

ATTACHMENT B

NCHRP Project 17-54, FY 2011

Consideration of Roadside Features in the Highway Safety Manual Comments on the September 2014 Quarterly Report

Below are comments from the panel on the June 2014 QPR. The research team's responses are indicated in an italicized font.

Reviewer No. 1

No comment.

Reviewer No. 2

No comment.

Reviewer No. 3

I agree that the use of speed and roadside environment, in place of the generic terms "urban" and "rural" will better explain to the user how to apply the SPF's and the CMF's which are derived from this project. I like the approach that the team is on for the upcoming Phase III work.

Thank you.

Reviewer No. 4

I look forward to the panel meeting on the 7th. The discussion on Table 5 of the second interim report will be valuable. My only concern is this approach to classify by speed and roadside environment too great a departure from the traditional urban/rural currently used in the HSM?

I imagine the "minor error" in the Ohio data led to some major work on your part. That had to be frustrating!

We believe the use of speed and roadside environment, while a departure from the current HSM terminology of rural/urban, is more definitive and more aligned with the principals of the Roadside Design Guide. This topic was discussed at length at the interim meeting and we believe agreement was reached to use the proposed approach.

Reviewer No. 5

I concur with the use of curb and speed of 45 mph or less to define the urban area. I don't think we need to spend much effort on the rural town center as I think these will generally be addressed by the intersection crashes.

Some typos - page C-20 1st paragraph, "off" vs "of"

Thank you.