

# Safe System Plan Policy and Program Assessment Memo

Plan, policy and program review is an important aspect of assessing the existing conditions of a study area. VHB has conducted a review of existing transportation plans, policies and programs to understand how effectively they address Safe System Approach principles. This analysis identifies key successes and opportunities for improvement in transportation safety planning in the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) jurisdiction. Understanding the current safety planning and program context of the capital area region will help guide the development of recommendations for improving safety performance.

The plan, policy and program review involved a comprehensive process designed to evaluate existing plans and documents. These documents collectively address various aspects of transportation needs and improvements in the region, from long-term infrastructure planning to specific enhancements in bicycle and pedestrian pathways. Through evaluating these documents against a comprehensive set of safety criteria, the VHB team identified several gaps, including considerations for the safety effects of vehicle speeds, vehicle characteristics, emergency response, and adopting risk-based approaches to proactive safety. By also integrating these criteria into city, county, and regional plans and policies, a cohesive and resilient transportation safety network can be developed to mitigate risks and additionally improve the safety for all road users.

The first section includes a description of the **Safe System Approach** framework for roadway safety, which provided the foundation for the plan and policy reviews. The second section **(Plan Assessment)** outlines the specific methodology and findings from the assessment of transportation plans reviewed. The third section **(Policy and Program Assessment)** outlines the methodology and findings from the assessment of policies and programs reviewed.

# The Safe System Approach

An emerging initiative in transportation planning has been the adoption and implementation of Safe System Approach principles. The Safe System Approach is recognized as an effective framework for managing risks within transportation networks. It establishes multiple layers of protection to minimize harm to individuals involved in crashes. The approach recognizes that crashes will happen, but that roadway deaths and serious injuries are unacceptable and preventable; humans make mistakes and are vulnerable; responsibility for roadway safety is shared among all stakeholders; and safety measures must be proactive and redundant. A Safe System is thus made up of five elements: safe road users, safe roads, safe vehicles, safe speeds, and post-crash care. The goal of the Safe System Approach is to achieve zero roadway fatalities and serious injuries by focusing on infrastructure improvements, modifying human behavior, ensuring responsible oversight of vehicles and transportation practices, and enhancing the effectiveness of emergency response.



<u>Safe Road Users</u>: Promote safe and responsible driving habits among road users, while prioritizing conditions that ensure their safe arrival at their destination.

<u>Safe Roads</u>: Create roads that help reduce human mistakes and consider injury tolerances. This encourages safer behavior and makes it easier for the most vulnerable people to travel safely.

<u>Safe Vehicles</u>: Increase the number of vehicle systems and features that prevent crashes and reduce impact on people inside and outside the vehicle.

<u>Safe Speeds</u>: Encourage safer driving speeds in all roadways by using a combination of smart road design, setting the speed limits, educating drivers, spreading awareness, and enforcing the rules.

<u>Post-Crash Care</u>: Enhance survivability of crashes through access to medical care, keep first responders safe, and prevent secondary crashes through traffic incidents management practices.

# **Plan Assessment**

VHB analyzed relevant CAMPO transportation plans using a Safe System Approach-Based Plan Review methodology. This methodology is based on a general scoring framework designed to assess the extent to which each plan or study addresses the different elements and principles of the Safe System Approach. Prompt questions incorporate these principles, and each plan is given a score from zero the three depending on the extent to which it addresses the question. An average score for each plan can be used to compare plans at a high level. Any prompt question with a score of 0 or 1 is considered an opportunity for improvement in safety planning. The general scoring framework and specific prompt questions are detailed below. There are some exceptions to this scoring methodology for each prompt question. The transportation plans selected for review and the correlation of questions to Safe System Approach objective are also detailed below.

# General Scoring Framework (there are some exceptions, detailed in the individual prompt questions that follow):

- 0 The plan does not address the topic.
- 1 The plan mentions or briefly addresses the topic but does not go into detail.
- 2 The plan addresses the topic more fully or includes safety strategies related to the topic but does not fully align with the Safe System Approach in doing so.
- 3 The plan presents focused safety strategies on the topic in alignment with the Safe System Approach.

# Q1. To what extent does the plan address the safety of multimodal road users (e.g., pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, micromobility users, or users of mobility assistance devices)?

- 0 The plan does not address the safety of multimodal road users.
- 1 The plan addresses multimodal road user safety but is mostly focused on passenger vehicles.
- 2 The plan is focused on a specific multimodal road user type.
- 3 The plan comprehensively addresses the safety of several vehicular and non-vehicular road user types.

## Q2. To what extent does the plan address road user behavior?

- 0 The plan does not address road user behavior.
- 1 The plan acknowledges the safety effects of road user behavior.
- 2 The plan includes specific strategies related to road user behavior (e.g., education- or enforcement-based strategies).
- 3 The plan is focused on specific safety strategies related to road user behavior (e.g., education- or enforcement-based strategies).

# Q3. To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of vehicle design?

- 0 The plan does not address the safety effects of vehicle design.
- 1 The plan acknowledges that vehicle design influences road user safety.
- 2 The plan identifies safety needs related to vehicle design.

• 3 – The plan includes specific safety strategies related to vehicle design.

# Q4. To what extent does the plan address heavy vehicles?

- 0 The plan does not address heavy vehicles.
- 1 The plan addresses heavy vehicles from an operational perspective
- 2 The plan addresses the safety effects of heavy vehicles.
- 3 The plan includes specific safety strategies related to heavy vehicles (e.g., business routes, etc.)

## Q5. To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of vehicle operating speed?

- 0 The plan does not address the safety effects of speed.
- 1 The plan acknowledges the safety effects of vehicle operating speed.
- 2 The plan includes data analysis related to the safety effects of vehicle operating speed.
- 3 The plan includes specific safety strategies to encourage appropriate speeds.

## Q6. To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of roadway design?

- 0 The plan does not address the safety effects of roadway design.
- 1 The plan acknowledges the safety effects of roadway design.
- 2 The plan discusses specific roadway design elements that can influence safety.
- 3 The plan includes specific safety strategies related to roadway design.

## Q7. To what extent does the plan address strategies for separating different road users?

- 0 The plan does not address strategies for separating road users.
- 1 The plan acknowledges the importance of separating road users.
- 2 The plan includes specific strategies related to separating road users in time (e.g., traffic signal timing strategies, traffic demand management strategies, etc.).
- 3 The plan includes specific strategies related to separating road users in space (e.g., separated pedestrians/bicyclist facilities, grade separation, etc.).

## Q8. To what extent does the plan address intersection design?

- 0 The plan does not address intersection design.
- 1 The plan acknowledges the safety effects of intersection design (including driveways or other access points).
- 2 The plan includes specific guidance or strategies related to the safety of different intersection design concepts.
- 3 The plan specifically addresses the safety effects of conflict points or conflict/collision angles.

## Q9. To what extent does the plan address how land use context affects roadway design?

- 0 The plan does not address the roadway design effects of land use context.
- 1 The plan acknowledges the relationship between land use context and roadway design.
- 2 The plan includes specific strategies related to land use context and roadway design.

• 3 – The plan includes specific strategies to support context classification of roadways.

## Q10. To what extent does the plan address post-crash care or emergency response?

- 0 The plan does not address post-crash care.
- 1 The plan acknowledges the importance of post-crash care to roadway safety.
- 2 The plan addresses the relationship of post-crash care to other aspects of roadway safety.
- 3 The plan includes specific strategies related to post-crash care.

## Q11. To what extent does the plan focus on crash severity?

- 0 The plan does not address crash severity.
- 1 The plan includes crash analysis based on crash severity.
- 2 The plan includes crash analysis focused specifically on fatalities and serious injuries.
- 3 The plan includes specific strategies designed to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

# Q12. To what extent does the plan promote proactive safety solutions (e.g., risk-based or systemic approaches as opposed to reactive or crash hot-spot approaches)?

- 0 The plan does not address proactive safety solutions.
- 1 The plan acknowledges a proactive approach to safety (systemic approach, risk-based approach, etc.)
- 2 The plan includes specific proactive safety strategies, in addition to reactive strategies.
- 3 The plan is completely focused on proactive safety strategies.

## Summary of Findings: Key Successes and Opportunities For Improvement

The review of the selected transportation plans (see Table 1) in the CAMPO region identified successes and opportunities for improving the alignment of regional transportation planning efforts with the Safe System Approach.

# Table 1 CAMPO Region Transportation Plans Reviewed

Name of Plan	Lead Agency	Associated Agencies	Jurisdictional Level	Year Published
Northeast Area Study	САМРО	Franklin and Wake Counties; City of Raleigh; Towns of Bunn, Franklinton, Knightdale, Rolesville, Wake Forest, Wendell, Youngsville, and Zebulon	MPO	2021
Southwest Area Study	CAMPO, NCDOT	Wake and Harnett Counties; Towns of Angier, Apex, Fuquay-Varina, and Holly Springs	MPO	2019

Southeast Area Study	CAMPO, NCDOT, Upper Coastal Plain RPO	Wake and Johnston Counties; City of Raleigh; Municipalities of Archer Lodge, Benson, Clayton, Four Oaks, Garner, Kenly, Micro, Selma, Smithfield, and Wilsons's Mills	MPO	2023
Harnett County CTP	NCDOT	Harnett County; Municipalities of Angier, Coats, Dunn, Erwin, and Lillington; Campbell University; CAMPO, FAMPO, and Mid-Carolina RPO	County	2013 (addendum 2017)
Johnston County CTP	NCDOT	Johnston County; Municipalities of Archer Lodge, Benson, Clayton, Four Oaks, Kenly, Micro, Selma, Smithfield, Wilson's Mills; Upper Coastal Plan RPO, and CAMPO	County	2014
Franklin County CTP	NCDOT	Franklin County; Municipalities of Bunn, Centerville, Franklinton, Louisburg, Wake Forest, Youngsville; CAMPO, and Kerr-Tar RPO	County	2014
Granville County CTP	NCDOT	Granville County; Municipalities of Creedmoor, Oxford, Butner, Stem, Stovall; Kerr-Tar RPO, and CAMPO	County	2021

Table 2 shows the overall results of the plan review, communicated using the average score for each plan across the 12 prompt questions and the total score (out of a maximum of 36 points).

# Table 2Average Scores of Each Plan

Plan	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	Harnett	Johnston	Franklin	Granville
T Iuli	Area Study	Area Study	Area Study	County CTP	County CTP	County CTP	County CTP

Average Score (max = 3)	1.75	0.67	1.17	0.92	0.67	0.83	0.33
Total Score (max = 36)	21	8	14	11	8	10	4

Table 3 breaks down how each plan scored according to the different elements of the Safe System Approach. Different prompt questions focused on different Safe System Approach elements. By considering how those subgroups of questions scored, Table 3 shows how well each plan is aligned with different aspects of the Safe System Approach. The questions aligned with the elements as follows:

- Safe Road Users: Questions 1 and 2
- Safe Roads: Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9
- Safe Vehicles: Questions 3 and 4
- Safe Speeds: Question 5
- Post-Crash Care: Question 10

Questions 11 and 12 are overarching (and focus more on Safe System Approach principles rather than elements) and so were not included in a specific element category for the sake of this metric. The metric was computed as the percentage score for each group of questions. For example, the Safe Road Users element is addressed in two questions, with a potential maximum total score of six. If a given plan scored a total of four for these two questions, the metric would be computed as 4/6 = 67 percent. The cells in Table 3 are colored according to the percent score, with 67 percent or greater as green, 33 to 66 percent as yellow, and less than 33 percent as red.

Plan	Safe Road Users	Safe Roads	Safe Vehicles	Safe Speeds	Post-Crash Care
Northeast Area Study	67%	75%	17%	33%	33%
Southwest Area Study	33%	25%	17%	33%	33%
Southeast Area Study	17%	67%	33%	33%	33%
Harnett County CTP	17%	50%	17%	0%	33%
Johnston County CTP	17%	33%	17%	0%	0%

# Table 3 Effectiveness of Plans in Addressing Safe System Approach Elements

Franklin County CTP	17%	42%	17%	0%	33%
Granville County CTP	17%	8%	17%	0%	33%

As Table 2 shows, the Northeast Area Study has the highest average score among the reviewed plans, with a score of 1.75, meaning it most effectively addresses the Safe System Approach. Table 3 shows that the Northeast Area Study effectively addressed the Safe Road Users and Safe Roads elements, and the Southeast Area Study effectively addressed the Safe Roads element, according to the methodology used in this plan review. All other elements were addressed at a level of 50 percent or less in each of the plans.

# Successes and Opportunities

The review of selected transportation plans in the CAMPO region finds some existing strengths in transportation safety planning and identifies opportunities for future improvement. The plans collectively addressed the Safe Roads (38 percent), Safe Road Users (25 percent), and Post-Crash Care (25 percent) elements with more depth.

The Safe Vehicles (17 percent) and Safe Speeds (13 percent) elements were less effectively addressed. The general lack of in-depth discussion of safe vehicles is understandable given the types of agencies involved in the development of these plans. However, the rapid acceleration of vehicle-to-everything technologies will increasingly bring this discussion into the realm of transportation planning and future planning efforts should anticipate this. The lack of discussion of the safety effects of vehicle speed is more surprising. None of the reviewed plans addressed this element beyond a brief mention. Several of the plans only discussed speed in the context of poor operational performance and congestion. The relationship between vehicle speed and safety performance is clear. Across the region, safety planning efforts should establish the desired level of safety (e.g., zero fatalities and serious injuries) and then seek to implement operational solutions that provide the best performance given that level of safety.

Several of the plans (Southeast Area Study, Harnett County CTP, Franklin County CTP) did a good job of addressing the relationship between land use and roadway design, even going so far as to consider future land use in roadway redesign recommendations. The Southeast Area Study's Land Use Implementation toolkit is a good example for supporting context-sensitive design.

Several of the plans (Northeast Area Study, Harnett County CTP, Johnston County CTP, Franklin County CTP) included crash severity in the analysis used to identify crash hot spots. This aligns with the Safe System Approach emphasis on preventing fatal and serious injury crashes rather than preventing all crashes. However, the crash hot spot approach to identifying locations for improvement is reactive in nature. Future planning efforts in the region could use crash severity analysis, such as those included in the above-mentioned plans, to identify risk factors in support of a proactive (or systemic) approach to site selection in the future.

It is also important to understand the intentions of a given plan. Some of the plans that scored low may not have intended to focus on transportation safety and therefore did not discuss it in depth. However, to create a truly Safe System in the region, safety should be woven in some way throughout all planning efforts. Local and regional planning bodies can work to determine in which types of transportation plans safety planning are appropriate and should be considered and how specifically safety can be included as a component of future plans.

#### Analysis by Plan

This section presents a brief description of the analysis results for each plan reviewed for the CAMPO region. It describes specific areas in which the plan aligned well with the Safe System Approach according to the methodology used in this plan review. It also identifies specific opportunities to improve Safe System Approach alignment in future planning efforts.

## Northeast Area Study (2021)

The Northeast Area Study had the highest score of the reviewed plans with a total score of 21 and an average score of 1.75. The plan addressed the **Safe Road Users** element well. It emphasizes multimodal road user safety consistently throughout. The plan also addressed the **Safe Roads** element well. It generally connects safety performance to roadway and intersection design features, especially in its discussion of Complete Streets. It promotes specific design features and improvements that align with the Safe System Approach, such as roundabouts and separating vulnerable road users from vehicle traffic. It briefly addresses the relationship between land use and roadway design in its Scenario Planning section.

The plan does not significantly address the **Safe Vehicles** element, providing a discussion of freight mobility that does not tie to safety. The plan addresses the **Safe Speeds** element by mentioning posted speed limits in the discussion of corridor redesigns but does not explicitly tie the discussion back to the safety effects of speed. The plan briefly mentions emergency access in support of **Post-Crash Care**.

The included crash analysis considers crash severity, focusing the discussion on locations with observed high severity crash history. The reactive hot-spot focus is consistent throughout the plan, but it does specify Safe System Approach-aligned treatments for addressing the identified locations.

## Southwest Area Study (2019)

The Southwest Area Study received a total score of 8 and an average score of 0.67. It addressed all the Safe System Approach elements at least briefly. For **Safe Road Users**, the plan discusses a variety of modes, but the included recommendations focus mostly on passenger vehicle transportation. The Plan does include cursory information on road user behavior, particularly in the discussion of Safe Routes to School.

The plan briefly addresses the **Safe Roads** element, and the linkage between roadway design and safety is not explicitly discussed. The plan briefly addresses the **Safe Vehicles, Safe Speeds**, and **Post-Crash Care** elements as well.

The plan generally does not consider crash severity, nor does it include proactive safety approaches as a method for identifying improvement locations.

## Southeast Area Study (2023)

The Southeast Area Study received a total score of 14 and an average score of 1.17. It addressed all the Safe System Approach elements at least briefly. For **Safe Roads**, the plan encourages separation of road users in several recommendations, including through separated bike lanes and multiuse paths. It also includes a Land Use Implementation Toolkit for context-based and interjurisdictional coordination of design recommendations.

The plan only briefly addresses the Safe Road Users, Safe Vehicles, Safe Speeds, and Post-Crash Care elements.

The plan briefly mentions crash severity when reviewing the background context of the area but does not specifically incorporate crash severity into the discussion of recommended improvements.

# Harnett County CTP (2013, addendum 2017)

The Harnett County CTP received a total score of 11 and an average score of 0.92. The plan addressed the **Safe Roads** element the best. It promotes multiuse paths and sidewalks as a means for separating different user types. It also discussed rail crossing grade separation as a tool for separating users. The highway recommendations examine existing and future land use, and land use is considered in the roadway redesign recommendations.

The plan briefly addresses the **Safe Road Users**, **Safe Vehicles**, and **Post-Crash Care** elements. It does not address the **Safe Speeds** element, only mentioning slow vehicular speed as an issue regarding inefficient regional travel.

The included crash analysis is reactive in nature, but the crash hot spots are identified based on crash severity, focusing the discussion on locations with observed high severity crash history.

## Johnston County CTP (2014)

The Johnston County CTP received a total score of 8 and an average score of 0.67. The plan briefly addresses the **Safe Road Users**, **Safe Roads**, and **Safe Vehicles** elements. It considers intersection design and conflict points throughout the roadway recommendations. Most recommendations are focused on motor vehicle improvements and mitigating congestion. The discussion of bicyclist and pedestrian recommendations does consider safety, but the recommendations are not specific in nature.

The plan does not address the Safe Speeds and Post-Crash Care elements.

The included crash analysis is reactive in nature, but the crash hot spots are identified based on crash severity, focusing the discussion on locations with observed high severity crash history. The recommendations are not directly tied to reducing crash severity.

# Franklin County CTP (2014)

The Franklin County CTP received a total score of 10 and an average score of 0.83. The plan addresses the **Safe Roads** element most effectively. It promotes multiuse paths as a means for separating different user types. It also discussed rail crossing grade separation as a tool for separating users. The highway recommendations examine existing and future land use, and land use is considered in the roadway redesign recommendations. The plan also somewhat addresses the **Post-Crash Care** element by emphasizing the use of demand-responsive transit for medical transportation. The plan includes brief mentions of the **Safe Road Users** and **Safe Vehicles** elements.

The plan does not address the Safe Speeds element.

The included crash analysis is reactive in nature, but the crash hot spots are identified based on crash severity, focusing the discussion on locations with observed high severity crash history.

# Granville County CTP (2021)

The Franklin County CTP received a total score of 4 and an average score of 0.33. The plan briefly addresses the **Safe Road Users**, **Safe Roads**, **Safe Vehicles**, and **Post-Crash Care** elements.

The plan does not address the Safe Speeds element.

The crash analysis does not address crash severity and is focused on hot-spot identification (i.e., it is reactive in nature).

#### **Plan Scorecards**

The following section includes the individual scorecards for each plan.

# Northeast Area Study (2021)

Prompt	Score	Evidence	Page Number(s)
To what extent does the plan address the safety of multimodal road users (e.g., pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, micromobility users, or users of mobility assistance devices)?	3	Plan emphasizes the safety of multimodal users throughout most of the report and generally gives equal attention in analysis and recommendations for various modes. Corridor Concept Designs provides multimodal safety recommendations and calls for specific Safe System Approach principles and design	(of PDF, not doc) Page 46: Proctor St Corridor. Provides multimodal safety recommendations, specifically calls for safe routes to schools and suggests a roundabout and RRFD (both of which are aligned with the Safe System Approach). Page 67: Complete Streets Section. emphasizes safe access for all users, ages, and abilities.
To what extent does the plan address road user behavior?	1	changes to be implemented. The plan acknowledges how road users currently or may potentially behave on a road as guidance for corridor redesigns and recommendations. The discussion is brief.	Page 25: Briefly mentions how road user behavior modifications may have impacted changes in crash frequency in the area. Page 48: Corridor redesigns consider how vehicle users currently tend to weave through traffic and to speed.
To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of vehicle design?	0	Not addressed.	
To what extent does the plan address heavy vehicles?	1	Incorporates section on Freight and Roadway Mobility. Emphasizes that trucks have the highest modal share for freight.	Page 58: Freight and Roadway Mobility section
To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of vehicle operating speed?	1	Speeding is considered for corridor redesigns. Posted speed limits are noted in this section.	Page 52
To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of roadway design?	3	The Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility sections highlight the safety effects of roadway design. Mentions how the size of a road has impacted crash rates in the area: "while 12% of roads are arterial roadways, they account for 44% of pedestrian injuries/fatalities". Complete Streets and its potential for safety improvements.	Page 82 Page 64: Complete Streets and safety

		Provides specific strategies to improve safety.	
To what extent does the plan address strategies for separating different road users?	3	Mentions the importance of physical separation from the roadway for bicycle and pedestrian modes. Suggests sidepaths, pedestrian bulb outs, greenways/trails/shared use paths.	Page 88: Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendations
To what extent does the plan address intersection design?	2	Intersection design is well-considered throughout the Corridor Concept Designs. Specific solutions are offered throughout this section and consider safety.	Page 44
To what extent does the plan address how land use context affects roadway design?	1	The Scenario Planning section provides various land use and growth scenarios and provides a high-level understanding of impacts on transportation modes and facilities.	Page 36: Scenario Planning section
To what extent does the plan address post-crash care or emergency response?	1	Brief mention of collector street recommendations should support emergency access	Page 95
To what extent does the plan focus on crash severity?	3	Considers crash severity based on fatalities and serious injuries. Locates hot spots of high average severity. Hot spots are considered throughout the plan and inform the recommendations.	Page 25: Safety section
To what extent does the plan promote proactive safety solutions (e.g., risk-based or systemic approaches as opposed to reactive or crash hot-spot approaches)?	2	Effectively specifies Safe System treatments for implementation. Maintains focus on crash hot-spot areas for redesigns. Both observations are noticeable throughout the report.	See pages above for examples of Safe System treatments and hot spot analysis
Average Score (max = 3)	1.75		
Total Score (max = 36)	21		

# Southwest Area Study (2019)

Prompt	Score	Evidence	Page Number(s) (of PDF, not doc)
To what extent does the plan address the safety of multimodal road users (e.g., pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, micromobility users, or users of mobility assistance devices)?	1	Provides an analysis of a variety of modes but recommendations are more concerned with motor vehicles, motor vehicle users, and roadways. Existing conditions sections provided for roadways, transit, bicycle/pedestrian, and rail facilities.	Page 18: Mobility/accessibility as a guiding principle which includes concern for multimodal connectivity for all ages and abilities. Page 75: Safe Routes to School Page 147: Roadway Recommendations
		Safe Routes to School incorporates	

		oveling and walking medae and has	
		intrinsic concern for safety but the discussion does not explain how the	
		recommendations improve safety.	
		consider safety. Roadway	
		recommendations recognize safety as	
		a concern, but safety is not a primary	
		facet nor is it discussed beyond a brief	
		mention.	
To what extent does the plan	1	Provides a very brief understanding of	Page 102
address road user behavior?		road user behavior and safety.	
		Advocates for School Encouragement	
		Programs to alter the behaviors and	
		to school	
To what extent does the plan	0	Vehicle designs are not considered in	
address the safety effects of	· ·	the context of safety.	
vehicle design?		,	
To what extent does the plan	1	Very brief recognition of safety	Page 123
address heavy vehicles?		concerns associated with rail	
		crossings.	
To what extent does the plan	1	Freight recommendations consider	Page 124
address the safety effects of		roadway and rail speed and briefly	
venicle operating speed?		collisions. All other recommendation	
		sections largely do not take note of	
		operating speeds.	
To what extent does the plan	1	Safety effects of roadway design are	
address the safety effects of		considered throughout, particularly in	
roadway design?		recommendations, but this linkage is	
		often not explicitly discussed.	
To what extent does the plan	1	Briefly mentions separation of	Page 58: Low Stress Facilities Components
address strategies for separating		different road users as it relates to	Page 61: Targeted Areas for Low Stress
different road users?		low stress facilities and separation	Improvements
		strategies that achieve low stress.	
To what extent does the plan	0	Intersection design is discussed	
address intersection design?		throughout various sections of	
		recommendations but not in the	
		context of safety.	
To what extent does the plan	1	Makes clear connections between	Page 39: Land Use Update existing land
aduress now land use context		novides general policy	use conditions were used as an input in travel demand model
		recommendations for coordinating	Page 185: Land Use and Transportation
		land use and transportation. but not	Policy Recommendations
		specific road design suggestions.	,
To what extent does the plan	1	Resiliency and Transportation section	Page 197
address post-crash care or		briefly states that important roads,	
emergency response?		such as those leading to hospitals,	

To what extent does the plan promote proactive safety solutions (e.g., risk-based or systemic	0	Safety is not included as a guiding principle in this study. Takes a crash hot spot (reactive) approach and	Page 147: Roadway Recs: Generally concerned with crash hot spots. Recommendations are not placed in a
approaches as opposed to reactive or crash hot-spot approaches)?		these areas are prioritized for improvement.	safety context. Page 164: Hot spot Concept Designs
Average Score (max = 3)	0.67		
Total Score (max = 36)	8		

# Southeast Area Study (2023)

Prompt	Score	Evidence	Page Number(s) (of PDF, not doc)
To what extent does the plan address the safety of multimodal road users (e.g., pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, micromobility users, or users of mobility assistance devices)?	1	Contains Multimodal Recommendations for vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians, and transit. Largely focused on motor vehicle operation and congestion, not safety.	Page 63: mention of Complete Streets for safety Page 80: Importance of filling gaps in sidewalk networks for safety Page 88: transit improvements to improve mobility Maintains primary focus on vehicular modes
To what extent does the plan address road user behavior?	0		
To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of vehicle design?	0		
To what extent does the plan address heavy vehicles?	2	Mention of truck network recommendations. Addresses safety concerns of some rail crossings.	Page 61: safety of rail crossings Page 79: truck network recommendations
To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of vehicle operating speed?	1	Very brief mention of limiting use of sharrows due to speed variances between road users.	Page 81: Sharrow mention
To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of roadway design?	1	Safety is briefly mentioned in sections regarding roadway design, but it is not specific in its recommendations for safety improvements.	Page 68-69: importance of access management and superstreets in reducing crashes/conflicts between drivers/peds/bikes Page 70: high level view of roadway redesign recommendations General recommendations

To what extent does the plan address strategies for separating different road users?	3	Some recommendations encourage separation of road users. Mentions of separated bike lanes and multiuse paths as methods of separation.	Page 81: SBLs should be the goal, sharrows should be limited, expansion of multiuse paths Page 82-83: high level view of bike/ped network and intersection redesigns recommendations
address intersection design?		Improvements section with general suggestions. No mention of specific safety design element and does not have safety as an explicit goal.	Page 72: Intersection recommendations Page 73: Intersection Control Evaluation Toolkit for improvements to multimodal safety Page 74: High level view of intersection redesign recommendations Page 83: Bicycle and pedestrian intersection redesign recommendations
To what extent does the plan address how land use context affects roadway design?	3	Includes Land Use Implementation toolkit in tool for context-based and interjurisdictional coordinated design recommendations. Contains Land Use and Scenario Planning Section. Provides various growth scenarios and potential impacts on land use.	Page 42: land use and scenario planning section. Page 48: Land Use Implementation Tool Kit
To what extent does the plan address post-crash care or emergency response?	1	Study includes travel safety as a guiding principle, including "improving emergency coordination."	Page 14
To what extent does the plan focus on crash severity?	1	Briefly mentions severity of crashes and frequency of them in the area in background context but not specifically incorporated into recommendations for transportation modes.	Page 32
To what extent does the plan promote proactive safety solutions (e.g., risk-based or systemic approaches as opposed to reactive or crash hot-spot approaches)?	0	Design recommendations are not specific enough to address this nor is safety a primary concern for them.	
Average Score (max = 3)	1.17		
Total Score (max = 36)	14		

# Harnett County CTP (2013, addendum 2017)

Prompt	Score	Evidence	Page Number(s)
			(of PDF, not doc)
To what extent does the plan	1	Provides multimodal	Page 96: Pedestrian
address the safety of multimodal		recommendations for improvements to	recommendations
road users (e.g., pedestrians,		roadway facilities but generally does	
bicyclists, transit users,		not discuss safety. Majority of	
micromobility users, or users of		recommendations are focused on	
mobility assistance devices)?		highway improvements and are	
		concerned with motor vehicles and	

		congestion solutions. Only pedestrian	
		recommendations consider safety	
To what extent does the plan	0	Not addressed.	
address road user behavior?			
To what extent does the plan	0	Not addressed.	
address the safety effects of			
vehicle design?			
To what extent does the plan	1	Rail and freight recommendations	Page 29 : Rail existing conditions
address heavy vehicles?		discuss improving access to transit.	Page 94: Rail recommendations
		Safety is not mentioned.	
To what extent does the plan	0	Highway recommendations mention	Page 48: Highway recommendations
address the safety effects of		slow vehicular speed as an issue on	
vehicle operating speed?		many roadways, stating this is	
		inefficient for regional travel. Safety	
		effects of speeds are not mentioned.	
To what extent does the plan	0	Not addressed.	
address the safety effects of			
roadway design?			
To what extent does the plan	3	Mentions multiuse paths as a means of	Page 96: Pedestrian recommendations
address strategies for separating	0	separating users and provides high	
different road users?		level recommendations for	
		implementation	
		Recommendations to install sidewalks	
		to improve pedestrian facilities, a	
		separation strategy.	
		Grade separation as a separation tool	
		is also discussed throughout the report	
		for roadways intersecting with	
		railroads. This is a Safe System	
		treatment.	
To what extent does the plan	1	Not significantly addressed. Specific	
address intersection design?		high crash intersection locations are	
		mentioned throughout roadway	
		recommendations.	
To what extent does the plan	2	Highway recommendations examine	Page 48: Highway recommendations
address how land use context		existing and future land use. Land use	
affects roadway design?		is considered in roadway	
		recommendations.	
To what extent does the plan	1	Mentions that evacuation and	Page 158
address post-crash care or		emergency plans should be considered	
emergency response?		in plan development. No mention of	
		post-crash care or safety.	

To what extent does the plan focus on crash severity?	2	Traffic Crash Analysis considers crash severity based on fatalities and serious injuries. Locates hot spots of high average severity. Hot spots considered throughout the plan.	Page 148
To what extent does the plan promote proactive safety solutions (e.g., risk-based or systemic approaches as opposed to reactive or crash hot-spot approaches)?	0	Not directly addressed. Solutions generally based on reactive approaches. Some highway recommendations specify the need for improvement due to the area being a high crash location.	
Average Score (max = 3)	0.92		
Total Score (max = 36)	11		

# Johnston County CTP (2014)

Prompt	Score	Evidence	Page Number(s) (of PDF, not doc)
To what extent does the plan address the safety of multimodal road users (e.g., pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, micromobility users, or users of mobility assistance devices)?	1	Majority of recommendations are focused on highway improvements and are concerned with motor vehicles and congestion solutions. Bicyclist and pedestrian recommendations consider safety, but recommendations are not specific.	Page 117: Bicycle and pedestrian recommendations
To what extent does the plan address road user behavior?	0	Not addressed.	
To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of vehicle design?	0	Not addressed.	
To what extent does the plan address heavy vehicles?	1	Brief recommendations are provided for rail.	Page 114
To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of vehicle operating speed?	0	Not significantly addressed.	
To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of roadway design?	0	Not addressed.	
To what extent does the plan address strategies for separating different road users?	1	Brief mention of multiuse paths as means of separating users and high- level recommendations for implementation.	Page 124

To what extent does the plan address intersection design?	2	Intersection design and conflict points are considered throughout roadway recommendations.	Page 71: Highway Recommendations
To what extent does the plan address how land use context affects roadway design?	1	Roadway recommendations consider their impacts on surrounding land use, but not vice versa.	Page 78: Briefly mentions existence of freeway and proposed changes could result in more opportunity for development.
To what extent does the plan address post-crash care or emergency response?	0	Not addressed.	
To what extent does the plan focus on crash severity?	2	Traffic Crash Analysis considers crash severity based on fatalities and serious injuries and locates hot spots of high average severity. The plan does not make specific recommendations to reduce crash severity.	Page 214
To what extent does the plan promote proactive safety solutions (e.g., risk-based or systemic approaches as opposed to reactive or crash hot-spot approaches)?	0	Solutions generally take a reactive approach and are concerned with crash hot spots.	
Average Score (max = 3)	0.67		
Total Score (max = 36)	8		

# Franklin County CTP (2014)

Prompt	Score	Evidence	Page Number(s) (of PDF, not doc)	
To what extent does the plan address the safety of multimodal road users (e.g., pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, micromobility users, or users of mobility assistance devices)?	1	Provides multimodal recommendations for improvements of roadway facilities but generally does not tie to safety. Majority of recommendations are focused on highway improvements and concerned with motor vehicles and congestion solutions. Bicyclist and pedestrian recommendations consider safety, but recommendations are not specific. County vision statement lists multimodal safety as a priority.	Page 130-136: Bicycle and pedestrian recommendations Page 209: Franklin County's Vision Statement: "provide safe multimodal regional transportation network".	
To what extent does the plan address road user behavior?	0	Not addressed.		
To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of vehicle design?	0	Not addressed.		

To what extent does the plan	1	Rail existing conditions and	Page 48: Existing
address heavy vehicles?		recommendations provided, though	rail/freight lines
To what outont does the plan	0	Safety is not considered.	Page 126: Rail recommendations
oddross the seferty effects of	0	Highway recommendations section	Page 77. Highway recommendations
vohicle operating speed?		issue on many readways that is	
venicie operating speed:		inefficient for regional-level travel	
		Safety effects of speed are not	
		mentioned	
To what extent does the plan	0	Not addressed.	
address the safety effects of	-		
roadway design?			
To what extent does the plan	3	Mentions multiuse paths as means of	Page 77: Highway recommendations
address strategies for separating		separating users and provides high	
different road users?		level recommendations for	
		implementation.	
		Grade separation as a separation tool	
		is also discussed throughout the report	
		for roadways intersecting with	
		railroads. This is a Safe System	
To sub-the sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-	0	treatment.	
To what extent does the plan	0	Not significantly addressed.	
To what extent does the plan	2	Highway recommendations examine	Page 50: Montions land use
address how land use context	2	evisting and future land use and is	and impacts on traffic demand
affects roadway design?		considered in roadway redesign	Page 77 onward: Highway
directs roddwdy design:		recommendations	recommendations
To what extent does the plan	1	Brief mention of existing demand-	Page 124
address post-crash care or		responsive transit service provided by	
emergency response?		KARTS that emphasizes medical	
		transportation.	
To what extent does the plan focus	2	Traffic Crash Analysis considers crash	Page 203
on crash severity?		severity based on fatalities and serious	
		injuries. Locates not spots of high	
		average severity. Hot spots are not	
To what extent does the plan	0	Not directly addressed Solutions	
nromote proactive safety solutions	0	generally based on reactive	
(e.g., risk-based or systemic		approaches	
approaches as opposed to reactive			
or crash hot-spot approaches)?			
Average Score (max = 3)	0.83		
Total Score (may - 36)	10		
10tal 3tole (Illax – 30)	10		

# Granville County CTP (2021)

Prompt	Score	Evidence	Page Number(s) (of PDF, not doc)	
To what extent does the plan address the safety of multimodal road users (e.g., pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, micromobility users, or users of mobility assistance devices)?	1	Recommendations are made for various modes: motor vehicle, public transportation and rail, bicycle, and pedestrian but places most of the focus on motor vehicle users, highways, and congestion solutions. Plan is explicitly stated as multimodal and considers recommendations consider safety important but are not specific nor placed in the context of safety.	Page 42-47: Highway recommendations for widening and extensions.	
To what extent does the plan address road user behavior?	0	Not addressed.		
To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of vehicle design?	0	Not addressed.		
To what extent does the plan address heavy vehicles?	1	Very briefly discusses rail and freight vehicles	Page 41	
To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of vehicle operating speed?	0	Not addressed.		
To what extent does the plan address the safety effects of roadway design?	0	Not addressed.		
To what extent does the plan address strategies for separating different road users?	1	Brief mention of multiuse paths as means of separating users.	Page 2-11	
To what extent does the plan address intersection design?	0	Does not mention specific intersection design features though briefly discusses high frequency crashes at intersections.	Page 23	
To what extent does the plan address how land use context affects roadway design?	0	The land use section is provided but does not relate to roadway design.	Page 33: Land Use section	
To what extent does the plan address post-crash care or emergency response?	1	Definition of highway improvements includes emergency management.	Page B-3	
To what extent does the plan focus on crash severity?	0	Not addressed.		
To what extent does the plan promote proactive safety solutions (e.g., risk-based or systemic	0	Utilizes reactive (crash hot spot) approaches for providing roadway recommendations.	Page 23: Traffic crash assessment based on hot spots.	

approaches as opposed to reactive or crash hot-spot approaches)?		
Average Score (max = 3)	0.33	
Total Score (max = 36)	4	

# **Policy and Program Assessment**

In the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) region there are a variety of plans, studies, policies, programs, and reports that are relevant to the development of a regional comprehensive safety action plan. Documents found for CAMPO-led projects and programs were reviewed as part of this Safe System Program Review. Those programs that have a primary consideration of systemic safety were included in the written summaries. The summaries included an overview of the document's purpose, timeframe, applicable geography, recommendations, and opportunities for improvement to prioritize roadway safety.

The programs and policies reviewed included the following:

- Safe Routes to School (SRTS)
- Public Engagement (PEP)
- Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)
- Locally Administered Projects Program (LAPP)
- Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- Congestion Management Process (CMP)
- Wake Transit Program (WTP)
- Community Funding Area Program (CFAP)
- Mobility Management Program (MMP)

The project team reviewed these programs and policies using a scoring rubric developed for the CAMPO Blueprint for Safety, following the elements and principles of the Safe System Approach. The categories and prompt questions used to score each program or policy are described below.

# **Scoring Criteria**

## Category 1: Safer People

To what extent does the policy prioritize measures to encourage safe, responsible driving and behavior among road users (e.g. pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists)?

- 0 The program does not prioritize measures to encourage safe, and responsible driving behavior among road users.
- 1 The program acknowledges the importance of safe driving behavior but lacks specific strategies to encourage it.

- 2 The program includes general strategies to promote safe driving behavior, such as awareness campaigns or education initiatives.
- 3 The program incorporates comprehensive and targeted strategies to actively promote safe driving behavior, including enforcement measures, education programs, and incentives.

# How effectively does the plan address the three most frequent and persistent behavioral safety factors in fatal crashes: seat belt usage, driving under the influence of alcohol, and speeding?

- 0 The program does not address any of the three behavioral safety factors.
- 1 The program acknowledges one or two of the safety factors but does not offer specific strategies to address them.
- 2 The program includes specific strategies related to behavioral safety factors (e.g. speed mitigation, driver education and training, seat belt usage promotion).
- 3 The program incorporates specific safety strategies to address each of the three behavioral safety factors, including actions to promote seat belt usage, prevent driving under the influence, and mitigate speedingrelated risks.

# To what extent does the program address vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians, bicyclists, and individuals with mobility challenges, to ensure their safety and prioritize their ability to travel unharmed?

- 0 The program does not address the safety concerns of road users.
- 1 The program acknowledges the presence of vulnerable road users but lacks specific strategies to enhance their safety.
- 2 The program includes some measures to improve the safety of vulnerable road users, such as basic infrastructure enhancements, but lacks comprehensive solutions.
- 3 The program incorporates a comprehensive range of strategies to enhance the safety of vulnerable road users, including significant infrastructure improvements, robust education campaigns, and tailored enforcement actions to address their specific needs.

## Category 2: Safer Roads

# To what extent does the program incorporate design elements (e.g., rumble strips, traffic calming measures, improved visibility etc.) aimed at mitigating human errors to enhance roadway safety?

- 0 The program does not incorporate design elements aimed at mitigating human errors or injury tolerances.
- 1 The program does incorporate design elements aimed at mitigating human errors or injury tolerances.
- 2 The program identifies specific safety needs related to human errors and injury tolerances.
- 3 The program includes detailed safety strategies aimed at mitigating human errors and injury tolerances in roadway design.

## To what extent does the program address strategies for separating different road users?

- 0 The program does address strategies for separating road users.
- 1 The program acknowledges the importance separating road users (e.g., separated bicycle lanes, medians, and refuge islands).
- 2 The program includes specific strategies related to separating road users in time (e.g., traffic signal timing strategies, traffic demand management strategies, crosswalk signing, pedestrian signals etc.)
- 3 The program includes specific strategies related to separating road users in space (e.g., separated bicycle/pedestrian facilities, grade separation

## Category 3: Safer Vehicles

To what extent does the program incorporate design elements (e.g., rumble strips, traffic calming measures, improved visibility etc.) aimed at mitigating human errors to enhance roadway safety?

- 0 The program does not incorporate design elements aimed at mitigating human errors or injury tolerances.
- 1 The program does incorporate design elements aimed at mitigating human errors or injury tolerances.
- 2 The program identifies specific safety needs related to human errors and injury tolerances.
- 3 The program includes detailed safety strategies aimed at mitigating human errors and injury tolerances in roadway design.

# To what extent does the program incorporate address the increasing proportion of fatalities involving pedestrians and cyclists, by promoting vehicle safety features?

- 0 The program does not address the increasing proportion of roadway fatalities involving protecting pedestrians and bicyclists.
- 1 The program does acknowledge the issue of increasing fatalities involving protecting pedestrians and bicyclists.
- 2 The program discusses potential vehicle safety features aimed at protecting pedestrians and bicyclists.
- 3 The program includes specific plans for promoting the adoption of vehicle safety features aimed at protecting pedestrians and bicyclists and reducing fatalities.

#### Category 4: Safer Speeds

# To what extent does the program address the safety effects (e.g., crash frequency, crash severity, impact on road users etc.) of vehicle operating speed?

- 0 The program does not address the safety effects of speed.
- 1 The program acknowledges the safety effects of vehicle operating speed.
- 2 The program includes data analysis related to the safety effects of vehicle operating speed.
- 3 The program includes specific safety strategies (e.g., speed feedback signs, Pedestrian and Cyclist Facilities, Driver education and training etc.) to encourage appropriate speeds.

# To what extent does the program address the issue of speeding-related crash factors, including both exceeding posted speed limit and driving too fast for conditions?

- 0 The program does not address speeding related crash factors.
- 1 The program acknowledges the issue of speeding related crash factors.
- 2 The program discusses potential strategies for addressing speeding-related crash factors.
- 3 The program includes specific plans for implementing strategies to address speeding related crash factors.

# To what extent does the program incorporate education and outreach campaigns to raise awareness about the risks of speeding and promote compliance with speed limits?

- 0 The program does not incorporate targeted education and outreach campaigns.
- 1 The program incorporates education and outreach strategies for addressing speeding risks and compliance (e.g., Safe Routes to School Programs, community engagement activities, partnership, and collaboration etc.).
- 2 The program acknowledges the importance of education and outreach on speeding risks.
- 3 The program includes specific plans for implementing education and outreach campaigns addressing speeding risks, promoting compliance with speed limit.

#### Category 5: Post-Crash Care

#### To what extent does the plan address post-crash care or emergency response?

- 0 The program does not address post-crash care.
- 1 The program acknowledges the importance of post-crash care to roadway safety.
- 2 The program addresses the relationship of post-crash care to other aspects of roadway safety.

• 3 – The program includes specific strategies related to post-crash care.

## To what extent does the program prevent secondary crash through effective traffic management practices?

- 0 The program does not address prevention of secondary crashes.
- 1 The program acknowledges the importance of preventing secondary crashes.
- 2 The program discusses traffic management strategies for reducing risk of secondary crashes.
- 3 The program includes specific plan measures like access to emergency medical care, quick clearance of crash scene, coordination with traffic agencies for traffic control, prioritizing post-crash care.

#### Summary Table

	Safer People	Safer Roads	Safer Vehicles	Safer Speeds	Post-Crash care
SRTS	н	Н	н	Н	М
PEP	М	L	L	L	L
UPWP	L	М	L	L	L
LAPP	Н	Н	М	М	L
TIP	М	М	М	М	L
CMP	М	М	М	М	L
WTP	М	Н	М	М	L
CFAP	М	М	L	М	L
MMP	Н	М	М	L	L

Scoring Criteria: 0-1 Low (L); 1-2 Medium (M); 2-3 High (H)

#### Programs

## Safe Routes to School Program

The Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) program promote safe walking and biking to school. It involves parents, teachers, and local governments working together to improve safety, reduce traffic, and pollution near schools. CAMPO partners with regional agencies and governments to support this effort.

Alignment with SSA:

- Identifies safety concerns and implements solutions to prioritize ability to travel safely.
- Addresses environments around schools, to reduce risks, creating safer conditions for users.
- Improves infrastructure around schools, contributing to promoting safer speeds and implementing traffic calming measures, encouraging safer behaviors and appropriate speed limits.

Possibilities concerning SSA:

- Could explore opportunities to integrate educational initiatives or infrastructure improvements around schools- carpooling, designated drop-off zones to minimize traffic congestion.
- While it focuses on preventing crashes, there may be room to enhance coordination with emergency responses to ensure access to medical care in the event of a crash related to school activities.
- There may be opportunities to enhance redundancy in safety measures by implementing engineering, education, enforcement strategies to address safety concerns comprehensively.
- Example: Engineering strategies- installing traffic calming measures/ improving visibility of sidewalk, teaching safe pedestrian behaviors or driver awareness campaigns, enforcing traffic laws- seatbelt use and speed limits

## **Public Engagement Program**

The aim of public engagement within CAMPO is to gather feedback from diverse community sectors to identify transportation needs and priorities, ensuring fairness across society. This engagement provides decision-makers with valuable input before making decisions, allowing for consideration of technical, political, and economic factors. By

using local knowledge from various groups, CAMPO aims to create inclusive, practical, and effective transportation solutions. The plan outlines strategies for enhancing public participation in CAMPO's transportation planning projects, including regular meetings and the 3C process, emphasizing goals, techniques, and the incorporation of environmental justice and innovative practices like visualization and scenario planning to better engage stakeholders and the public.

Alignment with SSA:

• Encourages safe and responsible driving behaviors by incorporating community feedback on needs and priorities.

Possibilities concerning SSA:

- Could enhance alignment of safer roads by incorporating discussions on design elements- traffic calming measures, improved visibility; ensuring transportation solutions prioritize road safety.
- Could explore opportunities to incorporate feedback on vehicle-related safety features/technologies.
- While the program does focus on gathering feedback on transportation needs and priorities, there may be opportunities to incorporate discussions on speed management strategies or community concerns related to speed limits.
- Opportunity to incorporate emergency response planning or community needs related to post-crash care through community engagement efforts.

https://nmcdn.io/e186d21f8c7946a19faed23c3da2f0da/8bfec28a290449a7b10eb1fee3a0e264/files/get-involved/publicparticipation-plan/CAMPO Public Participation Plan Update August-2023-APPROVED.pdf

# Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) serves as the central coordinating tool for metropolitan planning activities within the MPO's jurisdiction. Its main goal is to create an integrated planning framework that considers transportation modes and coordinates activities across the region. Developed in alignment with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the MPO's Strategic Plan, the UPWP includes task elements aimed at implementing strategic initiatives. Member jurisdictions are encouraged to submit planning study requests annually during the Fall Call for Projects. This annual program outlines schedules, funding sources, and technical work related to planning studies and updates to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Alignment with SSA:

• Partially aligns with SSA as it focuses on developing and integrated planning program that considers planning activities for each mode of transportation.

Possibilities concerning SSA:

- Incorporates comprehensive strategies to promote safe driving behavior, enforcement measures, education programs.
- Incorporate specific strategies for roadway design aimed at reducing human errors traffic calming measures or improving visibility.
- Specific plans for promoting the adoption of vehicle safety features to protect pedestrians and bicyclists.

- Strategies to encourage appropriate speeds and address speeding related crashes through education and outreach campaigns.
- Implementing measures to access emergency medical care, coordination with traffic agencies to enhance post-crash care.

https://www.campo-nc.us/funding/unified-planning-work-program/archive-of-unified-planning-work-programs

## Locally Administered Projects Program (LAPP)

The Locally Administered Projects Program (LAPP) is a competitive funding program managed by CAMPO. It prioritizes local transportation projects in the region that use federal funding and fall under the responsibility of the MPO. Projects funded through LAPP require a minimum 20% match and must include Complete Streets elements. Member jurisdictions of the CAMPO region are eligible to apply for funding, and projects can be in the categories of roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian, or transit.

Alignment with SSA:

- Requires complete street elements for all projects considered, promoting safer environments for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other users.
- Prioritizes local transportation projects using federal funding and require complete street elements, creating safer road environments for users.
- Includes complete street elements, which may include traffic calming measures and speed management strategies to promote safer driving speeds.

Possibilities concerning SSA:

- Enhance awareness and education programs on safe and responsible behaviors among road users.
- Include additional safety features and design elements to reduce human errors and enhance road safety.
- Include provisions for integrating vehicle safety features into transit projects and prioritize funding for projects that incorporate safety enhancements for all vehicles.
- Implement targeted strategies to address speed-related crash factors.
- Incorporate post-crash considerations into project design.

<u>Details about the CAMPO Program for local transportation project funding (campo-nc.us)</u> <u>Current Projects - NC Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (campo-nc.us)</u>

## Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CAMPO maintains the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which outlines the timing, funding sources, and project locations for initiatives in the CAMPO area deemed regionally significant or utilizing state or federal funds. Adopted by the MPO every four years, the TIP aligns with the State's Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and undergoes quarterly amendments overseen by the MPO. The current iteration is the FY 2024-2033 TIP.

Alignment with SSA:

• Aligns with SSA by prioritizing projects that include speed management strategies and promote compliance with speed limits.

Possibilities concerning SSA:

- Funding for projects that incorporate safety enhancements for all vehicles and promote adoption of vehicle safety features.
- Incorporating additional safety features and design elements in projects and including complete street principles are integrated in project designs.
- Ensuring adequate emergency access and quick clearance of crash scenes, and collaborate with emergency response agencies to integrate post-crash care.
- Prioritize funding for projects that incorporate safety enhancements for all vehicles and promote adoption of vehicle safety features.

https://www.campo-nc.us/funding/unified-planning-work-program/archive-of-unified-planning-work-programs

#### Congestion Management Process (CMP)

Reducing roadway congestion enhances safety and reliability for all users. CAMPO's federally mandated Congestion Management Program (CMP) aims to achieve this by measuring and managing current and future transportation systems. The CMP uses data collection, travel demand modeling, transit analysis, and highway performance analysis, following a 'Three M's' approach: Supply Management, Demand Management, and Land-use Management.

Alignment with SSA:

- Contributing to safer road environments by targeting congestion reduction and enhancing traffic flow and reliability.
- Addresses demand management strategies, influencing safer driving speeds.
- Indirectly contributes to safer vehicles by promoting congestion management.

Possibilities concerning SSA:

- Enhance strategies to actively promote safe driving and address behavioral safety factors, through education initiatives.
- Incorporate post-crash care and emergency response into congestion management strategies.

https://www.campo-nc.us/about-us/committees/congestion-management

#### Wake Transit Program

The Wake Transit program is a taxpayer-supported initiative to improve public transportation in Wake County. Its goal is to enhance connectivity between local communities and the Greater Triangle Region. By offering frequent and reliable access to commerce, education, employment, entertainment, healthcare, and recreation, the program aims to improve the quality of life for residents and reduce traffic congestion through increased transportation options.

Alignment with SSA:

- Optimized public transportation, which can reduce congestion and enhance road safety by providing more transportation choices and reducing reliance on private vehicles.
- By maximizing connectivity between communities and regions, the program contributes to safer speeds by offering more travel options, reducing speeding and promoting safer travel behaviors.
- The program's focus on providing frequent and reliable transportation opportunities, aligns with SSA's goal of enhancing access for all users.

Possibilities concerning SSA:

- While it enhances transportation options, educational campaigns can be integrated to promote safe transit behaviors.
- Consideration of post-crash measures and emergency response strategies.

# Community Funding Area Program (CFAP)

The Community Funding Area Program, part of the Wake Transit Program, provides funds for planning, capital, and operational projects to improve transit in underserved areas of Wake County. Eligible jurisdictions can apply for funding during the Fall Call for Projects to help implement these plans.

Alignment with SSA:

- Program aligns with SSA by targeting areas without consistent transit access, and contributes towards planning, and capital projects, contributing to safer travel experiences.
- By focusing on parts lacking reliable transit, the program contributes to safer roads by reducing congestion and reliance on single occupancy vehicles.
- Provides transit options in areas where transportation choices may be limited.

Possibilities concerning SSA:

- Opportunity to integrate behavioral safety measures, to enhance safety outcomes and responsible usage of transit services.
- Considering post-crash care measures and emergency response for transit users.

https://www.campo-nc.us/funding/unified-planning-work-program/archive-of-unified-planning-work-programs

## Mobility Management Program

The Mobility Management Program at CAMPO aims to expand transit access in communities. Partnering with regional paratransit services, the program addresses gaps in public transportation, especially in areas with limited fixed-route service. The program's focus is on improving mobility and transportation access for people with disabilities, seniors, and low-income individuals. These populations are inherently a focus of the Safe System Approach, and safety, land use context, post-crash care, and other factors addressed in the question prompts are closely intertwined with providing effective and safe mobility to these populations.

The Mobility Management Implementation Study (MMIS) for the CAMPO region outlines a plan to improve transportation, particularly in areas with limited fixed-route service. The study recommends a regional mobility

management program to enhance outreach, consolidate information, and improve coordination among providers, ultimately benefiting residents in need of transportation services.

The MMIS serves as a roadmap for developing and implementing the regional mobility management program, addressing identified transportation gaps and improving the overall transportation experience in the CAMPO region.

- Alignment with SSA:
- By addressing transportation gaps, the program contributes to safer travel experiences for residents and offers alternative transportation options.
- Partnering with paratransit services and implementing a regional mobility management, causes the program to support safer roads and improved traffic flow.
- Focusing on transit access and addressing gaps, enables the program to support safer vehicles and alternative transportation options.

Possibilities concerning SSA:

- Opportunity to integrate behavioral safety measures, to enhance safety outcomes and usage of transit services.
- Considering post-crash care measures and emergency response for transit users.