GHSA/IIHS Speed Management Pilot Program RFP

Call for Proposals

The Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA), the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) and the National Road Safety Foundation, Inc. (NRSF) invite state agencies (a State Highway Safety Office [SHSO], the SHSO’s governing agency or a State Department of Transportation) to submit a proposal for grant funding that would be used to develop, implement and evaluate a speed management pilot program in a community or corridor within their state. The proposed pilot program should combine proven and innovative countermeasures drawn from engineering, enforcement, communications/education, advocacy and policy that are implemented by the selected lead state agency in collaboration with a network of stakeholders and partners.

Up to $200,000 in funding will be awarded to the selected state agency(ies) in support of the proposed pilot program. IIHS will evaluate the impact of the pilot program and provide communications support. Additionally, the selected state agency(ies) will receive support from a consultant experienced in managing multidisciplinary safety campaigns. It is anticipated that this pilot program will commence in 2020 and last approximately six months, though the precise timeline will be established with the awarded state agency(ies). The findings from the pilot(s) will be used to develop a speed management program template for use by states and communities across the U.S.

Background

Most motorists speed and, unlike other risky behaviors, most motorists expect few, if any, consequences such as a crash, citation or social disapproval. Speeding, however, has been a factor in more than a quarter of U.S. motor vehicle crash deaths for more than 30 years, making it a leading highway killer. In 2017 (the latest year for which data are available), 9,717 people on our nation’s roadways died in a crash where a motorist was speeding. Despite speeding’s impact on roadway safety, however, most states have raised speed limits on interstate highways, with calls for even higher speeds a consistent theme in many state legislatures.

According to the 2018 AAA Safety Culture Index, 48.9% of motorists reported exceeding the posted speed limit by 15 mph on highways, while 40.1% reported exceeding the posted speed limit by 10 mph on residential streets in the past month. The latest speed research conducted for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) confirms what
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the motoring public admits: 68 percent of vehicles on limited access roads, 56 percent on arterials and 58 percent on collectors are exceeding the posted speed limit. Approximately 16 to 19 percent of those vehicles are also traveling more than 10 mph over the posted speed limit.¹

There is agreement within the traffic safety community that a change in the culture around speeding is needed to prevent crashes and save lives. As a result, national organizations such as NHTSA, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the National Transportation Safety Board, the Institute of Traffic Engineers, Vision Zero Network and others have developed recommendations, plans and/or toolkits for addressing speed. Some SHSOs are providing grants to law enforcement to specifically target speeders, while advocates in cities and local communities are joining forces with government to develop and implement action plans that include lowering speed limits, installing automated enforcement in school and work zones, and sharing victims’ stories to educate the public about the real danger of speeding. But a national initiative — one that has the same brand recognition, reach and impact as the Click It or Ticket campaign or MADD — is long overdue.

In April 2019, GHSA and IIHS hosted a national forum on speeding in Virginia. The goal was to determine how best to address this problem by tapping the expertise of more than 100 U.S. highway safety officials and advocates. Through panel discussions and brainstorming sessions, attendees identified engineering, enforcement, communication, policy and advocacy strategies that could be leveraged to tackle this problem. That summit prompted the commitment on the part of GHSA, IIHS and others to fund a speed management pilot program in 2020-21. The results of that pilot program will inform development of a template for use by other states and communities.

The proposed pilot program should not reinvent the wheel, but instead leverage existing resources and tools such as the ones found on pages 4-6 of this RFP. States may also benefit from ideas generated at the GHSA/IIHS national speed forum, which explored such issues as setting appropriate speed limits and the use of automated enforcement, investing in infrastructure improvements that slow driving speeds, conducting highly visible and sustained enforcement, and developing targeted messages that prompt behavior change.

Pilot Objectives

- To conduct a six-month pilot program that employs low-cost, temporary engineering techniques as well as high-visibility enforcement, grassroots advocacy, and public outreach.
- To conduct an outcome evaluation to assess the pilot program’s impact on changing motorist speeding behavior. (This will be conducted by IIHS.)
- To conduct a process evaluation of the pilot program’s implementation. (This will be conducted by the lead state agency, with guidance from the consultant.)

Scope of Work

The selected lead state agency(ies), in collaboration with other state and local stakeholders and partners, should be prepared to develop, implement and evaluate (the outcome evaluation will be led by IIHS) a speed management pilot program in a community or corridor employing engineering, enforcement, communications and advocacy countermeasures, along with policy and other initiatives. The proposal should describe the following:

A. Pilot and Control Sites

   I. Identify the proposed pilot site (a community) and explain why it was selected.

      a. This description should include key highway safety data — crash, citation and demographic — as well as other defining characteristics such as functional classification, traffic volume and composition (e.g., mix of cars, trucks, non-motorists), and posted speed limits.

      b. Identify the proposed control site (a community) that will not experience the interventions used at the pilot site so that evaluators can compare outcomes to the pilot site. The ideal control site is one that has no intention of implementing new speeding interventions that would confound the comparison. This includes changes in speed enforcement, messaging, engineering countermeasures or policy such as changes to speed limits and/or the use of automated enforcement immediately before (when pre-intervention data will be collected) or during the pilot program.

         i. Using relevant supporting data, describe how the proposed control site is like the proposed pilot site based on the characteristics identified under I.a.

         ii. Describe how the control site is geographically distant enough from the pilot site to avoid potential spillover effects. The proposed control site should also be in a different media market, so residents are not exposed to the speed-related messaging deployed in the pilot site.

         iii. Letters of commitment from the pilot and/or control sites are encouraged, but not required.

B. Data Availability and Collection

   I. IIHS will collect relevant data to evaluate the program, including public awareness, enforcement and vehicle speed data at the pilot and control sites before (baseline) and during (intervention) the pilot. The proposal should:

      a. Affirm agreement to collect baseline data before implementation of the selected countermeasures and affirm agreement to work with evaluation team in establishing the final timeline for countermeasure implementation so that the program can be rigorously evaluated (e.g., to ensure that weather conditions are similar during “before” and “after” speed data collection periods).
b. Describe what assistance the lead state agency and/or its partners can provide to help collect data. This includes identifying:
   i. Partners that can assist with data collection. The recommendation of a local contractor that could help with speed data collection is encouraged, but not required.
   ii. Assistance available to select data collection sites at the pilot and control locations for speed, traffic and public awareness data.
   iii. Assistance available to identify roadway characteristics, such as the posted speed limit, roadway alignment (curved or straight), number of lanes and relation to intersection, at potential speed data collection sites.

c. Indicate what enforcement data, such as speeding citations issued by traffic/road officers and automated speed enforcement cameras (if applicable) prior to and during the pilot, would be made available to IIHS and how it would be provided (format). To demonstrate the availability of this data, the proposal should include detailed information on the number of speeding citations issued during the past year along with location, date and time of day, if available.

C. Pilot Program Countermeasures

The proposal should describe countermeasures to be deployed in the following four areas: engineering, enforcement, communications and public outreach, and advocacy. Applicants are also encouraged, but not required, to describe policy initiatives related to speed management that will be championed in conjunction with the pilot. The proposal may include plans to use existing funding sources such as federal (FHWA, NHTSA), state and/or local grants. The GHSA/IIHS grant would be used to supplement the existing funds, and countermeasures implemented from all funding sources will be included in the pilot program evaluation conducted by IIHS. To support a rigorous evaluation, countermeasures that will be undertaken during the pilot should represent a meaningful change from current activities.

I. Engineering Initiatives

   a. The proposal should describe the use of engineering countermeasures at the pilot site (a corridor or community), including:
      i. Currently deployed infrastructure-oriented speed management countermeasures and relevant factors for changing the current infrastructure environment.
      ii. Proposed temporary engineering countermeasures designed to manage and reduce speeding. Often referred to as traffic calming, these include horizontal and vertical deflections, lane narrowing, signing, pavement markings and other features that use physical or psycho-perception means to produce the desired effect of getting motorists to slow down. For each countermeasure, the proposal should
indicate if any of these or other treatments are currently installed in
the pilot site and/or if one or more are planned, the timetable for
installation, the anticipated impact on reducing speeds and whether
education and training will be needed for law enforcement,
policymakers, the public and/or the media.

iii. Letters of support from the appropriate governing body, such as the
mayor, city council or county commissioners, in the locality where the
temporary engineering countermeasures will be implemented.

II. Enforcement Initiatives

a. The proposal should describe the use of enforcement countermeasures at
the pilot site, including:

i. Current speed-related enforcement (including the use of automated
enforcement, if applicable).

ii. The enforcement agency(ies) that would be involved in the pilot and
the tactics that would be deployed (i.e., high visibility, saturation
patrols, use of RADAR/LIDAR, automated enforcement), including
their frequency, to identify and engage with speeding motorists. All
participating agencies and their personnel would be expected to
enforce all traffic laws, but with the focus on speeding.

iii. Letters of commitment from participating agencies that identify the
type of enforcement data, such as citations issued, hours worked and
other relevant metrics that will be collected and made available for
evaluation purposes (strongly encouraged).

iv. What equipment (e.g., RADAR/LIDAR, portable roadway signs) will be
used and/or needed.

v. Any specialized training that officers have or would receive in support
of the pilot. The latter could range from simple directives or bulletins
to formalized instruction or training such as in the use of
RADAR/LIDAR.

III. Communications & Public Outreach Initiatives

a. The proposal should describe the use of communications, outreach and
community-based programs, including:

i. Any speed-related communication that has been conducted in the pilot
site.

ii. A proposed new communications program for the pilot site, keeping in
mind that technical support will also be available from IIHS.

b. For both past and proposed programs, the following should be addressed (if
applicable): campaign theme and logo, key message(s), target demographic
and the data used to identify this group, paid and earned media tactics
(e.g., advertisements, press releases, palm cards, kickoff event, billboards,
social media posts), and traditional and nontraditional media channels. The location of the pilot site may impact the ability to buy media, so special discounts, two-for-one matches, bonus buys and other ways to stretch the advertising budget should be identified. In addition, the use of innovative, effective and low-cost earned media is strongly encouraged.

c. Letters of commitment from partners that will help implement the communications and public outreach countermeasures are encouraged.

IV. Advocate/Community Partner Engagement & Activation

Survivor advocates can turn their personal tragedy into meaningful action by relaying stories that help motorists understand that speeding can result in negative consequences. They can also be a powerful voice in persuading policymakers to act by lowering speed limits on high-crash corridors or allowing for the use of speed cameras in school zones and densely populated neighborhoods. Community partners can help deliver the speeding message(s) to their peers, including delivery in a language other than English, through their own communication channels.

The proposal should:

a. Describe an existing program or plan to develop a program that leverages local survivor advocates and key community partners to advocate for change, and that identifies:
   i. Local survivor advocates and key community partners already active in addressing speeding, if available.
   ii. The role that advocates would play in engaging with and educating the target audience(s), policymakers and the media.
   iii. Any training, materials and/or other resources that advocates would need.

b. Include letters of commitment from advocates and community partners that would participate in the pilot program (highly encouraged).

V. Policy Initiatives

Applicants are also encouraged, but not required, to describe policy initiatives related to speed management that will be championed in conjunction with the pilot.

a. Describe the speed-related policy environment at the pilot site, including:
   i. Identifying the current speed-related policy environment and any relevant speed-related policy changes that have been instituted in the pilot site in the past 12 months. These could include measures such as raising/lowering speed limits, allowing/prohibiting the use of
automated speed enforcement or RADAR/LIDAR, establishing neighborhood slow zones and/or other initiatives.

ii. Any policy(ies) that will go into effect during the pilot.

iii. Any policy(ies) that the lead agency and its partners would champion in conjunction with the pilot, if applicable. (For the latter, it is understood that policy change takes time. Therefore, any effort to effect policy change would likely continue after the conclusion of the pilot.)

b. Letters of commitment from partners willing to advocate for speed-related policy change are encouraged.

Timeline

The proposal should include a detailed timeline showing when all countermeasures will be implemented during the six-month pilot. The use of a Gantt chart is strongly encouraged.

Budget

The proposal should include a detailed budget that describes how the lead state agency and its partners will leverage the grant funds and other financial and in-kind resources it can bring to the table to implement the proposed pilot program.

Letters of commitment and/or documentation confirming the availability of state, community and/or partner funds and other resources are strongly encouraged.

Lead State Agency and Program Partners

The proposal should identify the lead state agency that is applying for this grant and that is also responsible for planning and executing the community or corridor pilot program in collaboration with other state and local stakeholders and partners. The lead state agency must be an SHSO, an SHSO's governing agency or a State Department of Transportation. The proposal should also identify the key stakeholders and partners that have agreed to support this pilot program (as of the date the proposal was submitted for consideration).

The proposal should describe the organization of a local working group comprised of the lead state agency and partners that will guide the pilot program. Working group members do not necessarily have to be involved in implementing the pilot, but they could represent community stakeholders that would be impacted by or can help advance the initiative. The working group will hold regularly scheduled meetings before, during and after the pilot. During the kickoff meeting, the consultant will work with the planning group to formalize the work plan and implementation timeline. This group would also participate in the process evaluation and a final debrief that would help inform the template. The proposal should list the names, titles and organizations of participating or prospective working group members.
Selection Criteria

A grant(s) will be awarded to the state agency(ies) whose proposal best addresses the scope of work and other requirements outlined in this RFP. Each proposal received by the deadline will be evaluated by a Selection Committee using criteria including, but not limited to, the following:

- Quality, clarity, content and thoroughness of proposal in addressing the required tasks, including professional presentation
- Demonstration of understanding of the scope of work and the technical approach to the project
- The application and degree of innovation and creativity of proposed tactics to meet the project’s objectives using proven and promising countermeasures
- The ability to implement a multidisciplinary approach to speed management as demonstrated through the proposed tasks and key partners commitments
- Credit for past speed management efforts
- Well-reasoned allocation of grant funds and the ability to bring other resources to the table
- The degree to which the proposed pilot project can be rigorously evaluated
- The degree to which the proposed pilot project can be scaled to serve as a model for other states and communities

How to Respond

Complete and submit the online proposal form at https://fs8.formsite.com/ghsa/2020speed/. Applications submitted via an alternate method (i.e., mail, courier, hand delivery) will NOT be accepted. A state may submit more than one proposal, but each proposal must address all the required tasks as outlined in the Scope of Work and include a timeline and budget as well as identification of the lead state agency, program partners and working group.

The deadline for submitting a proposal is March 1, 2020, at 11:59 p.m. ET. Proposals received after this deadline will NOT be considered for review. GHSA and IIHS reserve the right to accept or reject any and all proposals.

Questions concerning this RFP should be directed to Pam Shadel Fischer at pfischer@ghsa.org.
Resources

Applicants are encouraged to consult the following resources for speed management program guidance, keeping in mind this list is by no means complete:

- The Institute of Transportation Engineers Speed Management Hub: [https://www.ite.org/technical-resources/topics/speed-management-for-safety/](https://www.ite.org/technical-resources/topics/speed-management-for-safety/)
- Vision Zero Network Case Studies: [https://visionzeronetwork.org/resources/case-studies/](https://visionzeronetwork.org/resources/case-studies/)
- Countermeasures That Work, 9th Edition: [https://www.ghsa.org/resources/countermeasures](https://www.ghsa.org/resources/countermeasures)
- IIHS Speed Management webpage and research: [https://www.iihs.org/topics/speed](https://www.iihs.org/topics/speed)
- Safe Mobility Santa Ana – A Vision Zero Plan, Appendix C: Countermeasure Toolbox: [https://www.santa-ana.org/sites/default/files/Documents/AppendixC.pdf](https://www.santa-ana.org/sites/default/files/Documents/AppendixC.pdf)
- GHSA/IIHS Speed Management Pilot Program webinar (audio and slides) conducted Nov. 14, 2019: [https://register.gotowebinar.com/recording/5849556194278259971](https://register.gotowebinar.com/recording/5849556194278259971) (registration required)

###