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## INTRODUCTION

Highways are populated by a large variety of sizes and types of vehicles, ranging from small lightweight motorcycles to large combination trucks. This variety is a major concern in highway safety. Different vehicle types have different operating characteristics that may affect their ability to avoid accidents. Vehicle size plays an important role in determining how well a vehicle survives a crash. Designs of highway safety devices are complicated due to this variation in sizes. In addition, recent shifts toward smaller cars and larger trucks have generated concern over the effects of those changes on the safety of highways. In an effort to analyze relative safety of different vehicle types, a study entitled "Effects of Vehicle characteristies on Highway Safety" was initiated. One aspect of that study, described in this report, was the calculation of accident rates for different vehicle types, using vehiclemiles travelled as the measure of exposure.

## PROCEDURE

A computer analysis of 1978 accident data was performed, to determine the numbers of accidents involving various vehicle types. Vehicle types identifiable from accident data are listed in Table 1. Breakdowns of numbers of accidents involving each of these vehicle types were performed for various highway types, using four different methods of classifying highways: 1) number of lanes and urban/ rural location, 2) functional classification, 3) administrative classification, and 4) federal-aid classification.

To convert accident numbers into rates, it was necessary to determine the number of vehicle-miles travelled by each vehicle type on each type of highway in 1978. The number of total vehiclemiles by highway type was available from a previous report (1). Total vehiclemiles were then apportioned to different vehicle types based on percentages calculated from the Vehicle Classification File. The procedure used in summarizing the vehicle

Classification File and results of that summary are presented in another report (2). Vehicle types contained in the Vehicle Classification file are listed in Table 2. These vehicle types did not match exactly with the vehicle types given in the accident data as shown in Table 1. Therefore, some grouping of vehicle types was required to obtain types for which both accident and volume data were available. The five basic types chosen were: 1) passenger car, 2) single-unit truck, 3) combination truck, 4) bus, and 5) motorcycle. Methods of combining the available vehicle types into these five basic groups are described in Table 3.

Accident rates were determined by dividing accident numbers by vehicle-miles travelled. Rates were expressed in terms of accidents per 100 million vehiclemiles

## RESULTS

Results of the calculations are presented in Tables 4 through 8. Table 4 presents accident rates for different vehicle types on each functional classification of highway. Motorcycles had the highest overall rate, followed by buses and single-unit trucks. The lowest overall rate was for combination trucks, followed by passenger cars. Motorcycles had the highest rates on rural and urban interstates, rural principal arterials, rural minor arterials, rural major collectors, and urban local routes. Buses had the highest rates on rural minor collectors, urban principal arterials and other freeways, and urban minor arterials. Combination trucks had the highest rates on rural local routes and urban collectors, while single-unit trucks had the highest rate on urban principal arterials (not including interstates or freeways). Passenger cars had the lowest rates on all but two highway types; rural interstates, where buses had the lowest rate, and rural minor collectors, where single-unit trucks had the lowest rate. It is interesting to note that combination trucks did not have the lowest rate on any of the individual highway types, but they had the lowest rate overall. This was due to the large
percentage of mileage driven by combination trucks on rural interstates and other high-type facilities, which are the safest routes. Although combination trucks had the lowest overall rate, it cannot be concluded they have the best accident record. The distribution of their miles driven by type of highway must be considered.

Accident rates by vehicle type for different federal-aid classifications are presented in Table 5. Overall rates for all highways are, of course, the same as in Table 4. Motorcycles had the highest rates on interstates, primary routes, and secondary routes; buses had the highest rates on federal-aid-urban and non-feder-al-aid routes. Combination trucks were lowest on interstates, single-unit trucks had the lowest rate on non-federal-aid routes, and passenger cars were lowest on the remainder of the routes.

The breakdown by administrative classification of the roadway is presented in Table 6. Motorcycles had the highest rates on primary, secondary, and rural secondary routes; combination trucks were highest on unclassified routes. Combination trucks had the lowest rate on primary routes, passenger cars were lowest on secondary and rural secondary, and buses were lowest on unclassified routes.

Accident rates on rural roads are presented by vehicle type and number of lanes in Table 7. The overall rates listed for rural roads only were lower for all vehicle types than the rates when all roads were considered. Accident rates for various vehicle types ranked in the same order for rural roads as for all roads. Motorcycles had the highest rate on each highway type. Passenger cars had the lowest rate on two-lane roads, single-unit trucks were lowest on four-lane divided highways (not including interstates and tollroads), combination trucks were lowest on four-lane undivided highways and tollroads, and buses had the lowest rate on interstates.

The corresponding rates, considering
only urban roads, are shown in Table 8. For all urban roads, passenger cars had the lowest overall rate. followed by combination trucks. Motorcycles had the highest rate, followed by buses. Buses had the highest rate on two-lane facilities, and motorcycles were highest on all others. Passenger cars had the lowest rates on all roads except tollroads, where single-unit trucks were lowest.

## SUMMARY

Motorcycles -- Considering all accidents, motorcycles had the highest accident rate. They consistently had either the highest or one of the highest accident rates when the various highway classifications were analyzed.

Combination Trucks -- Combination trucks had the lowest accident rate when all highways were included. This finding is related to the high percentage of miles driven by combination trucks on interstates and tollroads, which have the lowest accident rates. Combination trucks had some of the highest rates on rural and urban local roads and other classifications with less stringent design standards.

Passenger Cars -- Passenger cars had the second lowest accident rate when all data were considered. They had the lowest accident rate for several highway classifications and never had the highest rate in any instance. They had the lowest rate when urban roads were analyzed.

Single-Unit Trucks -- Generally, single-unit trucks had neither the highest nor lowest accident rates.

Buses -- This category included both commercial and school buses. Buses had the lowest accident rate on rural interstates. Bus traffic on rural interstates would consist largely of commercial buses. They had one of the highest accident rates for most of the other highway classifications and had the second highest overall accident rate.
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## TABLE 1. VEHICLE TYPES AVAILABLE FROM ACCIDENT DATA

```
VEHICLE
TYPE NO.* DESCRIPTION
    1 Passenger Car
    2 Single-unit Truck
    3 Combination Truck
    4 \text { Motorcycle}
    5 Bus
    6 School Bus
    7 Public Vehicle
    8 Emergency \forallehicle
    9 Farm Tractor
    10 Taxi
    11 Other
```

* Numbers here are for reference purposes only.

TABLE 2. VEHICLE TYPES ON THE VEHICLE CLASSIFIGATION FILE

| VEHICLE |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| TYPE | DESCRIPTION |
| 1 | In-state standard and compact passenger cars |
| 2 | In-state subcompact passenger cars |
| 3 | Out-of-state standard and compact passenger cars |
| 4 | Out-of-state subcompact passenger cars |
| 5 | Pickup trucks |
| 6 | 2-axle, 4-tire trucks greater than 1 ton |
| 7 | 2-axle, 6-tire trucks |
| 8 | 3-axle single-unit trucks |
| 9 | 4-axle single-unit trucks |
| 10 | 3-axle combinations: tractor and semi-trailer |
| 11 | 4-axle combinations: tractor and semi-trailer |
| 12 | 5-axle combinations: tractor and semi-trailer |
| 13 | 6-axle combinations: tractor and semi-trailer |
| 14 | 7-axle combinations: tractor and semi-trailer |
| 15 | 8-axte combinations: tractor and semi-trailer |
| 16 | 5-axle combinations: tractor and semi-trailer plus full trailer |
| 17 | 6-axle combinations: tractor and semi-trailer plus full trailer |
| 18 | 4-axle combinations: tractor plus full trailer |
| 19 | 5-axle combinations: tractor plus full trailer |
| 20 | Commercial buses |
| 21 | School and other buses |
| 22 | Motorcyoles |
| 23 | Coal trucks (trucks counted here are also counted in one of the categories above) |

TABLE 3. METHODS OF COMBINING VEHICLE TYPES
INTO FIVE BASIC GROUPS

|  | VEHICLE TYPES INCLUDED (SEE TABLES 1 AND 2) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BASIC | VEHICLE CLASSIFICATION | ACCIDENT |
| GROUP | DATA | DATA |
| Passenger Car | $1,2,3,4,5$ | 1,10 |
| Single-unit Truck | $6,7,8,9$ | 2 |
| Combination Truck | $10-19$ | 3 |
| Bus | 20,21 | 4,6 |
| Motoreycle | 22 | 4 |

TABLE 4. ACCIDENT RATES (ACCIDENTS PER 100 MILLION VEHICLE-MILES) BY VEHICLE TYPE BY FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF HIGHWAY

## VEHICLE TYPE

| FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION | $\begin{gathered} \text { PASS. } \\ \text { CAR } \end{gathered}$ | SINGLE-UNIT TRUCK | COMB. TRUCK | BUS | MOTOR- <br> CYCLE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ALL } \\ & \text { TYPES } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 (rural interstate) | 77 | 115 | 92 | 56 | 328 | 86 |
| 2 (rural principal arterial) | 200 | 250 | 266 | 261 | 1,007 | 218 |
| 6 (rural minor arterial) | 329 | 373 | 414 | 519 | 1,046 | 350 |
| 7 (rural major collector) | 355 | 381 | 609 | 758 | 1,226 | 383 |
| 8 (rural minor collector) | 349 | 337 353 | 507 757 | 1,347 705 | 1,081 509 | 374 337 |
| 9 (rural local) | 307 | 353 | 757 | 705 | 509 | 337 |
| 11 (urban interstate) | 239 | 819 | 363 | 834 | 932 | 292 |
| 12\%13 (urban prin. art. | 156 | 205 | 307 | 1,193 | 597 | 173 |
| 14815 (urban principal arterials) | 856 | 1,706 | 1,305 | 1,268 | 1,692 | 944 |
| 16 (urban minor arterials) | 826 | 1,495 | 2,631 | 3,458 | 3,443 | 920 737 |
| 17 (urban collectors) | 664 | 1,314 | 3,302 | 1,216 | 2,549 | 737 |
| 19 (urban local) | 379 | 959 | 1,771 | 1,771 | 2,361 | 437 |
| All Highways | 393 | 489 | 284 | 892 | 1,248 | 414 |

TABLE 5. ACCIDENT RATES (ACCIDENTS PER 100 MILLION VEHICLE-MILES) BY VEHICLE TYPE BY FEDERAL-AID CLASSIFICATION OF HIGHWAY

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PASS. | SINGLE-UNIT | COMB. |  | MOTOR- | ALL |
| FEDERAL-AID |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CLASSIFICATION | CAR | TRUCK | TRUCK | BUS | CYCLE | TYPES |
| 1 (FA interstate) | 146 | 331 | 127 | 239 | 436 | 161 |
| 2 (FA primary) | 412 | 478 | 473 | 627 | 1,343 | 438 |
| 3 (FA urban) | 814 | 1,670 | 3,002 | 3,929 | 3,307 | 915 |
| 4 (FA secondary) | 356 | 379 | 559 | 751 | 1,214 | 382 |
| 8 (non-federal-aid) | 343 | 338 | 557 | 1,175 | 1,012 | 369 |

All Highways
393
489
$284 \quad 892 \quad 1,248$
414

TABLE 6. ACCIDENT RATES (ACCIDENTS PER 100 MILLION VEHICLE-MILES) BY VEHICLE TYPE BY ADMINISTRATIVE CLASSIFICATION OF HIGHWAY

|  | VEHICLE TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADMINISTRATIVE CLASSIFICATION | PASS. CAR | SINGLE-UNIT TRUCK | COMB. <br> TRUCK | BUS | MOTORCYCLE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ALL } \\ & \text { TYPES } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 (primary) | 343 | 468 | 183 | 720 | 1,082 | 348 |
| 2 (secondary) | 498 | 558 | 688 | 1,450 | 1,513 | 538 |
| 6 (rural secondary) | 429 | 676 | 1,181 | 1,444 | 1,883 | 476 |
| 7 (unciassified) | 405 | 979 | 4,583 | 136 | 2,855 | 454 |
| All Highways | 393 | 489 | 284 | 892 | 1,248 | 414 |

TABLE 7. ACCIDENT RATES (ACCIDENTS PER 100 MILLION VEHICLEMMLES) ON RURAL ROADS BY VEHICLE TYPE BY NUMBER OF LANES

VEHICLE TYPE

| HIGHWAY TYPE | $\begin{gathered} \text { PASS. } \\ \text { CAR } \end{gathered}$ | SINGLE-UNIT TRUCK | COMB. TRUCK | BUS | MOTOR $=$ <br> CYCLE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ALL } \\ & \text { TYPES } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2-lane | 335 | 377 | 442 | 670 | 1,116 | 360 |
| 4-lane divided (not interstate or toll) | 211 | 198 | 218 | 401 777 | 735 900 | 218 416 |
| 4-lane undivided | 422 | 327 | 203 | 777 | 1,900 | 416 |
| Interstate | 77 | 114 | 92 | 56 | 329 | 86 |
| Tollroads | 95 | 132 | 70 | 209 | 250 | 95 |
| All rural roads | 264 | 301 | 206 | 557 | 917 | 276 |

TABLE 8. ACCIDENT RATES (ACCIDENTS PER 100 MILIION VEHICLE-MILES) ON URBAN ROADS BY VEHICLE TYPE BY NUMBER OF LANES

## VEHICLE TYPE

| HIGHWAY <br> TYPE | $\begin{gathered} \text { PASS } \\ \text { CAR } \end{gathered}$ | SINGLE-UNIT TRUCK | COMB. TRUCK | BUS | MOTOR- <br> CYCLE | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALL } \\ \text { TYPES } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2-I ane | 793 | 1,247 | 1,095 | 6,375 | 2,390 | 873 |
| 4-lane divided (not interstate or toll) | 688 | 1,162 | 1,603 | 1,137 | 1,762 | 751 |
| 4-lane undivided | 955 | 1,977 | 1,868 | 2,517 | 2,649 | 1,064 |
| Interstate | 240 | 822 | 364 | 837 | 936 | 293 |
| Tollroads | 111 | 47 | 137 | ---* | 220 | 116 |

$\begin{array}{lllllllllllllllll}\text { All urban roads } & 634 & 1,253 & 748 & 1,608 & 1,984 & 707\end{array}$

* Insufficient data for calculation of a meaningful rate.

