

# Synthesis of Western U.S. Automated Safety Warning Systems

Sean Campbell  
Caltrans Division of Research and  
Innovation

Leann Koon  
Western Transportation Institute  
Montana State University

Ian Turnbull  
Caltrans District 2

David Veneziano  
Western Transportation Institute  
Montana State University

NRITS 2013

***Session G2: Automated Safety Warning Systems***

Wednesday, August 28, 2013

# Overview

- Introduction
- Motivation
- Approach
- States surveyed
- Systems
- Conclusions

# Introduction

- ITS evolution has produced site-specific systems
  - Address local safety and/or operational issues
  - Ex. – Ice warning, queue presence, etc.
- Systems often “self-contained”
  - Collect localized data, process it, perform specific task such as post warning message on CMS
- Systems typically roadside-based
  - All equipment and processing completed on-site (no TMC input or activation)

# Introduction

- “Self-contained” safety warning systems exist throughout western United States
  - Deployed by wide range of entities
- Lack of documentation, specifically inventory/synthesis of deployments
- Tracking down information on deployments is a challenge
- Absence of information prevents practitioners from learning about other systems prior to pursuing their own

# Project Motivation

- Western States Rural Transportation Consortium pursued synthesis of safety warning devices in western U.S. to address information gap
  - <http://www.westernstates.org/>
- Identify past/present deployments, their function/purpose and other information
- Develop summaries that present practitioners with information on systems
- Information used to learn about benefits systems, provide contact information to learn more about specific sites/systems

# Approach

- Interview agency contacts via telephone
- Discussions generally 5-7 minutes per system
- Document active and inactive systems
- Information of interest:
  - Type of system, problem addressed, location, deployment year, status, type of roadway/speed, system components, effectiveness, evaluation results, consideration of use elsewhere, future improvements/changes

# States of Interest



- Alaska
- Arizona
- California
- Colorado
- Idaho
- Montana
- New Mexico
- Nevada
- Oregon
- Utah
- Washington
- Wyoming

# Summary of Systems

- Ice/Weather warning (9)
- Animal warning (8)
- Curve Speed warning (15)
- Traffic/Queue warning (5)
- Variable Speed Limit (3)
- Wind warning (7)
- Runaway Truck Ramp (2)
- Flood warning (3)
- Visibility warning (2)
- Tunnel warning (2)
- Seismic warning (2)
- “Other” (8) [vehicle overlength detection, travel time, downhill speed]



# Ice/Weather Warning

- Eight systems identified
  - CA (3), OR (1), NV (1), WA (1), AZ (1), ID (1)
- Purposes – ice warning (tangents, curves, tunnels), general storm warning
- Components - pavement sensors, RWIS, controller, CMS, CCTV, power, communications
- Experiences – systems work to differing extents (reduce speeds and crashes), sensor placement and accuracy critical to operations



Image: WTI

# Animal Warning Systems

- Eight systems identified
  - WA (3), NM (1), MT(1), WY (1), AZ (1)
- Purpose – provide animal presence warning
- Components – animal sensors (radio collars, infrared, laser, body heat or microwave sensors, video detection), receivers, controller, static signs with beacons, portable VMS
- Experiences – detection is difficult, varying effectiveness in meeting goals



Image: Ontario Ministry of Transportation

# Curve Warning Systems

- Fifteen systems identified
  - CA (8), OR (3), WA (3), NV (1)
- Purpose – provide curve and/or speed warning
- Components – Speed sensors (radar or microwave vehicle detection systems), controller, signage (CMS, DMS, VMS, static signs with beacons or chevrons w/ flashing LEDs)
- Experiences – Components straightforward, generally effective in addressing speeds/crashes



Image: Oregon Department of Transportation

# Traffic/Queue Warning Systems

- Five systems identified
  - CA (3), OR (2)
- Purpose – Provide warning of slowed or stopped traffic
- Components – Loop detectors, controller, CMS, DMS or overhead warning signs with beacons
- Experiences – Generally effective in addressing rear end crashes



Image: Caltrans

# Variable Speed Limit Systems

- Three systems identified
  - WA (2), OR (1)
- Purpose – Adjust speed limits based on traffic levels or weather conditions
- Components – Loop detectors, sidefire radar, RWIS, controller, CMS or VMS
- Experiences – Effective in reducing speeds, some reduction in crashes



Image: Warren, D. "Variable Speed Limits". Presented at the Federal Highway Administration Speed Management Workshop, Dallas, Texas, March 6, 2000.

# Wind Warning Systems

- Seven systems identified
  - OR (2), AZ (1), WA (1), NM (1), NV (1), CA (1)
- Purpose – Provide drivers warning of high winds at point and segment locations
- Components – Loop detectors, sidefire radar, RWIS, controller, CMS or VMS
- Experiences – Very effective in alerting drivers to presence of winds



Image: Phillip Graham/Caltrans

# Runaway Truck Ramp Systems

- Two systems identified
  - CA (1), AZ (1)
- Purpose – Notify truck drivers that a runaway ramp is occupied
- Components – Loop detectors, presence sensors, CCTV, controller, DMS, static metal signs with beacons
- Experiences – Very effective in providing information on ramp use, reduced truck crashes



Image: FHWA

# Flood Warning Systems

- Three systems identified
  - OR (3)
- Purpose – Notify drivers of water over roadway surface
- Components – Ultrasonic or float sensors, controller, static metal signs with beacons
- Experiences – Generally effective and reliable, straightforward in design



Image: Oregon DOT



# Additional Systems of Interest

- Additional systems documented
  - Visibility warning (CA – 1)
  - Tunnel warning (WA – 2)
  - Downhill truck speed warning (OR – 1, CO – 1)
  - Overheight/length detection (OR – 3)
  - Travel time – (WA -1, AZ – 1, CO - 1)
  - Seismic warning (WA – 2)

# Conclusions

- Variety of different systems deployed
  - Address many site-specific conditions
- Some states deploy more systems than others
  - Some agencies not comfortable with automation, prefer operator input
- As technologies improve, components have changed

# Conclusions

- Some systems operate better than others
  - Animal warning systems less reliable
- Most systems met intended objectives
- Work wrapping up, always interested in new study state contacts
  - Report is a living document, so additions can be made
- For more information:
  - <http://www.westernstates.org/>

# Disclaimer

*The contents of this presentation reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the various member States, their respective Departments of Transportation or the Federal Highway Administration. This information does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. This information is not intended to replace existing agency mandatory or advisory standards, nor the exercise of engineering judgment by licensed professionals.*

# Acknowledgements

- California Department of Transportation
- Nevada Department of Transportation
- Oregon Department of Transportation
- Washington Department of Transportation
- The numerous contacts that took the time to discuss their respective system(s)

# Questions