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## 1. Grand Plan (Activities of ITARDA and other groups)



## 2. Topics of the Presentation

O Patternization of Traffic Accidents
O Accident Pattern Sheets
O Trial Estimation of Traffic Fatality Reduction by Automated Driving Systems

Topics for Discussion

## 3. Accident Data Items for Patternization

| Primary Party | Road Category | Collision Type Roa | Road Type | Maneuver of Primary Party | Direction of Secondary Party |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vehicle motorcycle bicycle pedestrian <br> Secondary <br> Party <br> vehicle motorcycle bicycle pedestrian | Public road (non-expressway /non-motorway) | Pedestrian-Vehicle <br> *facing vehicle <br> *back to vehicle <br> *crossing the road - . . . . • <br> Vehicle-Vehicle <br> *head-on collision <br> *rear-end collision <br> *angle collision <br> *col. while turning left <br> *col. while turning right <br> -••••• <br> Single Vehicle <br> *col. with structures <br> *col. with parked vehicl <br> *running off the road | signalized intersection non-signalized intersection vicinity of intersection non-intersection <br> * tunnel/bridge <br> * curve or bend <br> * other other (not road) | starting up/ going forward changing lane turning left turning right U-turning going backward crossing other | <vehicle> coming from *opposite *left *right going the same direction standing/parking <pedestrian> facing/back *left side *right side crossing from *left *right other |
|  | Expressway /motorway | Pedestrian-Vehicle <br> Vehicle-Vehicle <br> *rear-end collision <br> *other collision <br> *other <br> Single Vehicle <br> *col. with structures <br> *col. with parked vehic <br> *running off the road <br> . . . . . . | Total : 3 <br> To select with m <br> cle | $500$ <br> patter re tha | tterns <br> S <br> 3 fatalities |

## 4. Patternization of Accident Types

ITARDA Macro Data
Accident Data 2013
Fatalities: 4373

## Serious Injuries: 44547 <br> Slight Injuries: 736947

Matters considered for Patternization

1. Useful for the impact assessment of safety devices
2. Suitable size of database
3. Easy to understand the context of the concerned accident


## 5. Summary of Accident Patterns

## 255 patterns are selected from 31500 patterns, and 3500

 fatalities ( $80 \%$ of 4373 fatalities) are involved in these patterns.

## 6. Example of Accidental Pattern Sheet

Vehicle vs. vehicle at a signalized intersection

| Pattern No |
| :--- |
| Road |
| Road design |

CTC-01

|  | Near intersection, <br> Uninterrupted road section, |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type <br> of primary party | Vehicle, Motorcycle, Bicycle <br> Pedestrian, |
| Type <br> of secondary party | Vehicle, Motorcycle, Bicycle <br> Pedestrian, |
| Movement <br> of primary party | Starting up/Go straight, <br> Turning left, <br> Turning Right, |

Traveling direction Opposite, Left, Right, Same, of secondary party Others,
Collision type
Head-on collision, Rear-end collision, Crossing collision, collision while turning right, collision while turning right,

|  | Fatal | Serious injury | Sight injury |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accident | 18 | 274 | 4,665 |
| Casualty | 19 | 316 | 7,081 |
|  | All Japan |  |  |
|  | Fatal | Serious injury | Sight injury |
| Accident | 4,278 | 42,361 | 582,382 |
| Casualty | 4,373 | 44,547 | 736,947 |

## 7. Example of Detail Accident Analysis Sheet

## Table: Detail Accident Analysis Sheet for Vehicle to Vehicle Collision



| Age (P | (Primary party) | (Secondary party) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| of driver | \% | \% |
| 6 yrs. or younger |  |  |
| 7-15 yrs. |  |  |
| $16-24$ yrs. |  |  |
| 25-49 yrs. |  |  |
| 50-54 yrs. |  | ariver |
| 55-64 yrs. |  |  |
| 65-74 yrs. |  |  |
| 75 yrs. and over |  |  |

Human error (Primary party)


The number of fatalities are very small for most of the patterns.

Therefore , it is practical to analyze injury accidents or casualties.

## 8. Impact Assessment for Rear-end Collision

## Reduction of fatalities is expected by the spread of the rearend collision damage reduction equipment on public road.

| Vehicle-vehicle(Public road) |  |  | Primary party | Starting up or go Straight |  |  |  |  | . $\cdot$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Secondary party | Same | Opposite | Right | Left | stopping | $\cdots$ |
| Primary party | Secondary party | Road types | Type of collision |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Vehicle | Near intersection | Rear-end collision | 11 |  |  |  | 22 |  |
| Vehicle | Vehicle | Tunnel/Bridge | Rear-end collision | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Vehicle | Straight line | Rear-end collision | 13 |  |  |  | 17 |  |
| Vehicle | Motorcycle | Straight line | Rear-end collision | 4 |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| Vehicle | Vehicle | intersection | Rear-end collision | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Bicycle | Near intersection | Rear-end collision | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Bicycle | Tunnel/Bridge | Rear-end collision | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Bicycle | Curve | Rear-end collision | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Bicycle | Straight line | Rear-end collision | 44 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Motorcycle | Vehicle | Straight line | Rear-end collision |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |

Applicable patterns: 13, Applicable total fatalities: 148
But the reduction of 148 fatalities by the system is not practical.

It is required to study the context of accident and the performance of the concerned device for the impact assessment.

## 9. Reference for Estimation of reduction of rear-end col.

## 79\% of drivers who caused rear-end collisions noticed the collided vehicle under the condition where they had enough space to stop safely.

Warning System might reduce 117 fatalities in rear-end collisions.
$148 \times 0.79=117$


Relation between the speed of the colliding vehicle and the distance of the collided vehicle and the colliding vehicle at the moment when the driver of the colliding vehicle noticed the collided vehicle ( $\mathrm{N}=33$ )

## 10. Impact Assessment for Pedestrian Accident

Reduction of Pedestrian fatalities is also expected by the safety device using autonomous pedestrian detection system(camera or radar).

| Pedestrian-vehicle accident |  |  | Primary party | Starting up or go Straight |  |  |  |  | Turning left |  | Turning right |  |  | Reversing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Secondary party | Neer Side | Foreside | Right | Left | Other | Right | Left | Right | Left | Other | Left | Other |
| Primary party | Secondary party | Road types | Type of collision | -... | $\ldots$ | .... - |  | - |  | -- - | . | -- | - .- | -- | $\cdots$ |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Intersection with signal | Pedestrian crossing |  |  | 27 | 21 |  | 5 | 9 | 36 | 44 | 3 |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Intersection with signal | Other crossing |  |  | 13 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Intersection with signal | On road |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Intersection | while walking parallel to vehicle | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Intersection | Pedestrian crossing |  |  | 56 | 19 |  |  |  | 3 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Intersection | Other crossing |  |  | 112 | 40 |  |  | 3 | 13 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Intersection | On road |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Near intersection | while walking parallel to vehicle | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Near intersection | Pedestrian crossing |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Near intersection | Other crossing |  |  | 84 | 39 |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Near intersection | On road |  |  |  | 4 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Tunnel/Bridge | On road |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Curve | while walking parallel to vehicle | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Curve | Other crossing |  |  | 17 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Curve | On road |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Straight line | while walking parallel to vehicle | 76 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Straight line | Pedestrian crossing |  |  | 12 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Straight line | Other crossing |  |  | 205 | 85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Straight line | On road |  |  |  | 4 | 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Straight line | Other | 3 |  |  | 9 | 9 |  |  | O |  |  |  | 3 |
| Vehicle | Pedestrian | Other | Other |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| Motorcycle | Pedestrian | Intersection | Other crossing |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Motorcycle | Pedestrian | Straight line | while walking parallel to vehicle | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Motorcycle | Pedestrian | Straight line | Other crossing |  |  | 12 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian | Vehicle | Intersection with signal | Pedestrian crossing |  |  | 36 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian | Vehicle | Intersection with signal | Other crossing |  |  | 15 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian | Vehicle | Near intersection | Other crossing |  |  | 6 | 4 |  |  |  | $a$ |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian | Vehicle | Straight line | while walking parallel to vehicle | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian | Vehicle | Straight line | Other crossing |  |  | 4 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian | Vehicle | Straight line | On road |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Applicable patterns : 43, Applicable fatalities: 1123
" 1123 " is very optimistic for the reduction by the system.

## 11. Reference: Distribution of TTC of Pedestrian Accidents



The distribution of TTC (Time to Collision) on pedestrian accidents in the jurisdiction of Toyota Police Station shows; 25\% for less than 1sec., 42\% for $1-2$ sec. and $33 \%$ for $2-3$ sec. $(N=12)$

Source: M.Shiota, et al.:Study on fatality reduction based on analysis of traffic accidents occurred in the jurisdiction of Toyota Police Station, Presentation at JSAE Chuubu-Area Workshop 2010

## 12. Impact Assessment of Pedestrian Detection System

The reduction of pedestrian fatalities might be estimated considering the distribution of TTC(Time to collision) and survival ratio.
Table Impact Assessment of the pedestrian detection system with CCTV/Radar for fatal pedestrian accident

| TTC <br> <Time to collision> |  | Target Group <real fatal occupants> |  | Survival ratio <br> (\%) <br> ri | Estimated survival occupants |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} (\%) \\ \text { di } \end{gathered}$ | (person) <br> Q | Estimated distribution $\mathrm{Qi}=\mathrm{Q}^{*} \mathrm{di}$ |  | Distribution $\mathrm{Si}=\mathrm{Qi} * \mathrm{ri}$ | (person <br> ) S |
| $\begin{gathered} 0.0<\mathrm{TTC} \leqq \\ 1.0 \mathrm{sec} \end{gathered}$ | 25.0 |  | 281 | 0 | 0 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 1.0<\mathrm{TTC} \leqq \\ 2.0 \mathrm{sec} \end{gathered}$ | 41.7 | 1123 | 468 | 50 | 234 | 608 |
| $\begin{gathered} 2.0<\mathrm{TTC} \leqq \\ 3.0 \mathrm{sec} \end{gathered}$ | 33.3 |  | 374 | 100 | 374 |  |

Source: M.Shiota, et al.:Study on fatality reduction based on analysis of traffic accidents occurred in the jurisdiction of Toyota Police Station, Presentation at JSAE Chuubu-Area Workshop 2010

## 13. Conclusion

(1) 4373 Traffic fatalities in 2013 are grouped by,

1) Combination of primary and secondary parties, 2) Road category, 3) Road design, 4) Collision type, and 5) maneuver/direction of movement, 255 patterns and several accident patterns with high frequency of fatalities are selected.
(2) 3500 fatalities ( $80 \%$ of 4373 fatalities) are involved in the selected 255 patterns.
(3) 255 accident pattern sheets with data; the number of fatalities, the seriously injured, the slightly injured, fatal accident, serious injury accident, and slight injury accident, and diagram showing the maneuver /direction of movement of the parties, are drawn.

## 13. Conclusion (continued)

(4) Detail accident analysis sheets are proposed for the impact assessment of safety techniques.
(5) Trial estimations are introduced;

117 (79\%) fatalities out of 148 in rear-end collision on public road might be saved by rear-end collision damage reduction equipment.

608 pedestrian fatalities out of 1123 might be saved by the autonomous pedestrian detection system.

## 14. Next Subjects

Following topics should be discussed;
(1) Safety techniques for the unconsidered 873 fatalities (=4373-3500) and the impact assessment of those techniques
(2) Patternization for promising safety techniques and the impact assessment of those techniques.
(3) Transition stages from automated driving to manual driving and the distribution of transition stages, considering distribution of recognition, decision and performance errors

## Topic 1: Human Error and safety devices

Table: Distribution of Human Errors of Rear-end collisions(2014)

| Human Errors | Details | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recognition error | *absent-minded driving, <br> *distracted driving, <br> *failure to perform a safety check, etc. | 60 |
| Decision error | *failure to confirm other's movement, <br> *improper forecast, <br> *misunderstanding the environment, etc. | 25 |
| Performance error | *improper braking/steering, *misuse of other devices, etc. | 15 |

Warning System may reduce accidents by recognition errors.
Some drivers may make decision or operation error even if they are warned timely.
M.Nakano: Reduction of Injuries involved in rear-end collisions, Presentation of the $18^{\text {th }}$ Symposium of ITARDA, 2015

## Topic 2: Possible travel speed based on Vision Zero

Traffic control and road design may improve the effect of Automated Driving Systems.

Table 1. Possible long term maximum travel speeds related to the infrastructure, given best practice in vehicle design and $100 \%$ restraint use.

| Type of infrastructure and traffic | Possible travel <br> speed $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h})$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Locations with possible conflicts between pedestrians <br> and cars | 30 |
| Intersections with possible side impacts between cars | 50 |
| Roads with possible frontal impacts between cars | 70 |
| Roads with no possibility of a side impact or frontal <br> impact (only impact with the infrastructure) | $100+$ |

Source) Vision Zero - An ethical approach to safety and mobility : Claes Tingvall and Narelle Haworth:Monash University Accident Research Centre, the 6th ITE International Conference Road 19 Safety \& Traffic Enforcement: Beyond 2000, Melbourne, 6-7 September 1999.

## Topic 3: Congestion and Accidents on Expressway

Reducing traffic congestion may reduce traffic accidents.
Table Accident fatalities and casualties by traffic incidents On expressway/motorway in 2010-2014

| Trouble | stopped vehicles | incidents | fatalities |  | casualties |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | daytime | night-time | daytime | night-time |
| yes | yes | accident* | 8.0 | 10.6 | 6.0 | 6.2 |
|  |  | road working | 3.9 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 1.5 |
|  |  | congestion* | 4.8 | 0.8 | 24.8 | 15.8 |
|  |  | others | 1.1 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 1.9 |
|  |  | subtotal | 17.8 | 16.0 | 35.9 | 25.4 |
|  |  | no | 7.8 | 11.1 | 2.3 | 4.1 |
| no |  |  | 74.3 | 72.7 | 61.6 | 70.3 |
| unknown |  |  | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| total |  |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  | ( n ) | 460 | 601 | 70,874 | 28,630 |

accident*: an accident occurred before the concerned accident.
congestion*: congestion caused by high traffic demand

## END

## Thank you for your attention!

