

ATTACHMENT B

NCHRP Project 17-54, FY 2011

Consideration of Roadside Features in the Highway Safety Manual

Comments on the March 2015 Quarterly Report

Below are comments from the panel on the March 2015 QPR. The research team's responses are indicated in an italicized font.

Reviewer No. 1

The report looks okay a lot of good work has been done, I am wondering about how the presence or absence of rumble strips is accounted for in the development of CMF's and EAF's?

Excellent question! There has been a good deal of work on rumble strips, therefore, that work need not be repeated under this effort. Each CMF and EAF is considered independent and can be multiplied together to account for the myriad of roadway/roadside characteristics. There is also ongoing work to assess just how many CMFs can be multiplied together. Currently, the research team plans to rely on the existing body of rumble strip research, pending the outcome of the ongoing research.

Reviewer No. 2

No comment.

Reviewer No. 3

No comment.

Reviewer No. 4

I found this typo on page C-11 of Attachment C: "The development of the CMFROADSIDE comprises a multi-sage process to find the probability of a longitudinal barrier crash..." Not sure if that's a typo or simply an unconscious observation, and I'm not talking about a herb!

At the last panel meeting we talked a lot about fixed objects, in particular functional v. aesthetic. At what point does this factor into the analysis?

Thank you for catching the typo. Editorial comments are always appreciated.

Regarding the fixed objects and their function, this quarter's attachment outlines how the fixed objects will be addressed and CMFs developed from the available data to complete Phase II. The functional v. aesthetic concerns will become a concern as phase III develops. Data collection for phase III commenced this quarter. If these items can be distinguished in the data,

then separate CMFs may be warranted. If not, we are confident that it can be handled through the development to CMFs which account for roadsides with functional hazards only vs. CMFs for roadsides with both functional and aesthetic hazards.

Reviewer No. 5

No comment.

Reviewer No. 6

Glad to see that Phase III is approved and ready to go. What is the expected notice-to-proceed date?

Will there be a panel meeting with the contractor later this year to catch us up on the findings and conclusions prior to the final report?

The Phase III contract modification was executed on April 4, 2015 the research team expects to receive notice-to-proceed shortly. A third panel meeting is not scheduled at this time. The research team plans to continue to present findings at TRB and AASHTO committee meetings when invited. As the research concludes, the research team can make themselves available for a third panel meeting if the panel determines it is needed. Alternatively we could have a web-enabled meeting later in the project as well.

Reviewer No. 7

No comment.