



UNIVERSITY OF
ALBERTA




A City-Wide Safety Analysis of Mobile Speed Enforcement

Presenter: Ran Li

Co-authors: Dr. Karim El-Basyouny, Dr. Amy Kim

7/28/2015

Outline





Introduction

Road Safety Problem

□ Global Issue

- **1.2 million** deaths, **50 million** injuries per year
 - **Young adults** (15~44) account for 59% of road traffic deaths
- (WHO, 2013)

□ In Canada

- More than **2,000** deaths and more than **166,000** injuries in 2013
- **\$63 billion** social cost, 5% of GDP in 2007

(Transport Canada)



Improving Safety

Education of children
Driver training
Public campaign



Road design
Road engineering
Vehicle technology

“More than 48% of fatal collisions due to traffic violations”

Drink driving
Seat belt usage
Speed enforcement

Speed Enforcement

- Types of Speed Enforcement
 - Conventional speed enforcement
 - Automated speed enforcement
 - Fixed photo enforcement
 - Mobile photo enforcement



Objectives

- ❑ Examine the long-term impacts of enforcement on collisions
- ❑ Calculate the marginal collision reduction effects of deployment hours and number of issued tickets





Literature Review

- ❑ 1823 fixed and 933 mobile cameras were installed from 2003 to 2010
- ❑ Interrupted time-series analyses (ARIMA)
- ❑ 21% reduction in the fatality rate per 100,000 vehicles
- ❑ the reduction in non-fatal injuries dropped from 26.2% in 2003 to only 0.8% in 2010

(Carnis & Blais, 2013)


Queensland, Australia

- ❑ Randomized schedule method --- unpredictable
- ❑ Collision reductions were evaluated to adjust the program
- ❑ Largest reduction was found in fatal collisions at 31%
- ❑ Non-fatal collision reduction was revealed to increase with time
- ❑ Benefit-cost ratio for the program was estimated to be 55:1

(Newstead, Cameron, & Leggett, 2001)

Accident Modification Function

- Doubled enforcement intensity would further reduce injury collisions by 20%



(Elvik, 2011)




Data Description

Data Description


- ❑ Study Period: April 2005 – March 2009

- ❑ City-Wide Monthly Data:
 - Severe Collision Data (fatal + injury)
 - Enforcement Statistics (deployment hour, number of issued tickets)
 - Employment Rate (socio-economic factors)


Number of Severe Collisions




Number of Deployment Hours



Number of Issued Tickets



Employment Rate





Methodology

Generalized Linear Model

Model Form:

$$\ln(\mu) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Hours} + \beta_2 \text{Tickets} + \beta_3 \text{Employment} + \beta_4 \text{Trend} + \beta_{5-15} \text{Monthly Dummies}$$

Model Distribution: Poisson Distribution (low dispersion parameter)

Model Calibration: SAS GENMOD procedure (maximum likelihood estimation)

Marginal Effect: $\frac{\partial E(\mu|x_j)}{\partial x_j} = \mu \cdot \beta_j$



Results

Results

□ Parameter Estimation Results

	Intercept	January	February	March	April	May
Estimate	7.8961	-0.0611	-0.1835	-0.0381	-0.1551	0.0353
P Value	0.000	0.063	0.000	0.276	0.000	0.417
	June	July	August	September	October	November
Estimate	0.0709	0.089	0.1987	0.1911	0.1926	0.011
P Value	0.130	0.078	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.761
	Employment	Trend	Hours (1,000)	Tickets (10,000)		
Estimate	-0.02	-0.0034	-0.1131	-0.148	Significant at 95% filled with yellow color	
P Value	0.034	0.004	0.049	0.000		

Results

□ Parameter Estimation Results

		January	February	March	April	May
Estimate		-0.0611	-0.1835	-0.0381	-0.1551	0.0353
P Value		0.063	0.000	0.276	0.000	0.417
	June	July	August	September	October	November
Estimate	0.0709	0.089	0.1987	0.1911	0.1926	0.011
P Value	0.130	0.078	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.761

Results

□ Parameter Estimation Results


	Employment	Trend				
Estimate	-0.02	-0.0034				
P Value	0.034	0.004				

Results


□ Parameter Estimation Results

			Hours (1,000)	Tickets (10,000)		
Estimate			-0.1131	-0.148		
P Value			0.049	0.000		

Goodness of Fit – R Squared



Goodness of Fit – R Squared



General Marginal Effects

$$\frac{\partial E(\mu|x_j)}{\partial x_j} = \mu \cdot \beta_j$$

1,000 deployment hours: **52** less severe collisions

10,000 issued tickets: **68** less severe collisions

Overall Collision Reduction per Month:

$$\frac{Hours}{1000} * ME_{Hour} + \frac{Tickets}{10000} * ME_{Tickets} = \mathbf{164}$$

45% of them are due to the deployment hours

55% of them are due to the issued tickets



Conclusions

Conclusions

- ❑ The significant negative sign of enforcement variables indicates that mobile photo enforcement led to severe collision reductions.
- ❑ The marginal effects of 1,000 deployment hours and 10,000 issued speed tickets were 52 and 68 less severe collisions, respectively.



Future Research

- ❑ Influences of other deployment variables (e.g., *number of enforcement sites, average deployment hours*)
- ❑ Distance halo effects of enforcement
- ❑ Drivers' attitude towards enforcement



UNIVERSITY OF
ALBERTA



Thank You