







Proposals for Road Infrastructure Safety Investments and Interventions in South East Europe

Final International Event and International Conference "Infrastructures and Behaviours to Enhance Road Safety" ^{Brescia, 21} November 2014</sup> George Yannis, Professor, NTUA Alexandra Laiou, Research Associate, NTUA









Scope of proposals on investments and interventions

Exploitation of the results of ROSEE project activities for the development of proposals on investments and interventions for the improvement of road safety in South-East European regions with regard to road infrastructure:

- Professional development courses on Road Safety Audit and Speed Management
- Conduct of Road Safety Audits/ Inspections
- Identification of appropriate **low cost infrastructure improvements**







Jointly for our common future









Methodology

A **three step** methodology:

- 1. Use of measures and priorities identified within the ROSEE project
- 2. Exploitation of input from existing lists of proposals and recommendations
- 3. Assessment and ranking of road safety measures based on:
 - the estimated safety benefit
 - the implementation cost
 - the implementation time
 by more than 100 road safety stakeholders







Jointly for our common future

Road Infrastructure proposals on investments and interventions matrix

| Recommendations | Investment Proposals | | Safety | Benefit | | In | nplement | ation Co | st | In | nplement | tation Ti | ne | Implementation |
|---|---|---|----------|----------|----------|----|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------------|
| • | • | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | >5y | 1-5y | 6-12m | <6m | Barriers |
| Pedestrian crossings | New pedestrian crossing | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| euestilan crossings | Upgrade of existing pedestrian crossing | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| l ighting treatment | Implementation of new street lighting | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Improving of existing lighting | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Speed limits | Changing from unrestricted speed to speed limit | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Lowering existing speed limit | | | | | | | | | | <u>.</u> | | | |
| | Creation of speed transition zones | | | <u>.</u> | | | | | <u>.</u> | | <u>.</u> | | | |
| Traffic control and operational elements | Traffic signs (regulatory) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Traffic signs (warning) | | <u>.</u> | <u>:</u> | <u>.</u> | | | | <u>:</u> | <u>.</u> | <u>.</u> | | <u>:</u> | |
| | Traffic signs (guide) | | | <u>.</u> | | | | | | <u>.</u> | <u>.</u> | | <u>.</u> | <u>.</u> |
| | Delineators and horizontal road markings | | <u>.</u> | | <u>;</u> | | | | | | <u>.</u> | | ; | |
| | Raised road markers | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Chevrons | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Post-mounted delineators | | <u>.</u> | <u>.</u> | <u>.</u> | | | | <u>.</u> | | <u>.</u> | | <u>.</u> | |
| | Rumble strips | | | <u>.</u> | | | | | | | <u>.</u> | | | |
| Traffic calming-Speed management measures | Speed humps | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Raised pedestrian crossings | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Raised Intersections | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Central islands | | <u>.</u> | <u>.</u> | <u>.</u> | | | | <u>.</u> | | <u>.</u> | | <u>.</u> | |
| | Lateral shifts | | | | | | | | <u>.</u> | | <u>.</u> | | | |
| Vertical curvature treatment | Reducing gradient | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Improvement of sight distances | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cross-section treatment | Increasing lane width | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Introduction of shoulder | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Increasing shoulder width | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Introduction of median | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Increasing median width | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Development of bicycle lanes | | | - | | | | | : . | | | | | |
| | Development of pedestrian sidewalk | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Roadside treatment | Implementation of safety barriers | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Implementation of motorcyclist safety barriers | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| Crossings treatment | Introduction of new pedestrian crossings | | | | | | | | : | | : | : | : | |
| | Upgrading of existing pedestrian crossings | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Introduction of rail/road grade crossings | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Protection of rail/road level crossings | | | | | | | | | | | : | | |
| Intersections layout | Development of roundabouts | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Intersection channelization | | | - | | | | | | - | | | | |
| | Implementation of yield signs at intersections | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Implementation of stop signs at intersections | | | | | | | | | |] | | | |
| I rattic control at intersections | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Implementation of traffic lights at intersections | | <u>;</u> | | <u>;</u> | | | | | | | | ; | |
| | Improvement of existing traffic lights | | | | | | | | | lointl | y for | our | com | mon future |
| Parking Facilities | | | : | : | : | | | | | 1 | 1 | : | | |

e

Road Infrastructure proposals – overall results

| Investment Proposals | Partner countries recording high safety benefit | Partner countries recording low implementation cost | Partner countries recording short implementation time |
|---|--|--|---|
| Implementation of safety barriers | 6 | 0 | 2 |
| Development of roundabouts | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Implementation of motorcyclist safety barriers | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| Speed humps | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Raised pedestrian crossings | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Creation of speed transition zones | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Implementation of traffic lights at intersections | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| Improvement of sight distances | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| Delineators and horizontal road markings | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Upgrade of existing pedestrian crossing | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Traffic signs (regulatory) | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Chevrons | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| Changing from unrestricted speed to speed limit | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| Raised road markers | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Improvement of existing traffic lights | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Rumble strips | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Traffic signs (warning) | 0 | 5 | 6 |
| Traffic signs (guide) | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Implementation of stop signs at intersections | 0 | 4 | 5 |
| Lowering existing speed limit | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| Post-mounted delineators | 0 | 3 Joint | 4 |
| Implementation of yield signs at intersections 21 11 2014 G Yannis A Laiou NTUA | 0 | 3 | 3 |

Road Infrastructure proposals – overall results

ROSEE countries differ widely in regard to:

- road network conditions
- road maintenance and managing
- road user behavior
- vehicle fleet and ownership
- general social and economic background
- legislation
- enforcement

Thus, different measures act differently between countries.

Generally, measures with the highest safety benefit are neither the fastest nor the cheapest to implement.

Jointly for our common future

Road Infrastructure proposals on investments and interventions

The **highest safety benefit** is related to:

- the implementation of safety barriers
- the development of roundabouts
- the implementation of motorcyclist safety barriers

Installation of traffic signs, such as stop signs at intersections, yield signs at intersections, warning and guide signs is related to the **lowest cost** and **implementation time**.

Cross-analysis of all criteria showed that **speed humps** are the most effective measure, related to high safety benefit, low cost and short time to take effect.

ROSEE - Future challenges for the improvement of road infrastructure in South-East Europe

Proposals for Road Infrastructure Safety Investments and Interventions in South East Europe

Final International Event and International Conference "Infrastructures and Behaviours to Enhance Road Safety" ^{Brescia, 21} November 2014</sup> George Yannis, Professor, NTUA Alexandra Laiou, Research Associate, NTUA