

# Calculating Crash Risk

*Driving Transportation with Technology*



# Importance of Crash Risk Calculation

- Extensive research identifying driver behaviors that impact driving performance (safety surrogate measures)
  - Secondary task engagement increases lane deviations, missed red lights, late braking behavior, etc.
- Does a decrease in driving performance = increased crash risk?

# Crash Risk Literature Review

- Reidelmeier & Tibshirani (1997)
  - Driving with cell phone increased risk by 4 times
- Violanti (1998)
  - Driving with a cell phone increases crash risk by 2 times.
- McEvoy, Stevenson, McCartt, Woodward, Haworth, Palamara, & Cercarelli (2005)
  - Driving with a cell phone increases crash risk by 4 times that of an alert driver.

# Epidemiological Analyses vs. Empirical Analyses

- Epidemiological Research
  - Analyses include thousands of actual crashes and/or police-reported/injury crashes
  - Data is limited in that PARs are not accurate
    - Victims may not be able to report or willing to report their actions
  - Timing is difficult to assess
- Empirical Research
  - Precise data collection on safety surrogates (i.e. lane deviations, speed deviations, etc.)
  - Little to no data on actual crashes
- Naturalistic Research
  - Analyses include hundreds of crashes and near-crashes
  - Driver behavior is captured in the seconds leading up to crash/near-crash

# Crash Risk...defined

- The ratio of the odds is a commonly employed measure of association between the presence of cases (crash and near-crash events) and the controls (baseline driving epochs).
- Odds ratios are used as an approximation of relative crash risk in case control designs.
  - This approximation is valid for evaluations of rare events.
    - (Greenberg, Daniels, Flanders, Eley, & Boring, 2001).

# Odds Ratio Calculation

- Odds =  $P(\text{Event will occur})/P(\text{Event will not occur})$
- $P(\text{crash with inattention occurs})/P(\text{crash occurs without inattention})$

- $OR = AD/BC$

	Event	Baseline
Inattention	A	B
No Inattention	C	D

# Identification of Events Using 100 Car Data

- Trained data reductionists recorded driver behaviors under the following circumstances:
  - Driver engaged in behavior within 5 seconds of onset of conflict or through the conflict
- Included both crashes and near-crashes
  - To increase power
  - Kinematic analysis indicated similarities between these two events and differences from incidents.

# Crash/Near-Crash Risks Due to Secondary Task Engagement

- Complex secondary tasks increased risk by 3.1 (CI:1.7, 5.5) times that of an alert driver.
- Moderate secondary tasks increased risk by 2.1 (CI: 1.6, 2.7) that of an alert driver.
- Simple secondary task did not increase risk. OR = 1.2 (CI: 0.9, 1.6)



# Crash/Near-Crash Risk for Total Time Eyes-Off Forward Roadway

- Eye glances less than 2s did not significantly increase risk
- Eye glances  $\geq 2.0$ s increased risk by 2.3 times (CI: 1.8, 2.9) that of an alert driver

# Risky Driving Behavior Analysis

- How do various risky driving behaviors, in isolation and combination, impact crash/near crash risk?
  - Calculated adjusted odds ratios (logistic regression) for risky driving behaviors since many are highly correlated with each other.
  - First comparison of adjusted ORs and crude ORs.

# Comparison of Crude and Adjusted Odds Ratios

<b>Driver State or Driving Behavior</b>	<b>Crude Odds Ratio</b>	<b>Adjusted Odds Ratio</b>
Drowsiness	3.17	2.90
Inappropriate Speed	3.52	2.90
Total Time EOR > 2 s	1.97	1.90
Close Proximity to Other Vehicle	0.56	0.40

# GEE Logistic Regression Odds Ratio Estimation Results for Roadway Infrastructure

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Odds Ratio</b>	<b>Lower CI</b>	<b>Upper CI</b>
<b>Weather: Cloudy versus clear</b>	3.75	2.74	5.13
<b>Alignment: Curve, level versus straight, level</b>	1.46	1.17	1.83
<b>Density: Forced/unstable versus free flow</b>	3.28	2.08	5.2
<b>Density: Unstable temporary flow versus free flow</b>	6.82	4.86	9.57
<b>Density: Stable flow versus free flow</b>	4.01	3.21	5.02

# Case-Crossover

Exposure information collected



Sample exposure immediate before crashes

Sample exposure for time interval some period before crash

■ Control exposure    ▲ Case Exposure    ★ Crash

# Control Factors

- Driver ID
- GPS location ( $\pm$  100 meters)
- Time of Day ( $\pm$  2 hours)
- Day of week (weekday vs. weekend)
- Relation to junction

# Future Analyses: Case-Crossover Baseline

- Compare the crash/near-crash risk calculations from the case-control analysis to the case-crossover analysis.
  - Assess the differences and compare to previous literature
  - More power in the case-crossover and anticipate tighter confidence intervals which may make some of the previously calculated OR significantly different from 1.0.

# Conclusions

- Naturalistic driving data are ideal for calculating crash/near-crash risks for driver behavior.
- While data are ideal, selecting baseline sample and type of baseline sample are complex issues.
  - Operationally defining event/baseline is tricky.
  - Larger scale studies may not have these issues.
- Different approaches have their pros/cons.
  - The research questions regarding risk need to drive decisions.



# Questions...