

## Southern Illinois University Edwardsville SPARK

---

SIUE Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

---

4-2016

# Long-Term Effectiveness of Radar Speed Display Signs in a University Environment

Michael R. Williamson  
*Indiana State University*

Ryan N. Fries  
[rfries@siue.edu](mailto:rfries@siue.edu)

Huaguo Zhou  
*Auburn University*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://spark.siue.edu/siue\\_fac](http://spark.siue.edu/siue_fac)

 Part of the [Civil Engineering Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Williamson, Michael R.; Fries, Ryan N.; and Zhou, Huaguo, "Long-Term Effectiveness of Radar Speed Display Signs in a University Environment" (2016). *SIUE Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity*. 62.  
[http://spark.siue.edu/siue\\_fac/62](http://spark.siue.edu/siue_fac/62)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by SPARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in SIUE Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity by an authorized administrator of SPARK. For more information, please contact [magrase@siue.edu](mailto:magrase@siue.edu).

1 **LONG TERM EFFECTIVENESS OF RADAR SPEED DISPLAY SIGNS IN A**  
2 **UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT**

3  
4 **Michael R. Williamson Ph.D.\***

5 Assistant Professor, Dept. of Civil Engineering,  
6 Indiana State University,  
7 650 Cherry Street Terre Haute, IN 47809-1902,  
8 Tel: 217-343-7512; email: michael.williamson@indstate.edu  
9

10 **Ryan Fries, Ph.D., P.E.**

11 Associate Professor, Dept. of Civil Engineering,  
12 Box 1800  
13 Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, IL 62026,  
14 Tel: 1 618-650-5026; email: rfries@siue.edu  
15

16 **Huaguo Zhou, Ph.D., P.E.**

17 Associate Professor, Dept. of Civil Engineering  
18 238 Harbert Engineering Center  
19 Auburn, AL 36849-5337  
20 Tel: 334-844-1239; Fax: 334-844-6290; Email: hhz0001@auburn.edu  
21

22  
23  
24 \* Corresponding Author

25 Word count: 3,903 words text + 3 tables/figures x 250 words (each) = 4,653 words  
26  
27  
28

**1 ABSTRACT**

2 Vehicular speeds are of particular interest in areas with a high number of pedestrians due to the  
3 fact that 14-percent of all fatal crashes involve pedestrians. This study investigated the effect of  
4 a radar speed display sign placed for an extended period of time, at a location frequented by law  
5 enforcement on a road segment entering a University campus with a high number of pedestrians  
6 and vehicle speed violations. The statistical analysis included a comparison between AM peak,  
7 PM peak, and midday speeds collected one year apart. The data suggested that radar speed  
8 display signs can remain effective over a long period of time; causing drivers to decelerate when  
9 warned of a speeding violation. While other studies have examined long-term impacts of similar  
10 technologies, none have included a road entering a University campus. Thus, these findings  
11 support that other similar locations entering University campuses could see long-term benefits to  
12 stationary radar speed display signs.  
13

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Pedestrian safety is an important concern on University campuses. Because many campus cores  
3 allow vehicle access, pedestrian-vehicle interactions are unavoidable, resulting in a high conflict  
4 rate and the potential for pedestrian related crashes. In addition, the driver population of a  
5 University campus includes higher proportions of unfamiliar drivers and younger drivers,  
6 compared to other road facilities. Distractions such as cell phones can also hinder the awareness  
7 of drivers and pedestrians alike. All together, these factors suggest the uniqueness of the  
8 transportation system surrounding a University campus. Thoughtful consideration should guide  
9 the application of transportation engineering design assumptions.

10 One way to address pedestrian safety has been reducing travel speeds through  
11 enforcement, engineering, and education programs. Enforcement options could include speed  
12 trailers, officer ticketing, and automated enforcement, to name a few. Engineering options could  
13 include chicanes, speed humps, or textured pavements, to name a few. Education programs  
14 could include informing pedestrians how to properly cross roadways and informing drivers of the  
15 danger pedestrian's face and the related traffic laws (Leaf & Preusser, 1999).

16 The objective of this study was to evaluate the long-term driver behavior at a location  
17 continuously monitored by a radar speed display sign entering a University campus. Past studies  
18 have shown reductions in speeding violations when radar speed display signs are placed at some  
19 location but mainly focused on short term effectiveness. The long term (i.e. one year or more)  
20 effects on travel speeds are still unclear due to few follow up studies and the effectiveness on  
21 changing travel speeds in a university environment is unknown at this time.

## 23 LITERATURE REVIEW

24 This literature review focuses on the topics that could have an impact on pedestrian safety  
25 regarding the vehicular speeds of vehicles in the area of pedestrian crossing zones. The three  
26 main areas included speed reductions, safety, and sign placement.

### 27 Speed Reduction

28 The Federal Highway Administration (Federal Highway Administration, 2009) offers a guide for  
29 reducing speeds with the purpose of improving safety on roadways. The guide provided  
30 historical data on the reduction of speeds caused by radar speed display signs in several  
31 environments including school (grades K-12), where most of the studies found effectiveness over  
32 short periods ranging from 1 week to 6 months. Compiling more-recent literature, research has  
33 focused on radar speed display signs use in rural communities (City of Bellevue DOT, 2009;  
34 Hallmark, et al., 2007), school zones (Chang, Nolan, & Nihan, 2004), and work zones (Mattox,  
35 Sarasa, Ogle, Eckenrode, & Dunning, 2007); however no studies were found that studied the  
36 effect in a university environment. An average reduction in the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of 7 mph  
37 with a median reduction of 3.5 mph was found from the various studies (Veneziano, Hayden, &  
38 Ye, 2010) with a speed reduction that ranged between 1 to 33 mph.

39 A study in Utah (Ash, 2006) investigated the impact of radar speed display signs in four  
40 school zones, looking at short and long term effects on drivers' speeds. The short term effect  
41 consisted of a two month before and after study which identified a small drop in mean, 85<sup>th</sup>  
42 percentile speed, and the percentage of drivers exceeding the posted 20 mph speed limit. The  
43 long term effects were measured out to six months, finding that over the longer period of time  
44 the drivers were less compliant with the posted speed limit and increased their speeds again. The  
45 mean speed reductions in this study were 1 to 2 mph.

1 Research has also evaluated speed-reduction technologies in work zones. One study in  
2 South Carolina found an average speed reduction of 2 to 6 mph for a speed-activated flashing  
3 beacon above a sign stating, "YOU ARE SPEEDING IF FLASHING". The study included three  
4 sites along two-lane rural secondary highways, data was collected when volumes were low  
5 giving opportunity for drivers to travel at their desired speed (Mattox, Sarasa, Ogle, Eckenrode,  
6 & Dunning, 2007). Another study of a one-lane freeway work zone along Interstate 95 in Maine  
7 found a 7 mph average decrease in vehicle speeds. This study evaluated radar linked to a  
8 portable changeable message sign (Thompson, 2002). More recent studies on work zones  
9 recommended that a radar speed display sign, in conjunction with a portable changeable message  
10 sign, could reduce the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds up to 6 mph in a freeway work zone (Gambatese &  
11 Zhang, 2014).

12 Similarly, speed reduction signs along curves were found to significantly reduce speeds  
13 during a comprehensive study of 22 sites across 7 states resulting in five to seven percent fewer  
14 crashes (Hallmark, Qiu, Hawkins, & Smadi, 2015). Other ongoing efforts to evaluate speed-  
15 reduction technologies along curves, such as reference (Smadi, Hawkins, Hallmark, &  
16 Knickerbocker, 2013), have not published results at the time of this writing.

17 Overall studies do not always agree on the long-term benefit of radar speed display signs.  
18 For example, the City of Bellevue, Washington, found effectiveness continued six to eight years  
19 after installation on two-lane arterials through residential areas. Some of these study sites even  
20 showed continued increases in effectiveness over time (City of Bellevue DOT, 2009). Others  
21 have noted positive impacts up to two years on rural curves (Hallmark, Qiu, Hawkins, & Smadi,  
22 2015), work zones (Fontaine & Clarson, 2001), and residential collector roads (Chang, Nolan, &  
23 Nihan, 2004). But, many studies (Hallmark, Knickerbocker, & Hawkins, Dynamic Speed  
24 Feedback Signs for Rural Traffic Calming, 2013; Hallmark, et al., 2007; Sikes, 2004) only report  
25 the effectiveness less than one year past installation date.

26 Other lessons learned from past studies remark that the character size of the speed display  
27 must be appropriate for the road speed limit (Hall & Wrage, 1997; Kamyab, Maze, Gent, &  
28 Poole, 2000) and that speeds returned to normal downstream of radar speed display signs  
29 (Meyer, 2000).

### 30 **Driving Behaviors in a University Environment**

31 There are several factors that arguable make the driving environment in a University campus  
32 unique. Some of these factors include driver familiarity, driver demographics, and the  
33 prevalence of pedestrians.

#### 34 *Driver familiarity*

35 One unique factor at a university is that each semester a large percentage of the drivers  
36 are new/unfamiliar drivers traveling to campus for the first time. Many of which are working  
37 students living off campus commuting in from the surrounding area to attend classes. Drivers  
38 typically enter the university campus 16 weeks a semester during the spring and fall for 2 to 4  
39 year period until a degree is earned.

#### 40 *Demographics*

41 The demographics of the drivers passing the study site can generally be broken into the  
42 time periods of the study. In the AM peak drivers are of a mixed populations consisting of  
43 teenagers to senior citizens. Some are students others are faculty or staff at the university. A  
44 similar demographic can be seen in the midday peak. During the PM peak the driver population  
45 consists mostly of no traditional students (i.e. students that have entered the workforce before

1 attending college for some time period). Many of the PM drivers have worked during the day  
2 and are entering campus to attend night classes.

### 3 *Pedestrian prevalence*

4 Pedestrians in a university environment are typically aggressive in nature, a trait common  
5 in younger individuals. In the study area parking lots are located on the East side of the  
6 road and pedestrians cross four lanes of traffic with a median refuge, to reach dormitories or to  
7 access lecture halls.

### 8 **Safety**

9 Although the road environment within a University campus core is similar to an urban core  
10 because of lower speed limits and higher high pedestrian volumes; University cores are unique  
11 because of the familiarity of their drivers and pedestrians, and age of those populations. These  
12 factors encourage many Universities to emphasize safety of pedestrians at crosswalks.

13 According to a report by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (National  
14 Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2014) pedestrian fatalities are on the rise topping 4,743  
15 in 2012; a 6 percent increase from the previous year, setting a five year high. Some facts of  
16 interest are that 70 percent of the pedestrian fatalities occurred at non-intersection locations and  
17 89 percent occurred during clear weather conditions.

18 Factors influencing pedestrian fatalities (Heinonen & Eck, 2007) can be placed into four  
19 categories: 1. Vehicle and Driver, 2. Physical Environment, 3. Special Conditions, and 4.  
20 Pedestrian Behavior. Within each of these categories there are risk factors impacting the safety  
21 of pedestrians. Vehicle speed and pedestrian's perception of vehicle speed were key factors in  
22 two of the listed categories (Heinonen & Eck, 2007), suggesting that the unique population  
23 driving and walking through pedestrian campuses raise unique challenges for pedestrian safety.  
24 Although other factors, such as roadway geometry, zoning, and availability of pedestrian  
25 facilities are important, they can be mitigated with proper design (Heinonen & Eck, 2007).

26 Past studies at the federal level (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2014)  
27 have been performed to identify the pedestrian groups at risk for injuries and fatalities. Of the  
28 three groups (16-20 and 21-24) found to be most frequently injured two are present in a  
29 university environment and make up a significant portion of the campus population. The groups  
30 most frequently involved in fatal pedestrian crashes were not the typical college age student,  
31 consisting of pedestrians between the ages of 0 to 15 and 40 to 80+, however that age group  
32 that were most frequently injured (i.e. ages 16-24) still made up 28 percent of the total fatalities.  
33 A reason more injuries occur for the typical college age student is that they are typically in good  
34 health and recover quickly unlike the very young and elderly population who are more likely to  
35 die from trauma that would only result in an injury to pedestrians in prime health.

36 Speed feedback signs (i.e. radar speed display signs) were found to lower the total  
37 crashes by 5-7 percent at locations studied in Arizona, Florida, Iowa, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, and  
38 Washington. The crash modification factors (CMF), for all crashes, associated with the study  
39 ranged from 0.93 to 0.95 (Hallmark, Qiu, Hawkins, & Smadi, 2015), showing potential for  
40 improving pedestrian safety, albeit not specifically on a University campus.

41

### 42 **Placement**

43 Radar speed display signs should not be placed along roadways without speed data supporting  
44 the presence of a problem. A study in California and Oregon (Veneziano, Hayden, & Ye, 2010)  
45 focused on identifying warrants for the placement of speed display signs in a scientific manner  
46 rather than by citizen requests. The study found that when sign placement was based on a

1 perceived problems reported by residents short term effects may be evident; however, long term  
2 effects were not quantifiable, suggesting a need to develop the warrants. The warrants  
3 developed that are of particular interest to this study include:

- 4 • 85<sup>th</sup> percentile and mean speeds exceeding the posted speed limit by 5 mph
- 5 • 85<sup>th</sup> percentile and mean speeds exceeding the posted speed limit by 3 mph within the  
6 area of a school.

7  
8 The thresholds for these warrants were identified because research has shown that signs  
9 placed in areas where the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile or mean speeds did not warrant radar speed display  
10 signs had little to no long term effectiveness, resulting in a waste of resources.

## 11 **METHODS**

12 This research built on a previous study at the same location using another pool of data collected  
13 one year after the original study (See Williamson and Fries 2015) and comparing that data to the  
14 first data set to identify the long term effectiveness of a radar speed display sign on drivers.


15 The methods selected for this study involved taking speed samples during three different  
16 time periods in optimal weather conditions on campus during the semester when students were  
17 present. Speeds were taken in a single setting on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday in the  
18 peak AM (7:30am-9:30am), midday (11:00am-1:00pm), and PM peak (3:30pm-5:30pm) periods.  
19 A minimum of two hundred speeds were recorded within each time period, covering the peak  
20 times when persons travel to the university. The data was collected in late November both  
21 semesters, so drivers frequenting campus throughout the fall semester had ample exposure to the  
22 radar speed display sign, approximately 3 months.

23 The radar speed display sign evaluated in this study showed the speed of the approaching  
24 vehicle(s) as well as the speed limit to the drivers. The radar speed display sign was movable but  
25 had been placed for approximately nine months at the time of the first study and one year and  
26 nine months at the time of the second study. Discussions with campus law enforcement  
27 indicated that the sign required a power source, limiting the locations for deployment; thus, the  
28 sign was left at the same location for an extended period of time. The authors used this  
29 opportunity as a testbed for the long-term effectiveness of radar speed display signs in a  
30 University environment.

31 The study location is at a point where vehicles first interact with pedestrians in the  
32 university environment. Drivers taking the selected route to campus have exited an interstate or  
33 highways with travel speeds of 55 to 65 mph and are required to reduce their speed to 25 mph in  
34 increments of 10 mph over approximately two miles. At the location where the speeds were  
35 collected, drivers have had three sets of 25 mph speed limit signs over 0.25 miles to react to the  
36 speed change before entering campus at the point where pedestrians are present and where the  
37 radar speed display sign is placed.

38 The study location was on the south end of Southern Illinois University Edwardsville  
39 campus more than two miles from the nearest signalized intersection and had ideal pedestrian  
40 facilities mitigating any effects found to have an impact of safety in past studies (Heinonen &  
41 Eck, 2007). The test approach taken in this research was to record driver speeds as they  
42 approached the area of the radar speed display sign and frequented by pedestrians. The  
43 researchers used a hand held radar gun to record the vehicle speeds. Lead vehicles were  
44 identified and tracked through the study area, no following vehicles were used due to the leading  
45 vehicle controlling the speed of all following vehicles. In FIGURE 1, the location of the initial

1 speed measurement is labeled indicating the point where the radar speed display sign  
 2 measurement is displayed to the driver. The location where the handheld radar speed  
 3 measurement was taken can be seen labeled as viewpoint. Drivers were unaware that their  
 4 speeds were being recorded allowing the data collection team to capture the true driver reaction  
 5 to radar speed display signs.



6 **FIGURE 1 Map of Study Location (not to scale)**

7  
 8 The two speed measurements of each vehicle were compared using a statistical approach  
 9 to identify the overall effectiveness of the radar speed display sign within each peak period. Two  
 10 additional groups were tested, 1) those vehicles initially traveling above the posted speed limit  
 11 and 2) those at-or-below the speed limit.

12 The data analysis involved using a two sample t-testing of the data set, results with less  
 13 than 90% significance would not be viewed as effective, results with 95 or 99% significance  
 14 were desirable and taken to be effective. Data was collected at two separate intervals one year  
 15 apart during the peak time periods to ensure a non-biased results.

16 Grouping was first done by examining the driver reactions in each of the time periods  
 17 (i.e. AM, midday, and PM) for each data set. The data was then combined within each year and  
 18 separated by speeding vs. speed compliant vehicles. Further analysis was conducted by  
 19 identifying the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile in each group for compliance with the posted speed limit of 25  
 20 mph.



## 1 ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

2 The following text explains about the information about the driver's behavior in  
 3 compliance with posted speed limits, the analysis and some important findings. The results of the  
 4 AM, Midday, and PM time periods can be seen in TABLE 1. Where the AM drivers in each data  
 5 set are least effected by the radar speed display sign, indicated by the high P-values from the  
 6 two-sample T-Test. The Midday drivers show marginal effects in study one but no effect in  
 7 study two. The group of drivers most affected by the radar speed display sign was PM drivers  
 8 with P-values of 0.000 indicating a strong effect to the radar speed display sign. These findings  
 9 contrast with previous studies where no difference was found between times of the day (Ash,  
 10 2006). These differences in effectiveness could indicated changes in driver populations between  
 11 the time periods observed.

12 **TABLE 1 Two Sample T-Test by Time Period**

Time Period	Study One		Study Two	
	Number of Samples	P-Value	Number of Samples	P-Value
AM	220	0.610	220	0.522
Midday	200	0.011	200	0.392
PM	200	0.000	200	0.000

13  
 14 The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds of vehicles entering campus of the first and second data set  
 15 was identified and determined to be 34 mph and 33 mph consecutively, more than 3 to 5 mph  
 16 above the posted speed limit of 25 mph meeting the warrant for a radar speed display sign in the  
 17 area (Veneziano, Hayden, & Ye, 2010). The similarity of the two 85<sup>th</sup> percentiles taken one year  
 18 apart also suggest that drivers behave in a similar manner under the given conditions. Drivers  
 19 entering the study site have previously traveled on a state highway with a speed limit of 55 miles  
 20 per hour, and have remained aggressive when entering the university disregarding several posted  
 21 speed limit signs. The mean speed of each data set was found to be 30 mph and 29 mph, greater  
 22 than the 3 to 5 mph limit found in the literature review.

23 To further understand drivers behavior related to the effect of the radar speed display sign  
 24 two groups within each data set were formed consisting of drivers that were in compliance with  
 25 the posted speed limit and those that were not (i.e. speed violations).

26 In the first study 85.6% of the drivers that were exceeding the speed limit reduced their  
 27 speed when warned of the violation with the radar speed display sign. The second study, one  
 28 year later, had similar results where 80.0% of the drivers that were violating the speed limit and  
 29 also made speed reductions when warned of a speed violation. The results of these t-tests are  
 30 shown in TABLE 2. The low P-values indicate a change in speed in the approach to the radar  
 31 speed display sign. Study one and two results indicate that drivers significantly reduced their  
 32 speeds when warned of the speed violation, with more than 99% significance. Inversely drivers  
 33 within compliance with the posted speed when entering campus also showed a significant change  
 34 in speeds, however the change was an increase in speed. The significance of the results for the  
 35 first study group meet the 95 % level indicating the drivers increased their speeds significantly.  
 36 The results of the second study group indicated only a marginal effect, where most of the speed  
 37 compliant drivers maintained their speed.

38 **TABLE 2 Violation vs. Compliance**

Study One	Study Two
-----------	-----------

Number of Samples	Speed Violation	P-Value	Number of Samples	Speed Violation	P-Value
531	Yes	0.000	496	Yes	0.004
89	No	0.000	124	No	0.062

1  
2 The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile and mean speed of vehicles at the location where the handheld radar  
3 was used was also identified. At this location drivers have had a chance to decelerate to the  
4 posted speed limit and statistical testing proved a significant portion of the drivers had reduced  
5 speeds within this area. However, the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile and mean speeds were nearly unchanged,  
6 resulting in no more than a 1 mph reduction still well above the desired speed of vehicle in the  
7 study area. The vehicle speed reduction in each study group was found to be 0 to 13 mph for the  
8 first study group and 0 to 5 mph for the second.

## 9 CONCLUSION

10 The authors believe this study to be the first long-term study of a radar speed display sign's  
11 effectiveness on a University campus environment, therefore providing new valuable  
12 information to the pool of knowledge within transportation engineering. Two separate groups of  
13 data were collected approximately one year apart which allowed the authors to identify the long  
14 term effectiveness of radar speed display signs in a university environment.

15 One unique discovery during the statistical analysis was that this study was the first to  
16 find a significant difference in effectiveness during different times of day, possibly caused by  
17 different populations of students entering the university environment. In particular, the data  
18 suggested the PM peak drivers, possibly coming from work to campus for evening courses,  
19 behaved significantly different than the other two time periods observed. In summary, these  
20 findings hint to the uniqueness of the driver populations accessing a University campus core and  
21 the effect of a radar speed display sign on their driver behavior.

## 22 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 23 Ash, K. G. (2006). *Increasing Speed Limit Compliance in Reduced Speed School Zones*.  
24 Brigham: Brigham Young University.
- 25 Chang, K., Nolan, M., & Nihan, N. L. (2004). Radar Speed Signs on Neighborhood Streets: An  
26 Effective Traffic Calming Device? *Proceedings from the 2004 ITE Annual Meeting and*  
27 *Exhibit* (p. 16). Lake Buena Vista, FL: Institute for Transportation Engineers.
- 28 City of Bellevue DOT. (2009). *Stationary Radar Sign Program 2009 Report*. Bellevue.
- 29 Federal Highway Administration. (2009). *Engineering Countermeasures for Reducing Speeds*.  
30 Washington, D.C.: FHWA.
- 31 Fontaine, M. D., & Clarson, P. J. (2001). Evaluation of Speed Displays and Rumble Strups at  
32 Rural-Maintenance Work Zones. *Transportation Research Record, 1745*, 27-38.
- 33 Gambatese, J. A., & Zhang, F. (2014). *Safe and Effective Speed Reductions for Freeway Work*  
34 *Zones Phase 2*. Washington, D.C.: FHWA.
- 35 Hall, J., & Wrage, E. (1997). *Controlling Vehicle Speeds in Highway Construction Zones*.  
36 NMSHTD-97-07, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- 37 Hallmark, S. L., Knickerbocker, S., & Hawkins, N. (2013, October). Dynamic Speed Feedback  
38 Signs for Rural Traffic Calming. *Tech Brief*.
- 39 Hallmark, S. L., Peterson, E., Fitzsimmons, E., Hawkins, N., Resler, J., & Welch, T. (2007).  
40 *Evaluation of Gateway and Low-Cost Traffic-Calming Treatments for Major Routes in*  
41 *Small Rural Communities*. FHWA, Washington.

- 1 Hallmark, S. L., Qiu, Y., Hawkins, N., & Smadi, O. (2015). Crash Modification Factors for  
2 Dynamic Speed Feedback Signs on Rural Curves. *Journal of Transportation*  
3 *Technologies*, 5, 9-23. doi:http://dx.doi/10.4236/jtts.2015.51002
- 4 Heinonen, J. A., & Eck, J. E. (2007). *Pedestrian Injuries and Fatalities*. Washington, D.C.: U.S.  
5 Department of Justice: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
- 6 Kamyab, A., Maze, T. H., Gent, S., & Poole, C. (2000). Evaluation Of Speed Reduction  
7 Techniques At Work Zones. *Mid-Continent Transportation Symposium Proceedings*, (pp.  
8 189-192). Ames.
- 9 Leaf, W., & Preusser, D. (1999). *Literature Review on Vehicle Travel Speeds and Pedestrian*  
10 *Injuries Among Selected Racial/Ethnic Groups*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of  
11 Transportation.
- 12 Mattox, J. H., Sarasa, W. A., Ogle, J. H., Eckenrode, R. T., & Dunning, A. (2007). Development  
13 and Evaluation of a Speed Activated Sign to Reduce Speeds in Work Zones. *Proceedings*  
14 *of the 2007 Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board*. Washington, D.C.:  
15 TRB.
- 16 Meyer, E. (2000). Midwest Smart Work Zone Deployment Initiative: Kansas' Results. *Mid-*  
17 *Continent Transportation Symposium Proceedings*, (pp. 57-61). Ames.
- 18 National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2014). *Traffic Safety Facts*. Washington,  
19 D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation.
- 20 Sikes, D. (2004). *Efficacy of Radar Speed Monitoring Displays in Reducing Vehicle Speeds*. 3M.  
21 3M Traffic Safety Systems Division.
- 22 Smadi, O., Hawkins, N., Hallmark, S., & Knickerbocker, S. (2013). *Evaluation of the Tapco*  
23 *Sequential Dynamic Curve Warning System*. Washington, D.C.: FHWA.
- 24 Thompson, B. (2002). *Evaluation of Radar Activated Changeable Message Sign for Work Zone*  
25 *Speed Control*. Augusta: Maine Department of Transportation.
- 26 Veneziano, D., Hayden, L., & Ye, J. (2010). *Effective Deployment of Radar Speed Signs*.  
27 Bozeman, MT: Western Transportation Institute.  
28