



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004
PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155
<http://mesillavalleympo.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

The following is the agenda for the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Technical Advisory Committee meeting to be held on **October 5, 2017 at 4:00 p.m.** in the **Las Cruces City Hall, 700 N. Main**, Las Cruces, New Mexico. Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](http://mesillavalleympo.org).

The Mesilla Valley MPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, color, ancestry, serious medical condition, national origin, age, or disability in the provision of services. The Mesilla Valley MPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the Mesilla Valley MPO at least 48 hours before the meeting by calling 528-3043 (voice) or 1-800-659-8331 (TTY) if accommodation is necessary. This document can be made available in alternative formats by calling the same numbers list above. *Este documento está disponible en español llamando al teléfono de la Organización de Planificación Metropolitana de Mesilla Valley: 528-3043 (Voz) o 1-800-659-8331 (TTY).*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** _____ **Chair**
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** _____ **Chair**
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** _____ **Chair**
 - 3.1. August 3, 2017 _____
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
5. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** _____
 - 5.1. New Mexico Department of Transportation Safety Targets Presentation
_____ **MPO Staff**
 - 5.2. Reducing Speeding-Related Crashes Involving Passenger Vehicles _____ **MPO Staff**
6. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** _____
 - 6.1. City of Las Cruces, Doña Ana County, Town of Mesilla, Las Cruces Public Schools,
RoadRUNNER Transit, and SCRTD Project Updates _____ **Jurisdictional Staff**
 - 6.2. NMDOT Projects Update _____ **NMDOT Staff**
 - 6.3. MPO Staff Update _____ **MPO Staff**
7. **PUBLIC COMMENT** _____ **Chair**
8. **ADJOURNMENT** _____ **Chair**

1 **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**
2 **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
3

4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee of the
5 Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) which was held August 3,
6 2017 at 4:00 p.m. in the City of Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main, Las
7 Cruces, New Mexico.
8

9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Richard Hanway proxy Mike Bartholomew (CLC Transit)
10 Bill Childress (BLM) (arrived 4:03)
11 Todd Gregory (LCPS) (arrived 4:03)
12 John Gwynne (DAC Flood Commission) (arrived 4:03)
13 Soo Gyu Lee (CLC) (arrived 4:13)
14 Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
15 Harold Love (NMDOT)
16 Jose Gonzalez proxy Debbi Lujan (Town of Mesilla)
17 Rene Molina (DAC Eng.)
18 Luis Marmolejo (DAC Planning)
19 Lily Sensiba (EBID)
20 Larry Shannon (Town of Mesilla)
21 Tony Trevino (CLC Public Works)
22

23 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** David Armijo (SCRTD)
24 Dale Harrell (NMSU)
25

26 **STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO Staff)
27 Andrew Wray (MPO Staff)
28 Michael McAdams (MPO Staff)
29 Dominic Loya (MPO)
30

31 **OTHERS PRESENT:** George Pearson
32 Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary
33

34 **1. CALL TO ORDER (4:00 PM)**
35

36 Marmolejo: Good afternoon everybody. Welcome to the August 3, 2017 Mesilla
37 Valley MPO TAC meeting. I'd like to call this to order. Just real quick,
38 please don't forget about your cell phones, put them on vibrate, turn them
39 off because you're in a meeting. I'll go ahead and call this to order. If you
40 will just give our names present.
41

42 Wray: The Chair may call for a role to establish quorum if you wish.
43

44 Marmolejo: We can start on the far right hand side please.
45

46 Sensiba: Lily Sensiba, EBID.

1
2 Love: Harold Love, New Mexico DOT.

3
4 Herrera: Jolene Herrera, NMDOT.

5
6 Trevino: Tony Trevino, City of Las Cruces.

7
8 Gonzalez: Jose Gonzalez, in place of Debbie for Town of Mesilla, Public Works.

9
10 Shannon: Larry Shannon, Town of Mesilla.

11
12 Molina: Rene Molina, Dona Ana County Engineering.

13
14 Hanway: Richard Hanway, RoadRUNNER Transit, sitting in for Mike Bartholomew.

15
16 Marmolejo: And Luis Marmolejo with Dona Ana County Planning. Good afternoon
17 everybody.

18
19 **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

20
21 Marmolejo: Okay so item two, approval of the agenda. Any changes to the agenda?

22
23 Wray: No Mr. Chair.

24
25 Marmolejo: Thank you.

26
27 Wray: Mr. Chair we need an action on approval of the agenda.

28
29 Marmolejo: I'm sorry. Do I have a motion to approve the agenda?

30
31 Shannon: I make a motion to approve the agenda.

32
33 Love: Second.

34
35 Marmolejo: Thank you.

36
37 Wray: We need a vote Mr. Chair.

38
39 Marmolejo: Everybody in favor say "aye."

40
41 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

42
43 Marmolejo: And we have another member present.

44
45 Gregory: Yes, Todd Gregory, School District.

1 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2
3 **3.1 May 4, 2017**

4
5 Marmolejo: Move on to item number three. Approval of minutes of the May 4, 2017
6 meeting. Any changes to those minutes? Hearing none, approval of the
7 May 4th minutes.

8
9 Trevino: I motion to approve the minutes.

10
11 Shannon: Second.

12
13 Marmolejo: All approve say "aye" please.

14
15 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

16
17 **3.2 June 1, 2017**

18
19 Marmolejo: And then item 3.2, approval of the minutes for June 1, 2017. Do I hear a
20 motion to approve or are there changes to them?

21
22 Wray: There are no changes Mr. Chair.

23
24 Marmolejo: Thank you sir.

25
26 Wray: We need a vote on the June minutes.

27
28 Marmolejo: On approval of the June 1, 2017.

29
30 Love: Move to approve.

31
32 Marmolejo: Do I hear a second?

33
34 Molina: Second.

35
36 Marmolejo: All in favor say "aye."

37
38 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

39
40 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

41
42 Marmolejo: Okay, item number four. Any public comment? Yes sir, please step up.

43
44 Pearson: My name's George Pearson. I'm the Chair of the BPAC, but I'm not here
45 for that today. Transit's here today and they don't come to our meetings
46 so I had some comments. After moving to Las Cruces when the bus

1 service first started I actually used the bus a couple of times the past
2 month or so, I found it clean, efficient, and served my destination well. But
3 I did learn a couple of things; on the bus that ... I went with my bicycle and
4 on the bus that I choose there were two bicycles on it and two bike rack,
5 but just before we were leaving, a third bicyclist wanted to get on the bus,
6 so he was denied. So we need to see about upgrading all these buses so
7 we can at least have the three bus racks available.

8 The other thing I found out, my destination was Sage Cafe and
9 when I got up to Sage Cafe, it's a City facility, I expected to find bike
10 parking; lo and behold, no bike parking. So probably upset the utilities
11 people if they found out where I actually locked my bike, but I don't how
12 we can manage to build Sage Cafe without having appropriate bicycle
13 parking for the community there. Those are my comments. Thank you.

14
15 Marmolejo: Yes sir. Sir your name was George Harrison.

16
17 Pearson: Pearson.

18
19 Marmolejo: Pearson. Thank you sir. Just real quick let the record so show I believe
20 we have two more members walked in.

21
22 Childress: Bill Childress with the Bureau of Land Management.

23
24 Marmolejo: And Mr. John Gwynne from the Flood Commission. Any other public
25 comment? Seeing none. We will move on.

26 27 **5. ACTION ITEMS**

28 29 **5.1 Amendments to the FFY 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Plan** 30 **(TIP)**

31
32 Marmolejo: Item number five, action item, 5.1 amendments to the Fiscal Year 2018-
33 2013 Transportation Improvement Program. Staff please.

34
35 ANDREW WRAY GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.

36
37 Herrera: Mr. Chair.

38
39 Marmolejo: Yes ma'am.

40
41 Herrera: Just one minor comment. Andrew sorry, I didn't catch it earlier. That
42 control number for the Soledad Canyon project should actually have one
43 more zero, so G100040.

44
45 Wray: Thank you for catching that. I will get that corrected.

1 Trevino: Motion to approve.
2
3 Marmolejo: So we need a motion for that staff.
4
5 Wray: Yes.
6
7 Marmolejo: Do I hear a motion for item 5.1 amendment to the Fiscal Year 2018-2023,
8 you said it wasn't a TIP.
9
10 Wray: It is the TIP, just not the current TIP.
11
12 Marmolejo: Okay.
13
14 Wray: It's the impending TIP.
15
16 Marmolejo: For the impending TIP.
17
18 Trevino: Motion to approve.
19
20 Molina: Second.
21
22 Marmolejo: All in favor say "aye."
23
24 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
25
26 Marmolejo: Motion passes.
27
28 **5.2 NACTO Draft Resolution for Policy Committee Approval**
29
30 Marmolejo: And then under action item as well, 5.2 NACTO draft resolution for Policy
31 Committee approval. Staff please.
32
33 MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.
34
35 Marmolejo: I wasn't here the last meeting, if you could just real briefly give a real quick
36 brief on that, I'd appreciate that.
37
38 MICHAEL MCADAMS GAVE HIS PRESENTATION.
39
40 Marmolejo: Okay. Thank you.
41
42 McAdams: Okay. Thank you.
43
44 Trevino: I've got a question. I just want to verify that by adopting these you're just
45 adopting guidelines, we're not putting any more restrictions on any new
46 development, we're just, I plan to follow that. MPO can utilize to do future

1 planning, but we're not going to create any more restrictions or any more
2 *(inaudible)* ...
3
4 McAdams: Correct.
5
6 Trevino: On any development or any new construction.
7
8 McAdams: No just say these are, gives you additional guidance on deciding bike
9 facilities and pedestrian facilities, but it doesn't restrict. In fact the other
10 thing is, is related to *(inaudible)* judgement. So it's really just another tool
11 to design bike facilities, pedestrian facilities according to a higher
12 standard, but it doesn't restrict, not *(inaudible)* as well.
13
14 Trevino: All right. So if a developer or somebody were to come here and does not
15 want to do any of this, we can just, pretty much putting suggestions onto
16 them of how to provide these bike facilities, we can't really enforce these,
17 have any teeth to these, they're just guidelines right.
18
19 McAdams: Yeah, that's correct. We would hope the City would like to have better
20 bike standards, but this gives you, say we have adopted them and gives
21 you the freedom to say we like you to develop your bike facilities
22 according to NACTO standards, that you can do. So it gives you another
23 tool. It doesn't restrict you in any way.
24
25 Trevino: So the next step from here would be to adopt some design standards in
26 regards to these NACTO as part of the community development and so
27 forth.
28
29 McAdams: I think you could do that, but this is just saying "we recommend that you
30 use, the MPO saying we're recommending you use these guidelines for
31 the City of Las Cruces, the Town of Mesilla, and the County of Dona Ana.
32 But again they have to sign separate resolutions saying we, just like the
33 complete streets, we're recommending, the MPO Policy Committee would
34 recommend to the different jurisdictions that they adopt the guidelines, as
35 guidelines. So it's two steps and one is the MPO Policy Committee
36 recommendation and would hope that the jurisdiction would follow suit.
37
38 Trevino: Okay. Thank you.
39
40 Marmolejo: Any further questions? Did you want a vote on this?
41
42 McAdams: Yes we would like a vote for recommendation of the resolution.
43
44 Marmolejo: The resolution.
45
46 McAdams: That's correct.

1
2 Marmolejo: Okay, do I hear a motion for a vote on the resolution for a NACTO Draft
3 Resolution Policy Committee approval guidelines.

4
5 Love: So moved.

6
7 Shannon: Second.

8
9 Marmolejo: All in favor.

10
11 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

12
13 McAdams: Thank you.

14
15 **6. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**

16
17 **6.1 City of Las Cruces, Dona Ana County, Town of Mesilla, Las Cruces**
18 **Public Schools, RoadRUNNER Transit, SCRTD Project Updates**

19
20 Marmolejo: Item number six, committee and staff comments. City of Las Cruces.

21
22 Trevino: We've got three projects going on right now; which is the Harrelson
23 reconstruction, that should be getting 90% design submittals here within
24 the next week or so. The Amador/Melendres traffic signal is under
25 construction and that should be done here in November, fingers crossed
26 and it stops raining. And the Solano ADA bids have been opened and
27 contracts are currently getting executed. So that's the status. That's it.

28
29 Marmolejo: Dona Ana County.

30
31 Molina: So we've got the Soledad Canyon Road project that's in design and we
32 had a 30% plan meeting two months ago and we should be at 60%
33 towards October and we'll have another public meeting. I'll get that
34 information out to you all if you want it. That way you're aware of it.
35 That's what we have. Thank you very much.

36
37 Marmolejo: And on the community development side of things we're still moving
38 forward with the UDC after its adoption. We have gone through and have
39 been making, are going before our Board plans commission for some
40 amendments to the ordinance if you will. Some having to do with road
41 standards within the former ETZ in the form of where used to be you'd
42 have to do replats, minor, major, replats now in this case, a lot of those
43 are coming through as claim of exemptions, they're exempt from
44 subdivision standards regarding road improvement standards and we're
45 weighing in on bringing in some more standards to design because there

1 would be, we are seeing an increase in below improvement standards to
2 some private roadways out there. Flood.
3
4 Gwynne: Currently we have a master drainage plan that we're trying to work on for
5 the area just outside the City limits, up off the East Mesa by (*inaudible*)
6 Drive. That's the RFP hasn't been out yet but it's up at the State
7 Engineer's office for their review. That's really about the only thing we
8 have going right now.
9
10 Marmolejo: Las Cruces Public Schools.
11
12 Gregory: Yes, we're just gearing up for the new school year. So we're just
13 scheduling meetings with the new principals to begin the program and
14 plan for International Walk to School Day and actually plan the dates for
15 our curriculum and just really meeting and planning right now. Thanks.
16
17 Marmolejo: I have a comment for Las Cruces Public Schools. I know that we do have
18 one fairly large subdivision that is going to be serviced actually by Las
19 Cruces Public Schools. Are you the point of contact for agency review
20 when it comes to that development? It's going to be a fairly large
21 development, you know over two-three year period and for comments
22 from you all, would you be the point of contact for review of the
23 subdivision?
24
25 Gregory: Yes, I can be and then I can get it to our transportation and our
26 construction coordinator too, so yes I can act as that contact.
27
28 Marmolejo: And CDs would be fine, or would you like the whole hard copies of?
29
30 Gregory: No you can just, like a digital copy.
31
32 Marmolejo: Yes sir.
33
34 Gregory: Yeah, that's fine.
35
36 Marmolejo: Okay. Thank you. And then RoadRUNNER Transit.
37
38 Hanway: We are having a free fare week August 21st through the 26th. Welcoming
39 back students. It's going to be free fare for the entire system. We're also
40 making a slight modification, the DACC area off of Sonoma Ranch right
41 now we are currently traversing onto Del Prado as a turnaround. We will
42 be extending that to Eastern Canyon starting August 16th, when school
43 starts.
44
45 Marmolejo: And then BLM.
46

1 Childress: No real updates for BLM. We're still working on the tri-county resource
2 management plan, the supplemental EIS, and we're still moving forward
3 with doing some preplanning for the Organ Mountain Desert Peaks which
4 will include transportation planning. That's it.

5
6 Marmolejo: And also for the record. This gentleman just walked in a minute ago, I'm
7 not sure, you want to go ahead and introduce yourself real quick.

8
9 Lee: Soo Gyu Lee, City of Las Cruces, City Traffic Engineer.

10 11 **6.2 NMDOT Projects Update**

12
13 Marmolejo: And then DOT projects, you have anything to add to 6.2?

14
15 Herrera: Thank you Mr. Chair. We do have a few projects in the area right now.
16 The big one is the intersection of Spitz/Solano/Three Crosses, and US-70,
17 that project is moving along. They did some concrete work late last night,
18 or early this morning I guess and traffic control should be shifting around
19 probably in the next few weeks, so just be careful as you go through there,
20 but everything is on schedule despite the weather that we've had the past
21 couple of weeks. So we're still looking at completion on that one probably
22 March or April of next year.

23 The other one we have going on right now is on US-70 over San
24 Augustin Pass, that project is also moving along pretty quickly. We got a
25 really good contractor on there and they should be finished up with
26 everything by the end of October and that's kind of giving a lot of leeway,
27 so they should be done before that, but end of October is the latest that it
28 should be done. And again that project is for shoulder widening over the
29 pass.

30 We also have the traffic signal at 17th Street and Picacho. That
31 project has unfortunately been held up by weather the past couple of
32 weeks and we were hoping to have it completed by the time school started
33 but it looks like it's going to be just a couple weeks late; we're hoping for
34 the end of August to have that project completed.

35 And then the Valley Drive project, the design was completed. It
36 should let in October. And we're looking at probably construction early
37 next year on that one. And that's all we have. If there are any questions
38 I'd be happy to answer them.

39
40 Marmolejo: Did I miss the Town of Mesilla? Okay, sorry.

41
42 Shannon: I have no comments or updates.

43
44 Marmolejo: Thank you.

45 46 **6.3 MPO Staff Projects Update**

1
2 Marmolejo: Staff do you all have any comments, 6.3?

3
4 McAdams: August the 8th we'll have a special BPAC meeting, work session, to
5 discuss the prioritization of the first tier trails of the trails plan, that include
6 EBID trails, really focusing on the City of Las Cruces because they have
7 MOU with EBID and also to look at other secondary facility we may
8 consider too. But the primary focus is to pick a list that is most appropriate
9 for going ahead as priority. That's to be a work session. The official
10 recommendation will come at the BPAC meeting later this month. And it'll
11 be 5:30 on August the 8th upstairs in 2007 B and C, the regular
12 conference rooms upstairs. If you have any questions please let me
13 know, but this is open to the public so if you know anybody that you think
14 should be involved or if you'd like to come, we please recommend you
15 coming and giving a comment. Thank you.

16
17 Marmolejo: So EBID and City of Las Cruces they have a MOU agreement on trails on
18 their facilities.

19
20 McAdams: That's correct. Well it means that they are open, they can negotiate about
21 the use of the trails. Maybe EBID can shed further light on that MOU.

22
23 Sensiba: You explained it pretty well. It's just an open agreement where we can
24 have discussions about how the banks are used and what kind of trails are
25 on them. And all of it will vary depending on which of our facilities they
26 want to use, because some of them will be very accessible and some of
27 them depending on how much we use them, might not be.

28
29 Marmolejo: Okay.

30
31 McAdams: We would encourage the Town of Mesilla and the Dona Ana County to
32 adopt MOUs with the EBID but until, it limits their ability to develop those.
33 In fact they can't right, they cannot develop those facilities without the
34 MOU. So we're focusing first on the City of Las Cruces.

35
36 Marmolejo: Yeah I know the City and EBID have had it for some time.

37
38 McAdams: That's correct.

39
40 Marmolejo: Under discussions, they've been discussing it for a long time. Anything
41 else from staff?

42
43 McAdams: That's it. Thank you sir.

44
45 Marmolejo: Okay.
46

1 **7. PUBLIC COMMENT**

2
3 Marmolejo: So one more time for public comment under item number seven. Hearing
4 none.

5
6 **8. ADJOURNMENT (4:27 PM)**

7
8 Marmolejo: And then item number eight. Anybody want to move for adjournment?

9
10 Gwynne: So moved.

11
12 Herrera: Second.

13
14 Marmolejo: All in favor.

15
16 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

17
18 Marmolejo: Thank you everybody.

19
20
21
22
23 _____
24 Chairperson
25
26



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004
PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155
<http://mesillavalleympo.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 5, 2017

AGENDA ITEM:

5.1 NMDOT Safety Targets Presentation

DISCUSSION:

23 CFR 490, Final Rule on the Highway Safety Improvement Program, published March 15, 2016 and effective April 14, 2017 requires each state to set annual targets for five performance measures:

1. Number of Fatalities
2. Rate of Fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles travelled (VMT)
3. Number of Serious Injuries
4. Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT
5. Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries

To comply with this rule, the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) undertook a coordination process with stakeholders from around the state to develop the New Mexico safety targets.

MPO Staff will present on the New Mexico safety targets.



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004
PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155
<http://mesillavalleympo.org>

MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF October 5, 2017

AGENDA ITEM:

5.2 Reducing Speeding-Related Crashes

SUPPORT INFORMATION:

Executive Summary of the National Transportation Safety Board Report

DISCUSSION: On July 15, 2017, the National Transportation Safety Board released a Safety Study entitled: **Reducing Speeding-Related Crashes Involving Passenger Vehicles**. MPO Staff will present findings from that study and show how local crash statistics compare with the national statistics. MPO Staff will then lead a discussion with the Policy Committee on using this information to assist the MPO in supporting the NMDOT Safety Targets presented in Item 6.1.

Safety Study

Reducing Speeding-Related Crashes Involving Passenger Vehicles



**National
Transportation
Safety Board**

490 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20594

Executive Summary

Speeding—exceeding a speed limit or driving too fast for conditions—is one of the most common factors in motor vehicle crashes in the United States. In this safety study, the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) examines causes of and trends in speeding-related passenger vehicle crashes and countermeasures to prevent these crashes.

Why the NTSB Did This Study

From 2005 through 2014, crashes in which a law enforcement officer indicated a vehicle's speed was a factor resulted in 112,580 fatalities, representing 31% of all traffic fatalities. Speeding or speed has been cited as a safety issue, or a causal or contributing factor in 49 major NTSB highway accident investigations since 1967. Although recent speeding-related NTSB investigations have primarily involved large trucks and buses, most speeding-related crashes involve speeding passenger vehicles. In 2014, passenger vehicles constituted 77% of speeding vehicles involved in fatal crashes, and 78% of all speeding-related fatalities involved a speeding passenger vehicle. This study leverages prior NTSB investigations, together with other research, to address the national safety issue of speeding among passenger vehicle drivers.

In this study, the NTSB used a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to summarize the risks of speeding, describe the scope of the problem, and promote the use of proven and emerging speeding countermeasures. This included a literature survey; analyses of speeding-related crash data; and interviews with national, state, and local traffic safety stakeholders. The stakeholders were representatives from transportation and highway safety agencies, law enforcement agencies, automobile manufacturers, research institutions, advocacy groups, equipment vendors, personal auto insurance providers, and professional associations.

This study assessed speeding among passenger vehicle drivers in a broad sense, as a factor that contributes to crashes and injury severity. Several, of many, potential solutions to the issue of speeding-related crashes are discussed. The solutions do not address every cause of speeding or type of speeding-related crash, but they are intended to be widely applicable to a significant portion of these crashes.

What the NTSB Found

Speed—and therefore speeding—increases crash risk in two ways: (1) it increases the likelihood of being involved in a crash, and (2) it increases the severity of injuries sustained by all road users in a crash.

The relationship between speed and crash involvement is complex, and it is affected by factors such as road type, driver age, alcohol impairment, and roadway characteristics like curvature, grade, width, and adjacent land use. In contrast, the relationship between speed and injury severity is consistent and direct. Higher vehicle speeds lead to larger changes in velocity in a crash, and these velocity changes are closely linked to injury severity. This relationship is especially critical for pedestrians involved in a motor vehicle crash, due to their lack of protection.

Typically, speed limits are set by statute, but adjustments to statutory speed limits are generally based on the observed operating speeds for each road segment—specifically, the 85th percentile speed of free-flowing traffic. Raising speed limits to match the 85th percentile speed can result in unintended consequences. It may lead to higher operating speeds, and thus a higher 85th percentile speed. In general, there is not strong evidence that the 85th percentile speed within a given traffic flow equates to the speed with the lowest crash involvement rate for all road types. Alternative approaches and expert systems for setting speed limits are available, which incorporate factors such as crash history and the presence of vulnerable road users such as pedestrians.

Speed limits must be enforced to be effective, and data-driven, high-visibility enforcement is an efficient way to use law enforcement resources. The success of data-driven speed enforcement programs depends on the ability to measure and communicate their effectiveness. However, law enforcement reporting of speeding-related crashes is inconsistent, which leads to underreporting of speeding-related crashes. This underreporting leads stakeholders and the public to underestimate the overall scope of speeding as a traffic safety issue nationally and hinders the effective implementation of data-driven speed enforcement programs locally.

Automated speed enforcement (ASE) is also widely acknowledged as an effective countermeasure to reduce speeding-related crashes, fatalities, and injuries. However, only 14 states and the District of Columbia use it. Many states have laws that prohibit or place operational restrictions on ASE, and federal guidelines for ASE are outdated and not well known among ASE program administrators. Point-to-point enforcement, which is based on the average speed of a vehicle between two points, can be used on roadway segments many miles long. This type of ASE has had recent success in other countries, but it is not currently used in the United States.

Vehicle technologies can also be effective at reducing speeding. Intelligent speed adaptation (ISA) uses an onboard global positioning system or road sign-detecting camera to determine the speed limit; it then warns drivers when they exceed the speed limit, or prevents drivers from exceeding the speed limit by electronically limiting the speed of the vehicle. Although passenger vehicle manufacturers are increasingly equipping their vehicles with technologies relevant to speeding, these technologies often are not standard features and require the purchase of certain option packages. New car safety rating systems are one effective way to incentivize the manufacture and purchase of passenger vehicles with advanced safety systems such as ISA.

Finally, the current level of emphasis on speeding as a national traffic safety issue is lower than warranted. Current federal-aid programs do not ensure that states fund speed management activities at a level commensurate with the national impact of speeding on fatalities and injuries. Also, unlike other traffic safety issues with a similar impact (such as alcohol-impaired driving) there are no nationwide programs to increase public awareness of the risks of speeding. Although the US Department of Transportation (DOT) has established a multi-agency team to coordinate speeding-related work throughout the DOT, this team's work plan does not include means to ensure that the planned actions are completed in a timely manner.

Recommendations

As a result of this safety study, the NTSB makes recommendations to the US Department of Transportation, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, 50 states, the Governors Highway Safety Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the National Sheriffs' Association.