3-11**  
Proposed Strategies, Crash Reduction Factors, and Typical Installation Costs

Strategy	Crash Reduction Factor <sup>a</sup>	Typical Installation Costs
<b>Rural Curves</b>		
Chevrons	20% to 30%	\$3,960 per curve
Arrow board only		\$1,200 per curve
Advance warning sign and advisory speed plaque		\$1,440 per curve
2-foot paved shoulder and shoulder rumble strips	20% to 30% run-off-the-road crashes	\$44,400 per mile +\$3,600 per mile
<b>Rural Intersections</b>		
Roundabout	20% to 50% all crashes/ 60% to 90% right-angle crashes	\$3,000,000 per intersection
Directional median (RCI or J-Turn)	17% all crashes/ 100% angle crashes	\$900,000 per intersection
Mainline dynamic warning sign	50% all crashes/ 75% serious right-angle crashes	\$60,000 per intersection
Close median		\$30,000 per intersection
Intersection lighting	25% to 40% nighttime crashes	\$10,200 per streetlight
Upgrade signs and pavement markings	40% upgrade of all signs and pavement markings/ 15% for STOP AHEAD pavement marking	\$2,640 per approach <sup>b</sup>
Clear sight triangle	37% serious injury crashes <sup>c</sup>	\$2,940 per intersection <sup>d</sup>
<b>Urban</b>		
Conversions (three-lane/five-lane)	30% to 50%	\$30,000 per mile [three-lane] \$42,000 per mile [five-lane] +\$30,000 per signalized intersection for updates (for example, loop and signal head placement)
Access management	5% to 31%	\$360,000 per mile <sup>e</sup>
Signal – confirmation lights	25% to 84% reduction in violations	\$1,200 per two approaches
Pedestrian/bicycle – advanced walk	Up to 60% pedestrian/vehicle crashes	\$0 per intersection
Pedestrian/bicycle – countdown timers	25% vehicle/pedestrian crashes	\$12,000 per intersection
Pedestrian/bicycle – curb extensions	Increase in vehicles yielding to pedestrians	\$36,000 per corner
Pedestrian/bicycle – median refuge island	46% in vehicle/pedestrian crashes	\$24,000 per approach

**TABLE 3-11**  
 Proposed Strategies, Crash Reduction Factors, and Typical Installation Costs

Strategy	Crash Reduction Factor <sup>a</sup>	Typical Installation Costs
<p>Notes:</p> <p><sup>a</sup> Crash reduction factors based on review of CMF Clearinghouse and other published research</p> <p><sup>b</sup> Includes \$540 per STOP sign, \$540 per junction sign assembly, \$600 per STOP AHEAD sign, \$600 per STOP AHEAD pavement marking message, and \$360 per stop bar</p> <p><sup>c</sup> Reduction based on increasing sight distance triangle</p> <p><sup>d</sup> Inclusive of sign upgrades identified and materials and labor for clearing of sight triangle.</p> <p><sup>e</sup> For management of unsignalized intersection movements within a corridor that has a divided median. Typical project may include minor street diverters, signed turn restrictions, and median closings.</p> <p>N/A = not applicable</p>		



## 4.0 Eastern Region Infrastructure Safety Projects

### 4.1 Eastern Region Proactive Project Decision Process

The primary objectives of the LRSP effort are to identify low-cost, safety-related infrastructure projects focused on each county’s documented safety emphasis areas and target crash types. These emphasis areas account for the greatest number of serious crashes occurring on the local road system. Mitigating the factors that contribute to these crashes will assist each county in reducing serious crashes on the local road system.

Projects were developed that include identifying a specific improvement at a specific location based on risk factors described in Chapter 2 and the high-priority safety strategies described in Chapter 3. Improvement strategies are consistent with the NDDOT’s SHSP with a focus on proven effectiveness at reducing the target crash type and low cost of implementation. Proven-effective strategies give safety program managers the highest level of confidence that the deployment will result in a reduction of crashes. Low-cost strategies allow improvements to be widely deployed across a system to address the low density of crashes and are less expensive than complete reconstruction of high-risk locations. Project development and mitigation focused on the following improvements:

- **Rural**
  - Lane-departure crashes along roadway segments and in curves
  - Intersection-related crashes
- **Urban**
  - Rear-end and head-on crashes on roadway segments
  - Angle crashes and pedestrian and bicycle crashes at intersections

For consistency across the eastern region, project decision trees were created so that locations with similar characteristics across the region received the same suggested mitigation treatment. Projects were chosen based on the identification of at-risk locations and the availability of proven strategies for crash reduction. This resulted in a systemic focus on rural paved roadway segments, horizontal paved curves, and rural intersections. In cities with populations over 5,000, the focus was on arterial and collector roadway segments and intersections along these segments. Projects were originally suggested based on the technical analysis and then revised in accordance with input from the local agencies and NDDOT.

High-priority rural roadway segment projects focused on addressing the most common type of serious segment-related crash – a single-vehicle, lane-departure crash – by implementing road edge improvements to alert drivers when they are drifting too far to the edge of the road (Figure 4-1).

High-priority rural curve projects focused on enhancing the curve delineation to improve driver’s ability to successfully navigate the curves (Figure 4-2). As shown in the figure, a curve is eligible for a safety improvement project in three ways.




FIGURE 4-1  
High-Priority Rural Roadway Segment Project Decision Tree




FIGURE 4-2  
High-Priority Rural Curve Project Decision Tree

High-priority rural intersection projects (Figure 4-3) focused on addressing the most common type of serious intersection crash – a right-angle collision – by making the intersection more visible to drivers and by reducing the number of intersection conflicts. Examples of suggested projects are shown in Figure 4-4.





FIGURE 4-3  
 High-Priority Rural Intersection Project Decision Tree



**FIGURE 4-4**  
 Intersection Safety Strategies Considered for Deployment

High-priority urban roadway segment projects focused on reducing rear-end and head-on crashes by creating buffer space in the middle of the roadway. This buffer space would be created by converting to a three-lane or five-lane roadway and by better managing access along divided arterials (Figure 4-5).

High-priority urban right-angle intersection projects focused on reducing right-angle crashes by reducing red-light running and managing access to reduce the number of conflict points along a corridor, particularly at signalized intersections (Figure 4-6).

High-priority urban pedestrian and bicycle intersection projects focused on reducing pedestrian and bicycle crashes by providing shorter crossing distances or median refuge islands, as well as advanced walk intervals and countdown timers at signalized intersections (Figure 4-7).

Project forms were completed for each high-priority intersection, curve, and roadway segment, including a description of the location, brief crash history, ranking factors, a picture of the location from the LRSP process (if needed), and the identified safety strategy. These forms were formatted so they could be submitted directly through the HSIP process, but may require supplemental information for the evaluation and scoring process.




FIGURE 4-5  
 High-Priority Urban Roadway Segment (Turning) Project Decision Tree




FIGURE 4-6  
 High-Priority Urban Right-Angle Intersection (Signalized) Project Decision Tree




FIGURE 4-7  
 High-Priority Urban Pedestrian and Bicyclist Intersection Project Decision Tree



The suggested low-cost safety projects for the eastern region are described in the following sections. The costs assigned to each project are planning level estimates and do not include right-of-way or some other supplemental costs such as signal revisions or replacement for three-lane conversion projects. Because of funding limitations, all potential projects would not be completed in 1 year. The actual schedule for implementing individual projects will necessitate securing funding from the state’s HSIP. The safety planning process followed for the eastern region is consistent with the North Dakota SHSP. In addition, several of the high-priority safety strategies are among those recommended for the state road system in the state’s SHSP.

It is not expected or required that each county or city pursue safety projects in the suggested ranking order. The ranking suggests general priorities, given that actual project development decisions will be made by each county or city staff based on economic, social, and political issues and in coordination with other pavement and reconstruction projects that are part of the county’s Capital Improvement Program.

Many project details are still undetermined, including general project termini. Each county or city will determine specific project details (such as termini and exceptions) as decisions regarding implementation of specific projects are made. These decisions may require that the county coordinate with various municipal departments, the public, and other county transportation departments.

The total cost of projects suggested for the eastern region is \$6,710,822. A cost breakout by project type and county/city is provided in Table 4-1.

TABLE 4-1  
 Eastern Region Total Safety Project Costs

Rural Projects	Roadway Segments	Intersections	Curves	Total
Barnes County	\$239,909	\$304,320	\$391,719	\$935,948
Eddy County	\$72,468	\$21,840	\$101,272	\$195,580
Foster County	\$144,240	\$104,400	\$72,246	\$320,886
Griggs County	\$36,762	\$160,320	\$53,640	\$250,722
Ransom County	\$150,936	\$141,240	\$29,520	\$321,696
Richland County	\$447,912	\$441,480	\$89,541	\$978,933
Sargent County	\$168,156	\$342,360	\$37,800	\$548,316
Steele County	\$134,683	\$54,000	\$65,172	\$253,855
Traill County	\$140,147	\$238,920	\$129,369	\$508,436
Urban Projects	Roadway Segments	Intersections – Right-Angle	Intersections – Pedestrians and Bicyclists	Total
Valley City	\$171,000	\$7,200	\$1,584,000	\$1,762,200
City of Wahpeton	\$175,850	\$374,400	\$84,000	\$634,250



# Barnes County

The total project cost suggested for Barnes County is \$935,948. The project cost breakout for intersection, roadway segment, and curve projects are listed in Table 4-2. High-priority locations that received a project are shown in Figures 4-8 and 4-9. These locations are described in further detail in Appendix: Barnes County, along with priority rankings and suggested project sheets.

TABLE 4-2  
 Barnes County Project Costs

Project Type	Cost
Intersections	\$304,320
Roadway Segments	\$239,909
Curves	\$391,719
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$935,948</b>




FIGURE 4-8  
 Barnes County Intersection and Segment Project Locations Map




FIGURE 4-9  
 Barnes County Curve Project Locations Map

## City of Valley City

The total project cost suggested for Valley City is \$1,762,200. The project cost breakout for roadway segment, right-angle intersection, and pedestrian/bicyclist intersection projects are listed in Table 4-3. High-priority locations that received a project are shown in Figures 4-10 and 4-11. These locations are described in further detail in Appendix: City of Valley City, along with priority rankings and suggested project sheets.

TABLE 4-3  
 Valley City Project Costs

Project Type	Cost
Roadway Segments	\$171,000
Right-Angle Intersections	\$7,200
Pedestrian and Bicyclist Intersections	\$1,584,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,762,200</b>




FIGURE 4-10  
 Valley City Urban Segment and Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Locations Map




FIGURE 4-11  
Valley City Right-Angle Project Locations Map



## Eddy County

The total project cost suggested for Eddy County is \$195,580. The project cost breakout for intersection, roadway segment, and curve projects are listed in Table 4-4. High-priority locations that received a project are shown in Figure 4-12. These locations are described in further detail in Appendix: Eddy County, along with priority rankings and suggested project sheets.

TABLE 4-4  
 Eddy County Project Costs

Project Type	Cost
Intersections	\$21,840
Roadway Segments	\$72,468
Curves	\$101,272
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$195,580</b>




FIGURE 4-12  
 Eddy County Projects Location Map

# Foster County

The total project cost suggested for Foster County is \$320,885.58. The project cost breakout for intersection, roadway segment, and curve projects are listed in Table 4-5. High-priority locations that received a project are shown in Figure 4-13. These locations are described in further detail in Appendix: Foster County, along with priority rankings and suggested project sheets.

TABLE 4-5  
 Foster County Project Costs

Project Type	Cost
Intersections	\$104,400
Roadway Segments	\$144,240
Curves	\$72,246
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$320,886</b>




FIGURE 4-13  
 Foster County Project Locations Map

## Griggs County

The total project cost suggested for Griggs County is \$250,722. The project cost breakout for intersection, roadway segment, and curve projects are listed in Table 4-6. High-priority locations that received a project are shown in Figure 4-14. These locations are described in further detail in Appendix: Griggs County, along with priority rankings and suggested project sheets.

TABLE 4-6  
Griggs County Project Costs

Project Type	Cost
Intersections	\$160,320
Roadway Segments	\$36,762
Curves	\$53,640
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$250,722</b>




FIGURE 4-14  
Griggs County Project Locations Map



# Ransom County

The total project cost suggested for Ransom County is \$321,696. The project cost breakout for intersection, roadway segment, and curve projects are listed in Table 4-7. High-priority locations that received a project are shown in Figure 4-15. These locations are described in further detail in Appendix: Ransom County, along with priority rankings and suggested project sheets.

TABLE 4-7  
Ransom County Project Costs

Project Type	Cost
Intersections	\$141,240
Roadway Segments	\$150,936
Curves	\$29,520
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$321,696</b>




FIGURE 4-15  
Ransom Project Locations Map

## Richland County

The total project cost suggested for Richland County is \$978,933. The project cost breakout for intersection, roadway segment, and curve projects are listed in Table 4-8. High-priority locations that received a project are shown in Figure 4-16. These locations are described in further detail in Appendix: Richland County, along with priority rankings and suggested project sheets.

TABLE 4-8  
 Richland County Project Costs

Project Type	Cost
Intersections	\$441,480
Roadway Segments	\$447,912
Curves	\$89,541
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$978,933</b>





FIGURE 4-16  
 Richland Project Locations Map

## City of Wahpeton

The total project cost suggested for City of Wahpeton is \$634,250. The project cost breakout for roadway segment, right-angle intersection, and pedestrian/bicyclist intersection projects are listed in Table 4-9. High-priority locations that received a project are shown in Figure 4-17. These locations are described in further detail in Appendix: City of Wahpeton, along with priority rankings and suggested project sheets.

TABLE 4-9  
 City of Wahpeton Project Costs

Project Type	Cost
Roadway Segments	\$175,850
Right-Angle Intersections	\$374,400
Pedestrian and Bicyclist Intersections	\$84,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$634,250</b>



**FIGURE 4-17**  
 City of Wahpeton Urban Segment, Right-Angle, and Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Locations Map





# Steele County

The total project cost suggested for Steele County is \$253,855. The project cost breakout for intersection, roadway segment, and curve projects are listed in Table 4-11. High-priority locations that received a project are shown in Figure 4-19. These locations are described in further detail in Appendix: Steele County, along with priority rankings and suggested project sheets.

TABLE 4-11  
 Steele County Project Costs

Project Type	Cost
Intersections	\$54,000
Roadway Segments	\$134,683
Curves	\$65,172
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$253,855</b>




FIGURE 4-19  
 Steele Project Locations Map



# Trail County

The total project cost suggested for Trail County \$508,436. The project cost breakout for intersection, roadway segment, and curve projects are listed in Table 4-12. High-priority locations that received a project are shown in Figure 4-20. These locations are described in further detail in Appendix: Trail County, along with priority rankings and suggested project sheets.

TABLE 4-12  
 Trail County Project Costs

Project Type	Cost
Intersections	\$238,920
Roadway Segments	\$140,147
Curves	\$129,369
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$508,436</b>




FIGURE 4-20  
 Trail Project Locations Map

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

APPENDIX  
**Barnes County**

---

---

**[Appendix Intentionally Left Blank]**

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

**[Appendix Intentionally Left Blank]**

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

**[Appendix Intentionally Left Blank]**



23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

APPENDIX  
**Foster County**

---

---

**Foster County  
Summary of Suggested Rural Segment Projects**

Page	Corridor ID	Route #	Start	End	Length	Risk Ranking	4" Edge Line	6" Edge Lines	Edge Rumble Strip	Center Line Rumble	6" Center Line	Project Cost (\$)
1	5.01	Foster 5	Foster/Stutsman County Line	Intersection with ND 200/US 52/3rd St NE	9.0	★★★★	0.9	0.0	8.1	0.0	0.0	\$35,208
2	21.02	Foster 21	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4	7.2	★★★	0.0	0.0	7.2	0.0	0.0	\$30,240
3	14.01	Foster 14	Intersection with US 52/US 281/4th Ave S	Intersection with 74th Ave SE/Foster 13	5.6	★★★	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$7,392
4	13.01	Foster 13	Foster/Stutsman County Line	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	9.0	★★	0.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	\$37,800
5	13.02	Foster 13	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	Intersection with 11th St NE/Foster 2	8.0	★★	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	\$33,600
23 USC 409 NDDOT Reserves All Objections							<b>6.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>32.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>\$144,240</b>

**Foster County  
Rural Segment Listing**

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

\*High Priority Segments Project Sheet Page Number

Project Sheet Page*	Corridor	Route	#	Start	End	Length (miles)	Lane Departure Crashes	ADT	Lane Departure Density	Access Density	Curves w/ Critical Radius / Mile	Edge Risk Assesment
	2.02	Foster	2	Intersection with Foster 2 Mainline/11th St NE	Foster/Eddy County Line	1.0	0	90	0.00	7.0	0.00	1
	2.03	Foster	2	Intersection with Foster 2 Spur/62nd Ave NE	Intersection with US 281	5.0	0	137	0.00	7.2	0.00	1
	2.04	Foster	2	Intersection with US 281	Intersection with 78th Ave NE	10.9	1	105	0.02	6.4	0.00	2
	2.06	Foster	2	Intersection with 82nd Ave NE/Foster 21	Intersection with ND 20/Bryon St (McHenry)	10.0	1	138	0.02	6.5	0.00	2
	2.07	Foster	2	Intersection with ND 20/Bryon St (McHenry)	Foster/Griggs County Line	4.1	0	145	0.00	3.4	0.00	3
1	5.01	Foster	5	Foster/Stutsman County Line	Intersection with ND 200/US 52/3rd St NE	9.0	3	296	0.07	5.2	0.22	2
4	13.01	Foster	13	Foster/Stutsman County Line	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	9.0	0	164	0.00	6.8	0.00	2
5	13.02	Foster	13	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	Intersection with 11th St NE/Foster 2	8.0	1	159	0.02	6.9	0.00	2
3	14.01	Foster	14	Intersection with US 52/US 281/4th Ave S	Intersection with 74th Ave SE/Foster 13	5.6	3	140	0.11	6.8	0.00	2
	20.01	Foster	20	Intersection with 85th Ave NE/Foster 21	Foster/Griggs County Line	8.0	0	55	0.00	4.8	0.00	2
	21.01	Foster	21	Foster/Stutsman County Line	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	9.0	1	93	0.02	4.8	0.11	3
2	21.02	Foster	21	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4	7.2	2	215	0.06	5.7	0.84	2
	21.03	Foster	21	Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4	Foster/Eddy County Line	1.8	0	153	0.00	5.1	0.00	2
						88.6	12					

Edge Risk Legend

- 1 3 -- Risky' - NEITHER shoulder or good clear zone
- 2 2 -- Either a shoulder OR good clear zone
- 3 1 -- BOTH shoulder and a good clear zone

Critical ADT Range - Lane Departure

Min	225
Max	100,000

	Access	Lane Departure	Critical Radius Curves
Total	545	12	4
Total Mileage	88.6	88.6	88.6
Years		5	
<b>Average Density (Total/Mile)</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.05</b>

**Foster County  
Rural Segment Prioritization - Lane Departure Priority**

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

#	Corridor	Route	#	Start	End	Length	ADT	ADT Range	Lane Departure Density	Access Density	Curve Critical Radius Density	Edge Risk	Tiebreakers		
													Totals	Edge Risk	ADT
1	5.01	Foster	5	Foster/Stutsman County Line	Intersection with ND 200/US 52/3rd St NE	9.0	296	★	★		★	★	★★★★	2	296
2	21.02	Foster	21	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4	7.2	215		★		★	★	★★★	2	215
3	14.01	Foster	14	Intersection with US 52/US 281/4th Ave S	Intersection with 74th Ave SE/Foster 13	5.6	140		★	★		★	★★★	2	140
4	13.01	Foster	13	Foster/Stutsman County Line	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	9.0	164			★		★	★★	2	164
5	13.02	Foster	13	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	Intersection with 11th St NE/Foster 2	8.0	159			★		★	★★	2	159
6	2.06	Foster	2	Intersection with 82nd Ave NE/Foster 21	Intersection with ND 20/Bryon St (McHenry)	10.0	138			★		★	★★	2	138
7	2.04	Foster	2	Intersection with US 281	Intersection with 78th Ave NE	10.9	105			★		★	★★	2	105
8	2.07	Foster	2	Intersection with ND 20/Bryon St (McHenry)	Foster/Griggs County Line	4.1	145					★	★	3	145
9	21.01	Foster	21	Foster/Stutsman County Line	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	9.0	93					★	★	3	93
10	21.03	Foster	21	Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4	Foster/Eddy County Line	1.8	153					★	★	2	153
11	20.01	Foster	20	Intersection with 85th Ave NE/Foster 21	Foster/Griggs County Line	8.0	55					★	★	2	55
12	2.03	Foster	2	Intersection with Foster 2 Spur/62nd Ave NE	Intersection with US 281	5.0	137			★			★	1	137
13	2.02	Foster	2	Intersection with Foster 2 Mainline/11th St NE	Foster/Eddy County Line	1.0	90			★			★	1	90

Total Stars -- 1 3 7 2 11  
% That Gets Star -- 8% 23% 54% 15% 85%

	#	%	Mileage	%
★★★★★	0	0%	0.0	0%
★★★★	1	8%	9.0	10%
★★★	2	15%	12.8	14%
★★	4	31%	37.9	43%
★	6	46%	28.9	33%
	0	0%	0.0	0%
	13	100%	88.6	100%

**Stars**

ADT Range - If segment has an ADT in the range of most at risk ADT based on North Dakota totals. (225 < ADT < 100000)

Lane Departure Density - If segment has higher lane departure density than the North Dakota average (0.04).

Access Density - If segment has access density than the North Dakota average (6).

Curve Critical Radius Density - If segment has higher density of curves with critical radius than the North Dakota average (0.111).

Edge Risk Assessment - Edge risk of 2 or 3, based on assessment of roadway edge and clear zone.

**HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) PROJECT APPLICATION**

North Dakota Department of Transportation Programming  
SFN 59959 (06-2011)

**Foster from Foster/Stutsman County Line to Intersection with ND 200/US 52/3rd St NE**

Agency Name: Foster County  
Contact Name: Nathan Monson  
Email Address: nmonson@daktel.com

ND DOT District: 2/3  
Telephone Number: 701-652-3926

Please attach a location map(s). You may use additional sheets to further describe your project.

**Location Description**

Start: Foster/Stutsman County Line  
End: Intersection with ND 200/US 52/3rd St NE  
Facility Type: 2-Lane  
ADT: 296  
Road Type Rural Paved  
County Road Foster

Lane Width: 12'  
Speed Limit: High  
Shoulder Width: 0'  
Shoulder Type: None  
Length (miles): 9.0  
Rumble Installed: No

- SHSP Emphasis Area (check all that apply)
- Reduce Alcohol Impaired Driving
  - Increase the Use of Safety Restraints for all Occupants
  - Younger Driver/Older Driver Safety
  - Curb Aggressive Driving
  - Improvements to Address Lane Departure Crashes
  - Enhancing Emergency Medical Capabilities to Increase
  - Improve Intersection Safety

**Describe Current Safety Issues & Systemic Ranking Review**

North Dakota Crashes, 2008 - 2012

5 years

	Total	Road Dept	K+A
Crashes	11	3	1
Density (per mile per year)	0.24	0.07	0.02
Rate (per MVM)	2.26	0.62	0.21

	Value	Critical	Road
ADT Range	296	225≤ADT≤100000	★
RD Density	0.067	0.040	★
Access Density	5.2	6.0	
Curve Critical Radius Density	0.223	0.111	★
Edge Risk	2	2 or 3	★

★★★★



**Describe Proposed Safety Improvements**

Description	Type	Cost per mi	Mileage	Cost	Notes - No edge rumble strip on north end. Intersection projects suggested on other sheets.
4" Edge Lines	Proactive	\$1,320	0.9	\$1,188	
6" Edge Lines	Proactive	\$1,980	0.0	\$0	
Edge Rumble Strip	Proactive	\$4,200	8.1	\$34,020	
Center Line Rumble Strip	Proactive	\$3,600	0.0	\$0	
6" Center Line	Proactive	\$1,020	0.0	\$0	

**Project Cost Estimate (attach detailed copy)**

**Proposed Year of Construction**

Federal Funds	\$31,687
Local Match (10% of Total project cost)	\$3,521
<b>*Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$35,208</b>

\* Based on typical NDDOT costs (March 2014); includes engineering, construction and contingency

**NDDOT Central Office Only**

Project Accepted?  Yes  No Reference Number ID Number

Notes

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

Project suggested for agency's consideration.

Page: 1  
Segment ID: 5.01  
Date: 6/11/2014

**HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) PROJECT APPLICATION**

North Dakota Department of Transportation Programming  
SFN 59959 (06-2011)

**Foster from Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE to Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4**

Agency Name: Foster County  
Contact Name: Nathan Monson  
Email Address: nmonson@daktel.com

ND DOT District: 2/3  
Telephone Number: 701-652-3926

Please attach a location map(s). You may use additional sheets to further describe your project.

**Location Description**

Start: Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE  
End: Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4  
Facility Type: 2-Lane  
ADT: 215  
Road Type Rural Paved  
County Road Foster

Lane Width: 12'  
Speed Limit: High  
Shoulder Width: 2'  
Shoulder Type: Gravel  
Length (miles): 7.2  
Rumble Installed: No

- SHSP Emphasis Area (check all that apply)
- Reduce Alcohol Impaired Driving
  - Increase the Use of Safety Restraints for all Occupants
  - Younger Driver/Older Driver Safety
  - Curb Aggressive Driving
  - Improvements to Address Lane Departure Crashes
  - Enhancing Emergency Medical Capabilities to Increase
  - Improve Intersection Safety

**Describe Current Safety Issues & Systemic Ranking Review**

North Dakota Crashes, 2008 - 2012

5 years

	Total	Road Dept	K+A
Crashes	7	2	0
Density (per mile per year)	0.19	0.06	0.00
Rate (per MVM)	2.48	0.71	0.00

	Value	Critical	Road
ADT Range	215	225≤ADT≤100000	
RD Density	0.056	0.040	★
Access Density	5.7	6.0	
Curve Critical Radius Density	0.837	0.111	★
Edge Risk	2	2 or 3	★
			★★★



**Describe Proposed Safety Improvements**

Description	Type	Cost per mi	Mileage	Cost	Notes - Curve projects suggested on other sheets.
4" Edge Lines	Proactive	\$1,320	0.0	\$0	
6" Edge Lines	Proactive	\$1,980	0.0	\$0	
Edge Rumble Strip	Proactive	\$4,200	7.2	\$30,240	
Center Line Rumble Strip	Proactive	\$3,600	0.0	\$0	
6" Center Line	Proactive	\$1,020	0.0	\$0	

**Project Cost Estimate (attach detailed copy)**

**Proposed Year of Construction**

Federal Funds	\$27,216
Local Match (10% of Total project cost)	\$3,024
<b>*Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$30,240</b>

\* Based on typical NDDOT costs (March 2014); includes engineering, construction and contingency

**NDDOT Central Office Only**

Project Accepted?  Yes  No Reference Number ID Number

Notes

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

Project suggested for agency's consideration.

Page: 2  
Segment ID: 21.02  
Date: 6/11/2014

**HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) PROJECT APPLICATION**

North Dakota Department of Transportation Programming  
SFN 59959 (06-2011)

**Foster from Intersection with US 52/US 281/4th Ave S to Intersection with 74th Ave SE/Foster 13**

Agency Name: Foster County  
Contact Name: Nathan Monson  
Email Address: nmonson@daktel.com

ND DOT District: 2/3  
Telephone Number: 701-652-3926

Please attach a location map(s). You may use additional sheets to further describe your project.

**Location Description**

Start: Intersection with US 52/US 281/4th Ave S  
End: Intersection with 74th Ave SE/Foster 13  
Facility Type: 2-Lane  
ADT: 140  
Road Type Rural Paved  
County Road Foster

Lane Width: 12'  
Speed Limit: High  
Shoulder Width: 0'  
Shoulder Type: None  
Length (miles): 5.6  
Rumble Installed: No

- SHSP Emphasis Area (check all that apply)
- Reduce Alcohol Impaired Driving
  - Increase the Use of Safety Restraints for all Occupants
  - Younger Driver/Older Driver Safety
  - Curb Aggressive Driving
  - Improvements to Address Lane Departure Crashes
  - Enhancing Emergency Medical Capabilities to Increase
  - Improve Intersection Safety

**Describe Current Safety Issues & Systemic Ranking Review**

North Dakota Crashes, 2008 - 2012

5 years

	Total	Road Dept	K+A
Crashes	5	3	0
Density (per mile per year)	0.18	0.11	0.00
Rate (per MVM)	3.49	2.10	0.00

	Value	Critical	Road
ADT Range	140	225≤ADT≤100000	
RD Density	0.107	0.040	★
Access Density	6.8	6.0	★
Curve Critical Radius Density	0.000	0.111	
Edge Risk	2	2 or 3	★
			★★★



**Describe Proposed Safety Improvements**

Description	Type	Cost per mi	Mileage	Cost	Notes - Intersection projects suggested on other sheets.
4" Edge Lines	Proactive	\$1,320	5.6	\$7,392	
6" Edge Lines	Proactive	\$1,980	0.0	\$0	
Edge Rumble Strip	Proactive	\$4,200	0.0	\$0	
Center Line Rumble Strip	Proactive	\$3,600	0.0	\$0	
6" Center Line	Proactive	\$1,020	0.0	\$0	

**Project Cost Estimate (attach detailed copy)**

**Proposed Year of Construction**

Federal Funds	\$6,653
Local Match (10% of Total project cost)	\$739
<b>*Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$7,392</b>

\* Based on typical NDDOT costs (March 2014); includes engineering, construction and contingency

**NDDOT Central Office Only**

Project Accepted?  Yes  No Reference Number ID Number

Notes

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

Project suggested for agency's consideration.

Page: 3  
Segment ID: 14.01  
Date: 6/11/2014



**HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) PROJECT APPLICATION**

North Dakota Department of Transportation Programming  
SFN 59959 (06-2011)

**Foster from Foster/Stutsman County Line to Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE**

Agency Name: Foster County  
Contact Name: Nathan Monson  
Email Address: nmonson@daktel.com

ND DOT District: 2/3  
Telephone Number: 701-652-3926

Please attach a location map(s). You may use additional sheets to further describe your project.

**Location Description**

Start: Foster/Stutsman County Line  
End: Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE  
Facility Type: 2-Lane  
ADT: 164  
Road Type Rural Paved  
County Road Foster

Lane Width: 12'  
Speed Limit: High  
Shoulder Width: 0'  
Shoulder Type: None  
Length (miles): 9.0  
Rumble Installed: No

- SHSP Emphasis Area (check all that apply)
- Reduce Alcohol Impaired Driving
  - Increase the Use of Safety Restraints for all Occupants
  - Younger Driver/Older Driver Safety
  - Curb Aggressive Driving
  - Improvements to Address Lane Departure Crashes
  - Enhancing Emergency Medical Capabilities to Increase
  - Improve Intersection Safety

**Describe Current Safety Issues & Systemic Ranking Review**

North Dakota Crashes, 2008 - 2012

5 years

	Total	Road Dept	K+A
Crashes	3	0	0
Density (per mile per year)	0.07	0.00	0.00
Rate (per MVM)	1.11	0.00	0.00

	Value	Critical	Road
ADT Range	164	225≤ADT≤100000	
RD Density	0.000	0.040	
Access Density	6.8	6.0	★
Curve Critical Radius Density	0.000	0.111	
Edge Risk	2	2 or 3	★
			★★



**Describe Proposed Safety Improvements**

Description	Type	Cost per mi	Mileage	Cost	Notes -
4" Edge Lines	Proactive	\$1,320	0.0	\$0	
6" Edge Lines	Proactive	\$1,980	0.0	\$0	
Edge Rumble Strip	Proactive	\$4,200	9.0	\$37,800	
Center Line Rumble Strip	Proactive	\$3,600	0.0	\$0	
6" Center Line	Proactive	\$1,020	0.0	\$0	

**Project Cost Estimate (attach detailed copy)**

**Proposed Year of Construction**

Federal Funds	\$34,020
Local Match (10% of Total project cost)	\$3,780
<b>*Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$37,800</b>

\* Based on typical NDDOT costs (March 2014); includes engineering, construction and contingency

**NDDOT Central Office Only**

Project Accepted?  Yes  No Reference Number ID Number

Notes

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

Project suggested for agency's consideration.

Page: 4  
Segment ID: 13.01  
Date: 6/11/2014

**HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) PROJECT APPLICATION**

North Dakota Department of Transportation Programming  
SFN 59959 (06-2011)

**Foster from Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE to Intersection with 11th St NE/Foster 2**

Agency Name: Foster County

ND DOT District: 2/3

Contact Name: Nathan Monson

Telephone Number: 701-652-3926

Email Address: nmonson@daktel.com

Please attach a location map(s). You may use additional sheets to further describe your project.

**Location Description**

Start: Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE  
End: Intersection with 11th St NE/Foster 2  
Facility Type: 2-Lane  
ADT: 159  
Road Type Rural Paved  
County Road Foster

Lane Width: 12'  
Speed Limit: High  
Shoulder Width: 0'  
Shoulder Type: None  
Length (miles): 8.0  
Rumble Installed: No

- SHSP Emphasis Area (check all that apply)
- Reduce Alcohol Impaired Driving
  - Increase the Use of Safety Restraints for all Occupants
  - Younger Driver/Older Driver Safety
  - Curb Aggressive Driving
  - Improvements to Address Lane Departure Crashes
  - Enhancing Emergency Medical Capabilities to Increase
  - Improve Intersection Safety

**Describe Current Safety Issues & Systemic Ranking Review**

North Dakota Crashes, 2008 - 2012

5 years

	Total	Road Dept	K+A
Crashes	2	1	0
Density (per mile per year)	0.05	0.03	0.00
Rate (per MVM)	0.86	0.43	0.00

	Value	Critical	Road
ADT Range	159	225≤ADT≤100000	
RD Density	0.025	0.040	
Access Density	6.9	6.0	*
Curve Critical Radius Density	0.000	0.111	
Edge Risk	2	2 or 3	*
			**



**Describe Proposed Safety Improvements**

Description	Type	Cost per mi	Mileage	Cost	Notes -
4" Edge Lines	Proactive	\$1,320	0.0	\$0	
6" Edge Lines	Proactive	\$1,980	0.0	\$0	
Edge Rumble Strip	Proactive	\$4,200	8.0	\$33,600	
Center Line Rumble Strip	Proactive	\$3,600	0.0	\$0	
6" Center Line	Proactive	\$1,020	0.0	\$0	

**Project Cost Estimate (attach detailed copy)**

**Proposed Year of Construction**

Federal Funds	\$30,240
Local Match (10% of Total project cost)	\$3,360
<b>*Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$33,600</b>

\* Based on typical NDDOT costs (March 2014); includes engineering, construction and contingency

**NDDOT Central Office Only**

Project Accepted?  Yes  No Reference Number ID Number

Notes

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

Project suggested for agency's consideration.

Page: 5  
Segment ID: 13.02  
Date: 6/11/2014

**Foster County Curves**

Curve Count	ID	Corridor	Segment	Start	End	Inside Shoulder Type	Outside Shoulder Type	Curve Advisory Sign	Speed Advisory Sign	Chevrons	Crashes		Radius (ft)	ADT	Intersection on Curve	Visual Trap	Speed Limit	Risk Ranking	Notes
											Total	Total Severe							
1	005A	5.01	Foster	Foster/Stutsman County Line	Intersection with ND 200/US 52/3rd St NE	None	None	Yes	No	No	-	-	2,091	296	No	No	High		Winding Road - Nonconforming
2	005B	5.01	Foster	Foster/Stutsman County Line	Intersection with ND 200/US 52/3rd St NE	None	None	Yes	No	No	-	-	1,823	296	No	No	High		Winding Road - Nonconforming
3	021A	21.01	Foster	Foster/Stutsman County Line	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	Paved	Paved	Yes	No	No	-	-	2,914	93	Yes	No	High	★	Curve Warning
4	021B	21.02	Foster	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4	Gravel	Gravel	No	No	No	-	-	1,246	215	No	Yes	High	★	
5	021C	21.02	Foster	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4	Gravel	Gravel	No	No	No	-	-	1,201	215	No	No	High		
6	021D	21.02	Foster	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4	Gravel	Gravel	No	No	No	1	-	1,045	215	No	No	High	★	
7	021E	21.02	Foster	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4	Gravel	Gravel	No	No	No	-	-	751	215	No	No	High	★	
8	021F	21.02	Foster	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4	Gravel	Gravel	Yes	No	No	-	-	1,136	215	Yes	Yes	High	★★★	Curve Warning
9	021G	21.02	Foster	Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE	Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4	Gravel	Gravel	Yes	No	No	-	-	1,174	215	Yes	Yes	High	★★★	Curve Warning
10	500A	500.01	Foster	Intersection with 66th Ave NE/Foster 5	Intersection with US 281/67th Ave NE	Paved	Paved	No	No	No	-	-	166	680	No	Yes	Low	★★	
11	500B	500.01	Foster	Intersection with 66th Ave NE/Foster 5	Intersection with US 281/67th Ave NE	Paved	Paved	No	No	No	-	-	166	680	No	Yes	Low	★★	
12	500C	500.01	Foster	Intersection with 66th Ave NE/Foster 5	Intersection with US 281/67th Ave NE	Paved	Paved	No	No	No	-	-	203	680	No	Yes	Low	★★	
13	500D	500.01	Foster	Intersection with 66th Ave NE/Foster 5	Intersection with US 281/67th Ave NE	Paved	Paved	No	No	No	-	-	213	680	Yes	Yes	Low	★★★	
14	500E	500.01	Foster	Intersection with 66th Ave NE/Foster 5	Intersection with US 281/67th Ave NE	Paved	Paved	No	No	No	-	-	368	680	No	No	Low	★	

1

-

Critical Ranges		
	Min	Max
Radius	500	1,200
ADT	300	100,000

Stars	Total		Chevroned
	#	%	(% of Stars)
★★★★★	0	0%	0%
★★★★	0	0%	0%
★★★	3	21%	0%
★★	3	21%	0%
★	5	36%	0%
	3	21%	0%
	14	100%	0%

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

**HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) PROJECT APPLICATION**

North Dakota Department of Transportation Programming  
SFN 59959 (06-2011)

**Curves on Foster from Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE to Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Ave/Foster 4**

Agency Name: Foster County  
Contact Name: Nathan Monson  
Email Address: nmonson@daktel.com

ND DOT District: 2/3  
Telephone Number: 701-652-3926

Please attach a location map(s). You may use additional sheets to further describe your project.

**Location Description (Corridor Containing Curves)**

Start: Intersection with ND 200/3rd St NE End: Intersection with 9th St NE/N Railroad Facility Type: 2-Lane ADT: 215 Road Type Rural Paved County Road Foster	Lane Width: 12' Speed Limit: High Shoulder Width: 2' Shoulder Type: Gravel Length (miles): 7.2 Rumble Installed: No	SHSP Emphasis Area (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> Reduce Alcohol Impaired Driving <input type="checkbox"/> Increase the Use of Safety Restraints for all Occupants <input type="checkbox"/> Younger Driver/Older Driver Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Curb Aggressive Driving <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvements to Address Lane Departure Crashes <input type="checkbox"/> Enhancing Emergency Medical Capabilities to Increase Survivability <input type="checkbox"/> Improve Intersection Safety
--	--	---

**Describe Current Safety Issues & Systemic Ranking Review**

North Dakota Crashes, 2008 - 2012

5 years

Curve ID	K	A	Radius (ft)	ADT	Intersection on Curve	Visual Trap	Risk Ranking	Proximity or Existing Chevrons	High Priority Segment + Critical Radius	Sign Improvement Project	Shoulder Paving Project	Shoulder Rumble Strip Project	Advance Horizontal Alignment Warning Sign	Advisory Speed Plaque
021B	0	0	1246	215	No	Yes	*	x	-	Chevron	Inside/Outside	Inside/Outside	-	-
021C	0	0	1201	215	No	No	*	x	-	Chevron	Inside/Outside	Inside/Outside	-	-
021D	0	0	1045	215	No	No	*	-	x	Chevron	Inside/Outside	Inside/Outside	x	50
021E	0	0	751	215	No	No	*	-	x	Chevron	Inside/Outside	Inside/Outside	x	45
021F	0	0	1136	215	Yes	Yes	***	-	x	Chevron	Inside/Outside	Inside/Outside	-	-
021G	0	0	1174	215	Yes	Yes	***	-	x	Chevron	Inside/Outside	Inside/Outside	-	-

\*Curve numbering not consecutive, as some curves may have been removed from further analysis because a large radius, located on a gravel road, etc

**Ranking Criteria**

Criteria	Curves are selected for project if:
Severe Crashes > 0	- 3 or more *s
Radius 500 to 1200	- x in Proximity or Existing Chevron column
ADT 00 to 100000	- within Critical Radius
Intersection on Curve Yes	
Visual Trap Yes	

**Describe Proposed Safety Improvements**

Description	Type	Unit Cost	Quantity	Total cost	Notes - Segment projects suggested on other sheets.
Chevrons	Proactive	\$3,960 per curve	6	\$23,760	
Arrow Board Only	Proactive	\$1,200 per curve	0	\$0	
Advance Warning Sign/Speed Advisory Plaque	Proactive	\$1,440 per curve	2	\$2,880	
Shoulder Rumble Strip	Proactive	\$3,600 per mile	1.0 miles	\$3,420	
Shoulder Paving	Proactive	\$44,400 per mile	1.0 miles	\$42,185	
				<b>\$72,246</b>	

**Project Cost Estimate (attach detailed copy)**

**Proposed Year of Construction**

Federal Funds	\$65,021
Local Match (10% of Total project cost)	\$7,225
<b>*Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$72,246</b>

\* Based on typical NDDOT costs (March 2014); includes engineering, construction and contingency

**NDDOT Central Office Only**

Project Accepted?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Reference Number	ID Number
-------------------	--	------------------	-----------

Notes

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

Project suggested for agency's consideration.

Page: 1  
Segment ID: 21.02  
Date: 6/11/2014

**Foster County  
Summary of Suggested Rural Intersection Projects**

Page	Intersection ID	Description	Risk Ranking	Directional Median	Mainline Dynamic Warning Sign	Close Median	Install Street Lights	Signs & Markings	Project Cost (\$)
1	5.02	3rd St NE (US 52) & 66th Ave NE (Foster 5)	★★★★★	-	x	-	-	x	\$64,680
2	14.01	4th Ave S (US 52) & 1st St SE (Foster 14)	★★★★	-	-	-	x	x	\$14,880
3	2.02	67th Ave NE (US 281) & 11st St NE (Foster 2)	★★★	-	-	-	x	x	\$15,480
4	5.05	67th Ave NE (US 281) & 7th St NE (Foster 5)	★★★	-	-	-	-	x	\$4,080
5	2.06	Bryon St (ND 20) & 11st St NE (Foster 2)	★★★	-	-	-	-	x	\$5,280
23 USC 409 NDDOT Reserves All Objections				0	1	0	2	5	<b>\$104,400</b>

**Foster County  
Rural Intersection Listing**

23 US 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

Int #	Sys	Num	Intersection Description	Skew	On/Near Curve	Development	RR Xing	ADT	Previous STOP (>5mi)	Total Crashes	ADT Cross Product > 60000	Crash Cost
2.02	Foster	2	67th Ave NE (US 281) & 11st St NE (Foster 2)	No	No	No	No	1890	Yes	1	Yes	\$ 12,000
2.06	Foster	2	Bryon St (ND 20) & 11st St NE (Foster 2)	Yes	Yes	No	No	413	Yes	0	No	\$ -
5.02	Foster	5	3rd St NE (US 52) & 66th Ave NE (Foster 5)	Yes	Yes	No	No	3050	Yes	4	Yes	\$ 285,000
5.05	Foster	5	67th Ave NE (US 281) & 7th St NE (Foster 5)	No	No	No	No	1940	Yes	1	Yes	\$ 12,000
13.02	Foster	13	3rd St NE (ND 200) & Bordulac Rd (Foster 13)	No	No	No	No	1050	Yes	0	Yes	\$ -
14.01	Foster	14	4th Ave S (US 52) & 1st St SE (Foster 14)	Yes	No	No	Yes	2613	Yes	0	Yes	\$ -
20.02	Foster	20	93rd Ave SE (ND 20) & 4th St SE (Foster 20)	No	No	No	No	255	Yes	0	No	\$ -
21.01	Foster	21	3rd St NE (ND 200) & 85th Ave NE (Foster 21) (E)	No	No	No	No	680	Yes	0	No	\$ -
21.02	Foster	21	3rd St NE (ND200) & 81st Ave NE (Foster 21) (W)	No	No	No	No	780	Yes	0	No	\$ -
500.01	Foster	N/A	67th Ave NE (US 281) & 11th St N (Foster 500)	No	No	Yes	No	4980	No	0	Yes	\$ -



**Foster County  
Rural Intersection Prioritization**

23 US 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

Rank	Int #	Intersection Description	Skew	On/Near Curve	Development	RR Xing	Previous STOP (>5mi)	Total Crashes	ADT Cross Product > 60000	Priority	Crash Cost
1	5.02	3rd St NE (US 52) & 66th Ave NE (Foster 5)	★	★			★	★	★	★★★★★	\$ 285,000
2	14.01	4th Ave S (US 52) & 1st St SE (Foster 14)	★			★	★		★	★★★★★	\$ -
3	2.02	67th Ave NE (US 281) & 11st St NE (Foster 2)					★	★	★	★★★	\$ 12,000
4	5.05	67th Ave NE (US 281) & 7th St NE (Foster 5)					★	★	★	★★★	\$ 12,000
5	2.06	Bryon St (ND 20) & 11st St NE (Foster 2)	★	★			★			★★★	\$ -
6	13.02	3rd St NE (ND 200) & Bordulac Rd (Foster 13)					★		★	★★	\$ -
7	500.01	67th Ave NE (US 281) & 11th St N (Foster 500)			★				★	★★	\$ -
8	20.02	93rd Ave SE (ND 20) & 4th St SE (Foster 20)					★			★	\$ -
9	21.01	3rd St NE (ND 200) & 85th Ave NE (Foster 21) (E)					★			★	\$ -
10	21.02	3rd St NE (ND200) & 81st Ave NE (Foster 21) (W)					★			★	\$ -

Totals  
 Total Stars -- 3 2 1 1 9 3 6  
 % That Gets Star -- 30% 20% 10% 10% 90% 30% 60%

	#	%
★★★★★★	0	0%
★★★★★★	0	0%
★★★★★	1	10%
★★★★	1	10%
★★★	3	30%
★★	2	20%
★	3	30%
-	0	0%
	10	100%

Stars

Skew - If intersection is skewed at an angle of 20 degrees or greater.

On/Near Curve - If intersection is on or within 1,000 feet of curve.

Development - If intersection aerial shows a commercial development with access near intersection.

RR Xing - If intersection has a railroad crossing on any approach within 500 feet.

Previous STOP (>5 mi) - If vehicles approaching the stop control have not had a previous stop along the roadway within 5 miles

Total Crashes - If intersection has at least 1 crash.

ADT Cross Product - If intersection has an ADT cross product > 60000

# HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) PROJECT APPLICATION

North Dakota Department of Transportation Programming  
SFN 59959 (06-2011)

## 3rd St NE (US 52) & 66th Ave NE (Foster 5)

**Agency Name:** Foster County  
**Contact Name:** Nathan Monson  
**Email Address:** nmonson@daktel.com

**ND DOT District:** 2/3  
**Telephone Number:** 701-652-3926

Please attach a location map(s). You may use additional sheets to further describe your project.

### Location Description

Configuration: X Traffic Control Device: Thru-STOP  
Configuration (2): Undivided Street Lights: Yes  
Urban/Rural: Rural Flashers: No  
County: Foster Major Entering ADT: 2653  
Entering ADT: 3050 Minor Entering ADT: 398

- SHSP Emphasis Area (check all that apply)
- Reduce Alcohol Impaired Driving
  - Increase the Use of Safety Restraints for all Occupants
  - Younger Driver/Older Driver Safety
  - Curb Aggressive Driving
  - Improvements to Address Lane Departure Crashes
  - Enhancing Emergency Medical Capabilities to Increase
  - Improve Intersection Safety

### Describe Current Safety Issues & Systemic Ranking Review

North Dakota Crashes, 2008 - 2012

5 years

	Total	Angle	K+A
Crashes	4	1	0.00
Rate (per MVM)	0.7	0.2	0.0



	Value	Critical	Risk Ranking
Skew	Yes	Yes	★
On/Near Curve	Yes	Yes	★
Development	No	Yes	
Near RR Crossing	No	Yes	
Distance from previous STOP	Yes	Yes	★
Volume Cross Product	Yes	≥ 100,000	★
Total Crashes	4	>0	★

★★★★★

### Describe Proposed Safety Improvements

Description	Unit Cost	Units	Cost	Notes - Segment projects suggested on other sheets.
Roundabout	\$3,000,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Directional Median	\$900,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Mainline Dynamic Warning Sign	\$60,000 per intersection	1	\$60,000.00	
Close Median	\$30,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Installing Street Lights	\$10,200 per street light	Installed	\$0.00	
Upgrade Stop Sign	\$540 per sign	2	\$1,080.00	
Upgrade Junction Sign	\$540 per sign	2	\$1,080.00	
Upgrade Stop Ahead Sign	\$600 per sign	2	\$1,200.00	
Upgrade Stop Ahead Marking	\$600 per marking	1	\$600.00	
Upgrade Stop Bar	\$360 per marking	2	\$720.00	
Review Signs and CST	\$2,940 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
			\$64,680.00	

Signs and Markings and Street Light project costs vary by the number of minor legs associated with the intersection.

### Project Cost Estimate (attach detailed copy)

### Proposed Year of Construction

Federal Funds	\$58,212
Local Match (10% of Total project cost)	\$6,468
<b>*Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$64,680</b>

\* Based on typical NDDOT costs (March 2014); includes engineering, construction and contingency

### NDDOT Central Office Only

Project Accepted?  Yes  No Reference Number ID Number

Notes

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

Project suggested for agency's consideration.

Page: 1  
Intersection ID: 5.02  
Date: 6/11/2014

# HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) PROJECT APPLICATION

North Dakota Department of Transportation Programming  
SFN 59959 (06-2011)

## 4th Ave S (US 52) & 1st St SE (Foster 14)

**Agency Name:** Foster County  
**Contact Name:** Nathan Monson  
**Email Address:** nmonson@daktel.com

**ND DOT District:** 2/3  
**Telephone Number:** 701-652-3926

Please attach a location map(s). You may use additional sheets to further describe your project.

### Location Description

Configuration: X      Traffic Control Device: Thru-STOP  
Configuration (2): Undivided      Street Lights: No  
Urban/Rural: Rural      Flashers: No  
County: Foster      Major Entering ADT: 2523  
Entering ADT: 2613      Minor Entering ADT: 90

- SHSP Emphasis Area (check all that apply)
- Reduce Alcohol Impaired Driving
  - Increase the Use of Safety Restraints for all Occupants
  - Younger Driver/Older Driver Safety
  - Curb Aggressive Driving
  - Improvements to Address Lane Departure Crashes
  - Enhancing Emergency Medical Capabilities to Increase
  - Improve Intersection Safety

### Describe Current Safety Issues & Systemic Ranking Review

North Dakota Crashes, 2008 - 2012

5 years

	Total	Angle	K+A
Crashes	0	0	0.00
Rate (per MVM)	0.0	0.0	0.0



	Value	Critical	Risk Ranking
Skew	Yes	Yes	★
On/Near Curve	No	Yes	
Development	No	Yes	
Near RR Crossing	Yes	Yes	★
Distance from previous STOP	Yes	Yes	★
Volume Cross Product	Yes	≥ 100,000	★
Total Crashes	0	>0	

★★★★

### Describe Proposed Safety Improvements

Description	Unit Cost	Units	Cost	Notes - Segment projects suggested on other sheets..
Roundabout	\$3,000,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Directional Median	\$900,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Mainline Dynamic Warning Sign	\$60,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Close Median	\$30,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Installing Street Lights	\$10,200 per street light	1	\$10,200.00	
Upgrade Stop Sign	\$540 per sign	2	\$1,080.00	
Upgrade Junction Sign	\$540 per sign	2	\$1,080.00	
Upgrade Stop Ahead Sign	\$600 per sign	2	\$1,200.00	
Upgrade Stop Ahead Marking	\$600 per marking	1	\$600.00	
Upgrade Stop Bar	\$360 per marking	2	\$720.00	
Review Signs and CST	\$2,940 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
			\$14,880.00	

Signs and Markings and Street Light project costs vary by the number of minor legs associated with the intersection.

### Project Cost Estimate (attach detailed copy)

### Proposed Year of Construction

Federal Funds	\$13,392
Local Match (10% of Total project cost)	\$1,488
<b>*Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$14,880</b>

\* Based on typical NDDOT costs (March 2014); includes engineering, construction and contingency

### NDDOT Central Office Only

Project Accepted?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Reference Number	ID Number
-------------------	--	------------------	-----------

Notes

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

Project suggested for agency's consideration.

Page: 2  
Intersection ID: 14.01  
Date: 6/11/2014

# HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) PROJECT APPLICATION

North Dakota Department of Transportation Programming  
SFN 59959 (06-2011)

## 67th Ave NE (US 281) & 11st St NE (Foster 2)

**Agency Name:** Foster County  
**Contact Name:** Nathan Monson  
**Email Address:** nmonson@daktel.com

**ND DOT District:** 2/3  
**Telephone Number:** 701-652-3926

Please attach a location map(s). You may use additional sheets to further describe your project.

### Location Description

Configuration: X      Traffic Control Device: Thru-STOP  
Configuration (2): Undivided      Street Lights: No  
Urban/Rural: Rural      Flashers: No  
County: Foster      Major Entering ADT: 1745  
Entering ADT: 1890      Minor Entering ADT: 145

- SHSP Emphasis Area (check all that apply)
- Reduce Alcohol Impaired Driving
  - Increase the Use of Safety Restraints for all Occupants
  - Younger Driver/Older Driver Safety
  - Curb Aggressive Driving
  - Improvements to Address Lane Departure Crashes
  - Enhancing Emergency Medical Capabilities to Increase
  - Improve Intersection Safety

### Describe Current Safety Issues & Systemic Ranking Review

North Dakota Crashes, 2008 - 2012

5 years

	Total	Angle	K+A
Crashes	1	2	0.00
Rate (per MVM)	0.3	0.6	0.0



	Value	Critical	Risk Ranking
Skew	No	Yes	
On/Near Curve	No	Yes	
Development	No	Yes	
Near RR Crossing	No	Yes	
Distance from previous STOP	Yes	Yes	★
Volume Cross Product	Yes	≥ 100,000	★
Total Crashes	1	>0	★
			★★★

### Describe Proposed Safety Improvements

Description	Unit Cost	Units	Cost	Notes -
Roundabout	\$3,000,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Directional Median	\$900,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Mainline Dynamic Warning Sign	\$60,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Close Median	\$30,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Installing Street Lights	\$10,200 per street light	1	\$10,200.00	
Upgrade Stop Sign	\$540 per sign	2	\$1,080.00	
Upgrade Junction Sign	\$540 per sign	2	\$1,080.00	
Upgrade Stop Ahead Sign	\$600 per sign	2	\$1,200.00	
Upgrade Stop Ahead Marking	\$600 per marking	2	\$1,200.00	
Upgrade Stop Bar	\$360 per marking	2	\$720.00	
Review Signs and CST	\$2,940 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
			\$15,480.00	

Signs and Markings and Street Light project costs vary by the number of minor legs associated with the intersection.

### Project Cost Estimate (attach detailed copy)

### Proposed Year of Construction

Federal Funds	\$13,932
Local Match (10% of Total project cost)	\$1,548
<b>*Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$15,480</b>

\* Based on typical NDDOT costs (March 2014); includes engineering, construction and contingency

### NDDOT Central Office Only

Project Accepted?  Yes  No      Reference Number \_\_\_\_\_      ID Number \_\_\_\_\_

Notes

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

Project suggested for agency's consideration.

Page: 3  
Intersection ID: 2.02  
Date: 6/11/2014

# HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) PROJECT APPLICATION

North Dakota Department of Transportation Programming  
SFN 59959 (06-2011)

## 67th Ave NE (US 281) & 7th St NE (Foster 5)

**Agency Name:** Foster County  
**Contact Name:** Nathan Monson  
**Email Address:** nmonson@daktel.com

**ND DOT District:** 2/3  
**Telephone Number:** 701-652-3926

Please attach a location map(s). You may use additional sheets to further describe your project.

### Location Description

Configuration: X Traffic Control Device: Thru-STOP  
Configuration (2): Undivided Street Lights: No  
Urban/Rural: Rural Flashers: No  
County: Foster Major Entering ADT: 1893  
Entering ADT: 1940 Minor Entering ADT: 48

- SHSP Emphasis Area (check all that apply)
- Reduce Alcohol Impaired Driving
  - Increase the Use of Safety Restraints for all Occupants
  - Younger Driver/Older Driver Safety
  - Curb Aggressive Driving
  - Improvements to Address Lane Departure Crashes
  - Enhancing Emergency Medical Capabilities to Increase
  - Improve Intersection Safety

### Describe Current Safety Issues & Systemic Ranking Review

North Dakota Crashes, 2008 - 2012

5 years

	Total	Angle	K+A
Crashes	1	2	0.00
Rate (per MVM)	0.3	0.6	0.0



	Value	Critical	Risk Ranking
Skew	No	Yes	
On/Near Curve	No	Yes	
Development	No	Yes	
Near RR Crossing	No	Yes	
Distance from previous STOP	Yes	Yes	★
Volume Cross Product	Yes	≥ 100,000	★
Total Crashes	1	>0	★
			★★★

### Describe Proposed Safety Improvements

Description	Unit Cost	Units	Cost	Notes -
Roundabout	\$3,000,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Directional Median	\$900,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Mainline Dynamic Warning Sign	\$60,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Close Median	\$30,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Installing Street Lights	\$10,200 per street light	0	\$0.00	
Upgrade Stop Sign	\$540 per sign	2	\$1,080.00	
Upgrade Junction Sign	\$540 per sign	2	\$1,080.00	
Upgrade Stop Ahead Sign	\$600 per sign	2	\$1,200.00	
Upgrade Stop Ahead Marking	\$600 per marking	0	\$0.00	
Upgrade Stop Bar	\$360 per marking	2	\$720.00	
Review Signs and CST	\$2,940 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
			\$4,080.00	

Signs and Markings and Street Light project costs vary by the number of minor legs associated with the intersection.

### Project Cost Estimate (attach detailed copy)

### Proposed Year of Construction

Federal Funds	\$3,672
Local Match (10% of Total project cost)	\$408
<b>*Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$4,080</b>

\* Based on typical NDDOT costs (March 2014); includes engineering, construction and contingency

### NDDOT Central Office Only

Project Accepted?  Yes  No Reference Number ID Number

Notes

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

Project suggested for agency's consideration.

Page: 4  
Intersection ID: 5.05  
Date: 6/11/2014



# HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP) PROJECT APPLICATION

North Dakota Department of Transportation Programming  
SFN 59959 (06-2011)

## Bryon St (ND 20) & 11st St NE (Foster 2)

**Agency Name: Foster County**

**Contact Name: Nathan Monson**

**Email Address: nmonson@daktel.com**

**ND DOT District: 2/3**

**Telephone Number: 701-652-3926**

Please attach a location map(s). You may use additional sheets to further describe your project.

### Location Description

Configuration: X      Traffic Control Device: Thru-STOP  
 Configuration (2): Undivided      Street Lights: No  
 Urban/Rural: Rural      Flashers: No  
 County: Foster      Major Entering ADT: 273  
 Entering ADT: 413      Minor Entering ADT: 140

- SHSP Emphasis Area (check all that apply)
- Reduce Alcohol Impaired Driving
  - Increase the Use of Safety Restraints for all Occupants
  - Younger Driver/Older Driver Safety
  - Curb Aggressive Driving
  - Improvements to Address Lane Departure Crashes
  - Enhancing Emergency Medical Capabilities to Increase
  - Improve Intersection Safety

### Describe Current Safety Issues & Systemic Ranking Review

North Dakota Crashes, 2008 - 2012

5 years

	Total	Angle	K+A
Crashes	0	0	0.00
Rate (per MVM)	0.0	0.0	0.0



	Value	Critical	Risk Ranking
Skew	Yes	Yes	★
On/Near Curve	Yes	Yes	★
Development	No	Yes	
Near RR Crossing	No	Yes	
Distance from previous STOP	Yes	Yes	★
Volume Cross Product	No	≥ 100,000	
Total Crashes	0	>0	

★★★

### Describe Proposed Safety Improvements

Description	Unit Cost	Units	Cost	Notes -
Roundabout	\$3,000,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Directional Median	\$900,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Mainline Dynamic Warning Sign	\$60,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Close Median	\$30,000 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
Installing Street Lights	\$10,200 per street light	0	\$0.00	
Upgrade Stop Sign	\$540 per sign	2	\$1,080.00	
Upgrade Junction Sign	\$540 per sign	2	\$1,080.00	
Upgrade Stop Ahead Sign	\$600 per sign	2	\$1,200.00	
Upgrade Stop Ahead Marking	\$600 per marking	2	\$1,200.00	
Upgrade Stop Bar	\$360 per marking	2	\$720.00	
Review Signs and CST	\$2,940 per intersection	0	\$0.00	
			\$5,280.00	

Signs and Markings and Street Light project costs vary by the number of minor legs associated with the intersection.

### Project Cost Estimate (attach detailed copy)

### Proposed Year of Construction

Federal Funds	\$4,752
Local Match (10% of Total project cost)	\$528
<b>*Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$5,280</b>

\* Based on typical NDDOT costs (March 2014); includes engineering, construction and contingency

### NDDOT Central Office Only

Project Accepted?  Yes  No      Reference Number \_\_\_\_\_      ID Number \_\_\_\_\_

Notes

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

Project suggested for agency's consideration.

Page: 5  
Intersection ID: 2.06  
Date: 6/11/2014



23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

**[Appendix Intentionally Left Blank]**

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

APPENDIX  
**Ransom County**

---

---

**[Appendix Intentionally Left Blank]**

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

**[Appendix Intentionally Left Blank]**

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections



**[Appendix Intentionally Left Blank]**

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

**[Appendix Intentionally Left Blank]**

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

**[Appendix Intentionally Left Blank]**

23 USC 409  
NDDOT Reserves All Objections

**[Appendix Intentionally Left Blank]**



## 5.0 Behavioral Safety Strategies

---

### 5.1 Purpose of Driver Behavior Safety Strategies

North Dakota’s Local Road Safety Program (LRSP) recognizes that driver behavior is a significant factor contributing to a majority of the serious crashes on North Dakota’s local roads. Traffic crashes may result from any combination of overlapping crash factors, such as the roadway, the vehicle, and driver behavior. Research supports and experts agree that in most cases driver behavior – risky decisions, driver error, lapses of attention, and driver limitations – is a chief factor contributing to traffic crashes (Lerner et al., 2010). Serious traffic crashes in the eastern region can be largely prevented and reduced if motorists, especially younger drivers, were persuaded to engage in key safe driving practices to buckle up, drive at safe speeds, pay attention, and plan ahead to avoid impaired driving. For maximum safety benefit, these measures should be undertaken in addition to adopting infrastructure safety strategies to help ensure the safest and most forgiving roadway possible.

### 5.2 Overview of Behavioral Crash Data for Eastern Region

**Unbelted Vehicle Occupants:** Traffic safety research demonstrates that a motorist’s seat belt is the most effective defense in the event of a crash. When lap and shoulder seat belts are used, the risk of fatal injury to front-seat passenger car occupants is reduced by 45 percent and the risk of moderate-to-critical injury is reduced by 50 percent (NHTSA, 2001). Safety benefits are even greater for light-truck occupants, with seat belts reducing fatalities by 60 percent and moderate-to-critical injury by 65 percent (NHTSA, 2009). North Dakota’s 2013 statewide seat belt use of drivers and right-front seat passengers is 77.7 percent; lower than the nationwide use of 86 percent in 2012. Unbelted serious crashes are the eastern region’s greatest opportunity to strengthen road safety through improving driver behavior. The trend of serious unbelted crashes is increasing statewide. The eastern region is above the 48 percent statewide-unbelted serious crashes with 53 percent of the region’s serious crashes involving unbelted motorists.

**Alcohol-Related Crashes:** Nationally, although impaired driving fatalities have decreased since 2007, the percentage of alcohol-impaired fatalities in the U.S. has remained essentially unchanged (NHTSA, 2012). Similarly, over the last decade, each year nearly half of motor vehicle fatalities statewide in North Dakota continue to be alcohol-related. In the eastern region, 34 percent of the county’s serious crashes are alcohol-related – slightly higher than the statewide 30 percent. From statewide crash data, nearly half of these preventable serious crashes are on the local road system.

**Young Driver-Involved:** Young drivers have the highest involvement in fatal crashes of any age group. The fatal crash involvement of drivers age 16 to 20 is nearly twice that of drivers’ age 21 and older (NHTSA, 2012a). Key underlying factors to their high crash risk are the developmental and behavioral issues of adolescence coupled with driving inexperience. Young drivers too often immaturely take risks while driving without thinking through the potential consequences of their life-threatening decisions (Keating, 2007). Such high-risk behaviors

typically include lack of seat belt use, aggressive driving/speeding, and distractions while driving. Although serious injury crashes involving young drivers have gradually declined statewide, young drivers under the age of 21 continue to be overrepresented in crashes with 67 percent occurring on local roads. In the eastern region, 22 percent of serious crashes involve young drivers, which is the same as the 22 percent of statewide serious crashes.

**Excessive Speed or Aggressive Driving:** Speeding is common and is a tough nut to crack nationally and in North Dakota. Although drivers generally acknowledge that speeding is an unsafe behavior, speeding remains common because the perceived risk of injury is low relative to the perceived benefits of driving fast such as saving time and driving pleasure (Lerner et al., 2010). Consequently, the percentage of speeding-related fatal crashes has remained essentially unchanged over the years and remains a contributing factor in 31 percent of traffic fatalities in the U.S. (NHTSA, 2012b). Speeding and aggressive driving continue to account for approximately 26 percent of all serious crashes in North Dakota with 62 percent of these crashes occurring on the local road system. In the eastern region, 35 percent of its serious crashes involve speeding or aggressive driving, above the statewide percentage of 26 percent.

## 5.3 Importance of Traffic Safety Culture Change

### 5.3.1 Influence of Traffic Safety Culture

In adopting North Dakota's long-term vision of zero fatalities, the 2013 North Dakota SHSP establishes a statewide goal to reduce the 3-year average of traffic fatalities to 100 or fewer by 2020. To accomplish this interim goal, the eastern region, together with its traffic safety partners, seeks to develop and implement its LRSP safety strategies within the broader societal context of motorists' behavior and North Dakota's traffic safety culture. Traffic safety culture can be defined as the implicit shared values, beliefs, and perceptions that shape motorists' behavior.

### 5.3.2 Social Norms Inhibiting a Strong Traffic Safety Culture

At the core of the nation's and North Dakota's traffic safety challenge is a complacency toward risk-taking by drivers and a tolerance for traffic crashes and the resulting deaths and incapacitating injuries. Contributing factors include a sense of individual driver invulnerability, perceived driving skills and vehicle control, and a sense of anonymity and entitlement on the road. The latest data from the *2012 Traffic Safety Culture Index Survey* reports that, as in previous years, the safety culture in the United States surrounding distracted driving can best be described as "do as I say, not as I do" – due to the high numbers of people who object to certain behaviors, yet will admit that they, themselves, engage in them (AAA, 2012). Real progress in traffic safety depends largely on addressing and changing this culture of indifference to effectively implement and see results of both SHSP and LRSP safety strategies.

### 5.3.3 Social Levels Influencing Safety Culture

Efforts to change individual driver and motorist behaviors should be planned and executed from an ecological viewpoint – one that examines the driving public and their interaction with their social environments. Traffic safety culture and its influence operate at different levels within society. Therefore, a broader definition of traffic safety culture includes the values, beliefs, and perceptions of not only the individual driver, but of those shared by the various communities of which the driver is a part (Figure 5-1). The individual driver exists within a

system that includes the following levels, each embodying factors that influence driving culture and crash risk (Ward et al., 2010; Dahlberg and Krug, 2002):

- Individual level – Factors such as driver age, driving experience, self-esteem, income, and substance abuse
- Relationship level – Factors such as relationships with peers, co-workers, supervisors, and family members
- Community level – Factors include the settings or environments in which relationships occur such as school, church, workplaces, and neighborhoods
- Societal level – Large-scale factors such as safety, health, economic, and educational policies, as well as government commitments and priorities




FIGURE 5-1

Social Ecological Perspective of Culture

Source: "Violence – A Global Public Health Problem" by L.L. Dahlberg and E.G. Krug, in *World Report on Violence and Health* (World Health Organization)

Social norms at each level and within each group point to what behaviors are perceived as important. Norms create conformity to expectations that allows people (that is, drivers) to successfully socialize to the subcultures in which they belong. These norms create a climate in which unsafe driving behavior is either encouraged or discouraged. Perceived social norms condoning high-risk driving behaviors provide the case for drivers to rationalize their own high-risk behaviors. To accomplish the culture change, traffic safety behavioral strategies seek to make safe-driving behaviors the accepted norm across all social ecological levels.

The implication of the social ecological model for LRSP efforts is that the implementation plans of LRSP strategies plans should attempt to:

- Increase perceived social pressure to comply with traffic safety laws and practices, thereby, producing safety behavioral norms (Ward et al., 2010)
- Shift the social acceptance of high-risk behaviors to one of perceived unacceptance by significant others and one's peers.

## 5.4 Behavioral Safety Strategies

### 5.4.1 Role of Policy, Education, and Enforcement

Techniques or strategies to change driver behavior essentially fall into one of three categories: (1) *policy change* or laws, local ordinances, regulations, sanctions and penalties; (2) *enforcement* of the laws; and (3) *education* or public information, media, and training. These three categories of behavioral safety strategies work together to have the greatest impact on changing risky driver behavior. The degree of effectiveness of any one strategy on behavioral change depends not only on how effectively the strategy is implemented, but also on how these three categories of policy, enforcement, and education are working together.

For example, a state or local agency that is seeking to increase motorists' seat belt use and decides to use a "buckle up" public information campaign (behavioral change strategy). The effectiveness of the campaign not only depends on the quality of the education or public information campaign (relevance to target group, duration, saturation of the messaging), but also the strength of the law in place (primary vs. secondary seat belt law, all passengers vs. front seat only, higher penalty/fee vs. low penalty/fee) and, most important, the degree of seat belt use enforcement (coverage, intensity, visible by the public).

Consequently, the strength of driver safety policy, enforcement, and education surrounding a behavioral strategy selected greatly impact its effectiveness. Therefore, when selecting and implementing a behavioral strategy, an agency must examine the policy, enforcement, and educational context of the strategy and explore ways to strengthen each, as appropriate, to gain the most from a selected strategy.

Finally, it is critically important that traffic safety enforcement is viewed as a priority within local law enforcement agencies and that agency leaders and administrators advocate for strong local enforcement of traffic laws. It is imperative that agency leaders actively address political and public resistance and provide a pathway to deploy the leading strategy to save lives on North Dakota roadways – effective traffic enforcement coupled with public outreach. By advocating for enforcement, educating local elected officials, and equipping officers to effectively enforce traffic safety laws, North Dakota will reap far greater life-saving outcomes from its local safety initiatives.

### 5.4.2 Effective Use of Public Information Strategies

Public information (education) strategies are often popular among communities seeking to change risky driving behaviors. Education or public information campaigns can range from brochures and mailings to peer-to-peer safety messaging. Brochures and mailings are a passive approach, while peer-to-peer messaging provides a more effective behavioral change approach. In general, a key challenge in influencing driver behavior is that most drivers know what they are supposed to do to drive safely, yet, due to successfully driving with risky patterns with no incidence of crashes, drivers underestimate the risk of their choices. For this reason, research supports that education, coupled with enforcement, will have the strongest impact in changing driver behavior (NHTSA, 2013).

Following are key characteristics of impactful public information/education campaigns (Williams, 2007):

- Implemented in support of a high-visibility enforcement program

- Focused messaging for a target group
- Longer-term programs delivering messages of sufficient intensity over time
- Messages communicating new information not previously well known
- Messages that are part of a broader-based, longer-term community program with similar messaging coming from multiple sources
- Using behavior change models including interactive methods teaching skills to resist social pressure (such as role playing, group discussion)

### 5.4.3 LRSP Phase 2 Priority Strategies

During the LRSP workshop, participants reviewed the eastern region’s behavioral crash data and discussed behavioral safety strategy alternatives that could be implemented at the local level. Out of the strategy review discussions, participants engaged in a prioritization process with six strategies emerging as the preferred local behavioral safety strategies for the four behavioral critical emphasis areas. Table 5-1 reflects the LRSP Phase 2 results of the strategy prioritization, as well as each strategy’s alignment with the North Dakota SHSP (indicated by an “X” if included in the SHSP).

TABLE 5-1  
North Dakota Phase 2 LRSP Workshop Priority Behavioral Strategies and Relationship with the North Dakota SHSP

Phase 2 LRSP Workshop Priority Driver Behavior Strategies	Cass County Region	Eastern Region	Grand Forks Region	2013 North Dakota SHSP
<b>Impaired Driving</b>				
• Employ Alcohol Screening and Brief Interventions	X			X
• Support Community Program for Alternative Transportation		X		X
• Promote Sobriety Initiatives for DUI Offenders (24/7, Ignition Interlock, DUI Courts)	X	X		X
• Educate and Enforce Zero Tolerance Laws for Drivers Under Age 21		X		
• Court Monitoring of Prosecution and Sentencing of DUI Offenders			X	
<b>Speeding and Aggressive Driving</b>				
• Conduct high-visibility targeted enforcement of speeding and aggressive driving <i>Note: Added following speed and aggressive driving enforcement strategy to support priority lane departure infrastructure safety strategy: Provide enhanced enforcement on local, at-risk locations for lane departure.</i>	X	X	X	X
• Conduct Enhanced Enforcement of Red-Light Running			X	X
<b>Young Drivers</b>				
• Publicize and conduct a high-visibility enforcement of GDL restrictions, cell phone use and texting laws, underage drinking and driving, and seatbelt laws	X			X
• Encourage driver education providers (local schools and private providers) to require parent education component		X	X	X



Phase 2 LRSP Workshop Priority Driver Behavior Strategies	Cass County Region	Eastern Region	Grand Forks Region	2013 North Dakota SHSP
<b>Unbelted Occupants</b>				
• Conduct highly publicized enforcement campaigns to maximize restraint use.		X	X	X
• Enforce Secondary Belt Use Law		X		X
• Pursue Local Support for Primary Seat Belt	X	X	X	X
Note: DUI = driving under the influence GDL = graduated driver's license				

The following subsections provide a more complete description of each priority strategy, suggested steps to launch local agency efforts, recommended implementation resources, and potential future considerations for expanded local agency and community-based support for the SHSP safety strategies. It is important to note that multidisciplinary SHSP implementation teams will be formed to support the implementation of priority strategies for each of the six SHSP priority emphasis areas including lane departure, unbelted vehicle occupants, alcohol-related, speed or aggressive drivers, young drivers, and intersections. Therefore, local agencies seeking to leverage local-level safety initiatives described in the following subsections are encouraged to coordinate with and/or engage in the statewide SHSP implementation teams.

### 5.4.4 Impaired Driving

#### Eastern Region Priority Strategy – Support Community Programs for Alternative Transportation

**Description:** A growing strategy in local communities to combat alcohol-impaired driving is to provide alternative community transportation services for those who have been drinking and who might otherwise choose to drink and drive. Alternative transportation programs may employ a variety of transportation alternatives including taxis, privately owned vehicles, buses, tow trucks, and law enforcement agents. To increase accessibility of services, local communities often seek cooperative programming and cost-sharing approaches involving a spectrum of partners such as local drinking establishments and restaurants, alcohol beverage industry, local transportation providers, non-profit community organizations and volunteers, agency participation, and the users themselves. Programs reflect a spectrum of options, from those that provide alternative transportation services within a limited time frame--a particular community festival or holiday--to professional year-round services to pick up drivers and their vehicles at a bar and transport both home after drinking (Sprattler, 2010). The most effective characteristics of safe ride programs most widely used by drinkers choosing not to drive include programs that are continually available, low or no cost to users, convenient, and easy to use (NHTSA, 2009a).

#### *Getting Started:*

- Contact the Traffic Safety Office (TSO) to participate in the SHSP process as a stakeholder in the implementation of strategies identified for priority safety emphasis areas, such as impaired driving, in the SHSP.

- The following steps offer guidance to start a safe ride initiative in the local communities of the eastern region (adapted from Sprattler, 2010):
  1. Access community needs by identifying local impaired driving issues and potential barriers to the use of alternative transportation
  2. Identify community supporters and potential partners
  3. Call a meeting of all interested parties
  4. Determine the service area
  5. Choose or create transportation providers
  6. Develop “level of service” program model
  7. Establish hours and days of operation
  8. Price services and secure cooperative funding
  9. Determine program structure and management
  10. Market the program to the hospitality industry, its patrons, and the public

***Implementation Resources:***

- See Section 5.5, Traffic Safety Office Supporting Resources.
- Local impaired driving/alternative transportation community resources in the eastern region include:
  - Kasey Skalicky, Traffic Safety Program Coordinator, City-County Health District, [kskalicky@barnescounty.us](mailto:kskalicky@barnescounty.us) or 701-845-6672 (for all of eastern region)
  - South Central Adult Services (Barnes, Ransom & surrounding counties)
  - Pat Hansen at [pat@southcentralseniors.org](mailto:pat@southcentralseniors.org) or 701-845-4300
- For information on The SAFE CAB Program in Isanti County, Minnesota visit <http://www.centurycouncil.org/drunk-driving/safe-cab-program>.
- For information on how Minnesota has set up regional/county based safe ride programs visit: <http://www.minnesotatzd.org/topics/impaired/saferide/documents/report.pdf>.
- For guidance on local community development or expansion of alternative transportation programs for impaired drivers and for a list of selected alternative transportation programs meeting core program evaluation criteria, see *Alternative Transportation Programs: A Countermeasure for Reducing Impaired Driving* at: <http://mcs.nhtsa.gov/index.cfm/product/449/alternative-transportation-programs-a-countermeasure-for-reducing-impaired-driving-booklet.cfm>
- For information on establishing community designated drivers programs, visit: <http://www.nhtsa.gov/people/injury/alcohol/DesignatedDriver/comm1.html>
- To contact local public health unit addressing alcohol use/impaired driving issues, see state listing located at: <http://www.ndhealth.gov/localhd/lphu-directory.pdf>

- For North Dakota road safety information including impaired driver facts sheets, issue briefs, and other education and outreach resources, visit the NDSU Rural Transportation Safety and Security Center (RTSSC) at:  
<http://www.ugpti.org/rtssc/resources/>

The NDSU Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute at:  
<http://www.ugpti.org/resources/>

### **Eastern County Region Priority Strategy – Promote Sobriety Initiatives for DUI Offenders: 24/7, Ignition Interlock, DUI Courts.**

**Description:** To reduce impaired driving on state and local roadways, in addition to regular high-visibility DUI enforcement saturation patrols and DUI sobriety checkpoints, North Dakota uses 24/7, alcohol ignition interlocks, and DUI court programs to effectively monitor hardcore DUI offenders. Most hardcore repeat DUI offenders are alcohol dependent and often unable to control their drinking and driving behavior. For this reason, the following programs are important and proven tools in North Dakota’s strategy to combat impaired driving.

24/7 – North Dakota’s 24/7 Sobriety Program provides an alternative to jail time for DUI offenders charged with or convicted of two or more or drunk driving offenses; first-time drunk driving offenders under the age of 18 are also required to participate in the 24/7 program. The program requires offenders to abstain from alcohol use and submit to sobriety testing twice per day through preliminary breath test (PBTs) or through continuous monitoring via a SCRAM; requiring sobriety 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. If the arrestee’s test registers any alcohol use then he or she is immediately taken into custody. If the arrestee fails to show for testing, his or her jail bond is revoked. An offender may participate in the 24/7 Sobriety Program as a condition of bond or pre-trial release and to participate in the program as a condition of sentence or probation.

Ignition Interlock – Ignition interlock is an aftermarket technology device installed in a motor vehicle to prevent a DUI offender from operating a vehicle if the offender has been drinking. Before starting the vehicle, the driver must breathe into the device and if the driver’s breath alcohol reading is above a preset blood alcohol concentration (BAC ) limit, the interlock device will not allow the vehicle to start. In North Dakota, the use of alcohol ignition interlocks is discretionary for all DUI offenders.

DUI Courts – North Dakota’s four Drug/DUI Courts are hybrid courts; namely, they are drug courts that also work with DUI offenders. North Dakota Drug/DUI Courts are an effective tool to combat the hardcore impaired driver by using intensive supervision and treatment to change the offender’s behavior. DUI Courts use all the criminal justice stakeholders (judge, prosecutor, defense attorney, law enforcement, probation, and treatment) using a cooperative approach to change the offender’s behavior by meeting regularly as a team to discuss the status of each offender’s case and to assure that alcohol treatment and all sentencing requirements are satisfied. With the input of all parties, Judges are more informed and can immediately revise restrictions when necessary.

#### ***Getting Started:***

- Contact the Traffic Safety Office (TSO) to participate in the SHSP process as a stakeholder in the implementation of strategies identified for priority safety emphasis areas, such as impaired driving, in the SHSP.



- Enlist the support of local traffic safety stakeholders to conduct a proactive publicity and education campaign on the above discussed tools to:
  - Inform local policy makers—county board and city council members, judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, treatment officials and other concerned local stakeholders of the important role of 24/7, ignition interlock, and DUI courts in combating hard core drunk drivers.
  - Educate the public on the nature of the impaired driving problem in the local community and how these tools will provide necessary sanctions on the offenders as well as enhance the safety of all roadway users; and
  - Act as a general deterrent by putting potential offenders on notice that if they are arrested for impaired driving they may become subject to a highly supervised sanction with the costs and stigma associated with its use.

***Implementation Resources:***

- See Section 5.5, Traffic Safety Office Supporting Resources.
- For information on ND sobriety initiatives (24/7, Ignition Interlock, DUI/Drug Courts) and for DUI data sources, contact ND Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutors:
  - Aaron Birst at [aaron.birst@ndaco.org](mailto:aaron.birst@ndaco.org), 701-328-7342
  - Kristi Pettit Venhuizen at 701/780-9276
- Local impaired driving community resources in the eastern region include:
  - Mental Health Access Group (Barnes County/City of Valley City)  
Theresa Will, CCHD Director at [twill@barnescounty.us](mailto:twill@barnescounty.us) or 701-845-8518  
Sharon Buhr at [SharonBuhr@CatholicHealth.net](mailto:SharonBuhr@CatholicHealth.net)
  - DUI Court Team (located in Richland County, but a resource all of the eastern region)  
Kasey Skalicky, Traffic Safety Program Coordinator, City-County Health District,  
[kskalicky@barnescounty.us](mailto:kskalicky@barnescounty.us) or 701-845-6672 (for all of the eastern region)  
Honorable B. Cruff - [bcruff@ndcourts.gov](mailto:bcruff@ndcourts.gov)
- To contact local public health unit addressing alcohol use/impaired driving issues, see state listing located at:  
<http://www.ndhealth.gov/localhd/lphu-directory.pdf>
- For information on county DUI conviction and recidivism rates, see the North Dakota 2013 DUI Recidivism Fact Sheet at:  
[http://www.ugpti.org/rtssc/briefs/downloads/2013\\_Recidivism.pdf](http://www.ugpti.org/rtssc/briefs/downloads/2013_Recidivism.pdf)
- For information on the North Dakota's 24/7 Program:  
<http://www.ag.nd.gov/TwentyFourSeven/>
- For a helpful overview of alcohol interlocks and their use as well as public outreach talking points, see *Ignition Interlocks - What You Need to Know: A Toolkit for Policymakers, Highway Safety Professionals, and Advocates* at:  
[http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/nti/pdf/IgnitionInterlocks\\_811883.pdf](http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/nti/pdf/IgnitionInterlocks_811883.pdf)
- The National Center for DWI Courts provides quick reference information for traffic safety stakeholders and policy makers on what they need to know about DUI courts:  
<http://www.dwicourts.org/sites/default/files/ncdc/The%20Bottom%20Line.pdf>

<http://www.dwicourts.org/node/98>

- For North Dakota road safety information including facts sheets, issue briefs, and other education and outreach resources, visit the NDSU Rural Transportation Safety and Security Center (RTSSC) at:

<http://www.ugpti.org/rtssc/resources/>

And the NDSU Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute at:

<http://www.ugpti.org/resources/>

*For additional impaired driving safety strategies, see the following priority ND Local Road Safety Program strategies:*

- Employ alcohol screening and brief Interventions by health care providers following an impaired driving crash. (Further explanation can be found in the North Dakota Local Road Safety Program, Phase 2, Cass County Report located at: <http://www.dot.nd.gov/divisions/safety/trafficsafety.htm>)
- Conduct court monitoring of prosecution and sentencing of DUI offenders. (Further explanation can be found in the North Dakota Local Road Safety Program, Phase 2, Grand Forks Report located at: <http://www.dot.nd.gov/divisions/safety/trafficsafety.htm>)

*Potential future considerations for expanded local agency and community-based support of SHSP impaired-driving safety strategies:*

- Engage local safety stakeholders (law enforcement, Mothers Against Drunk Driving [MADD], Students Against Drunk Driving [SADD], North Dakota Safety Council, community health provider, emergency medical service providers) and facilitate coalition development to educate local elected officials on the importance of state agency impaired-driving legislative initiatives resulting from the state's comprehensive assessment of North Dakota impaired-driving laws.

### **Eastern County Region Priority Strategy – Educate and Enforce Zero Tolerance Laws for Drivers under Age 21**

**Description:** North Dakota has a zero tolerance standard for anyone under the age of 21 operating a motor vehicle. Under North Dakota's "Use/Lose Laws," when minors measure a BAC of 0.02 or above, there is loss of driving privileges. The North Dakota Highway Patrol receives and distributes Enforcement of Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL) funds provided by the North Dakota Department of Human Services (federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention [OJJDP] funding). These funds are used by the Highway Patrol and dispersed to local law enforcement to facilitate underage drinking enforcement efforts across the state. The Highway Patrol participates with local law enforcement in multiagency efforts to stop underage drinking and driving using the following strategies to enforce Zero Tolerance Laws:

- Cops in Shops
- Shoulder Tap Operations
- Party Patrol Operations
- Underage Alcohol-Related Fatality Investigations

In addition, North Dakota state, county, and city law enforcement participate in the national impaired driving prevention campaign, Driver Sober or Get Pulled Over, to ensure high visibility enforcement including North Dakota's zero-tolerance law for those under age 21.

In addition to enforcement, research demonstrates the primary role of parents in shaping their children's decision to not drink. To support parents' healthy influence, North Dakota's comprehensive Parents LEAD (Listen, Educate, Ask, Discuss) program is a primary resource for local traffic safety partners to engage parents to discuss the topic of underage drinking on an ongoing basis with their younger and adult children. Finally, OJJDP program outreach also provides information on social hosting, parental involvement, and consequences of underage drinking.

### *Getting Started*

- Contact the Traffic Safety Office (TSO) to participate in the SHSP process as a stakeholder in the implementation of strategies identified for priority safety emphasis areas, such as impaired driving, in the SHSP.
- Inquire about and support law enforcement efforts to actively enforce laws and programs that fight underage drinking. For example, when an underage drinker is involved in a traffic crash, find out how the youths obtained the alcohol, then hold whoever gave or sold it to them accountable.
- The TSO may offer grant funds for law enforcement to conduct alcohol compliance checks and server training programs; other communities conduct server training as required through city or county ordinances including Dickinson, Fargo, Grand Forks and Williston.
- The North Dakota Department of Human Services (DHS) administers funds from the Federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) which allowed state and local law enforcement agencies to deter underage drinking through various enforcement strategies (compliance checks, shoulder taps, saturation, and party patrols). OJJDP program outreach also provided information on social hosting, parental involvement, and consequences of underage drinking.

### *Implementation Resources:*

- Local underage drinking prevention community resources in the eastern region include:
  - Safe Communities Coalition (All of the eastern region)  
Kasey Skalicky, Traffic Safety Program Coordinator, City-County Health District,  
kskalicky@barnescounty.us or 701-845-6672 (for all of the eastern region)  
Doug Kiefert, dkiefert@hotmail.com
  - VCSU alcohol prevention group (Barnes County and City of Valley City)  
Erin Klingenberg, erin.klingenberg@vcsu.edu
  - Juvenile Court  
Karen Kringlie - kkringlie@ndcourts.gov (All of the eastern region)  
Curt Brown - cbrown@ndcourts.gov (Barnes County, Eddy County, Foster County,  
Griggs County, LaMoure County)
  - ND Safety Council  
Terry Weaver, Traffic Safety Coordinator, TerryW@ndsc.org, 701-751-6106

- To contact local public health unit addressing alcohol use/impaired driving issues, see state listing located at: <http://www.ndhealth.gov/localhd/lphu-directory.pdf>

#### *Enforcement Resources:*

- For a list of approved DHS OJJDP grant enforcement strategies:  
<http://www.nd.gov/dhs/services/mentalhealth/prevention/pdf/eudl-enforcement-strategies-v2.pdf>
- For information on effective enforcement strategies, challenges, and suggested solutions, see NHTSA “Community How To Guide on Underage Drinking Enforcement” at:  
[http://www.nhtsa.gov/people/injury/alcohol/community%20guides%20html/Book5\\_Enforcement.html](http://www.nhtsa.gov/people/injury/alcohol/community%20guides%20html/Book5_Enforcement.html)
- For enforcement training and technical assistance in most promising practices for law enforcement operations to reduce underage drinking, see the Underage Drinking Enforcement Training Center at:  
<http://www.udetc.org/LawEnforcement.htm>

#### *Education Outreach Resources*

- For underage drinking laws and resources for parents on how to start and continue the conversation about alcohol use with their children, see the North Dakota’s *Parents LEAD* (Listen, Educate, Ask, Discuss) program at:  
<http://www.parentslead.org/>
- For information on MADD’s underage drinking programs and information resources such as Power of Parents, Power of You(th), PowerTalk 21, and Why 21? see MADD’s underage drinking website at:  
<http://www.madd.org/underage-drinking/>

Additional information provided by Students Against Destructive Decisions or SADD at:  
<http://www.sadd.org/u21toolkit.htm>

- For North Dakota road safety information including facts sheets, issue briefs, and other education and outreach resources, visit the NDSU Rural Transportation Safety and Security Center (RTSSC) at:  
<http://www.ugpti.org/rtssc/resources/>

The NDSU Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute at:  
<http://www.ugpti.org/resources/>

### 5.4.5 Speeding and Aggressive Driving

**Eastern County Region Priority Strategy** – Conduct highly publicized and targeted speeding and aggressive driving enforcement campaigns

**Description:** High-visibility enforcement is a high-priority, proven safety strategy to reduce serious crashes in North Dakota and across the nation. The most effective way to deter unsafe driving is through a highly visible enforcement effort to reinforce the driving public’s perception that driving behavior, such as speeding, is at high risk of being stopped and ticketed. High-visibility enforcement consists of multiple jurisdictions and/or multiple squads patrolling a segment of roadway at the same time, often using brightly colored signage and vests. Planned

high-visibility enforcement is publicized extensively through community kickoff events involving the local media and public education campaigns about the enforcement. High visibility also includes enforcement agencies reporting to news media the outcome of the campaign such as tickets issued and arrests made.

North Dakota law enforcement agencies (state, county, city and tribal) participate in the state's cooperative enforcement programs to reduce speed-related fatalities and incapacitating injuries through stepped up enforcement of aggressive cars and trucks primarily in oil-impacted counties. For aggressive driving enforcement, officers focus on drivers who commit a combination of moving traffic violations such as speeding, following too closely, and running red lights endangering other persons or property.

### ***Getting Started:***

- Contact the Traffic Safety Office (TSO) to participate in the SHSP process as a stakeholder in the implementation of strategies identified for priority safety emphasis areas, such as speeding, in the SHSP.
- Assist local law enforcement agencies with identifying locations with high-speed and aggressive driving-related crash involvement for high-visibility enforcement.
- With local law enforcement, attend county board/city council meetings to speak on the importance of enforcing speed and aggressive driving.
- Collaborate with highway patrol, local law enforcement, community health officials, and local traffic safety stakeholders to use TSO speed campaign materials to conduct community outreach on the enforcement campaign.

### ***Implementation Resources:***

- For crash data and analysis to focus speed enforcement efforts, contact the NDDOT Traffic Safety Office (TSO) at (701) 328-4692.
- To learn about local traffic safety enforcement initiatives and enforcement grant opportunities, contact the TSO and the state's Law Enforcement Liaison at (701) 328-4692. Enforcement grant application information for overtime speed enforcement can be found at: <https://www.dot.nd.gov/divisions/safety/trafficsafety.htm>
- See Section 5.5, Traffic Safety Office Supporting Resources.
- For guidance for law enforcement on planning and publicizing local speed saturation patrols and successful case examples, see NHTSA's *Guidelines for Developing a Municipal Speed Enforcement Program* at: <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/enforce/program.htm>
- For a summary of successful aggressive driving enforcement programs deployed at the local and state-level across the country, see NHTSA's *Aggressive Driving Enforcement: Strategies for Implementing Best Practices* at: <http://www.nhtsa.gov/people/injury/enforce/aggressdrivers/aggenforce/>
- Other speed-related safety resources:  
Governor's Highway Safety Administration:  
<http://www.ghsa.org/html/issues/speeding.html>

Insurance Institute for Highway Safety:

<http://www.iihs.org/iihs/topics/t/speed/topicoverview>

- For North Dakota road safety information including facts sheets, issue briefs, and other education and outreach resources, visit the NDSU Rural Transportation Safety and Security Center (RTSSC) at:

<http://www.ugpti.org/rtssc/resources/>

The NDSU Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute at:

<http://www.ugpti.org/resources/>

**Eastern Region's Priority Strategy** – Provide enhanced enforcement on local, at-risk locations for lane-departure crashes.

**Description:** To reduce serious lane-departure crashes on rural paved roads, the eastern region plans to deploy infrastructure safety improvements (for example, centerline rumble strips, edge line rumble strips, adding or widening edge lines, high-visibility pavement markings) at select at-risk corridors. To maximize the expected safety benefit of the road improvements, integrating increased enforcement presence at targeted at-risk locations and timeframes will reduce risky driving behaviors through strengthening the public's perceived risk of being stopped.

***Getting Started:***

- Contact the Traffic Safety Office (TSO) to participate in the SHSP process as a stakeholder in the implementation of strategies identified for priority safety emphasis areas, such as lane departure, in the SHSP.
- Work with NDDOT staff regarding specific design features of the system. Contact NDDOT Traffic Operations Section, Shawn Kuntz, 701-328-2673.
- Coordinate with local law enforcement to provide enhanced enforcement at local, at-risk locations for lane departure.
  - Based on crash data, identify timeframes for high crash risk (such as Saturday evening hours)
  - Ask for an agreement regarding minimum levels of enforcement (such as 1 hour per day at any of the equipped locations, target contacts per hour, etc.)

***Implementation Resources:***

- For crash data and analysis to focus lane departure enforcement efforts, contact the NDDOT Traffic Safety Office (TSO) at 701328-4692.
- See Section 5.5, Traffic Safety Office Supporting Resources.
- Safety project developed as part of the LRSP are eligible for funding through the state's Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) including enhanced enforcement.
- See Section 5.4.5 for speed and aggressive driving implementation resources.

***For additional potential aggressive driving safety strategies, see the following ND Local Road Safety Program strategy:***

- Conduct enhanced enforcement of red-light-running using confirmation lights in high-risk intersections. (Further explanation can be found in the North Dakota Local Road Safety



Program, Phase 2, Grand Forks County Region Report located at:  
<http://www.dot.nd.gov/divisions/safety/trafficsafety.htm>

***Potential future considerations for expanded local agency, tribal, and community-based support of SHSP safety strategies:***

- Engage local safety stakeholders (law enforcement, Mothers Against Drunk Driving [MADD], Students Against Drunk Driving [SADD], North Dakota Safety Council, community health provider, emergency medical service providers) and facilitate coalition development to educate local elected officials on the importance of state agency legislative initiatives to strengthen penalties such as increased fines for right-of-way and speed violations.

## 5.4.6 Young Drivers

### **Eastern Region Priority Strategy – Encourage driver education providers (local schools and private providers) to require a parent education component**

**Description:** Effective parental monitoring of teen driving can go a long way in helping to keep novice drivers safe on the roadway. Programs offering teen driver safety materials together with facilitated guidance help parents make the important connection between teen driving restrictions and teen driving risks. Without a required parent component for teen driver education, parents lack awareness of graduated driver's license (GDL) safety provisions, don't fully recognize teen driving risks, are often anxious to be relieved of shuttling their teens, may be reluctant to invest the necessary time to instruct and supervise their teen's driving, and often believe their teen is the exception and is a good and safe driver. To help overcome these parent challenges and more effectively engage parents, incorporating a parent education component into driver education programs is demonstrating promising results.

Key components of a good parent education program include:

- Discusses risks for novice teen drivers
- Explains how and why GDL works to address risks
- Reviews the critical role parents play in teaching, supporting and managing their novice drivers
- Explains the importance of and provides an opportunity to try out a parent/teen driving agreement
- Delivery by trained, educated facilitators
- Emphasizes parents and teens working together for safety

#### ***Getting Started:***

- Contact the Traffic Safety Office (TSO) to participate in the SHSP process as a stakeholder in the implementation of strategies identified for priority safety emphasis areas, such as young drivers, in the SHSP.
- Learn about education providers in your local community by contacting the Traffic Safety Office at (701) 328-4692.
- Explore county-mandated parent training through examining the state of Virginia's Planning District 8 (includes four counties and four cities) 90-minute driving safety program for parents and teens as part of the in-classroom portion of the state's driver education

curriculum. Contact Ben Swecker (703) 791-7328 or Tim TeWalt (703) 791-7353 at Prince William County Schools.

- With local law enforcement and driver educators, attend county board/city council meetings to inform them of the local initiative to incorporate parent education into driver's education programs to more fully engage parents and reduce teen driver serious crashes.
- Post information on teen driving laws on local school websites or request school resource officer to send information to parents highlighting driving risks for teens and existing North Dakota teen driver laws.
- Consider linking parent-teen participation in a teen-driving program to school parking privileges.

#### *Implementation Resources:*

- See Section 5.5, Traffic Safety Office Supporting Resources.
- For educational materials for parents of teen drivers including guidelines to ensure teen drivers are educated on safe driving practices as well as *The North Dakota Parent Guide to Teen Driving* and the *Parent Teen Driver Agreement*, see the Teen Drivers & Parents section of the NDDOT website:  
<http://www.dot.nd.gov/divisions/safety/teens-parents.htm>
- For an example parent-teen class outline and discussion guide, download the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Office of Traffic Safety's *Teen Drivers: The Parent's Role at:*  
<https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/ots/teen-driving/Documents/Parent-class-leaders-guide-july-2013.doc>
- The Minnesota Office of Traffic Safety developed, *Point of Impact: Teen Driver Safety Parent Awareness Program*, as a community-based class for parents and their soon-to-be teen drivers. The Point of Impact Leader's Guide is a resource for implementing the class. The Point of Impact video is an important component of the program. A PowerPoint presentation and other information are available by contacting Gordy Pehrson at [gordy.pehrson@state.mn.us](mailto:gordy.pehrson@state.mn.us).
- For information on the nationally recognized University of Michigan's *Checkpoints* program offering facilitated parent education:  
<http://youngdriverparenting.org/> and <http://www.saferdrivingforteens.org/>
- For a comprehensive guide to strengthen parental roles in teen safe driving, see the Governors Highway Safety Association's (GHSA's) *Promoting Parent Involvement in Teen Driving: An In-Depth Look at the Importance and the Initiatives*.  
<http://www.ghsa.org/html/publications/pdf/sfteens13.pdf>
- For additional information on mandated and voluntary parent/teen education programs in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Georgia, and select Virginia counties, see GHSA's *Curbing Teen Driver Crashes: An In-Depth Look at State Initiatives*.  
<http://www.ghsa.org/html/publications/pdf/sfteens12.pdf>
- For age-specific information and resources for parents on how to start and continue the conversation about alcohol use with their children, see the North Dakota's *Parents LEAD* program (Listen, Educate, Ask, Discuss).  
<http://www.parentslead.org/>



- For PowerPoint presentations, parent/teen activities and other tools to be adopted for driver education providers, see *Teendriversource: Research Put into Action*.  
[www.teendriversource.org](http://www.teendriversource.org)
  - For information on *Teen Driving Parents/Alive at 25* that includes a 1-hour parent, 4-hour teen driving program including a comprehensive publication, *Teen Driver; A Family Guide to Teen Safe Driving*.  
[http://www.nsc.org/products\\_training/Products/MotorVehicleSafety/Pages/TeenDriving.aspx](http://www.nsc.org/products_training/Products/MotorVehicleSafety/Pages/TeenDriving.aspx)
  - For information in Utah's award winning "Don't Drive Stupid" Parent Night Program.  
<http://publicsafety.utah.gov/highwaysafety/documents/smart.pdf>  
<http://www.ghsa.org/html/meetings/awards/2013/13utah.html>
  - For information on *Parents are the Key* and free downloadable resources that can be customized.  
[www.cdc.gov/ParentsAreTheKey/](http://www.cdc.gov/ParentsAreTheKey/)
  - For North Dakota road safety information including facts sheets, issue briefs, and other education and outreach resources, visit the NDSU Rural Transportation Safety and Security Center (RTSSC) at:  
<http://www.ugpti.org/rtssc/resources/>
- The NDSU Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute at:  
<http://www.ugpti.org/resources/>

***Other high-impact, proven strategies for local agency consideration:***

- Conduct locally facilitated peer-to-peer driver safety outreach campaigns designed for high school students to raise peer awareness of the common risk factors threatening novice drivers.

***Considerations for future expanded local agency/community support of North Dakota SHSP young-driver safety strategies:***

- Engage local traffic safety stakeholders (law enforcement, school administrators, driving schools, insurance companies, community health providers, emergency medical service providers) and facilitate coalition development to educate local elected officials on the importance of state agency GDL and teen driver safety policy initiatives.

## 5.4.7 Unbelted Occupants

### Eastern Region Priority Strategy – Enforce secondary seat belt law

**Description:** Research has demonstrated that the most important difference between the high and low seat belt use states is enforcement of the states' belt use law and this is true for both secondary and primary law states (NHTSA, 2008). Although a few geographic, demographic, and cultural factors are associated with lower seat belt use, none of these factors is a barrier to high seat belt use. However, law enforcement officers find it more difficult to enforce secondary belt laws than primary laws and are sometimes reluctant to issue tickets because secondary status implies that these laws are of lower priority to their superiors, policy makers, judges, and the general public (NHTSA, 2008).

With the emphasis on enforcing the state's secondary belt law as the most effective strategy to increase belt use and reduce serious unbelted crashes, North Dakota law enforcement agencies

(state, county, city, and tribal) participate in the state's *Click It or Ticket* mobilization program through stepped up enforcement of unrestrained occupants. The mobilization is supported by national and local paid advertising and earned media campaigns aimed at raising awareness before the enforcement saturation. North Dakota now conducts four annual *Click It or Ticket* campaigns – including participation in the national *Click It or Ticket* campaign in May. North Dakota has increased its focus on nighttime seat belt use because fewer motorists buckle up at night resulting in a greater number of serious nighttime crashes.

See Section 5.4.5 for a description of high-visibility/highly publicized enforcement campaigns.

#### ***Getting Started:***

- Contact the Traffic Safety Office (TSO) to participate in the SHSP process as a stakeholder in the implementation of strategies identified for priority safety emphasis areas, such as unbelted crashes, in the SHSP.
- Assist local law enforcement agencies with identifying locations with high unbelted crash involvement for high-visibility enforcement.
- With local law enforcement, attend county board/city council meetings to speak on the importance and safety benefits of local enforcement of belt use.
- Collaborate with highway patrol, local law enforcement, community health officials, and local traffic safety stakeholders to use TSO belt use campaign materials to conduct community outreach on the enforcement campaign.

#### ***Implementation Resources:***

- For crash data and analysis to focus seat belt enforcement efforts, contact the NDDOT Traffic Safety Office (TSO) at 701-328-4692.
- To learn about local traffic safety enforcement initiatives, secondary enforcement strategies, and enforcement grant opportunities, contact the TSO and the state's Law Enforcement Liaison at (701) 328-4692. Enforcement grant application information for overtime belt enforcement can be found at:  
<https://www.dot.nd.gov/divisions/safety/trafficsafety.htm>
- See Section 5.5, Traffic Safety Office Supporting Resources.
- For statewide belt use mobilizations, the TSO distributes media outreach materials to local enforcement agencies which may include: press releases, talking points, camera-ready artwork and posters, belt-use fact sheets, a print public service announcement (PSA), and live-read radio PSAs. (*Note: TSO to assemble available information resources.*)
- For information on strategies and recommendations for effective enforcement of secondary belt use:

How States Achieve High Seat Belt Use Rates

<http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/Pubs/810962.pdf>

*Innovative Seat Belt Demonstration Programs in Kentucky, Mississippi, North Dakota, and Wyoming*, NHTSA, Report No. DOT HS 811 080, March 2009.

<http://www.nhtsa.gov/Driving+Safety/Occupant+Protection>

*Avoiding "Tween" Tragedies: Demonstration Project to Increase Seat Belt Use Among 8- to 15-year-old Motor Vehicle Occupants*, NHTSA, Report No. DOT HS 811 096, June 2012.

<http://www.nhtsa.gov/Driving+Safety/Occupant+Protection>

- For guidance on planning and publicizing belt-use saturation patrols:

NHTSA 2014 national seat belt enforcement *Products for Enforcement Action Kit (PEAK)* to help enforcement rally officers and alert the public to prepare for maximum high-visibility seat belt enforcement during the day and also at night.

<http://www.trafficsafetymarketing.gov/CIOT-PEAK>

*Nighttime Enforcement of Seat Belt Laws: An Evaluation of Three Community Programs*, NHTSA, Report No. DOT HS 811 189, August 2009.

For the above and other belt enforcement and information outreach resources:

<http://www.nhtsa.gov/Driving+Safety/Occupant+Protection>

- Other seat-belt safety resources:

Governor's Highway Safety Administration:

<http://www.ghsa.org/html/issues/occp/occp/index.html>

Insurance Institute for Highway Safety:

<http://www.iihs.org/iihs/topics/t/safety-belts/topicoverview>

- For North Dakota road safety information including facts sheets, issue briefs, and other education and outreach resources, visit the NDSU Rural Transportation Safety and Security Center (RTSSC) at:

<http://www.ugpti.org/rtssc/resources/>

The NDSU Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute at:

<http://www.ugpti.org/resources/>

*Potential future considerations for expanded local agency, tribal, and community-based support of SHSP safety strategies:*

- Pursue tribal ordinances for primary enforcement of seat belt laws.
- Conduct community-wide and sustained public information outreach to educate and create cultural awareness of the risks associated with unbelted motorists.

### Eastern Region Priority Strategy – Pursue local support for primary seat belt law

**Description:** Seat belts save lives. Research supports that lap/shoulder seat belts reduce the risk of fatal injury to front-seat passenger car occupants by 45 percent and the risk of moderate-to-critical injury by 50 percent. For light-truck occupants, seat belts reduce the risk of fatal injury by 60 percent and moderate-to-critical injury by 65 percent. Seat belts are extremely effective in preventing occupant ejection from the vehicle, the most injurious of crash outcomes (NHTSA, 2014).

Primary enforcement of seat belt laws has a proven track record of getting more people to buckle up. A primary enforcement seat belt law enables a law officer to stop motorists if the driver or any occupant is unbelted. North Dakota's secondary enforcement law permits law enforcement to ticket unbelted motorists only if they are stopped for some other offense such as speeding.

Studies show that seat belt use in states with primary laws is 9 percentage points higher compared to states with secondary laws (Shults and Beck, 2012). Primary enforcement sends a clear message to the motoring public that the State views safety belt use (and the safety belt law) as essential for the safe operation of a motor vehicle. When States upgrade their laws from secondary to primary, the perceived public importance of safety belt use is strengthened leading to greater seat belt compliance. Increasing adult belt use also has a significant impact on child passenger safety, because drivers who wear safety belts are more likely to restrain their child passengers.

The foundation of enacting a primary seat belt law begins with developing grassroots, local-level support. Local community support, when thoughtfully and strategically applied, gets the attention of state elected officials. A community shift toward supporting primary seat belt occurs incrementally, one step at a time. Following are some initial steps and resources to launch the eastern region's efforts.

### *Getting Started:*

- Contact the Traffic Safety Office (TSO) to participate in the SHSP process as a stakeholder in the implementation of strategies identified for priority safety emphasis areas, such as unbelted crashes, in the SHSP.
- Establish a local seat belt coalition or advocacy group to strengthen grassroots support for upgrading North Dakota's secondary belt law to primary seat belt enforcement. Following the national model of engaging multiple disciplines for traffic safety, support for primary enforcement can be found and strengthened throughout the community, including:
  - Enforcement: NDDOT District State Patrol, county sheriff and city police enforcement personnel
  - Emergency Medical Response/Medical Community: EMS, fire and rescue departments; local county health and injury prevention organizations; injury prevention advocacy groups; ER doctors and nurses, and other health care professionals
  - Education Outreach: NDDOT District, county, and city public affairs/media outreach professionals; local school boards, PTAs, school administrators, Mothers Against Drunk Driving [MADD], Students Against Destructive Decision (SADD), North Dakota Safety Council, AAA North Dakota
  - Engineering: NDDOT District, county, and city traffic safety and road maintenance personnel
  - Employers/Business Leaders: Chambers of commerce, leading local companies/major employers, insurance companies, auto dealers and manufacturers
- Engage advocacy group members to develop unified key messages for a consistent and clear message of support for primary seat belt (key unbelted crash facts, primary belt benefits, employer and societal costs of unbelted crashes, key community supporters of primary). Seek example outreach resources from neighboring "primary" states and states who've passed primary seat belt law.
- Create advocacy web portal of information in support of primary seat belt (key unbelted crash facts, primary seat belt benefits, employer and societal costs of unbelted crashes).

- Identify key local champions to help carry the message to local elected officials (city council, county board, mayoral offices) and key community influencers (for example, business leaders).
- Conduct legislative outreach in support of primary seat belt using interdisciplinary team from primary advocacy group (enforcement, engineering, health/injury prevention).

***Implementation Resources:***

- For crash data and analysis to focus seat belt enforcement efforts, contact the NDDOT Traffic Safety Office (TSO) at (701) 328-4692.
- Local primary seat belt community resources in the eastern region include:
  - Safe Communities Coalition (All of the eastern region)  
Kasey Skalicky, Traffic Safety Program Coordinator, City-County Health District,  
kskalicky@barnescounty.us or 701-845-6672 (for all of the eastern region)  
Doug Kiefert, dkiefert@hotmail.com
- Upgrading Minnesota’s secondary seat belt law to a primary law resulted in an estimated 68 to 92 fewer deaths, between 320 and 550 fewer incapacitating injuries, and \$45 million in avoided hospital charges in the 2 years since the primary law was enacted and enforced. See *Impacts of Minnesota’s Primary Seat Belt Law* at:  
<https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/ots/seat-belts-air-bags/Documents/dps-eval-primary-seat-belt-law.pdf>
- For Minnesota Seat Belt Coalition’s Primary Seat Belt legislative talking point booklet addressing key questions about Primary Seat Belt, facts sheets, and unbelted fatalities and serious injuries by legislative district, contact the Minnesota Safety Council at 651-291-9150 or [msc@minnesotasafetycouncil.org](mailto:msc@minnesotasafetycouncil.org)
- Florida’s statewide belt usage leaped from 80.9 percent in May 2009 to 87.4 percent after the May 2010 seat belt enforcement campaign and the passage of the state’s primary seat belt law. See *Impact of Implementing a Primary Enforcement Seat Belt Law in Florida: A Case Study* at:  
<http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/45000/45800/45875/811656.pdf>
- For seat belt key messages see NHTSA CIOTI web site:  
<http://www.nhtsa.gov/nhtsa/2013ciot/stats.html>
- Center for Disease Control and Prevention seat belt briefing:  
<http://www.cdc.gov/motorvehiclesafety/seatbeltbrief/>
- For example tribal council primary seat belt law:  
<http://staging.dl-online.com/content/white-earth-council-passes-seat-belt-law>
- For North Dakota road safety information including facts sheets, issue briefs, and other education and outreach resources, visit the NDSU Rural Transportation Safety and Security Center (RTSSC) at:  
<http://www.ugpti.org/rtssc/resources/>  
  
The NDSU Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute at:  
<http://www.ugpti.org/resources/>

## 5.5 Traffic Safety Office Supporting Resources

Unless otherwise indicated, for technical assistance and supporting resources contact the NDDOT Traffic Safety Office (TSO) at (701) 328-4692.

### 5.5.1 TSO Grant Program Application Process

The TSO solicits grant applications from eligible state and local agencies and for-profit and non-profit organizations that address North Dakota's problem solution plans or PSPs. PSPs reflect the state's greatest opportunities for behavioral safety improvement. Grant applications are due June 30 of each year and are evaluated based on: (1) response to identified problems; (2) proposed evidenced-based strategy; (3) clear objectives; (4) comprehensive evaluation plans; and (5) cost-effective budgets. Selected projects are included in TSO's Highway Safety Plan and once approved by NHTSA, grant contracts are generally effective October 1 through September 30.

### 5.5.2 Technical Assistance

#### County Outreach Program

The TSO, in cooperation with the North Dakota Association of Counties, offers a county-based Traffic Safety Outreach program to provide advocacy and community mobilization, media support, public outreach, and training to address seat belt use, impaired driving, speeding, and distracted driving at the county level. County participants include county employees, county officials, law enforcement, transportation engineering, public health, schools, businesses, nonprofit agencies, media, and other entities.

### 5.5.3 Traffic Records/Crash Data

#### Traffic and Criminal Software (TraCS)

The quality of traffic safety issue identification and decision-making regarding effective safety strategies and their implementation is based on the quality and timeliness of crash data. Data is collected from officer crash reports at the time of the incident when a crash involves fatalities, injuries, or at least \$1,000 in property damage. NDDOT reviews the crash report and enters the data into a centralized database called the Crash Reporting System (CRS).

To assist law enforcement in providing timely, complete, and accurate crash reports, the NDDOT Traffic Safety Office (TSO) supports the installation of Traffic and Criminal Software or TraCS and provides technical assistance and training to local agency and tribal law enforcement to effectively deploy TraCS for in-the-field incident reporting. Local and tribal enforcement agencies are strongly encouraged to utilize the convenience of TraCS for the electronic submission of crash reports to the NDDOT. Key benefits to participating agencies and tribes are the reduced officer time and effort required for duplicate entry into local and state crash databases, reduced need for data entry resources and administrative support, as well as improving the overall quality and timeliness of the crash report.

#### Local Agency Crash Data Support

The Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute develops crash data summaries for each law enforcement agency under contract with the TSO for overtime enforcement supporting impaired driving and seat belt enforcement campaigns. The crash data summaries demonstrate the priority crash factors and trends within each local agency's jurisdiction.



## Annual Crash Summary

The NDDOT annually publishes the Crash Summary to identify and describe the annual crash data and historical crash trends in North Dakota including the description of factors contributing to the occurrence of traffic crashes and the resulting injuries and fatalities. The Crash Summary is a valuable reference resource for local agencies and their safety partners for problem identification, safety strategy planning, targeted strategy implementation, program evaluation, and media inquiries, and is located at:

<http://www.dot.nd.gov/divisions/safety/docs/crash-summary.pdf>

## References

- AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety (AAA), 2012. *2012 Traffic Safety Culture Index*. Washington DC. January.
- Dahlberg, Linda L., and Etienne G. Krug, 2002. "Chapter 1. Violence-a Global Public Health Problem." *World Report on Violence and Health*. Edited by Etienne G. Krug, Linda L. Dahlberg, James A. Mercy, Anthony B. Zwi, and Rafael Lozano. World Health Organization: Geneva, Switzerland.
- Keating, Daniel P., 2007. "Understanding Adolescent Development: Implications for Driving Safety." *Journal of Safety Research*. Vol. 38, Issue 2. Pages 147-157.
- Lerner, Neil, Jeremiah Singer, and James Jenness, 2010. "Safer Drivers." White Papers for: *Toward Zero Deaths: A National Strategy on Highway Safety*. White Paper No. 3. July 12.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), 2014. *Traffic Safety Facts, 2012: Occupant Protection*. Report No. DOT HS 811 892. Washington DC.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), 2013. *Countermeasures that Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices*. 7th Edition. Report No. DOT HS 811 727. Washington DC. April.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), 2012. *Traffic Safety Facts 2010: A Compilation of Motor Vehicle Crash Data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System and the General Estimates System*. Report No. DOT HS 811 659. Washington DC.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), 2012a. *Traffic Safety Facts, 2010 Data: Young Drivers*. Report No. DOT HS 811 622. National Center for Statistics and Analysis. Washington DC. May.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), 2012b. *Traffic Safety Facts, 2010 Data: Speeding*. Report No. DOT HS 811 636. National Center for Statistics and Analysis. Washington DC. August.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), 2009. *Traffic Safety Facts, 2008 Data: Occupant Protection*. Report No. DOT HS 811 160. National Center for Statistics and Analysis. Washington DC.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), 2009a. *Alternative Transportation Programs: A Countermeasure for Reducing Impaired Driving*. NHTSA, Report No. DOT HS 811 188, Washington, DC. September.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), 2001. *Effectiveness of Occupant Protection Systems and Their Use*. Fifth/Sixth Report to Congress. Report No. DOT HS 809 442. Washington DC. November.
- Shults, RA, Beck, LF, 2012. *Self-reported seatbelt use, United States, 2002-2010: Does prevalence vary by state and type of seatbelt law?* *Journal of Safety Research*; 43 (5-6): 417-42
- Sprattler, Karen, 2010. *Minnesota Safe Ride Program Report*. Center for Transportation Studies, University of Minnesota. March.
- Ward, Nicholas J., Jeff Linkenback, Sarah N. Keller, and Jay Otto, 2010. "White Paper on Traffic Safety Culture." White Paper No. 2. *White Papers for: Toward Zero Deaths: A National*



*Strategy on Highway Safety.* Western Transportation Institute, College of Engineering, Montana State University. July 7.

Williams, Allan F., 2007. *Public Information and Education in the Promotion of Highway Safety.* Research Results Digest 322. National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP). Washington DC. August.