



Road Safety Audits: An Emerging and Effective Tool for Improved Safety

What is a Road Safety Audit?

Every year, a large number of people are killed and injured on roads in developed and developing countries. Every year, states, counties, regions and municipalities spend considerable amount of resources on trying to reduce crashes by reconstructing and improving the roads. This work—crash reduction—is still necessary and should continue to be of high priority. However, these activities are reactive.

New roads must incorporate design and operational safety elements from the start. Roadway safety in new projects can be improved by having independent road safety specialists systematically examining and commenting on the projects, while they still only exist on paper. This is called a **road safety audit (RSA)**.

RSAs are in essence, crash prevention. The purpose is to make new roads as safe as possible—before the projects are implemented, and before any crashes happen. RSAs require an independent and systematic formal procedure for assessing or checking the crash potential and safety performance of a new road project or existing roads. Safety should be considered throughout the entire project—from planning and development, to construction and operations and maintenance.

The basis for a RSA is the application of safety principles to new project design and improvements to the highway to prevent crashes from occurring or to reduce their severity. The outcome of the audit is the identification of any potential safety issues, together with suggestions on how to address the issues. Additionally, road safety audits are systematic; auditing takes place according to agreed upon procedures, in which the parties involved have designated roles in the process.

The central principle of an RSA is the independence of the auditors. The auditors exclusively evaluate the road safety of projects—and not participants in the planning or design of the project itself. Furthermore, it is not the task of the auditors to weigh safety considerations against other considerations, e.g., economic criteria although they may be aware of them.

"We view RSAs as a proactive low-cost approach to improve safety. The RSAs helped our engineering team develop a number of solutions incorporating measures that were not originally included in the projects. The very first audit conducted saved SCDOT thousands of dollars by correcting a design problem."

Terecia Wilson,
Director of Safety
South Carolina Department of Transportation

Road safety audits can be applied to both small as well as large projects, regardless of whether the project concerns new construction or the rebuilding of existing roads.

It will often be advantageous to carry out an audit several times during the course of a project, depending on its size, complexity and character. Therefore, the following five stages have been defined:

- ◆ Stage 1: Planning
- ◆ Stage 2: Preliminary Design
- ◆ Stage 3: Detailed Design
- ◆ Stage 4: Construction
- ◆ Stage 5: Monitoring Existing Projects



U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration



Institute of Transportation Engineers

It is essential that the suggestions of the RSA are consistent with the stage of the project. For example, audit suggestions related to design details are inappropriate at the planning phase, and audit suggestions that require major design alterations are inappropriate at the detailed design phase. Experienced auditors will limit the safety audit suggestions to items that can still be practically and cost-effectively addressed at the stage of the project.

The final design-related decisions are always the responsibility of the design team and the project owner. The auditors simply provide input, and the design team and owner have absolute flexibility to accept or reject any of the audit suggestions, with proper justification and documentation.

Who needs RSA guidelines?

RSAs should be an integral part of high-way planning, design, construction and maintenance. Therefore, there needs to be an explicit commitment to safety amongst elected officials, management in any transportation organization, together with an awareness of the role and benefits of safety audits.

The RSA process requires an objective approach to the assessment of crash risk. The principal method of ensuring this objectivity is through the **independent** safety assessment of projects by persons not connected with the original design. Designers and planners need to be familiar with procedures and practices, and provide the necessary background information required for the audit to be undertaken. A designated audit team should undertake the audit with experience conducting road safety engineering techniques.

What Should be Audited?

Projects eligible for audit cover a wide range of types and sizes, on different classes of roads, in urban and rural areas. The variety of design is broadly covered under the following categories:

- (I) major highway projects;
- (II) minor improvements (rehabilitation, retrofitting, upgrading) projects;
- (III) traffic management plans;
- (IV) development projects; and
- (V) maintenance.

Ideally, all projects should be subject to an independent safety audit. If this is not achievable within available resources, a clear procedure is required for prioritizing projects in terms of type of project and level of audit required. Projects that benefit from audits typically have the following characteristics:

- ◆ Complex, unusual, or new design characteristics;
- ◆ Significant budget or land constraints;
- ◆ A high public profile; and
- ◆ A history of high crash risk at the project location.

What resources are needed?

RSAs require the assembly of a RSA team, and some resources from the

design team and the owner to compile information, attend meetings and respond to the audit suggestions.

The cost of a road safety audit is often an insignificant amount compared to the overall project cost. In the United States and Canada, highly complex RSAs for major projects (with a capital cost in the hundreds of millions of dollars) have been conducted at a cost of \$30,000 to \$40,000. Small audits for relatively minor projects can be completed for a cost of \$15,000 or less. Audits can be conducted by in-house transportation department staff or from a consulting organization.

The cost of implementing the acceptable suggestions from the RSA (including re-design) may be relatively low and manageable, since by definition RSA suggestions need to be compatible and cost-efficient relative to the phase of the project. Allowance should be made in the original design costing and time schedule of projects for both audit and possible redesign.



Before RSA



After RSA

What are the Benefits of RSAs?

It is difficult to quantify the benefits of road safety audits, since by definition audits are preventing crashes from occurring. Studies that have attempted to quantify the benefits of audits have yielded impressive results. In the United Kingdom, a local authority has estimated the benefit-cost ratio of an RSA to be 15:1, while TRANSIT New Zealand has estimated the benefit to cost ratio as 20:1. Cost-benefit analysis of safety audited projects in Denmark yielded an expected average first year rate of return of 146 percent.

With the low cost of conducting road safety audits, it is fair to say that audits need only to prevent a very low number of crashes, injuries and fatalities over the life of the project to provide a high benefit to cost ratio.

Who is Now Using or Planning to Use Road Safety Audits?

The RSA concept was originally developed and introduced in the United Kingdom (UK) in 1989. The benefits of such systematic checking were soon recognized by many safety professionals around the world and the following countries, among many others, are actively conducting RSAs: USA, Canada, UK, Australia, New Zealand, Denmark, Norway, Ireland, Singapore, India, Italy and Malaysia.

Road Safety Audits in the United States and Canada

There are many successful on-going RSA programs in the United States and Canada. The states of Pennsylvania, Iowa, New York, Minnesota and South Carolina are actively conducting RSAs. The first RSA for a mega-project was conducted in 2003 at the Marquette Interchange in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. In Canada, the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta and New Brunswick have been actively implementing RSAs. In 2001, a National Road Safety Audit Guide was published by the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC). RSA training is available in both countries, through the National Highway Institute (NHI) in the United States and through TAC in Canada.

Road Safety Audit Training

National Highway Institute (NHI)

Course 380069A
Road Safety Audit and Road Safety Audit Reviews
<http://www.nhi.fhwa.dot.gov>
703-235-0528

Transportation Association of Canada (TAC)

<http://www.tac-atc.ca/english/educationandtraining/courses-safetyaudit.cfm>
613-736-1350 ext. 261

Key References

1. Transportation Association of Canada. *Canadian Guide to Road Safety Audits*. Ottawa: TAC, 2001.
2. Institution of Highways and Transportation. *Guidelines for the Safety Audit of Highways*. London: IHT, London, 1996.
3. Ministry of Transport. *Manual of Safety Audit, Road Directorate*. Copenhagen, Denmark: 1997.
4. Transfund New Zealand. *Safety Audit Procedures for Existing Roads*. Wellington: TNZ, 1998.
5. Asian Development Bank. *Road Safety Audit for Road Projects – An Operational Toolkit*. Manila: ADB, 2003.
6. Public Works Department. *Guidelines for the Safety Audit of Roads and Road Projects in Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: PWD, 1997.
7. Transportation Research Board. *Roadway Safety Tools for Local Agencies*, NCHRP Synthesis Report 321. Washington, DC: TRB, 2003.
8. A. Schelling. *Road Safety Audit—The Danish Experience*. (Presentation at IRSAF in London) Road Directorate, Copenhagen: 2003.
9. P. Jordan. *The Costs and Benefits of Road Safety Audit*. (Presentation at II London), Melbourne: Vic Roads, 2003.
10. I. Appleton. *The Safety Audit of Roads*. (Presentation at PIARC CI in Lisbon), Wellington: TNZ, 2003.
11. E. Wilson. *Auditing of Existing Experiences from the US*. IRSAF. Wyoming: 2003.



U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration



Institute of Transportation Engineers