Analysis of Safety Benefits for Shielding of Bridge Piers

Final Report June 2009



IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Sponsored by the Iowa Department of Transportation (InTrans Project 08-322)

About the Institute for Transportation

The mission of the Institute for Transportation (InTrans) at Iowa State University is to develop and implement innovative methods, materials, and technologies for improving transportation efficiency, safety, reliability, and sustainability while improving the learning environment of students, faculty, and staff in transportation-related fields.

Iowa State University Disclaimer Notice

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the information presented herein. The opinions, findings and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the sponsors.

The sponsors assume no liability for the contents or use of the information contained in this document. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

The sponsors do not endorse products or manufacturers. Trademarks or manufacturers' names appear in this report only because they are considered essential to the objective of the document.

Iowa State University Non-discrimination Statement

Iowa State University does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, age, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity, sex, marital status, disability, or status as a U.S. veteran. Inquiries can be directed to the Director of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, (515) 294-7612.

Iowa Department of Transportation Statements

Federal and state laws prohibit employment and/or public accommodation discrimination on the basis of age, color, creed, disability, gender identity, national origin, pregnancy, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation or veteran's status. If you believe you have been discriminated against, please contact the Iowa Civil Rights Commission at 800-457-4416 or Iowa Department of Transportation's affirmative action officer. If you need accommodations because of a disability to access the Iowa Department of Transportation's services, contact the agency's affirmative action officer at 800-262-0003.

The preparation of this (report, document, etc.) was financed in part through funds provided by the Iowa Department of Transportation through its "Agreement for the Management of Research Conducted by Iowa State University for the Iowa Department of Transportation," and its amendments.

The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Iowa Department of Transportation.

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog	No.	
InTrans Project 08-322				
4. Title and Subtitle	5. Report Date			
Analysis of Safety Benefits for Shielding	of Bridge Piers	June 2009		
		6. Performing Organiz	zation Code	
7. Author(s)		8. Performing Organiz	zation Report No.	
Thomas J. McDonald, Inya Nlenanya, Za	ch Hans			
9. Performing Organization Name and	Address	10. Work Unit No. (TF	RAIS)	
Institute for Transportation				
Iowa State University		11. Contract or Grant	No.	
2711 South Loop Drive, Suite 4700				
Ames, IA 50010-8664				
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and	Address	13. Type of Report and	d Period Covered	
Iowa Highway Research Board		Final Report		
Iowa Department of Transportation		14. Sponsoring Agency	y Code	
800 Lincoln Way				
Ames, IA 50010				
15. Supplementary Notes				
Visit www.intrans.iastate.edu for color PI	DF files of this and other research reports.			
The highway system in the State of Iowa mobility to road users on intersecting road underneath due to close proximity of pier years. This study examines historical crash expe as well as other structure support element that six states had bridge pier shielding pr 2007) from the Iowa Department of Trans (GIMS) structure and roadway data (2006 bridges of interest. Additionally, original structures over high-speed, multilane divi roadways with a speed limit of at least 45 analysis using crash data. The study also	includes many grade separation structures dways. However, these structures can press s and abutments. Shielding of these potent rience in the State of Iowa to address the a s considering the offset from the traveled v actices consistent with those in Iowa. Data sportation (Iowa DOT), the Iowa DOT's G b) obtained from the Office of Transportati crash reports and the Iowa DOT video log ded Interstate and primary highways were mph. Bridges that met the criteria for incl included economic analysis for possible sh	constructed to provide ma ent possible safety concerr ial hazards has been a desi advisability of shielding br way. A survey of nine Mid a used for the analyses incl deographic Information Ma on Data, and shielding and were also utilized as need selected for analysis, inclu- usion in the study were ide- nielding improvement.	aximum safety and as for traffic passing ign consideration for many idge piers and abutments western states showed lude crash data (2001 to anagement System d offset data for the led. Grade-separated uding 566 bridges over entified for further	
17. Key Words		18. Distribution Staten	nent	
bridge abutments—bridge piers—median	No restrictions.			
19. Security Classification (of this	21. No. of Pages	22. Price		
Unclassified.	Unclassified.	126	NA	
Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)		Reproduction of o	completed page authorized	

ANALYSIS OF SAFETY BENEFITS FOR SHIELDING OF BRIDGE PIERS

Final Report June 2009

Principal Investigator

Thomas H. Maze Professor of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering Institute for Transportation, Iowa State University

Co-Principal Investigator

Thomas J. McDonald Safety Circuit Rider Institute for Transportation, Iowa State University

Authors Tom McDonald, Inya Nlenanya, Zach Hans

Preparation of this report was financed in part through funds provided by the Iowa Department of Transportation through its research management agreement with the Institute for Transportation, InTrans Project 08-322.

> A report from **Institute for Transportation Iowa State University** 2711 South Loop Drive, Suite 4700 Ames, IA 50010-8664 Phone: 515-294-8103 Fax: 515-294-0467 www.intrans.iastate.edu

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	XI
ADVISORY COMMITTEE	XIII
INTRODUCTION	1
PRACTICE OF OTHER STATES	3
Midwest Survey	3
METHODOLOGY	4
Bridge Selection Crash Analysis	4 7
ECONOMIC ANALYSIS	
Background	
Crash Selection	
Scenario 1: Do Nothing beyond Current Status	
Scenario 2: Snield All Piers at Bridges Located on Curves	
Scenario 4: Shield All Median Piers	29
Scenario 5: Shield All Bridge Piers without Exception	
Scenario 6: Shield All Two-Span Bridge Embankments	
CONCLUSIONS	37
RECOMMENDATIONS	
REFERENCES	40
APPENDIX A. SHIELD ALL UNPROTECTED PIERS ON CURVES	A-1
APPENDIX B. SHIELD ALL UNPROTECTED PIERS BASED ON OFFSET	B-1
B.1. Median Side	B-1
B.2. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 65 mph and above	B-16
APPENDIX C. SHIELD ALL UNPROTECTED MEDIAN PIERS	C-1
C.1. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 55 mph and above	C-1
C.2. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 65 mph and above	C-4
APPENDIX D. SHIELD ALL UNPROTECTED PIERS	D-1
D.1. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 55 mph and above	D-1
D.2. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 65 mph	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

and above	. D-7
APPENDIX E. SHIELD ALL UNPROTECTED TWO-SPAN EMBANKMENTS	E-1
E.1. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 55 mph and above	E-1
E.2. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 65 mph and above	E-3
APPENDIX F. SHIELD ALL UNPROTECTED PIERS INCLUDING RECENT FATAL CRASH ON I-380	F-1
F.1. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 55 mph and above	F-1
F.2. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 65 mph and above	F-4
APPENDIX G. IOWA DESIGN POLICY	. G-1
APPENDIX H. INSTALLATION AND ANNUAL MAINTENANCE COST ESTIMATE FOR HIGH-TENSION CABLE RAIL	. H-1
APPENDIX I. BRIDGE SHIELDING PHOTOGRAPHS	I-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure I.1. W-beam guardrail at outside pier	I-1
Figure I.2. W-beam guardrail and concrete retaining wall combination at outside pier	I-1
Figure I.3. W-beam guardrail in median	I-2
Figure I.4. High-tension cable rail in median	I-2
Figure I.5. Truck crash at unshielded pier on I-380, March 2009	I-3
Figure I.6. Crash damage to high-tension cable rail on I-35, July 2008	I-3
Figure I.7. Crash damage to a W-beam guardrail on I-80, May 2009	I-4

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Bridge-level summary of Iowa bridges by shielding and district	5
Table 2. Bridge-level summary of Iowa bridges by shielding type	5
Table 3. Summary of Iowa bridges by number of main spans	6
Table 4. Bridge-level summary of Iowa bridges by shielding and roadway (under bridge)	
geometry	6
Table 5. Bridge-level summary of Iowa bridges by shielding and lateral clearance (minimum	
offset)	7
Table 6a. Crash frequency by category	8
Table 6b. Frequency of crashes by severity	8
Table 7. Number of bridges involved in a crash by horizontal alignment and category	9
Table 8a. Summary of crash frequency by bridge-level protection status and	
horizontal alignment	9
Table 8b. Summary of crash frequency at partially shielded bridges (bridge-level classification)
by horizontal alignment and type of fixed object struck	9
Table 9. Summary of prevailing light conditions at time of crashes	.10
Table 10. Summary of reported road surface conditions at time of crashes	.10
Table 11. Summary of reported weather conditions at time of crashes	.11
Table 12. Summary of crash occurrence by annual average daily traffic	.12
Table 13. Crash summary by category and side of departure (SOD)	.13
Table 14a. Severity of crashes by crash categories and shielding status	.13
Table 14b. Severity of crashes by crash categories and horizontal alignment	.14
Table 14c. Bridge-related crash severity by fixed object struck median side/left departures	.14
Table 14d. Bridge-related crash severity by type of fixed object struck, outside/right	
departures	.15
Table 14e. Bridge-related crash severity by type of shielding—median departures	.15
Table 14f. Bridge-related crash severity by type of shielding—outside departures	.16
Table 15. Crash severity by crash category, lateral offset and traffic volumes, median-side	
crashes	.17
Table 16. Crash severity by crash category, lateral offset, and traffic volumes, outside- departu	re
crashes	.19
Table 17. Number of bridges involved in a bridge-related crash by minimum offset and	
protection type, median	.20
Table 18. Number of bridges involved in a bridge-related crash by minimum offset and shielding	ng
type, outside	.21
Table 19. Number of bridges involved in a multiple bridge-related crash by side of departure and	nd
horizontal alignment	.21
Table 20. Fatalities and injuries associated with multiple crash locations	.21
Table 21. Number of bridges involved in a multiple bridge-related crash by minimum lateral	
offset, shielding type, and traffic volume	.22
Table 22. Number of bridges involved in a multiple bridge-related crash by minimum lateral	
offset, shielding type, and traffic volume	.22
Table 23. Number of bridges involved in a multiple bridge-related crash by the number of	
crashes	.23
Table 24. Crash severity for two-span bridges	.24
Table 25. Bridge count and shielding type at two-span bridges, median side	.24

Table 26. Bridge count and shielding type for two-span bridges, outside/embankment side	25
Table 27. Bridges by speed limit	26
Table 28. Crashes for each speed limit	27
Table 29a. LOSS costs of a crash	27
Table 29b. Crash reduction factors used for analysis	28
Table 29c. Sensitivity analysis for scenario 5	28
Table 30a. Shield all unshielded piers located on curves on divided Interstate and primary	
highways with posted speed limit 55 and above	29
Table 30b. Shield all unshielded piers located on curves on divided Interstate and primary	
highways with posted speed limit 65 and above	29
Table 31a. Summary of crash severity and losses for unshielded piers based on offset on divid	led
Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit of 55 and above	31
Table 31b. Summary of B/C analysis of unshielded piers based on offset on divided Interstate	;
and primary highways with posted speed limit of 55 and above	31
Table 31c. Summary of crash severity and losses for unshielded piers based on offset on divid	led
Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit of 65 and above	32
Table 31d. Summary of B/C analysis of unshielded piers based on offset on divided Interstate	2
and primary highways with posted speed limit of 65 and above	32
Table 32a. Summary of crash severity for all unshielded median piers on divided Interstate an	ıd
primary highways with posted speed limit of 55 and above	33
Table 32b. Summary of B/C analysis for shielding at unshielded median piers on divided	
Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit of 55 and above	33
Table 32c. Summary of crash severity for all unshielded median piers on divided Interstate an	ld
primary highways with posted speed limit 65 and above	33
Table 32d. Summary of B/C analysis for shielding at unshielded median piers on divided	24
Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 65 and above	34
Table 33a. Summary of crash severity for all unshielded piers on divided Interstate and prima	ry
highways with posted speed limit 55 and above	
Table 33b. Summary of B/C analysis of all unshielded piers on divided interstate and primary	24
nignways with posted speed limit 55 and above	
Table 35c. Summary of crash severity for all unshielded piers on divided interstate and prima	ry 25
Table 22d Symmetry of D/C analysis of all ynchielded niors on divided Interstate and nimery	
highwaya with posted speed limit 65 and above	25
Table 34a. Summary of crash severity for all unshielded two span embankments on divided	
Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 55 and above	35
Table 3/b Summary of B/C analysis of all unshielded two-span embankments on divided	
Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 55 and above	36
Table 34c. Summary of crash severity for all unshielded two-span embankments on divided	
Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 65 and above	36
Table 34d Summary of B/C analysis of all unshielded two-span embankments on divided	
Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 65 and above	36
mereta and printing ingritings that posted speed mint of and above minimum	

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Office of Traffic and Safety at the Iowa Department of Transportation (Iowa DOT) for sponsoring this research. Iowa DOT District staff provided bridge data for use in this study. Adam Larsen of the Federal Highway Administration performed much of the valuable preliminary investigation and analysis that preceded this broader scoped study. The contributions of other individuals from InTrans are also gratefully acknowledged. The guidance, suggestions, and review comments of the advisory committee were invaluable in the completion of this research.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Troy Jerman, Iowa DOT Office of Traffic and Safety Michael Kennerly, Iowa DOT Office of Design Deanna Maifield, Iowa DOT Office of Design Chris.Poole, Iowa DOT Office of Design Dave Little, Iowa DOT District 2 Office Will Zitterich, Iowa DOT Office of Maintenance Shashi Nambisan, Institute for Transportation Adam Larsen, FHWA Troy.Jerman@dot.iowa.gov Michael.Kennerly@dot.iowa.gov Deanna.Maifield@dot.iowa.gov Chris.Poole@dot.iowa.gov Davi.Little@dot.iowa.gov William.Zitterich@dot.iowa.gov shashi@iastate.edu Adam.Larsen@fhwa.dot.gov

INTRODUCTION

The highway system in the State of Iowa includes many grade separation structures constructed to provide maximum safety and mobility to road users on intersecting roadways. However, these structures can present possible safety concerns for traffic passing underneath due to close proximity of piers and abutments. Shielding of these potential hazards has been a design consideration for many years.

Prior to construction of the Interstate system, most grade separation structures in Iowa involved a rail crossing. These structures were typically short span bridges with resulting substructure elements quite close to the traveled way underneath. To the researchers' knowledge, all of the overhead rail structures in Iowa feature beam guardrail and/or concrete retaining wall protection for roadway traffic.

With the Interstate system construction that began in the late 1950s, many grade separation structures were constructed, mostly four-span bridges with piers located adjacent to the outside lanes and in the median. The early Interstate design featured relatively narrow medians with piers located less than 20 ft from the traveled way, thus most are protected with w-beam guardrails and/or concrete barriers. Some crash cushions are also in service at these locations. Examples of several common shielding options are included in Appendix I.

Beginning in the 1970s, longer span structures were designed and, along with wider medians, pier offset distances increased to the point that AASHTO clear zone guidelines were exceeded. For many of these structures, no shielding was provided with the initial construction.

The Interstate system in Iowa was essentially completed over 20 years ago but subsequently, Iowa has added hundreds of miles of four-lane expressways to the highway system that also include considerable miles of fully controlled access roadways with grade separation structures. In recent years, the Iowa Department of Transportation (Iowa DOT) has adopted design guidelines with much wider medians and two-span overhead bridges for these non-Interstate multi-lane divided highways. The piers located in the median generally meet or exceed clear zone guidelines for shielding and only an earthen berm supporting the abutments exists along the outside lanes. Generally no shielding has been provided in these instances.

In addition to grade separation structures, both the Interstate and expressway systems in Iowa feature numerous other structures with support elements in close proximity to the traveled way, including standard and changeable message signs.

The existence of numerous situations as described above has presented a quandary for both designers and field maintenance staff in deciding whether shielding is needed and, if so, what type of shielding is appropriate. This study will attempt to provide guidance for several differing conditions.

Iowa currently determines if a substructure element should or should not be shielded on a case by case basis during the design process. This typically means that a designer will evaluate the clear zone distance recommended in the *AASHTO Roadside Design Guide* and protect only the piers that are within a calculated clear zone distance of the traveled way. This distance is based on annual average daily traffic (AADT), design speed, and slope from the roadway to the obstruction, but typically falls between 30 and 35 ft from the edge of traveled way on a high speed roadway. AASHTO clear zones represent the distance that 85% of run-off-road vehicles will traverse before stopping or regaining directional control. Since about 15% of vehicles will travel beyond the clear zone, objects outside this distance are occasionally protected at the discretion of the designer.

AASHTO issued a 3rd Edition of the *Roadside Design Guide* with an updated Chapter 6 on median barriers in 2006. However, this chapter only mentions median obstacles briefly and is not of consequence to this study.

A copy of the *Iowa DOT Design Manual* guidelines for shielding of side obstacles is included in Appendix G.

This study will examine historical crash experience in the State of Iowa to address the advisability of shielding bridge piers and abutments as well as other structure support elements, considering offset from the traveled way and several other factors.

PRACTICE OF OTHER STATES

Midwest Survey

A survey was conducted to determine how other Midwest states determine if a grade separation bridge pier will be shielded or left unshielded. Of the nine states surveyed, six follow the same policy as Iowa, which is that bridge piers only require shielding when located within the calculated clear zone. The states that follow this policy are Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

Kansas is currently working on a pooled fund study with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) to determine if a revised policy is advisable. Similarly, Wisconsin has proposed this same topic as a research project for the Midwest Safety Research Pooled Fund.

Additionally, Missouri has installed numerous changeable message signs mounted above Interstate roadways on fixed supports originally without shielding. However, the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) has recently opted to retrofit these sign installations with crash protection devices. Missouri is now working on a policy to require barrier protection for large fixed objects placed in the state right-of-way.

Two states, Illinois and Indiana, have adopted design policies requiring that all bridge piers be shielded, regardless of offset from the traveled way.

METHODOLOGY

The following three primary data sets were utilized and integrated to analyze the crash history at bridges over state-maintained high-speed, multilane divided roadways: (1) Iowa Department of Transportation (Iowa DOT) crash database (2001 to 2007) provided by the Office of Traffic and Safety, (2) Iowa DOT Geographic Information Management System (GIMS) structure and roadway databases (2006) obtained from the Office of Transportation Data, and (3) shielding and offset data for the bridges of interest (provided by the six Iowa DOT District offices). When necessary, original crash reports and the Iowa DOT video log were also utilized.

The methodology section is divided into the following three parts: (1) bridge selection, (2) crash analysis, and (3) economic analysis for improvements.

Bridge Selection

While the district-provided data included the most comprehensive bridge details, such as shielding and offset by approach, bridge referencing inconsistencies precluded the data's use as the underlying data set for analysis. Therefore, using the Iowa DOT GIMS structures database, a systematic approach was employed to identify grade-separated structures over high-speed, multilane divided Interstate and primary highways in the state. This resulted in 566 bridges over a roadway with a speed limit of at least 45 mph. Where possible, the district-provided bridge data were then used to validate some of the attributes presented in the GIMS data set. Additionally, the districts' data provided information not maintained in GIMS, such as presence of pier shielding, type of shielding, and horizontal alignment of roadway under the structure.

Sites that could not be validated using the district-provided data were augmented using the most recent Iowa DOT video log inventory. Following is a summary of all identified structures of interest.

Because not all of the district-provided data could be integrated with the GIMS data, preliminary system-wide analysis focused on the structure as a whole and not on an approach level. Therefore, only the minimum median and outside offsets are considered (discussed in more detail in "Lateral Clearance under Bridges" below). Structure-level shielding is also broadly classified as (1) full (all piers/embankments are shielded), (2) none (no piers/embankments are shielded), or (3) partial (some of the piers/embankments are not shielded). In the "Economic Analysis" section of this report, approach-level data will be analyzed, which is possible because of the limited number of sites being considered.

Following is a summary of all identified structures of interest, focusing on the structure as a whole.

Available Bridge Data

Forty-six percent of the bridges were found to have complete shielding—both median and outside piers/embankments. A total of 42% had either median only or outside pier/embankment

only (partial) shielding. The remaining 12% had no shielding on either the median or outside pier/embankment sides. See Table 1.

Districts							
Shielding	1	2	3	4	5	6	Grand Total
Full	67	3	18	76	29	65	258
None	13	42		1	13	3	72
Partial	62	35	16	13	23	87	236
Grand Total	142	80	34	90	65	155	566

Table 1. Bridge-level summary of Iowa bridges by shielding and district

Inventory of Shielding Types

A further analysis of bridge pier shielding on the median side and those substructure elements to the outside of the roadway was performed. Table 2 details the types of shielding used for median and outside piers. W-beam guardrail is the dominant shielding type used for bridge substructures. High-tension cable, from now on referred to as cable, has not been used extensively because the design was not available until recently. This option is a popular selection currently, where feasible, due to lower initial and maintenance costs. Concrete barriers are used more commonly for shielding outside piers than for shielding numbers for median and outside piers, it appears to be more common practice to shield median piers than outside piers. It is possible that the number of two-span bridges in the inventory, which do not feature outside piers, may impact these totals. The two-span bridge design makes up about 11% of the bridges listed in Table 3.

		Outside
Shielding Type	Median	Piers/Embankments
Barrels	2	
Beam Guardrail	386	139
Cable	64	3
Concrete	41	116
None	73	308
Grand Total	566	566

Table 2. Bridge-level summary of Iowa bridges by shielding type

Main span Type	Total
Single span	3
2-Span	63
Multi-span	500
Grand Total	566

Table 3. Summary of Iowa bridges by number of main spans

Horizontal Alignment of Roadway under Bridges

To investigate whether bridge pier crashes occur more frequently when the obstruction is located on a horizontal curve of the roadway passing under the bridge, an inventory of roadway alignment was obtained from the district-provided data and the DOT video log. These references show that 94 of 566 or approximately 17% of the bridges were located on curves, and only 16 of these did not have shielding in either the median or along the outside pier/embankment. Table 4 presents the proximity of curves to bridges in the study data. The degree of curvature was not provided in any of the available data sets.

Table 4. Bridge-level summary of Iowa bridges by shielding and roadway (under bridge) geometry

Protection Status	Tangent	Curve	Grand Total
Full	225	33	258
None	56	16	72
Part	191	45	236
Grand Total	472	94	566

Lateral Clearance under Bridges

An examination of the offset distance from edge of traveled roadway to obstruction was undertaken as part of this study. While lateral clearance should not be confused with clear zone, it can be thought of as an operational offset with potential impacts to safety. Per the *AASHTO Roadside Design Guide*, which provides ranges for clear zone based on speed, traffic, and roadside slope, the typical design clear zone for these roadways is 30–35 ft.

The *Structure Inventory and Appraisal Manual* from the Iowa DOT defines offset as the distance from the edge of the travelled lane to the beam guard face or concrete barrier face if shielded, or to the near pier or column face abutment or to a critical slope if unshielded. The DOT GIMS manual uses the minimum of these offsets for both directions of travel.

To perform this analysis, the lateral offsets under the structures were divided into the following four categories: less than 30 ft, 30–34 ft, 35–40 ft, and greater than 40 ft. Table 5 reveals that the majority of the bridges with full shielding have a lateral offset less than 30 ft. This may be impacted by the fact that any existing shielding reduces the offset measurement.

Offset	Median Piers			Outside P	iers/Emba	ankment
Shielding	Tangent	Curve	Total	Tangent	Curve	Total
<30 feet	334	57	391	329	61	390
Full	221	29	250	218	31	249
None	9	5	14	33	11	44
Partial	104	23	127	78	19	97
30-34 feet	101	29	130	119	27	146
Full	3	4	7	6	1	7
None	13	4	17	23	4	27
Partial	85	21	106	90	22	112
35-40 feet	34	7	41	16	4	20
Full	1		1		1	1
None	32	6	38	16	3	19
Partial	1	1	2			
>40 feet	3	1	4	8	2	10
Full 1						1
None	2	1	3		1	1
Partial	1		1	7	1	8
Grand Total	472	94	566	472	94	566

 Table 5. Bridge-level summary of Iowa bridges by shielding and lateral clearance (minimum offset)

Crash Analysis

The crash analysis in this study uses historical data from the Office of Traffic and Safety of the Iowa DOT. The crash data includes all reportable crashes occurring during the seven-year period from January 1, 2001, through December 31, 2007. All reported crashes within 50 m of the bridges of interest were initially identified. The distance of 50 m was utilized primarily because of the possible variation in spatial accuracy of the structure, roadway, and crash data sets during the analysis period. Crashes were further limited to include only crashes where one or more sequences of events involved a lane departure and/or collision with a bridge support/underpass, concrete barrier, impact attenuator, guardrail, or ditch/embankment, the latter especially for right-hand departures.

The GIS location of crashes does not differentiate between crashes that occurred on the roadway carried by the bridge and those on the roadway under the bridge. As a result, the crash dataset was filtered to exclude crashes that occurred on the overpass or on an adjoining road by comparing the direction of travel for each crash with the direction of the roadway under the bridge. Additionally, because of data ambiguity for some of the crashes, actual crash reports, particularly the narratives, were reviewed to determine if the crash(es) should be included in the analysis.

Crash data are summarized in the following sections by crash types, traffic volume, frequency and location of crashes, contributing factors, crash severities, horizontal alignment of the roadway under a bridge, and crash frequency by lateral offset of obstruction.

Number and Types of Crashes (Definitions)

The aforementioned crashes were broadly categorized as (1) bridge-related or (2) lane-departure. Bridge-related crashes were limited to those where one or more sequence of events involved fixed-object collision with a bridge support/underpass, concrete barrier, impact attenuator, guardrail, or ditch/embankment. In general, bridge-related crashes were those in which the vehicle departed the roadway and, according to the crash data, struck a fixed object off the roadway near a bridge. Ditch/embankment crashes were included in this category but represent only a fraction of the total bridge-related crashes and are generally low severity. Only bridge-related crashes are utilized in the "Economic Analysis" section of the report. All other crashes involving a lane or roadway departure where a vehicle did not strike a fixed object were classified as lane-departure crashes. These crashes represent those that, given their proximity to a bridge, could have potentially resulted in a collision with a pier or shielding hardware. However, since there is no corroborating evidence of a fixed-object collision in the crash data, these crashes are included in the general crash overview for comparison purposes only and are not considered in the later economic analysis.

Table 6a details the crash frequency by category. Note that 66% of the crashes in this study were bridge related.

Table 6a. Crash frequency by category

Category	Crash Count
Bridge Related	385
Lane Departure	200
Grand Total	585

Location of Crashes

During the seven-year study period, there were a total of 585 crashes recorded as either bridgepier related or lane departure within 50 m of 285 bridges. No crashes occurred during this period at approximately 50% of the study locations. The severity distribution of these crashes considering horizontal alignment is shown in Table 6b.

Horizontal Alignment	Fatal	Major Injury	Minor Injury	Possible Injury	Property Damage Only	Grand Total
Tangent	7	36	66	98	274	481
Curve	2	8	17	18	59	104
Grand Total	9	44	83	116	333	585

Table 6b. Frequency of crashes by severity

These summary data depict both bridge-related crashes and lane-departure crashes. The frequency of crashes by horizontal alignment appears consistent with the ratio of bridges by alignment, about 17%, as shown in Table 7. Note that some of the bridges in this table were involved in multiple crashes, which will be discussed later in this report.

	Lane Departure	Bridge-Related
Tangent	108	186
Curve	25	40
Grand Total	133	226

 Table 7. Number of bridges involved in a crash by horizontal alignment and category

Table 8a details the frequency of crashes by protection status and horizontal alignment, while Table 8b details the type of fixed objects struck at partially shielded bridges. As might be expected from Table 5, more than half the crashes occurred at bridges with full protection.

Table 8a. Summary of crash frequency by bridge-level protection status and horizontal alignment

Shielding Status	Tangent	Curve	Grand Total
Full	262	53	315
None	22	10	32
Partial	197	41	238
Grand Total	481	104	585

 Table 8b. Summary of crash frequency at partially shielded bridges (bridge-level classification) by horizontal alignment and type of fixed object struck

Crash Category/Fixed Object	Tangent	Curve	Totals
Bridge-Related	128	26	154
Bridge support/underpass	31	5	36
Concrete barrier	22	5	27
Guardrail	41	10	51
Ditch/Embankment	23	5	28
Other	11	1	12
Lane Departure	69	15	84
Grand Total, Partially Shielded	197	41	238

Contributing Factors

To determine effective mitigation strategies for bridge support crashes, contributing factors for the crashes must be known. An analysis was conducted to investigate factors involved in the study crashes and to identify any common elements in these crashes.

Driver condition at the time of crash was examined first. In 74% of the crashes, the driver was reported as appearing to behave in a normal manner. In 9% of the crashes the driver had fallen asleep, was fatigued, or fainted before the crash. Another 9% of drivers were impaired by drugs or alcohol. It is noteworthy that 96% of the crashes involved a single vehicle.

Next, environmental conditions at the time of the crashes were investigated. Table 9 summarizes light condition at the time of the crash.

Light Conditions	Bridge Related	Lane Departure	Grand Total
Daylight	52%	60%	55%
Dusk	2%	1%	2%
Dawn	4%	4%	4%
Dark- roadway lighted	14%	16%	15%
Dark- roadway not lighted	26%	19%	24%
Dark- unknown roadway lighting	1%	1%	1%
Unknown	1%	0%	1%
Not Reported	0%	0%	0%
Grand Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 9.	Summary o	of prevailing	, light	conditions	at time	of crashes
Lable 7.	Summary	n prevanni <u>e</u>	, ngnu	contantions	at time	or crashes

Table 10 lists roadway surface conditions at the time of the crash occurrence.

Surface Conditions	Bridge- Related	Lane Departure	Grand Total
Dry	49%	57%	52%
Wet	15%	13%	14%
Ice	17%	17%	17%
Snow	14%	12%	13%
Slush	1%	2%	1%
Sand/mud/dirt/oil/gravel	1%	0%	1%
Water (standing/moving)	1%	0%	1%
Other	0%	0%	0%
Unknown	1%	0%	1%
Not Reported	1%	1%	1%
Grand Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 10. Summary of reported road surface con	nditions at time of crashes
--	-----------------------------

Weather Conditions	Bridge- Belated	Lane	Grand Total
Clear	35%	39%	37%
Partly Cloudy	13%	16%	14%
Cloudy	12%	12%	12%
Fog/smoke	1%	1%	1%
Mist	3%	2%	3%
Rain	8%	8%	8%
Sleet/hail/freezing rain	4%	4%	4%
Snow	19%	17%	18%
Severe winds	1%	0%	0%
Blowing sand/soil/dirt/snow	2%	3%	2%
Not Reported	1%	1%	1%
Unknown	1%	0%	0%
Grand Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 11. Summary of reported weather conditions at time of crashes

An analysis of historic precipitation data (1998–2007) in Iowa (maintained at the Iowa Environmental Mesonet, <u>http://mesonet.agron.iastate.edu/sites/locate.php</u>) reveals that precipitation occurs during 31% of the days in the year. Snow occurs during 4% of the days. Comparing these totals to the data presented in Tables 10 and 11 suggests that surface and weather conditions may play a major role in these crashes. Specifically, approximately 48% of the crashes occur under imperfect surface conditions (13% snow on roadway), and 18% occur during snowfall. The degree to which such conditions influence these crashes is somewhat more difficult to quantify given that precipitation events may vary by location, duration, and intensity; surface conditions may remain imperfect after precipitation has stopped; and traffic volumes may decrease during inclement weather. But it clearly appears from these data that road surface and weather conditions contribute to these roadway departure crashes.

Table 12 shows the percentage of crashes and the percentage of bridges by ranges of the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) carried on the roads where crashes occurred for both bridge-related and lane-departure crashes.

A few significant observations could be drawn from the contributing factors analysis. Apparently 26% of the bridge-related crashes occurred in dark conditions on an unlighted roadway. It appears that 49% of bridge-related and 42% of lane-departure crashes happened when road surface conditions were not ideal. Comparing crash occurrence with bridge numbers by traffic volume range yields quite consistent results except for traffic volumes that exceed 55,000 vehicles per day. For these very high volumes, crash percentages are disproportionately higher than the number of bridges on those roadways.

	Bridge-	Bridge-Related		parture
	% of	% of	% of	% of
AADT Range	Crashes	Bridges	Crashes	Bridges
0 - 4999	5.97%	5.31%	8.00%	7.52%
5000 - 9999	12.99%	15.04%	10.00%	12.03%
10000 - 14999	15.32%	15.93%	18.50%	18.05%
15000 - 19999	12.73%	15.04%	14.00%	16.54%
20000 - 24999	13.51%	15.93%	11.50%	11.28%
25000 - 29999	5.45%	7.96%	4.50%	6.02%
30000 - 34999	8.31%	8.85%	5.50%	7.52%
35000 - 39999	0.78%	1.33%	1.50%	1.50%
40000 - 44999	8.05%	4.87%	6.00%	5.26%
45000 - 49999	3.38%	2.21%	2.00%	2.26%
50000 - 54999	1.82%	0.88%	1.00%	0.75%
55000+	11.69%	6.64%	17.50%	11.28%
Grand Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Table 12. Summary of crash occurrence by annual average daily traffic

Obstruction Location Relative to Roadway

The relationship between the location of piers, left or right of the traveled way, and crashes was also investigated. Since vehicles in the left lane are typically traveling at faster speeds, it may be reasonable to assume that more crashes may occur with median piers. In addition, median piers can typically be shielded with w-beam or cable guardrail, which is less costly than the combination concrete barrier/w-beam guardrail typically required for closer proximity outside piers.

To properly assign pier location to the crashes, each crash direction of travel was determined from the crash data sequence of events, which explicitly defined a left- or right-side departure. Left-side departures were associated with median obstructions, while right-side departures were associated with outside obstructions/embankments crashes. Table 13 details the crash count by direction of travel and shows that 41% of bridge-related crashes involved vehicles departing the roadway to the left while 30% of the crashes involved vehicles departing to the right. A total of 27% of the bridge-related crashes did not have side of departure explicitly identified as one of the sequence of events, possibly because some of these crashes were self-reported. To maintain a level of consistency and data integrity, these were not included in the analysis of crash severities by median or outside pier/embankment crashes.

Crash Category/SOD	Crash Count
Lane Departure	200
Left	88
Right	112
Bridge Related	385
Left	156
Right	125
STRAIGHT	3
Not Reported	101
Grand Total	585

Table 13. Crash summary by category and side of departure (SOD)

Severity of Crashes

To investigate the severity of crashes, shielding status, horizontal alignment, and side of departure were compared, particularly for bridge-related crashes. For side of departure, each crash was characterized as either a median or an outside pier or embankment impact. In addition to the number of crashes that were excluded in the preceding sub-section, an additional 30 bridge-related crashes were also eliminated from the analysis involving side of departure to minimize any ambiguity in the results. These were all left-side departures that may or may not have crossed the median but did not strike an identified bridge or shielding element.

Table 14a details the severity of crashes by shielding type, crash, and category. Bridge-related crashes resulted in one more fatal crash than lane-departure crashes but these resulted in a fewer number of fatalities. Five fatalities were reported for bridge-related crashes compared to 12 from four fatal lane-departure crashes. Although bridges with no shielding accounted for two of the five bridge-related fatal crashes, even with full protection some bridges still experienced a significant number of severe crashes.

Crash Category/		Major	Minor	Possible	Property	Grand
Shielding Status	Fatal	Injury	Injury	Injury	Damage Only	Total
Bridge Related	5	35	48	78	219	385
Full	1	17	23	40	131	212
None	2	3	4	2	8	19
Partial	2	15	21	36	80	154
Lane Departure	4	9	35	38	114	200
Full	4	3	20	17	59	103
None			5	2	6	13
Partial		6	10	19	49	84
Grand Total	9	44	83	116	333	585

Table 14a. Severity of crashes by crash categories and shielding status

Table 14b details the severity of crashes by horizontal alignment. For bridge-related crashes, two of five fatal crashes were recorded on a horizontal curve and these both happened at unshielded bridge pier locations, see Table 14a.

Crash Category/		Major	Minor	Possible	Property	Grand
Alignment	Fatal	Injury	Injury	Injury	Damage Only	Total
Bridge Related	5	35	48	78	219	385
Tangent	3	29	37	64	184	317
Curve	2	6	11	14	35	68
Lane Departure	4	9	35	38	114	200
Tangent	4	7	29	34	90	164
Curve		2	6	4	24	36
Grand Total	9	44	83	116	333	585

Table	14b.	Severity of	crashes by	y crash	categories a	and hori	zontal align	ment
		•						

Tables 14c and Table 14d detail bridge-related crashes by side of departure and type of fixed object struck. On the median side, there were more impacts with guardrails with 74 crashes followed by bridge support/underpass with 33 and then concrete barriers with a total of 19. This may be expected since guardrail is the dominant shielding type on the median side and relatively few unshielded median piers exist. Although collisions with bridge support/underpass experienced more fatal crashes, collisions with guardrails accounted for 59% of bridge-related crashes on the median side and one of the four fatal crashes. In addition, collisions with either guardrail or concrete barrier represented 11 of the 16 total major injury crashes. However, it should be noted that approximately 63% (47 of 74) of the guardrail crashes resulted in property damage only while 33% (11 of 33) collisions with bridge support/underpass did not result in some level of injury.

		Major	Minor	Possible	Property	Grand
Fixed Object	Fatal	Injury	Injury	Injury	Damage Only	Total
Bridge Related	4	19	14	29	90	156
Bridge Support/ Underpass	3	5	4	10	11	33
Concrete Barrier		2	1	1	15	19
Guardrail	1	9	5	12	47	74
Ditch/Embankment/ Other		3	4	6	17	30
Grand Total	4	19	14	29	90	156

Table 14c. Brid	ge-related crash	severity b	y fixed ob	ject struck media	n side/left departures
	8				

As shown in Table 14d, collisions with an outside (right) bridge support/underpass accounted for most crashes at 38% followed by guardrail with 30%. Collisions with outside ditch/embankment

and other obstacles combined for 26%. Collisions with ditch/embankment and "other" are always grouped together in this report because a closer inspection of the DOT crash reports reveals similar characteristics.

Fixed Object	Fatal	Major Iniury	Minor Iniury	Possible Injury	Property Damage Only	Grand Total
Bridge Support/ Underpass	1	6	8	11	21	47
Concrete Barrier			1	1	6	8
Guardrail		4	6	9	18	37
Ditch/Embankment			4	6	13	23
Other		1		1	8	10
Grand Total	1	11	19	28	66	125

Table 14d. Bridge-related crash severity by type of fixed object struck, outside/right departures

The number and severity of impacts with shielded vs. unshielded structures is interesting. Although fatal crashes occur less frequently, more injury crashes occur at shielded structures than unshielded. Obviously the major factor here is the number in each category and thus opportunity for a crash. But it also should be noted that installation of shielding at the unshielded piers will not eliminate all serious crashes at those locations and will increase the length of obstruction.

Overall for bridge-related crashes, left-side departures accounted for four of five fatal crashes, 59% of major injury crashes, and 53% of property damage only crashes. On the other hand, right-side departures resulted in 66% of minor injury crashes and 55% of possible injury crashes.

From Tables 14e and 14f, two of four median-side bridge-related fatal crashes occurred at unshielded piers. The only fatal crash at an outside pier/embankment happened at an unshielded location. While these tables present bridge-level data, it was observed from the district-provided data and video log review that shielding presence and type were typically the same for each direction of travel on a given bridge.

Tuble 140. Diluge	usie rei Druge remed crush severnej sij ejpe er shietaning median departure.										
Protection Type	Fatal	Major Injury	Minor Injury	Possible Injury	Property Damage Only	Grand Total					
Cable	1	1		7	11	20					
Concrete		2	1	2	7	12					
Guardrail	1	13	11	19	67	111					
None	2	3	2	1	5	13					

14

Grand Total

4

19

T 11 44	D • • • • • •			
Table 14e	Rridge-related	crach ceverity	y hy tyne of chieldir	ngmedian denartures
1 april 140.	Di luge-i ciateu	crash severity	by type of smelun	ig—mculan ucpartures

29

90

156

Outside Protection Type	Fatal	Major Injury	Minor Injury	Severity Possible Injury	Property Damage Only	Grand Total
Cable			1			1
Concrete		2	7	13	25	47
Guardrail		3	3	4	17	27
None	1	6	8	11	24	50
Grand Total	1	11	19	28	66	125

Table 14f. Bridge-related crash severity by type of shielding—outside departures

Tables 15 and 16 summarize crash severity by side of departure, lateral offset, and traffic volume. Regardless of which side (median or outside), crash category (bridge-related or lane-departure), or type of fixed object struck (bridge piers/support or shielding), more crashes occurred at an offset of less than 30 ft than occurred at higher offset distances. Two of five bridge-related fatal crashes happened at an offset of less than 30 ft and two additional bridge-related fatal crashes happened at an offset of 30 to 34 ft. For lane departure crashes, 100% of fatal crashes occurred at an offset of less than 30 ft. These numbers should not be surprising considering that obstacle offset distances of less than 30 ft make up nearly 70% of the study sample. It should also be noted that the Iowa DOT data base and district-provided data only recorded the minimum offset at a given structure. Furthermore, this study did not consider direction of travel for crashes. Therefore it is possible that crashes reported at a structure with a variation in offsets could be recorded here at a lesser clearance than what actually existed for the crash.

Considering traffic volumes in Tables 15 and 16, it seems that the impact of this attribute on severity was related to the side of departure. The three bridge-related fatal crashes that happened at an offset of less than 35 ft also had traffic volumes in the 5,000–25,000 AADT range for median pier crashes and 10,000–15,000 for outside pier/embankment crashes. In fact, five of seven fatal crashes on the median side were in the 15,000–25,000 AADT traffic volume range while both fatal crashes at outside piers were in the 10,000–15,000 AADT range. Overall, roadways in the 5,000–25,000 traffic volume range accounted for most fatal crashes and more total crashes than the proportionate share of the entire traffic volume exposure in the study sample (Table 12).

	Fatal	Major Injury	Minor Injury	Possible Injury	Property Damage Only	*Total DEV	Crash Totals
**Bridge Related Totals	4	19	14	29	90	4188610	156
<30 feet crashes	1	13	9	23	74	3479710	120
AADT 0 - 4999			1	2	6	20610	9
5000 - 9999		3	3	2	8	103300	16
10000 - 14999		1	1	4	10	188800	16
15000 - 19999			1	4	6	187400	11
20000 - 24999	1	1		1	10	294800	13
25000 - 29999		1	1	1	7	265700	10
30000 - 34999		3		5	3	351200	11
35000 - 39999					1	37700	1
40000 - 44999		1	1	2	5	377500	9
45000 - 49999		1	1		2	191100	4
50000 - 54999		1			5	322500	6
55000+		1		2	11	1139100	14
30-34 feet crashes	2	1	4	6	12	417500	25
5000 - 9999	1			3	3	57100	7
10000 - 14999			2		2	49200	4
15000 - 19999				2	5	122700	7
20000 - 24999	1		1	1	2	121100	5
25000 - 29999		1				26700	1
40000 - 44999			1			40700	1
35-40 feet crashes	1	5	1		4	291400	11
10000 - 14999		1	1		1	37000	3
15000 - 19999	1	2			3	100200	6
55000+		2				154200	2

Table 15. Crash severity by crash category, lateral offset and traffic volumes, median-side crashes

* DEV = Daily Entering Vehicles ** Includes Collisions with Ditch, Embankment, and Other

	Eatal	Major	Minor	Possible	Property	*Total	Crash Totals
Lane Departure Totals	3	7	19	16	43	2776030	88
<30 feet crashes	3	6	12	12	31	1937620	64
AADT 0 - 4999		1	1	3	3	15720	8
5000 - 9999		1	1	2	1	37000	5
10000 - 14999			1	2	7	123500	10
15000 - 19999			2	2	2	104900	6
20000 - 24999	2	2	2		2	179600	8
30000 - 34999			1	1	4	188300	6
35000 - 39999					1	36900	1
40000 - 44999		1	1		3	210900	5
45000 - 49999	1		1			93500	2
50000 - 54999					2	107000	2
55000+		1	2	2	6	840300	11
30-34 feet crashes		1	1	2	7	136310	11
0 - 4999					2	3010	2
5000 - 9999		1			1	15000	2
10000 - 14999			1		4	59200	5
15000 - 19999				1		18400	1
40000 - 44999				1		40700	1
35-40 feet crashes			6	2	5	702100	13
15000 - 19999			4	1		85300	5
55000+			2	1	5	616800	8
Grand Total	7	26	33	45	133	6964640	244

Table 15. Crash severity by crash category, lateral offset and traffic volumes, median-side crashes (continued)

* DEV = Daily Entering Vehicles ** Includes Collisions with Ditch, Embankment, and Other

		Major	Minor	Possible	Property		Crash
	Fatal	Injury	Injury	Injury	Damage Only	*Total DEV	Totals
Bridge Related Totals	1	11	19	28	66	3678410	125
<30 feet crashes	1	8	11	25	52	3071610	97
AADT 0 - 4999				1	5	14210	6
5000 - 9999		1			5	36600	6
10000 - 14999	1	1	3	2	6	162000	13
15000 - 19999		3		4	5	214400	12
20000 - 24999			1	7	11	421200	19
25000 - 29999					4	110300	4
30000 - 34999			2	1	6	293500	9
35000 - 39999				1		39200	1
40000 - 44999			4		4	335400	8
45000 - 49999		2		1		144900	3
50000 - 54999					1	54000	1
55000+		1	1	8	5	1245900	15
30-34 feet crashes		3	6	3	12	478200	24
0 - 4999			1			1200	1
5000 - 9999			1	1	4	44900	6
10000 - 14999					4	44000	4
15000 - 19999			1		1	35600	2
20000 - 24999		2		1		69500	3
25000 - 29999			1			25700	1
30000 - 34999		1	1		1	99000	3
35000 - 39999				1		36200	1
40000 - 44999			1		2	122100	3
35-40 feet crashes			2		2	128600	4
15000 - 19999			2		1	51500	3
55000+					1	77100	1
Lane Departure Totals	1	2	16	22	71	3113090	112
<30 feet crashes	1	1	12	16	54	2604820	84
AADT 0 - 4999				1	1	3220	2
5000 - 9999			1		7	50400	8
10000 - 14999	1		2	4	9	192200	16
15000 - 19999			2	1	7	180700	10
20000 - 24999			2	3	7	270000	12
25000 - 29999				1	7	221200	8
30000 - 34999			1	1	2	127100	4
35000 - 39999					2	78400	2
40000 - 44999		1	1	1	3	253500	6
45000 - 49999					2	96100	2
55000+			3	4	7	1132000	14

Table 16. Crash severity by crash category, lateral offset, and traffic volumes, outsidedeparture crashes

	Fatal	Major Injury	Minor Injury	Possible Injury	Property Damage Only	*Total DEV	Crash Totals
30-34 feet crashes		1	2	4	13	248070	20
0 - 4999			1		3	11770	4
5000 - 9999				1	4	39800	5
10000 - 14999		1	1		4	72100	6
15000 - 19999					1	18100	1
20000 - 24999				1	1	48000	2
25000 - 29999				1		27500	1
30000 - 34999				1		30800	1
35-40 feet crashes			2	2	4	260200	8
15000 - 19999			1	1	3	83800	5
20000 - 24999				1		22200	1
55000+			1		1	154200	2
Grand Total	2	13	35	50	137	6791500	237

Table 16. Crash severity by crash category, lateral offset, and traffic volumes, outsidedeparture crashes (continued)

* DEV = Daily Entering Vehicles

Pier Offset

As was indicated in previous sections, more shielding at median piers was impacted by errant vehicles than unshielded piers; in fact, only 8% of unshielded median piers were involved in a bridge-related crash during the seven-year analysis period. More than 60% of shielded median piers involved in a crash had a minimum offset of less than 30 ft. Table 17 details the bridge frequency by minimum offset and shielding type for median piers involved in a crash.

Table 17. Nu	umber of bridges	involved in a	bridge-related	crash by	minimum o	offset and
protection ty	ype, median					

Lateral Offset	Cable	Concrete	Guardrail	None	Grand Total
<30 feet	14	12	92	2	120
30-34 feet	6		17	2	25
35-40 feet			2	9	11
Grand Total	20	12	111	13	156

Table 18 shows that 40% (50 of 125) of outside bridge-related crashes were at an unshielded pier. It will be instructive to note that almost 11% of the bridges involved in a crash were two-span, with no outside pier. In addition, nearly 70% of bridge piers, median and outside, have an offset of less than 30 ft (Table 5).
Lateral Offset	Cable	Concrete	Guardrail	None	Grand Total
<30 feet	1	47	27	27	102
30-34 feet				18	18
35-40				3	3
>40 feet				2	2
Grand Total	1	47	27	50	125

Table 18. Number of bridges involved in a bridge-related crash by minimum offset and shielding type, outside

Bridges with Multiple Crashes

Table 19 lists bridges with multiple crashes, which are defined as those median or outside piers/embankments that experienced more than one bridge-related crash within the seven-year analysis period. This number excludes collisions with ditch/embankment and "other". In the next section we will look more closely at 2-span bridges and will include collisions with ditch/embankment and "other" in that discussion. Only one of the 43 total bridges with multiple crashes shown in Table 20 had no protection in either the median or outside lane/embankment

Multiple bridge-related crashes accounted for 112 crashes and one fatality as shown in Table 20. Only two of these bridges were two-span structures.

Table 19. Number of bridges involved in a multiple bridge-related crash by side of departure and horizontal alignment

Side of Departure	Tangent	Curve	Grand Total
Left	13	3	16
Right	12	1	13
Not Reported	10	4	14
Grand Total	35	8	43

Side of	Crash		Major	Minor	Possible	Property
Departure	Count	Fatalities	Injuries	Injuries	Injuries	Damage (\$)
Left	42	1	8	8	11	261175
Right	28	0	3	5	10	480566
Not Reported	42	0	3	10	10	242068
Grand Total	112	1	14	23	31	983809

Tables 21 and 22 detail the bridges with multiple bridge-related crashes by side of departure, minimum offset, shielding type, and traffic volume.

Outside	Bridge Count
<30 feet	11
Concrete	6
AADT 0 - 4999	1
15000 - 19999	1
20000 - 24999	1
40000 - 44999	1
55000+	2
Guardrail	3
10000 - 14999	1
30000 - 34999	1
40000 - 44999	1
None	2
40000 - 44999	1
55000+	1
30-34 feet	1
None	1
5000 - 9999	1
35-40 feet	1
None	1
55000+	1
Grand Total	13

Table 21. Number of bridges involved in a multiple bridge-related crash by minimum lateral offset, shielding type, and traffic volume

Table 22. Number of bridges involved in a multiple bridge-related crash by minimum lateral offset, shielding type, and traffic volume

Median	Bridge Count
<30 feet	10
Cable	1
AADT 40000 - 44999	1
Guardrail	9
AADT 5000 - 9999	2
10000 - 14999	1
20000 - 24999	1
25000 - 29999	2
50000 - 54999	2
55000+	1

Median	Bridge Count
30-34 feet	5
Cable	2
15000 - 19999	1
20000 - 24999	1
Concrete	2
5000 - 9999	1
10000 - 14999	1
None	1
15000 - 19999	1
35-40 feet	1
Concrete	1
55000+	1
Grand Total	16

Table 22. Number of bridges involved in a multiple bridge-related crash by lateral offset, shielding type, and traffic volume (continued)

As shown in Table 23, the bridge with 11 crashes is located on a curve and is fully shielded

Table 23. Number of bridges involved in a multiple bridge-related crash by the number of	of
crashes	

Crashes	Bridge Count
2	31
Full	16
Partial	15
3	8
Full	4
None	1
Partial	3
4	2
Full	1
Partial	1
7	1
Full	1
11	1
Full	1
Grand Total	43

Two-Span Bridges

It should be noted that two-span bridges only feature a single pier in the median; abutments for these structures are supported by earthen embankments along the outside of the roadway passing under the structure. Only bridge-related crashes were used in the analysis for two-span bridges.

Of a total of 63 two-span design bridges, 24 were involved in 31 bridge-related crashes. One fourth of these bridges were a multiple-crash site. One fatal crash was reported for bridge-related crashes involving two-span bridges. Almost half of these crashes were left-side departures while 29% were right-side departures, the other reports did not have a side of departure explicitly identified. Eight of nine right-side departures occurred at an unshielded embankment (bridge abutment berm). Three of 15 left-side departures happened at an unshielded median pier. The fatal crash in Table 24 occurred on a horizontal curve. There were no major injuries reported at two-span bridges. Tables 24–26 summarize relevant information for two-span bridges involved in bridge-related crashes. It should be noted all the two-span bridges involved in bridge-related crashes had an offset distance on at least one side that was less than 35 ft.

		Major	Minor	Possible	Property	Grand
Type of Collision	Fatal	Injury	Injury	Injury	Damage Only	Total
Bridge Support	1		3	2	2	8
Concrete barrier			1	2	2	5
Guardrail				3	8	11
Ditch/Embankment				2	3	5
Other					2	2
Grand Total	1	0	4	9	17	31

Table 24. Crash severity for two-span bridges

Table 25. Bridge count and shielding type at two-span bridges, median side

Median Pier	Horizontal Alignment			
Shielding Type	Tangent	Curve	Grand Total	
Cable	2		2	
Concrete	4	2	6	
Guardrail	9	4	13	
None	2	1	3	
Grand Total	17	7	24	

Outside Pier	Horizontal Alignment			
Protection Type	Tangent	Grand Total		
Concrete	1		1	
Guardrail	1	1	2	
None	15	6	21	
Grand Total	17	7	24	

Table 26. Bridge count and shielding type for two-span bridges, outside/embankment side

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Background

Several options should be evaluated when considering the advisability of installing shielding to reduce the severity of collisions with bridge supports. The following scenarios will be considered in this report:

- Do nothing beyond current status
- Shield all unprotected piers on curves
- Shield piers based on offset
- Shield all median piers, regardless of offset
- Shield all bridge piers, regardless of offset
- Shield all two-span bridge embankments

For this study, installation of high-tension cable to shield unprotected bridge piers is used for cost analysis. While initial installation costs do not differ significantly from w-beam guardrail, cable is much less expensive and time-consuming to maintain. The study also assumes a 10-year lifespan for cable installations.

The study included all grade separation structures indentified on multi-lane divided roadways with posted speed limits of 45 mph or greater. Table 27 lists the number of structures in each speed category.

Posted Speed	Number of Bridges
45	27
50	7
55	115
60	9
65	183
70	225
Total	566

Table 27. Bridges by speed limit

Table 28 lists the number of crashes that were recorded by speed that occurred at unshielded median piers or outside pier/embankments. These crashes were used in the economic analyses that follow. The number of crashes approximately reflects the number of bridges at each speed. It should be noted that the Interstate speed limit in Iowa was raised from 65 mph to 70 mph in July 2005, which probably impacts the number of crashes listed for those speeds. All rural Interstate crashes before that date would have occurred at a speed limit of 65 mph. Very few crashes were recorded at lower speeds, and crashes at these speeds were not considered in the economic analyses.

Posted Speed	Number of Crashes Recorded
45	2
50	1
55	17
60	2
65	28
70	17
Total Crashes	67

Table 28. Crashes for each speed limit

A benefit to cost comparison will be calculated for each of the options listed above. The benefit will be defined as the dollar value of societal costs from crashes that might be reduced in number and severity by implementing the option. The cost of a crash, sometimes called the Level of Service for Safety (LOSS) for a given severity is defined by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) as the values shown in Table 29a. Property damage from all crashes is included in these analyses using the investigating officer's estimate of damages.

Table 29a. LOSS costs of a crash

Severity	Cost
Fatality	\$ 3,500,000
Major Injury	240,000
Minor Injury	48,000
Possible Injury	25,000
Property Damage	Police estimate
	or \$2,700

Table 29b details the crash reduction factors (CRF) used in the benefit/cost estimates (B/C). These values were taken from the Desktop Reference for Crash Reduction Factors published by the FHWA in September 2007, and while the conditions described for specific situations in this document do not always agree precisely with the treatment being analyzed, these values represent the best data available for reference.

Type of treatment	Severity	CRF
Shield all unshielded	Fatal and	200/
piers on a curve	Injury	59%
Shield all unshielded	All	14%
	Injury	51%
piers	Fatal	65%
Shield all unshielded	All	7%
embankments	Injury	42%

Table 29b. Crash reduction factors used for analysis

Table 29c lists alternative crash reduction factors that were selected randomly and used in a sensitivity analysis for option 5 only to illustrate the resulting benefit/cost impacts of variable crash reduction factors.

Table 29c. Sensitivity analysis for scenario 5

Type of treatment	Severity		CRF
		Low	14%
Chield all unchielded	All	Medium	50%
sineia all'unshielaea		High	70%
piers	loiuo/	Medium	51%
	nijury	High	70%

Crash Selection

To investigate the economic benefits of shielding bridge piers, only crashes that occurred at unshielded piers were utilized. Crashes were attributed to the median or outside pier or abutment based on the side of departure. To include all pertinent crashes in the economic analysis, crashes occurring at completely unshielded bridges with unknown side of departure were assigned based on the overall proportion of median and outside bridge element crashes. Interestingly, only one unknown side of departure crash occurred at a totally unshielded bridge. Three crashes that were recorded as run-off-road straight were assigned to outside pier/embankment crashes for the economic analyses that follow.

Scenario 1: Do Nothing beyond Current Status

Based on the study analysis period from 2001 to 2007, three fatalities, 10 major injuries, 13 minor injuries, 12 possible injuries, and property damage totaling \$858,172 resulted from 67 crashes at unshielded bridge piers. Based on the data in Table 29a, that would result in a total crash loss of nearly \$17 million or approximately \$2.25 million dollars annually. Doing nothing to improve shielding of bridge piers would not seem consistent with state and national goals to reduce fatalities and serious injuries on roadways.

Scenario 2: Shield All Piers at Bridges Located on Curves

At the commencement of this study, it was speculated that bridge piers on curves may be more exposed to crashes than those on tangent sections of roadways as more roadway departure crashes seem to occur in those locations. Tables 30a and 30b summarize the B/C analysis of shielding these structure for posted speed limits 55 mph and above and 65 mph and above. For worksheets and calculations, see Appendix A. Note that the 55 mph and above data also include the 65 mph and above bridges.

Table 30a. Shield all unshielded piers located on curves on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 55 and above

Install	ations				Crashes			
Median	Outsida	Eatal	Major Injury	Minor	Possible	*PDO	Crash Count	**DEV
Weulan	Outside	Tatai	mjury	mjury	nijury	FDO	count	
12	55	2	1	2	2	6	13	735180
Ber	nefit	\$3 <i>,</i> 654	,953					
Cost		\$1,130,058						
B	/C	3.	.23					

*Property damage only

**Daily entering vehicles

Table 30b. Shield all unshielded piers located on curves on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 65 and above

Install	ations				Crashes			
			Major	Minor	Possible		Crash	
Median	Outside	Fatal	Injury	Injury	Injury	*PDO	Count	**DEV
12	44	2	1	2	2	5	12	605600
Ber	efit	\$3,654	,953					

B/C *Property damage only

Cost

**Doily antoring vohiolo

**Daily entering vehicles

Scenario 3: Protect Unprotected Piers Based on Offset

\$944,526

3.87

Using existing Iowa DOT design guidance allows engineers to calculate a dimension designated as a clear zone based on several factors including traffic speed, roadway alignment, and slope. This clear zone is anticipated to allow drivers to regain control of errant vehicles and return to the roadway. Consequently, shielding of obstacles such as bridge piers outside of this calculated

dimension is considered optional. For the roadways in this study, the clear zone is approximately 30 to 35 ft from the edge of the traveled way.

Four lateral offset dimensions were selected to analyze the potential crash impacts related to offset distance. These dimensions were the following: less than 30 ft, 30 to 35 ft, 35 to 40 ft, and greater than 40 ft. Tables 31a through 31d show the B/C summaries by pier offset distance and posted speed limits. Since many bridges do not have the same offset distance for median and outside and to avoid double counting of crashes, the B/C analysis was divided into two parts: median-side and outside exposure. For worksheets and calculations, see Appendix B.

	# of			Major	Major	Minor	Minor	Possible	Possible		Property	Crash	
	Туре	Fatal	Fatalities	Injury	Injuries	Injury	Injuries	Injury	Injuries	PDO	Damage	Count	DEV
Median													
<30 ft	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4000	2	58600
30-34 ft	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2015	2	127700
35-40 ft	38	1	1	3	3	1	3	0	0	4	274600	9	642000
>40 ft	3												34600
Outside													
<30 ft	123	1	1	2	3	6	6	5	3	11	256358	25	2101700
30-34 ft	134	0	0	2	2	3	3	4	4	11	253500	20	2369800
35-40 ft	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	12099	3	323720
>40 ft	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	40000	2	126520

Table 31a. Summary of crash severity and losses for unshielded piers based on offset on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit of 55 and above

Table 31b. Summary of B/C analysis of unshielded piers based	ed on offset on divided Interstate and primary highways with
posted speed limit of 55 and above	

	Crash	Crash Reduction	Μ	edian Piers		Outside Piers			
Offset	Severity	Factor (CRF)	Benefit	Cost	B/C	Benefit	Cost	B/C	
	All	14	\$706	\$67,466	0.01	\$854,103	\$2,074,584	0.41	
<30 feet	Injury	51	I	No injury		\$696,295	\$2,074,584	0.34	
	Fatal	65	Ν	No fatality		\$2,867,980	\$2,074,584	1.38	
	All	14	\$622,487	\$269,865	2.31	\$172,520	\$2,260,116	0.08	
30-34 feet	Injury	51	\$16,073	3 \$269,865 0.06		\$465,483	\$2,260,116	0.21	
	Fatal	65	\$2,867,980	\$269,865	10.63		No fatality		
	All	14	\$818,671	\$640,928	1.28	\$52,259	\$303 <i>,</i> 598	0.17	
35-40 feet	Injury	51	\$555,493	\$640,928	0.87	\$186,450	\$303,598	0.61	
	Fatal	65	\$2,867,980	\$640,928	4.47		No fatality		
	All	14				\$53,830	\$151,799	0.35	
>40 feet	Injury	51	N	No crashes			\$151,799	1.12	
	Fatal	65				No fatality			

	# of			Major	Major	Minor	Minor	Possible	Possible		Property	Crash	
	Туре	Fatal	Fatalities	Injury	Injuries	Injury	Injuries	Injury	Injuries	PDO	Damage	Count	DEV
Median													
<30 ft	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4000	2	58600
30-34 ft	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2015	2	116200
35-40 ft	37	1	1	3	3	1	3	0	0	4	274600	9	626500
>40 ft	0												000000
Outside													
<30 ft	88	1	1	0	0	5	5	3	3	6	190677	15	1425290
30-34 ft	112	0	0	1	1	3	3	3	3	9	183000	16	1917600
35-40 ft	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6099	1	160700
>40 ft	8	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	40000	2	121600

Table 31c. Summary of crash severity and losses for unshielded piers based on offset on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit of 65 and above

32

Table 31d. Summary of B/C analysis of unshielded piers based on offset on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit of 65 and above

	Crash	Crash Reduction	Μ	Median Piers			Outside Piers			
Offset	Severity	Factor (CRF)	Benefit	Cost	B/C	Benefit	Cost	B/C		
	All	14	\$706	\$67,466	0.01	\$706,966	\$1,484,255	0.48		
<30 feet	Injury	51	I	No injury		\$696,295	\$1,484,255	0.47		
	Fatal	65	Ν	No fatality			\$1,484,255	1.93		
	All	14	\$622,487	\$269,865	2.31	\$113,307	\$1,889,052	0.06		
30-34 feet	Injury	51	\$16,073	\$269,865	0.06	\$295,106	\$1,889,052	0.16		
	Fatal	65	\$2,867,980	\$269,865	10.63		No fatality			
	All	14	\$818,671	\$640,928	1.28	\$43,434	\$168,665	0.26		
35-40 feet	Injury	51	\$555,493	\$640,928	0.87	\$154,304	\$168,665	0.91		
	Fatal	65	\$2,867,980	\$640,928	4.47		No fatality			
	All	14				\$53,830	\$151,799	0.35		
>40 feet	Injury	51	Ν	No crashes			\$151,799	1.12		
	Fatal	65				No fatality				

Scenario 4: Shield All Median Piers

As previously discussed, median piers were assumed to present a higher crash potential because traffic on the inside lanes is typically moving faster and perhaps making more lane changes. The data supported this theory quite well, as 41% of crashes where side of departure was a factor involved median piers, compared to 30% that involved outside piers/embankments.

A B/C analysis was conducted to determine the benefit that could be attained by shielding only median piers. Tables 32a through 32d detail crash severity and B/C results for shielding all median piers based on posted speed limits, regardless of lateral offset. For worksheet and calculations, see Appendix C.

Table 32a. Summary of crash severity for all unshielded median piers on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit of 55 and above.

Installations					Crashes			
			Major	Minor	Possible		Crash	
Median	Outside	Fatal	Injury	Injury	Injury	PDO	Count	DEV
61		2	3	1	1	6	13	847700

Table 32b. Summary of B/C analysis for shielding at unshielded median piers on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit of 55 and above

	Crash Reduction			
Crash Severity	Factor (CRF)	Benefit	Cost	B/C
All	14	\$1,442,852	\$1,028,859	1.40
Injury	51	\$571 <i>,</i> 566	\$1,028,859	0.56
Fatal	65	\$5,735,959	\$1,028,859	5.58

Table 32c. Summary of crash severity for all unshielded median piers on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 65 and above

Installations					Crashes			
			Major	Minor	Possible		Crash	
Median	Outside	Fatal	Injury	Injury	Injury	PDO	Count	DEV
54		2	3	1	1	6	13	801300

	Crash Reduction			
Crash Severity	Factor (CRF)	Benefit	Cost	B/C
All	14	\$1,442,852	\$910,793	1.58
Injury	51	\$571 <i>,</i> 566	\$910,793	0.63
Fatal	65	\$5 <i>,</i> 735,959	\$910,793	6.30

Table 32d. Summary of B/C analysis for shielding at unshielded median piers on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 65 and above

Scenario 5: Shield All Bridge Piers without Exception

This option examined the feasibility of shielding all existing bridge piers regardless of lateral offset. Shielding all existing piers that exist today would require a substantial investment in funding estimated at \$1.22 million dollars for all exposed bridge piers on divided Interstate and primary highways with speed limits between 55 mph and 65 mph and \$4.59 million dollars for speed limits at and above 65 mph. The cost assumes installation of high-tension cable rail at all exposed bridge piers. Tables 33a–33d detail the crash severity and the B/C analysis for shielding all piers. For worksheet and calculations, see Appendix D.

Table 33a. Summary of crash severity for all unshielded piers on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 55 and above

Installations					Crashes			
			Major	Minor	Possible		Crash	
Median	Outside	Fatal	Injury	Injury	Injury	PDO	Count	DEV
284	61	3	9	10	13	28	63	4921770

Table 33b. Summary of B/C analysis of all unshielded piers on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 55 and above

		Crash Reduction			
Crash Severity	Sensitivity	Factor (CRF)	Benefit	Cost	B/C
	Low	14	\$2,580,047		0.44
All	Medium	50	\$9 <i>,</i> 214,454		1.58
	High	70	\$12,900,235		2.22
loiun/	Medium	51	\$2,106,244	\$2,010,955	0.36
injury	High	70 \$2,890,923			0.50
Fatal		65	\$8,603,939		1.48

Instal		Crashes						
	• • • •		Major	Minor	Possible		Crash	
Median	Outside	Fatal	Injury	Injury	Injury	PDO	Count	DEV

Table 33c. Summary of crash severity for all unshielded piers on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 65 and above

Table 33d. Summary of B/C analysis of all unshielded piers on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 65 and above

		Crash Reduction			
Crash Severity	Sensitivity	Factor (CRF)	Benefit	Cost	B/C
	Low	14	\$2,363,814		0.52
All	Medium	50	\$8,442,191		1.84
	High	70	\$11,819,068	¢4 F97 609	2.58
loiun.	Medium	51	\$1,409,949	\$4,587,698	0.31
injury	High	70 \$1,935,			0.42
Fatal		65	\$8,603,939		1.88

Tables 34b and 34d include a sensitivity column to illustrate the impacts on resulting B/C ratios from a range of crash reduction factors listed earlier in Table 29c.

Scenario 6: Shield All Two-Span Bridge Embankments

This study also analyzed the benefits of shielding the embankments along the outside (right side) at two-span bridges (Tables 34a and 34b). Considering that right-side departures accounted for 29% of crashes at two-span bridges with no fatalities or major injuries in seven years, the B/C ratio for shielding two-span bridge embankments is consequently negligible. For worksheet and calculations, see Appendix E.

Table 34a. Summary of crash severity for all unshielded two-span embankments on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 55 and above

Install	ations				Crashes			
			Major	Minor	Possible		Crash	
Median	Outside	Fatal	Injury	Injury	Injury	PDO	Count	DEV
	49	0	0	1	2	3	6	701350

Crash Severity	Crash Reduction Factor (CRF)	Benefit	Cost	B/C
All	7	\$10,545	\$826 <i>,</i> 460	0.01
Injury	47	\$58,066	\$826 <i>,</i> 460	0.07

 Table 34b. Summary of B/C analysis of all unshielded two-span embankments on divided

 Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 55 and above

 Table 34c. Summary of crash severity for all unshielded two-span embankments on divided

 Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 65 and above

Installations					Crashes			
			Major	Minor	Possible		Crash	
Median	Outside	Fatal	Injury	Injury	Injury	PDO	Count	DEV
	36	0	0	1	2	3	6	484970

Table 34d. Summary of B/C analysis of all unshielded two-span embankments on divided Interstate and primary highways with posted speed limit 65 and above

	Crash Reduction			
Crash Severity	Factor (CRF)	Benefit	Cost	B/C
All	7	\$10,016	\$607,195	0.02
Injury	47	\$58,066	\$607,195	0.10

In March 2009, a fatal truck crash occurred at an unshielded outside bridge pier on I-380 in Johnson County. Iowa DOT staff measured the near offset of the impacted pier at 34 ft from the edge of the outside lane. However, as can be seen from the images in Appendix I, the path of the errant vehicle would have impacted a pier at a much greater offset as well. Anticipating interesting results, the research team examined several B/C computations from including this fatal crash and one year of additional traffic volume with the calculations for the report analysis period. The following B/C ratios were obtained when including the additional fatality:

- For a 30–34 ft offset on a 65 mph highway, B/C for all crashes is calculated at 0.34. (Compare to Table 31d)
- For shielding of all piers, regardless of offset on 65 mph highways, B/C ratios ranged from 0.57 for a low-sensitivity CRF, 2.03 for a medium-sensitivity CRF, and 2.84 for a high-sensitivity CRF.(Compare to Table 33d)

Thus the addition of this fatality did not significantly impact calculated B/C ratios for these two scenarios when the additional year of traffic volume was considered.

CONCLUSIONS

This study was undertaken to ascertain criteria for shielding exposed obstructions at gradeseparated structures on Interstate and primary roads in Iowa. Data were gathered from all crashes reported in the most current seven years of data and from the Iowa DOT inventory of study subject structures on four or more lane-divided roadways on the Interstate and primary highway system. Based on the data and the analysis described in this report, the following conclusions can be drawn and recommendations can be made:

- Since the construction of multi-lane divided highways began in Iowa, close compliance with roadside design standards and guidance has been maintained. Highway designers have carefully calculated clear-zone requirements and specified shielding as thus determined.
- Over approximately 40 years of experience since commencement of Interstate construction, numerous crashes have occurred at unshielded structures, both piers and other substructure elements. This study proposed to examine past and current criteria used by the state for specifying shielding at these structures.
- Of the 566 bridges identified by this study, 258 have shielding in place for all exposed substructure elements, 236 are partially shielded (most at the median pier only), and 72 have no shielding at all. Virtually all exposed substructure elements within the clear zone are shielded.
- A total of 585 crashes occurred at or near the subject bridges during the seven-year analysis period; 385 were defined as bridge-related by this study and 200 were lane-departure crashes.
- A total of 472 of the 566 study bridges (83%) are located on tangent sections of roadway, 17% are on curves. It is interesting to note that 104 of the 585 recorded crashes (18%) occurred in curve areas and 481 in tangent locations (82%).
- Approximately 55% of these crashes occurred during daylight conditions, 52% on dry pavement, and about 63% in clear, cloudy, or partly cloudy conditions. However, these data indicate that a high percentage of these crashes, (37%) occur in less than desirable weather or driving conditions. Since environmental data indicates that less than desirable pavement surface conditions only exist about 31% of the time, it appears that drivers are not properly responding to adverse driving situations.
- Most lane departure crashes, 112 of 200 (56%) were right-side departures; for bridge related crashes, 156 of 385 (41%) were left-side or median side departures.
- Most fatal crashes involved impacts with unshielded structure elements, but more injury crashes occurred at previously shielded structures. It may be surmised that shielding of an exposed element should reduce crash severity, but not necessarily the number of crashes. These results may be partially attributable to the increased potential length of the obstacle presented by the guardrail installation compared to an exposed pier or bridge embankment.
- Most fatal crashes and more total crashes were recorded on lower traffic volume roadways, less than 25,000 AADT than the proportionate share of these roadways in the total system.
- Lateral offset of obstruction seemed to impact the number of crashes; 79% of crashes

impacted obstructions within 30 ft of the roadway while the total percentage of obstructions at the offset is approximately 70%.

- A total of 43 bridges were involved in multiple crashes during the study period, with 112 crashes and one fatality recorded. As most of these structure elements are fully shielded, other mitigation may be needed to reduce crash occurrences at these bridges.
- When compared to the total crashes that are recorded on Iowa's Interstate roadways of about 1850 per year with an average of 20-25 fatal crashes, the total number of crashes that occur at all grade separated bridges on an annual basis is quite low, 55 crashes with a total of 5 fatalities in a 7 year period.

The economic analysis revealed the following results:

- A relatively high crash loss has occurred over the study period from these bridge substructure crashes, and some appropriate mitigation should be determined.
- The economic analysis was conducted for two posted speed exposures, roadways of 55 mph and greater and roadways of 65 mph and greater. In general but not entirely, calculated B/C ratios were slightly higher for the higher speed roadways.
- Piers located on horizontal curves experienced a total of 13 crashes from which two fatalities occurred. Shielding of these piers would yield a B/C return of 3.29 for all crashes on roadways with posted speed of 55 mph and greater and 3.87 for roadways with posted speeds of 65 mph and greater.
- Since most close proximity piers and other substructure elements have been shielded, little additional benefit would be gained by shielding those obstructions based solely on offset distance.
- Piers located in the median appeared to present the most likely potential for impact by errant vehicles. Shielding of all median piers, regardless of offset distance would yield a B/C return of 5.58 for fatal crashes and 1.40 for all crashes on 55 mph and greater roads, and 6.30 for fatal crashes and 1.58 for all crashes on 65 mph and greater roads.
- Shielding of all exposed bridge substructure elements in both the median and along the outside of divided roadways does not appear feasible with a calculated B/C for fatal crashes of 1.48 and all crashes of only 0.44 for 55 mph, and 1.88 for fatal crashes and 0.52 for all crashes on 65 mph and greater roads. However, when arbitrarily higher crash reduction factors are applied, the resulting B/C ratios for all crashes increases to 2.22 for 55 mph and greater and 2.58 for 65 mph and greater roads.
- Shielding of exposed abutment embankments at two-span bridges would yield a very low B/C return, well below 1.00 for all speeds.

RECOMMENDATIONS

With few exceptions the economic analyses performed for several scenarios did not indicate an urgent need to install shielding at a significant number of currently exposed bridge substructure elements. It would be recommended that additional shielding only be installed at locations where the need is clearly warranted, perhaps considering a combination of factors such as offset, horizontal alignment, side of roadway, traffic volume, and especially crash history. Each structure should be analyzed on an individual basis.

Unshielded grade separation structures with a multiple crash history at or in near proximity to the bridge should be analyzed to determine if the existing design of shielding is appropriate.

Structures with a multiple crash history at or near the structure, even if fully shielded, should be studied for possible safety mitigation, considering such enhancements as improved pavement markings, retro-reflectorization of the substructure element, and installation of closely spaced delineators along the frequent road departure area.

The study confirmed the commonly held opinion that many drivers do not utilize prudent caution when traveling on other than dry pavement surfaces. A public information effort to publicize this finding may be beneficial, even wet pavement conditions can contribute to road departure incidents.

Crash history, especially for serious injury crashes at individual structures should be evaluated and proper mitigation, including shielding undertaken when warranted by engineering judgment and field experience, regardless of offset.

The economic analyses performed with this study relied on crash reduction factors suggested in an FHWA document *Desktop Reference for Crash Reduction Factors*, and those factors may seem quite low, especially in some categories. As newer data and references are developed, the B/C comparisons presented in this report should be re-calculated.

This study utilized an extensive volume of data from the Iowa DOT databases for roadways, structures, and crashes but the information available for the specific issues of interest was still limited, impacting the scope of study results. With additional data, issues such as effects of direction of travel, offset distance by one foot increments, vehicle type, and type of shielding could be analyzed for impacts on crashes and severity. Additional data might also permit development of more descriptive and accurate crash reduction factors than are available at this time. A multi-state research project should be considered for accomplishment of these worthwhile goals.

REFERENCES

American Association of State and Highway Transportation Officials. 2002. *Roadside Design Guide*, 3rd Edition. American Association of State and Highway Transportation Officials.
 Iowa Department of Transportation. 2009. *Design Manual*. Iowa Department of Transportation, Office of Design. http://www.iowadot.gov/design/dmanual/manual.html.

APPENDIX A. SHIELD ALL UNPROTECTED PIERS ON CURVES





Rev. 5/08

APPENDIX B. SHIELD ALL UNPROTECTED PIERS BASED ON OFFSET

B.1. Median Side



Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Median: 16 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Median Piers Based on Offset: Between 30-35ft \$ 192,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 9,600 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 14 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 77.865 Present Value Other Annual Costs. OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 269,865 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT (1 + INT)Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 46,610,500 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 127700 155,666 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 510.37 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right) \right)$ TMEV = 127,700 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ 3 500 000 1 0 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 0 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ Injury Crashes 1 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 25,000 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 2,015 2 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 3,527,015 0.29 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR ######### Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 622,487 Present Value of Avoided 3.1 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV Crashes, BENEFIT 0.04 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 70,540 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ BEN. 0.4 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$269,865 2.31 : 1 \$622,487 :

Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety



Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety



Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety

STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Median: 38 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Median Piers Based on Offset: Between 35 - 40ft \$ 456,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 22,800 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 14 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 184,928 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 640,928 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 234,330,000 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 642000 782,594 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 2,565.85 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right)^{1} \right)$ TMEV =642,000 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes \$3,500,000 \$ 3,500,000 Fatalities @ 1 3 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 720,000 3 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 4 Injury Crashes 144,000 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 274,600 9 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 4,638,600 1.29 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 515,400 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 818,671 Present Value of Avoided 14.1 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV Crashes, BENEFIT 0.18 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 92,772 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{AVC \times AAR}{1 - G}\right)\right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ BEN. 2.0 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$640,928 1.28 : 1 \$818.671 :

Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety

STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Median: 38 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Median Piers Based on Offset: Between 35 - 40ft \$ 456,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 22,800 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 184,928 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 640,928 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT (1 + INT)Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 234,330,000 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 642000 782,594 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 2,565.85 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right)^{1} \right)$ TMEV = 642,000 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 3 720,000 3 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 4 Injury Crashes 144,000 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: 4 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 864,000 0.57 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 216,000 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 555,493 Present Value of Avoided 6.3 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV Crashes, BENEFIT 0.29 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 62,949 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC s $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ BEN. 3.2 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$555.493 \$640,928 0.87 : 1 :



Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Median: 4 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Median Piers Based on Offset: Less than 30ft 48,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 2,400 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 14 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 19,466 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 67,466 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT (1 + INT)Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 21,389,000 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 58600 71,433 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 234.20 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right) \right)$ TMEV = 58,600 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 0 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ 0 0 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 0 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ Injury Crashes 0 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ \$2,700 \$ Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 4,000 2 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 4,000 0.29 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR 2,000 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 3.1 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 706 Present Value of Avoided \$ Crashes, BENEFIT 0.04 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{1}$ 80 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC s 1 + GBEN. 0.4 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 (INT - G)Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$706 \$67,466 0.01 : : 1

Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety

STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 123 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Less than 30ft \$ 1,476,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 73,800 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 65 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 598,584 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 2,074,584 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = IAM (1 + INT)Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 767,131,450 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 2101730 2,561,997 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 8,399.88 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right) \right)$ TMEV : 2,101,730 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes \$3,500,000 \$ 3 500 000 Fatalities @ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ Injury Crashes Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 3,500,000 1 0.14 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 3,500,000 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 2,867,980 Present Value of Avoided 1.6 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV Crashes, BENEFIT 0.09 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 325,000 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ 1.0 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 BEN. Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$2,867,980 \$2,074,584 1.38 : 1 :

Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 134 Sites Improvement Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Between 30-35 ft Proposed Improvement(s): \$ 1,608,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 80,400 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 14 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 652,116 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 2,260,116 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 864,977,000 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 2369800 2,888,773 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 9,471.26 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{\gamma}\right)$ TMEV =2,369,800 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ 2 \$240,000 \$ Major Injuries @ 480,000 3 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 9 Injury Crashes 144,000 Δ Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 100,000 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ 11 -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 253,500 20 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 977,500 2.86 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR 48,875 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 31.3 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV \$ 172,520 Present Value of Avoided 0.40 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT \$ 19,550 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ 4.4 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 BEN. Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$2,260,116 80.0 \$172,520 : 1 :

Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis lowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety

STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 134 Sites Improvement Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Between 30-35 ft Proposed Improvement(s): \$ 1,608,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 80,400 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 652,116 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 2,260,116 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 864,977,000 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 2369800 2,888,773 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 9,471.26 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right)^{\gamma} \right)$ TMEV =2,369,800 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ 2 \$240,000 \$ Major Injuries @ 480,000 3 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 9 Injury Crashes 144,000 Δ Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 100,000 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ --OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: 9 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 724,000 1.29 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR 80,444 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 14.1 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV \$ 465,483 Present Value of Avoided Crashes, BENEFIT 0.66 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 52,749 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 + G}{1 + INT} \right) \right)$ 7.2 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 BEN. Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$2,260,116 0.21 : 1 \$465,483 : =

Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 18 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Between 35-40 ft \$ 216,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 10,800 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 14 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 87,598 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 303,598 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT (1 + INT)Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 118,157,800 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 323720 394,613 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 1,293.79 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right)^{1} \right)$ TMEV =323,720 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 240,000 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 3 Injury Crashes 2 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 50,000 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ 0 -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 6,099 3 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 296,099 0.43 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR 98,700 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 4.7 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 52,259 Present Value of Avoided \$ Crashes, BENEFIT 0.06 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 5,922 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC s $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ BEN. 0.7 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$52.259 \$303,598 0.17 : 1 :

Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 18 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Between 35-40 ft \$ 216,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 10,800 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 87,598 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT \$ 303,598 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC ACOC = INT (1 + INT)Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 118,157,800 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 323720 394,613 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 1,293.79 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right)^{1} \right)$ TMEV =323,720 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 240,000 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 3 Injury Crashes 2 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 50,000 (assumed cost per crash) Property Damage Only \$2,700 \$ 0 --OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: 3 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 290,000 0.43 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR 96,667 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ \$ 186,450 Present Value of Avoided 4.7 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV Crashes, BENEFIT 0.22 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 21,129 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ 2.4 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 BEN.

Benefit / Cost Ratio

Benefit : Cost = \$186,450 : \$303,598 = 0.61 : 1

Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE **Outside: 9 Sites** Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Greater than 40 ft \$ 108,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 5,400 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 14 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 43,799 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 151,799 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT (1 + INT)Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 46,179,800 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 126520 154,227 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 505.66 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{||g||}{-G} |1 \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)$ TMEV = 126,520 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 240,000 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ Injury Crashes 2 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 50,000 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ 0 -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 40,000 2 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 330,000 0.29 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 165,000 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) 3.1 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 58,242 Present Value of Avoided \$ Crashes, BENEFIT 0.04 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 6,600 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC s

Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis

Rev. 5/08

Benefit / Cost Ratio

0.4 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100

Benefit : Cost =	\$58.242	:	\$151,799	=	0.38	:1

BEN.

 $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)\right)$
Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE **Outside: 9 Sites** Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Greater than 40 ft \$ 108,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 5,400 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 43,799 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 151,799 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 46,179,800 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 126520 154,227 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 505.66 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right)^{1} \right)$ TMEV =126,520 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 240,000 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ Injury Crashes 2 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 50,000 (assumed cost per crash) Property Damage Only \$2,700 \$ 0 --OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: 2 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 290,000 0.29 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 145,000 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 186,450 Present Value of Avoided 3.1 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV Crashes, BENEFIT 0.15 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 21,129 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ BEN. 1.6 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$151,799 \$186,450 1.23 : 1 :

Rev. 5/08

B.2. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 65 mph and above



Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Median: 13 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Median Piers Based on Offset: Between 30-35ft \$ 156,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 7,800 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 14 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 63.265 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 219,265 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 42,413,000 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 116200 141,647 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 464.41 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{2}$ TMEV = 1 -116,200 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes \$3,500,000 \$ Fatalities @ 3,500,000 1 0 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 0 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ Injury Crashes 1 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 25,000 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 2,015 2 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 3,527,015 0.29 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 1,763,508 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) 3.1 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV \$ 622,487 Present Value of Avoided 0.04 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT \$ 70,540 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $AVC \times AAR$ 1 + G0.4 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 BEN. (INT - G)Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$622,487 \$219,265 2.84 _:1 .

Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis lowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety

STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Median: 13 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Median Piers Based on Offset: Between 30 - 35ft \$ 156,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 7,800 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 63.265 Present Value Other Annual Costs. OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 219,265 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT (1 + INT)Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 42,413,000 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 116200 141,647 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 464.41 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right) \right)$ TMEV : 116,200 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 0 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ Injury Crashes 1 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 25,000 (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ Property Damage Only . -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: 1 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 25,000 0.14 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR 25,000 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 1.6 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV \$ 16,073 Present Value of Avoided Crashes, BENEFIT 0.07 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 1,821 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC s $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ 0.8 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 BEN. Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$16.073 : \$219,265 0.07 : 1



Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis lowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety

STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Median: 37 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Median Piers Based on Offset: Between 35 - 40ft \$ 444,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 22,200 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 14 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 180,062 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 624,062 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 228,672,500 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 626500 763,700 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 2,503.90 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right)^r \right)$ TMEV =626,500 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 3,500,000 Fatal Crashes \$3,500,000 \$ Fatalities @ 1 3 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 720,000 3 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 4 Injury Crashes 144,000 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 274,600 9 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 4,638,600 1.29 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 515,400 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) 14.1 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV \$ 818,671 Present Value of Avoided Crashes, BENEFIT 0.18 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 92,772 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 + G}{1 + INT}\right)\right)$ BEN. 2.0 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$624,062 \$818.671 1.31 : 1 :

Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety

STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Median: 37 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Median Piers Based on Offset: Between 35 - 40ft \$ 444,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 22,200 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 180,062 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 624,062 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT (1 + INT)Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 228,672,500 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 626500 763,700 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 2,503.90 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right)^{1} \right)$ TMEV = 626,500 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 3 720,000 3 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 4 Injury Crashes 144,000 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: 4 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 864,000 0.57 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 216,000 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) 6.3 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV \$ 555,493 Present Value of Avoided Crashes, BENEFIT 0.29 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 62,949 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ 3.2 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 BEN. Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$555.493 \$624,062 0.89 : 1 :

Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 88 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Less than 30ft \$ 1,056,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 52,800 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 14 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 428,255 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 1,484,255 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT (1 + INT)Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 520,230,850 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 1425290 1,737,421 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 5,696.38 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right)^{1} \right)$ TMEV = 1,425,290 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes \$3,500,000 \$ 3,500,000 Fatalities @ 1 0 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 5 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 8 Injury Crashes 240,000 3 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 75,000 6 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 190,677 15 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 4,005,677 2.14 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 267,045 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 706,966 Present Value of Avoided 23.5 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV Crashes, BENEFIT 0.30 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 80,114 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ 3.3 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 BEN. Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$706,966 \$1,484,255 0.48 : 1 :

Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis lowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety

STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 88 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Less than 30ft \$ 1,056,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 52,800 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 428,255 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 1,484,255 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT (1 + INT)Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 520,230,850 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 1425290 1,737,421 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 5,696.38 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right)^{1} \right)$ TMEV = 1,425,290 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 0 5 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 8 Injury Crashes 240,000 3 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 75,000 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ --OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: 8 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 315,000 1.14 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR 39,375 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 12.5 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV \$ 202,523 Present Value of Avoided Crashes, BENEFIT 0.58 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 22,950 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC s $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ 6.4 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 BEN. Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$1,484,255 0.14 \$202,523 : 1 :



Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 112 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Between 30-35 ft \$ 1,344,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 67,200 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 14 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 545,052 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 1,889,052 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 699,924,000 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 1917600 2,337,544 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 7,663.97 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right)^{1} \right)$ TMEV = 1,917,600 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 1 240,000 3 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 7 Injury Crashes 144,000 3 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 75,000 9 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 183,000 16 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 642,000 2.29 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR 40,125 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 25.0 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV \$ 113,307 Present Value of Avoided Crashes, BENEFIT 0.32 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 12,840 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ BEN. =3.5 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$1,889,052 0.06 \$113,307 : 1 :

Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 112 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Between 30-35 ft \$ 1,344,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 67,200 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 545,052 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 1,889,052 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 699,924,000 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 1917600 2,337,544 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 7,663.97 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right)^{1} \right)$ TMEV = 1,917,600 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 1 240,000 3 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 7 Injury Crashes 144,000 3 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 75,000 (assumed cost per crash) Property Damage Only \$2,700 \$ --OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: 7 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 459,000 1.00 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR 65,571 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 10.9 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV \$ 295,106 Present Value of Avoided Crashes, BENEFIT 0.51 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 33,441 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ 5.6 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 BEN. Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$1,889,052 0.16 : 1 \$295,106 :

Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 10 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Between 35-40 ft \$ 120,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 6,000 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 14 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 48.665 Present Value Other Annual Costs. OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 168,665 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC = INT (1 + INT)Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 58,655,500 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 160700 195,892 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 642.26 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right) \right)$ TMEV = 160,700 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 240,000 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ Injury Crashes Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ 0 -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 6,099 1 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 246,099 0.14 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 246,099 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) 1.6 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 43,434 Present Value of Avoided \$ Crashes, BENEFIT 0.02 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 4,922 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC s $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$ $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$ 0.2 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 BEN. Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$43.434 \$168,665 0.26 : : 1

STATEWIDE County: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 Prepared by: **Outside: 10 Sites** Improvement Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Between 35-40 ft Proposed Improvement(s): \$ 120,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 6,000 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 48,665 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 168,665 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ ACOC =INT $(1 + INT)^{1}$ Traffic Volume Data Source: 2007 Date of traffic count GIMS Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 58,655,500 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 160700 195,892 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 642.26 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $TMEV = \frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right)^{\gamma} \right) / 10^6$ 160,700 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV

Crash Data				
2001	First full year> 2007	Last full year	7.0 years, Time Per	iod, T
	Additional months		values as of Dec. 20	<u>)07</u>
	Fatal Crashes	Fatalities @	\$3,500,000	\$-
		1 Major Injuries @	\$240,000	\$ 240,000
1	Injury Crashes	Minor Injuries @	\$48,000	\$-
		Possible Injuries @	a) \$25,000	\$-
0	Property Damage Only	(assumed cost per cra	ash) \$2,700	\$-
1	-O Total Crashes, TA =	R- enter Actual Cost of a	all property damage: Total \$ Loss, LOSS	\$ 240,000
0.14	Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T	г о	.00 Crashes / MEV,	Crash Rate, CR
\$ 240,000	Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA		CR = TA x 10^	6 / (DEV x 365 x T)
1.6	Total Expected Crashes, TECR = C	R x TMEV \$ 154,3	304 Present Value o	f Avoided
0.07	Crashes Avoided First Year AAR =	AA x CRF / 100	Crashes, BEN	EFIT
\$ 17,486	Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, /	AAR x AVC	AVC \times AAR ($(1+G)^{\gamma}$
0.8	Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CR	RF/ 100 BEN . =	$=$ $(INT - G)$ $\left(1 - G\right)$	$\left(\frac{1+INT}{1+INT}\right)$
Benefit / Cost	Ratio			
	Benefit : Cost = \$154,304	: \$168,665	= 0.91	: 1

Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis Rev Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008

Rev. 5/08



Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety STATEWIDE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 8 Sites Improvement Shield All Unshielded Outside Piers Based on Offset: Greater than 40 ft Proposed Improvement(s): 96,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 4,800 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 38,932 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT \$ 134,932 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC ACOC = INT (1 + INT)Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 44,384,000 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 121600 148,230 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 485.99 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1} \right) \right)$ TMEV = 121,600 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ \$3,500,000 \$ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 240,000 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ Injury Crashes 2 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 50,000 (assumed cost per crash) Property Damage Only \$2,700 \$ 0 --OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: 2 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 290,000 0.29 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 145,000 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) 3.1 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV \$ 186,450 Present Value of Avoided

Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis

Rev. 5/08

B-30

0.15 Crashes Avoided First Year **AAR** = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 21,129 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC

\$186,450

:

1.6 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100

Benefit : Cost =

Benefit / Cost Ratio

Crashes, BENEFIT

 $\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)$

: 1

 $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \right)$

1.38

BEN.

\$134,932

APPENDIX C. SHIELD ALL UNPROTECTED MEDIAN PIERS

C.1. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 55 mph and above



Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis lowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety

County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 Outside: -- Sites Median: 61 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): **Shield All Unshielded Median Piers** \$ 732,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y 36,600 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ \$ 296,859 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 1,028,859 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ AC1 IN7 $(1 + INT)^{1}$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 309,410,500 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 847700 1,033,342 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 3,387.96 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{r} \right) / 10^{6}$ TMEV =847,700 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 \$3,500,000 \$ Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ 3 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 720.000 3 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 144,000 5 Injury Crashes 1 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 25,000 \$2,700 \$ Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) --OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: 5 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 889,000 0.71 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 177,800 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 571,566 Present Value of Avoided 7.8 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV Crashes, BENEFIT 0.36 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 64,770 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 + G}{1 + INT}\right)\right)$ BEN. =4.0 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$571,566 \$1,028,859 0.56 : :1



Rev. 5/08

C.2. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 65 mph and above



Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis lowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety

County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 Outside: -- Sites Median: 54 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): **Shield All Unshielded Median Piers** \$ 648,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 32,400 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 262,793 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 910,793 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ AC1 IN7 $(1 + INT)^{1}$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 292,474,500 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 801300 976,780 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 3,202.51 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{r} \right) / 10^{6}$ TMEV =801,300 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes \$3,500,000 \$ Fatalities @ 3 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 720.000 3 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 144,000 5 Injury Crashes 1 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 25,000 \$2,700 \$ Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) . -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ Total Crashes, TA 5 Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 889,000 0.71 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 177,800 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 571,566 Present Value of Avoided 7.8 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV Crashes, BENEFIT 0.36 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 64,770 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 + G}{1 + INT}\right)\right)$ BEN. 4.0 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$571,566 \$910,793 0.63 : 1 :

Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis Iowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety

Rev. 5/08



APPENDIX D. SHIELD ALL UNPROTECTED PIERS

D.1. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 55 mph and above



County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 Outside: 284 Sites Median: 61 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Piers \$ 4,140,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 207,000 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 50 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,678,955 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 5,818,955 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC AC1 \$ INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 1,796,446,050 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 4921770 5,999,610 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 19,670.58 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^r \right) / 10^6$ TMEV =4,921,770 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 \$3,500,000 \$ 10,500,000 3 Fatal Crashes 3 Fatalities @ 10 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 2,400,000 12 Minor Injuries @ 32 \$48,000 \$ 576,000 Injury Crashes 12 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 300,000 \$2,700 \$ (assumed cost per crash) 28 Property Damage Only -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 842.572 Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 63 Total Crashes, TA 14,618,572 9.00 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 232,041 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 9,214,454 Present Value of Avoided 98.5 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 4.50 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT \$ 1,044,184 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =49.3 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$9,214,454 \$5,818,955 1.58 : 1 : =

County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 Outside: 284 Sites Median: 61 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Piers \$ 4,140,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 207,000 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 70 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,678,955 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 5,818,955 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC AC1 \$ INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 4921770 1,796,446,050 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 5,999,610 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 19,670.58 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{r} \right) / 10^{6}$ TMEV =4,921,770 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 \$3,500,000 \$ 10,500,000 3 Fatal Crashes 3 Fatalities @ 10 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 2,400,000 12 Minor Injuries @ 32 \$48,000 \$ 576,000 Injury Crashes 12 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 300,000 \$2,700 \$ 28 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 842.572 Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 63 Total Crashes, TA 14,618,572 9.00 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 232,041 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 12,900,235 Present Value of Avoided 98.5 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 6.30 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT \$ 1,461,857 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =69.0 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$12,900,235 \$5,818,955 2.22 : 1 : =

County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 Outside: 284 Sites Median: 61 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Piers \$ 4,140,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 207,000 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,678,955 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 5,818,955 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC AC1 \$ IN7 $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 1,796,446,050 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 4921770 5,999,610 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 19,670.58 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{r} \right) / 10^{6}$ TMEV =4,921,770 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 0 \$3,500,000 \$ Fatal Crashes 0 Fatalities @ 10 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 2,400,000 12 Minor Injuries @ 32 \$48,000 \$ 576,000 Injury Crashes 12 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 300,000 0 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$. -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 32 Total Crashes, TA 3,276,000 4.57 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 102,375 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 2,106,244 Present Value of Avoided 50.1 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 2.33 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT \$ 238,680 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 + G}{1 + INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =25.5 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$2,106,244 \$5,818,955 0.36 : 1 : =

Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 284 Sites Median: 61 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Piers \$ 4,140,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 207,000 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 70 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,678,955 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 5,818,955 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC AC1 \$ IN7 $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 1,796,446,050 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 4921770 5,999,610 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 19,670.58 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{r} \right) / 10^{6}$ TMEV =4,921,770 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 0 \$3,500,000 \$ Fatal Crashes 0 Fatalities @ 10 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 2,400,000 12 Minor Injuries @ 32 \$48,000 \$ 576,000 Injury Crashes 12 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 300,000 \$2,700 \$ 0 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) . -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 32 Total Crashes, TA 3,276,000 4.57 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 102,375 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 2,890,923 Present Value of Avoided 50.1 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 3.20 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT \$ 327,600 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 + G}{1 + INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =35.0 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$2,890,923 \$5,818,955 0.50 : = : 1

Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 284 Sites Median: 61 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): **Shield All Unshielded Piers** \$ 4,140,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 207,000 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 65 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,678,955 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 5,818,955 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC 1 \$ IN7 $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: 2007 Date of traffic count GIMS Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 1,796,446,050 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 4921770 5,999,610 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 19,670.58 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{\gamma}\right) / 10^6$ TMEV = 4,921,770 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 Fatal Crashes \$3,500,000 \$ 10,500,000 3 Fatalities @ 3 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ Injury Crashes Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage 3 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 10,500,000 0.43 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 3,500,000 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 8,603,939 Present Value of Avoided 4.7 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV Crashes, BENEFIT 0.28 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 975,000 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 + G}{1 + INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =3.1 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$8,603,939 \$5,818,955 1.48 :1 : =

D.2. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 65 mph and above



County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 Outside: 218 Sites Median: 54 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Piers \$ 3,264,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 163,200 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 50 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,323,698 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 4,587,698 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC AC1 \$ IN7 $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 3625190 1,323,194,350 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 4,419,086 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 14,488.61 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^r \right) / 10^6$ TMEV = 3,625,190 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 \$3,500,000 \$ 10,500,000 3 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ 3 6 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 1,440,000 11 Minor Injuries @ 23 \$48,000 \$ 528,000 Injury Crashes 9 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 225,000 \$2,700 \$ 28 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 700,391 Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 54 Total Crashes, TA 13,393,391 7.71 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 248,026 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 8,442,191 Present Value of Avoided 84.5 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 3.86 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT \$ 956,671 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =42.2 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$8,442,191 \$4,587,698 1.84 : 1 : =

County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 Outside: 218 Sites Median: 54 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Piers \$ 3,264,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 163,200 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 70 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,323,698 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 4,587,698 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC AC1 \$ IN7 $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 3625190 1,323,194,350 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 4,419,086 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 14,488.61 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^r \right) / 10^6$ TMEV = 3,625,190 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 \$3,500,000 \$ 10,500,000 3 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ 3 6 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 1,440,000 11 Minor Injuries @ 23 \$48,000 \$ 528,000 Injury Crashes 9 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 225,000 \$2,700 \$ 28 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 700,391 Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 54 Total Crashes, TA 13,393,391 7.71 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 248,026 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 11,819,068 Present Value of Avoided 84.5 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 5.40 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT \$ 1,339,339 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =59.1 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$11,819,068 \$4,587,698 2.58 : 1 : =

County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 Outside: 218 Sites Median: 54 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Piers \$ 3,264,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 163,200 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 51 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,323,698 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 4,587,698 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC AC1 \$ INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 3625190 1,323,194,350 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 4,419,086 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 14,488.61 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{r} \right) / 10^{6}$ TMEV =3,625,190 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 0 \$3,500,000 \$ Fatal Crashes 0 Fatalities @ 6 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 1,440,000 11 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 23 Injury Crashes 528,000 9 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 225,000 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ 0 . -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 23 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$,193,000 3.29 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR 95,348 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ \$ 1,409,949 Present Value of Avoided 36.0 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 1.68 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT \$ 159,776 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =18.3 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$1,409,949 \$4,587,698 0.31 : 1 : =

County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 Outside: 218 Sites Median: 54 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Piers \$ 3,264,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 163,200 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 70 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,323,698 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 4,587,698 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC AC1 \$ INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 3625190 1,323,194,350 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 4,419,086 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 14,488.61 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{r} \right) / 10^{6}$ TMEV =3,625,190 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 0 \$3,500,000 \$ Fatal Crashes 0 Fatalities @ 6 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 1,440,000 11 Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 23 Injury Crashes 528,000 9 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 225,000 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ 0 . -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 23 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$,193,000 3.29 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR 95,348 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ \$ 1,935,224 Present Value of Avoided 36.0 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 2.30 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT \$ 219,300 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =25.2 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$1,935,224 \$4,587,698 0.42 : 1 : =

Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 218 Sites Median: 54 Sites Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): **Shield All Unshielded Piers** \$ 3,264,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 163,200 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 65 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,323,698 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 4,587,698 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ 1 IN7 $(1 + INT)^{1}$ Traffic Volume Data Source: 2007 Date of traffic count GIMS Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 3625190 1,323,194,350 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 4,419,086 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 14,488.61 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{\gamma}\right) / 10^6$ TMEV = 3,625,190 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 \$3,500,000 \$ 10,500,000 3 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ 3 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ Injury Crashes Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) \$2,700 \$ -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: 3 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 10,500,000 0.43 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 3,500,000 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 8,603,939 Present Value of Avoided 4.7 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 0.28 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT \$ 975,000 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 + G}{1 + INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =3.1 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$8,603,939 \$4,587,698 1.88 : 1 : =

APPENDIX E. SHIELD ALL UNPROTECTED TWO-SPAN EMBANKMENTS

E.1. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 55 mph and above

Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis								
		104		i france	& Salety			
Co	unty:	STATEWIDE	Prepared b	y:	CTRE	Date Prepared:	Dec 15, 2008	
		Outside: 49 Sites	Median:					
Impro	vement							
Pro	posed Im	provement(s):	Shield All Unshie	lded Emba	ankments (2-	Span Bridges)		
\$	588,000	Estimated Improvem	ent Cost, EC		10 Est.	Improvement Life	e, years, Y	
\$	29,400	Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 7 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF						
\$	238,460	Present Value Other	Annual Costs, OC		4.0% Disc	ount Rate (time v	/alue of \$), INT	
		$OC = \frac{AC}{INT} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\left(1 + I\right)} \right)$	$\overline{(VT)^{Y}}$	\$	826,460 Pres	sent Value Cost, o	COST = EC + OC	
Traffi	c Volum	e Data						
Sou	urce:	GIMS				2007	Date of traffic count	
Dai	ily Enterin	ig Vehicles by Approa	ch (or AADT / 2)					
		701350	25	5,992,750	Current Ann	ual Entering Veh.	, AEV = DEV * 365	
		*-		854,942	veh / day, Fi	nal Year DEV, FD	DEV	
		*	-	2,803.05	MEV, Total M	Aillion Entering V	eh. Over	
	2.0%	Projected Traffic Gro	wth (0%-10%) G		life of Proje	ect, TMEV	1	
_	701,350	Current Daily Enterin	ng Vehicles, DEV		$TMEV = \frac{AE}{-1}$	$\frac{V}{G}\left(1-\left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)\right)$	$\int /10^{\circ}$	
Crash	n Data							
	2001	First full year>	2007 Last	full year	7.	0 years, Time Pe	riod, T	
		Additional months			<u>Va</u>	alues as of Dec. 2	2007	
		Fatal Crashes		Fatalitie	s @	\$3,500,000	- \$	
				Major In	juries @	\$240,000	· \$ -	
	3	Injury Crashes	1	Minor In	juries @	\$48,000	\$ 48,000	
		-	2	Possible	e Injuries @	\$25,000	\$ 50,000	
	3	Property Damage O	nly ""	(assumed	cost per crash) \$2,700	\$ -	
_	6	Total Crashes, TA	-OR-	enter Actu	al Cost of all To	property damage: ital \$ Loss, LOSS	\$ 21,500 \$ 119,500	
	0.86	Current Crashes / Ye	ear. AA = TA / T		0.00	Crashes / MEV	, Crash Rate, CR	
\$	19,917	Cost per Crash, AVC	C = LOSS / TA			CR = TA x 10	^6 / (DEV x 365 x T)	
	9.4	Total Expected Cras	hes, TECR = CR x	TMEV	\$ 10,545	Present Value	of Avoided	
\$	0.06	Crashes Avoided Fir	st Year AAR = AA x d in First Year AAR	X AVC)	Crashes, BEN	IEFII	
Ψ	0.7	Total Avoided Crash	es, TECR x CRF/ 1	00	BEN. = -	$\frac{4VC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1\right)$	$-\left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT}\right)^{\prime}$	
Benef	fit / Cost	Ratio						
		Benefit : Cost =	\$10,545 :	\$826	6,460 =	0.01	:1	

Intersection or Spot Benefit / Cost Safety Analysis lowa DOT Office of Traffic & Safety

County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 Outside: 49 Sites Median: --Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Embankments (2-span bridges) \$ 588,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 29,400 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 47 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 238,460 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 826,460 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ AC1 IN7 $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 255,992,750 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 701350 854,942 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 2,803.05 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G}\left(1-\left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{\gamma}\right)$ TMEV = 701,350 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 \$3,500,000 \$ Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ Injury Crashes Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 48,000 2 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 50,000 (assumed cost per crash) Property Damage Only \$2,700 \$ --OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage 3 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 98,000 0.43 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR 32,667 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 4.7 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 58,066 Present Value of Avoided \$ 0.20 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT 6,580 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC s $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 + G}{1 + INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =2.2 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$58,066 : \$826,460 0.07 : 1
E.2. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 65 mph and above



County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 Outside: 36 Sites Median: --Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Embankments (2-span bridges) \$ 432,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 21,600 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 47 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 175,195 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 607,195 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC \$ AC1 IN7 $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 177,014,050 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 484970 591,176 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 1,938.25 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G}\left(1-\left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{\gamma}\right)$ TMEV = 484,970 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2007 Last full year 7.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 \$3,500,000 \$ Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ Injury Crashes Minor Injuries @ \$48,000 \$ 48,000 2 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 50,000 (assumed cost per crash) Property Damage Only \$2,700 \$ --OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage 3 Total Crashes, TA Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 98,000 0.43 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR 32,667 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 4.7 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 58,066 Present Value of Avoided \$ 0.20 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT 6,580 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC s $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 + G}{1 + INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =2.2 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$58,066 : \$607,195 0.10 : 1 =

APPENDIX F. SHIELD ALL UNPROTECTED PIERS INCLUDING RECENT FATAL CRASH ON I-380

F.1. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 55 mph and above



County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 Outside: 284 Sites Median: 61 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Piers \$ 4,140,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 207,000 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 50 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,678,955 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 5,818,955 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC AC1 \$ INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 1,796,446,050 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 4921770 5,999,610 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 19,670.58 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{r} \right) / 10^{6}$ TMEV = 4,921,770 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2008 Last full year 8.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 \$3,500,000 \$ 14,000,000 4 Fatal Crashes 4 Fatalities @ 10 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 2,400,000 12 Minor Injuries @ 32 \$48,000 \$ 576,000 Injury Crashes 12 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 300,000 \$2,700 \$ 28 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 842.572 Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 64 Total Crashes, TA 18,118,572 8.00 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 283,103 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 9,993,018 Present Value of Avoided 87.6 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV Crashes, BENEFIT 4.00 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 ########### Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =43.8 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$9,993,018 \$5,818,955 1.72 : 1 : =

Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 284 Sites Median: 61 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Piers \$ 4,140,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 207,000 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 70 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,678,955 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 5,818,955 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC AC1 \$ INT $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 1,796,446,050 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 4921770 5,999,610 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 19,670.58 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^{r} \right) / 10^{6}$ TMEV =4,921,770 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2008 Last full year 8.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 \$3,500,000 \$ 14,000,000 4 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ 4 10 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 2,400,000 12 Minor Injuries @ 32 \$48,000 \$ 576,000 Injury Crashes 12 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 300,000 \$2,700 \$ 28 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 842.572 Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 64 Total Crashes, TA 18,118,572 8.00 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.00 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 283,103 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 13,990,225 Present Value of Avoided 87.6 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 5.60 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT \$ 1,585,375 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1+INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =61.3 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$13,990,225 \$5,818,955 2.40 : 1 : =

F.2. Benefit-Cost Analysis Worksheet for Highways with Posted Limit 65 mph and above



Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 218 Sites Median: 54 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Piers \$ 3,264,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 163,200 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 50 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,323,698 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 4,587,698 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC AC1 \$ IN7 $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 1,323,194,350 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 3625190 4,419,086 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 14,488.61 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^r \right) / 10^6$ TMEV =3,625,190 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2008 Last full year 8.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 \$3,500,000 \$ 14,000,000 4 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ 4 6 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 1,440,000 11 Minor Injuries @ 23 \$48,000 \$ 528,000 Injury Crashes 9 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 225,000 \$2,700 \$ 28 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 700,391 55 Total Crashes, TA 16,893,391 6.88 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 307,153 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 9,317,288 Present Value of Avoided 75.3 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV 3.44 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 Crashes, BENEFIT \$ 1,055,837 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 + G}{1 + INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =37.6 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$9,317,288 \$4,587,698 2.03 : 1 : =

Date Prepared: Dec 15, 2008 County: STATEWIDE Prepared by: CTRE Outside: 218 Sites Median: 54 Improvement Proposed Improvement(s): Shield All Unshielded Piers \$ 3,264,000 Estimated Improvement Cost, EC 10 Est. Improvement Life, years, Y \$ 163,200 Other Annual Cost (after initial year), AC 70 Crash Reduction Factor (integer), CRF \$ 1,323,698 Present Value Other Annual Costs, OC 4.0% Discount Rate (time value of \$), INT 4,587,698 Present Value Cost, COST = EC + OC AC1 \$ IN7 $(1 + INT)^2$ Traffic Volume Data Source: GIMS 2007 Date of traffic count Daily Entering Vehicles by Approach (or AADT / 2) 1,323,194,350 Current Annual Entering Veh., AEV = DEV * 365 3625190 4,419,086 veh / day, Final Year DEV, FDEV 14,488.61 MEV, Total Million Entering Veh. Over life of Project, TMEV 2.0% Projected Traffic Growth (0%-10%), G $\frac{AEV}{-G} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+G}{1}\right)^r \right) / 10^6$ TMEV =3,625,190 Current Daily Entering Vehicles, DEV Crash Data 2001 First full year --> 2008 Last full year 8.0 years, Time Period, T Additional months values as of Dec. 2007 \$3,500,000 \$ 14,000,000 4 Fatal Crashes Fatalities @ 4 6 Major Injuries @ \$240,000 \$ 1,440,000 11 Minor Injuries @ 23 \$48,000 \$ 528,000 Injury Crashes 9 Possible Injuries @ \$25,000 \$ 225,000 \$2,700 \$ 28 Property Damage Only (assumed cost per crash) -OR- enter Actual Cost of all property damage: \$ 700,391 Total \$ Loss, LOSS \$ 55 Total Crashes, TA 16,893,391 6.88 Current Crashes / Year, AA = TA / T 0.01 Crashes / MEV, Crash Rate, CR \$ 307,153 Cost per Crash, AVC = LOSS / TA CR = TA x 10^6 / (DEV x 365 x T) \$ 13,044,204 Present Value of Avoided 75.3 Total Expected Crashes, TECR = CR x TMEV Crashes, BENEFIT 4.81 Crashes Avoided First Year AAR = AA x CRF / 100 \$ 1,478,172 Crash Costs Avoided in First Year, AAR x AVC $\frac{AVC \times AAR}{(INT - G)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 + G}{1 + INT} \right) \right)$ BEN. =52.7 Total Avoided Crashes, TECR x CRF/ 100 Benefit / Cost Ratio Benefit : Cost = \$13,044,204 \$4,587,698 2.84 : 1 : =



Shielding Side Obstacles

8B-1

Design Manual Chapter 8 Safety Design

Originally Issued: 09-23-97

This section provides information on (1) determining whether or not barrier is needed, (2) what factors influence the choice of barrier system, (3) where to locate the installation, and (4) what length of barrier is needed to provide adequate protection. Information on shielding culverts, bridge endposts, median obstacles, embankments, standing water and other unique obstacles is covered in sections that follow.

Determining the Need for a Barrier System

Obstacles alongside a roadway, such as bridge piers and sign trusses, should be analyzed in order to determine the best way to protect motorists should they run off the road. Several treatment options are available to the designer (in order of preference): removing the obstacle entirely, moving it outside the clear zone, making it breakaway (such as light poles), shielding the obstacle, or delineating the obstacle. In some cases, the designer may be able to make the obstacle traversable, for example placing a safety grate over a culvert.

Shielding an obstacle should be considered only if the obstacle cannot be removed, moved, made breakaway, or made traversable. Determining whether or not a barrier system is necessary is often the most difficult task when addressing the presence of a side obstacle in the clear zone (see Section 1C-2 for more information regarding the clear zone). Projected traffic and crash history can provide insight as to whether or not to shield a particular existing obstacle. However, other factors, for example type of roadway, treatments for similar obstacles along the roadway, and the presence of other side obstacles in the area, should weigh into the decision as well. Field crews can also provide valuable information regarding the need for and maintenance of a barrier system. Often, the decision to shield a side obstacle comes down to sound engineering judgment on the part of the designer.

Choosing a Barrier System

Three primary factors are involved when choosing a barrier system: deflection of the barrier system, maintaining an open shoulder, and design vehicle. The designer must be sure there is sufficient space between the back of the barrier system and the face of the obstacle to allow for deflection of the barrier system if impacted. Table 1 provides typical maximum deflections that can be expected for several types of barrier systems.

Table 1:	Typical	Maximum	Deflections	for	Barrier	Systems
----------	---------	---------	-------------	-----	---------	---------

harriar system	deflection		
barner system		d (meters)	
cable guardrail (RE-29C)	12	3.6	
w-beam guardrail with 6'-3" (1.905-meter) post spacing (RE-54A and RE-55A)	3	1	
w-beam guardrail with 3'-11/2" (0.953-meter) post spacing (RE-54B and RE-55B)	2	0.6	
F-shape concrete barrier (RE-74A and RE-74B)	0	0	
concrete vertical wall (detail sheet available from the Methods Section)	0	0	

Page 1 of 5

In addition, the designer should make every effort to insure the barrier system does not encroach on the shoulder. The designer should also consider traffic in the area of the barrier. Barriers with a higher performance capability may be required in areas of high truck traffic, especially if penetration of the system must be avoided.

Other factors that influence choosing a barrier system include cost, maintenance, snow removal and drifting, and aesthetics. For example, an F-shape or concrete vertical wall deflects very little compared to other systems, but is substantially more expensive and less forgiving when impacted. Thus, these systems are most suitable for situations where minimal deflection is required, or if penetration of the system must be avoided. The designer should balance all factors to determine which system will work best for any situation.

Locating the Installation Line

Ideally, a barrier system should be placed 2 feet (0.6 meters) off the shoulder, but it may be placed just outside the shoulder line if necessary. The barrier system will be placed close enough to the roadway that earthwork required around the end terminal of the barrier will not be excessive, yet the barrier is located far enough away from the roadway that there are not a large number of incidental hits. At the same time, the likelihood of an impact at a steep angle is reduced.

If the obstacle being shielded is so close to the roadway that w-beam guardrail would encroach on the shoulder, the F-shape concrete barrier should be used. If the obstacle being shielded is so close to the roadway that F-shape concrete barrier would encroach on the shoulder, concrete vertical wall should be used.

Length of Need

The total length of a guardrail installation is divided into three parts: the approach length (A), the trailing length (T), and the length adjacent to the obstacle (H) (see RE-54A).

To determine the length of need, the following variables must be determined:

- obstacle length, L_o (see Figure 1).
- lateral extent of the area of concern, L_A: the distance from the edge of traveled way to the far side of the obstacle or the distance from the edge of traveled way to the outside edge of the clear zone, whichever is smaller (see Figure 1).
- L₂ is the distance from the edge of traveled way to the installation line.
- design speed.
- traffic volume.



Figure 1: Before locating the installation line and determining the length of need, L_A, L_o, and d must be determined. Note that L_A is not always the distance to the back of the obstacle; it is this distance or the clear zone distance, whichever is smaller.

Based on the design speed and the traffic volume, the runout length (L_R) can be determined using Table 2. L_R is the theoretical distance needed for a vehicle that has left the roadway to come to a stop and it is used to determine the length of need.¹

Table 2: Runout lengths.	Runout lengths.
--------------------------	-----------------

English units						
Design	Traffic Volume					
Speed	$ADT \ge 10000$	$5000 \le ADT \le 10000$	$1000 \leq ADT < 5000$	ADT < 1000		
(mph)	L _R (ft)	L_{R} (ft)	L_{R} (ft)	L_{R} (ft)		
70	360	300	260	220		
60	260	210	180	170		
50	210	170	150	130		
40	160	130	110	100		
30	110	90	80	70		

				••
n / I	\sim		~	 110
			• •	
	-	••••	•	

Design	Traffic Volume					
Speed	$ADT \ge 10000$	$5000 \leq ADT < 10000$	$1000 \leq ADT < 5000$	ADT < 1000		
(km/h)	L _R (m)	$L_{R}(m)$	$L_{R}(m)$	$L_{R}(m)$		
110	110	90	80	70		
100	95	80	70	60		
90	80	65	55	50		
80	65	55	45	40		
70	55	45	40	35		
60	45	40	30	25		
50	35	30	25	20		

¹ Sicking, D.L. and Wolford, D.F., "Development of Guardrail Runout Length Calculation Procedures," NDOR Research Project Number SPR-PL-1(3) P479, University of Nebraska, Lincoln Nebraska, May 1996.

Determining the Length of Need Graphically

To determine the length of need graphically, see the procedures and examples in Chapter 5 of the *Roadside Design Guide*. Determining the appropriate combination of variable tangent (VT) and variable flare (VF) is explained below.

The Trailing Length (T)

The trailing length (T) will not be required on one-way or divided highways.

On two-way, undivided highways the designer must determine if the obstacle is within the clear zone of the opposing traffic lane. Remember that for opposing traffic the clear zone is measured from the pavement centerline. If the obstacle is within the clear zone, the length of T is determined in the same manner as A.

Even if the obstacle is not within the clear zone for opposing traffic, the guardrail installation itself often is. Therefore it is still normally terminated with a breakaway end terminal (RE-76).

If the installation is well outside the clear zone for opposing traffic (such as on a four-lane undivided highway), a breakaway end terminal on the trailing side may not be needed. The designer may Contact the Methods Section in the Office of Design if unsure.

Variable Tangent and Variable Flare

The Standard Road Plans indicate a variable tangent (VT) and a variable flare (VF). Different combinations of VT and VF may be used to meet the length of need. The best combination to use depends on the site characteristics.

In Figure 2, the installation on top minimizes the amount of guardrail needed by using VF. However, the amount of earthwork required increases because the installation terminates a greater distance into the ditch. The installation on the bottom minimizes the earthwork required by using no VF. This installation requires more guardrail but remains closer to the roadway. This design would be better in areas with steep foreslopes, where using no VF would minimize the amount of earthwork needed around the end terminal.

Tabulation

Tabulation 108-8B is used for systems with only w-beam guardrail. Tabulations 108-8A and 108-18B are used for systems with the F-shape concrete barrier along with 112-9 for the paved shoulder.

See Section 8B-10 for more information on tabulating guardrail.

Gaps between Barrier Installations

Gaps between barrier installations on the same side of the facility should not be less than 200 feet (60 meters). If two obstacles are so close that this is not possible, then a continuous length of barrier should be run between them.

Obstacles on Horizontal Curves

If the obstacle is located on a horizontal curve, a special design may be required. Consult the Methods Section for assistance or refer to Chapter 5 of the *Roadside Design Guide* for an example problem of shielding an obstacle located on a horizontal curve.



Page 5 of 5

APPENDIX H. INSTALLATION AND ANNUAL MAINTENANCE COST ESTIMATE FOR HIGH-TENSION CABLE RAIL

Crash data indicates a total of 385 crashes occurred at the 566 study bridges in seven years. Extending that data to a 10 year period would yield approximately 550 crashes at these same 566 bridges.

Historic maintenance costs for high tension cable rail received from Dave Little in District 2 indicated that DOT maintenance costs for repair average about \$425/impact not including retensioning of the terminals.

Three impacts with recently installed high-tension cable were experienced in District 2 also, and these were repaired by extra work order to a contractor and all involved re-tensioning of the anchors. Cost for these repairs averaged \$3040/each

From the prorated crash data above, it could be anticipated that a cable rail installation at a bridge pier would have an approximate opportunity of being impacted once during the 10 year service life of the installation. Repair of these installations would almost always involve damage to the anchor system due to the short length of installation and therefore re-tensioning would be required.

Based on the above analysis, we could conclude an annual maintenance cost of $\frac{300}{\text{year}}$ based on 3000/10 years for each installation.

Initial installation costs are approximately \$6000/installation for both high tension cable and wbeam guardrail, but maintenance costs are generally assumed to be lower for cable rail.

One site = 2 installations at median piers

APPENDIX I. BRIDGE SHIELDING PHOTOGRAPHS



Figure I.1. W-beam guardrail at outside pier



Figure I.2. W-beam guardrail and concrete retaining wall combination at outside pier



Figure I.3. W-beam guardrail in median



Figure I.4. High-tension cable rail in median



Figure I.5. Truck crash at unshielded pier on I-380, March 2009



Figure I.6. Crash damage to high-tension cable rail on I-35, July 2008



Figure I.7. Crash damage to a W-beam guardrail on I-80, May 2009