



CMF Clearinghouse Webinar – December 08, 2021

Looking Behind the Curtain: Spotlight on CMFs, DDSA and Decision-Making Processes in Wisconsin, North Carolina, and Beyond

Audience Questions with CMF Clearinghouse Team Responses

**Some questions have been reworded for clarity.*

Questions for Clearinghouse/CMF Use

Question: Is there a minimum star rating recommended to use when selecting CMFs for various application scenarios?

The star quality rating indicates the quality or confidence in the results of the study producing the CMF. Various factors go into determining the star rating of a CMF. Further details about star quality rating can be found at <http://cmfclearinghouse.org/sqr.cfm>.

When selecting a CMF for use, users are encouraged to look at the CMF details in addition to the star ratings to ensure that the CMF that is being selected is appropriate for and applicable to their specific use case. The CMF Clearinghouse does not recommend a minimum star rating when selecting a CMF, rather it provides users with pertinent information to make informed decisions.

Question: Could the CMF Clearinghouse website consider adding a feature that allows requests from users for future CMFs that are not found on the site?

The CMF Clearinghouse hosts a “Most Wanted CMF” list that represents areas or specific countermeasures for which the CMF Clearinghouse does not have CMFs. These areas have been shown to be of interest to users of the Clearinghouse based on an analysis of searches conducted. Essentially, the question posed when developing this list is, "what are people searching for but not finding?". This “Most Wanted CMF” list can be found at http://cmfclearinghouse.org/most_wanted.cfm.

We always encourage users to submit their CMF research needs (as well as newly developed CMFs) to the CMF Clearinghouse. Further information on submitting any ideas or needs you have for CMFs that are not presented in the CMF Clearinghouse can be found at http://cmfclearinghouse.org/research_submit.cfm. Based on the ideas/needs we receive, we endeavor to target published studies (for the specific countermeasure) for review and inclusion in the Clearinghouse. If there are no published studies (on that countermeasure), we view it as a future research need and potentially include it on the "CMF Most Wanted" list.

Questions for WisDOT Presentation

Question: When combining Highway Safety Manual Part D CMFs, how do you apply the standard error?

WisDOT does not apply the standard error. WisDOT just uses the point estimate of the CMF for our calculations and consider the standard error when selecting which CMF to use and put into the WisDOT CMF Table ([link](#)).

Question: What time period do you use for method 1 for observed crashes?

WisDOT typically uses 5 years of before data for observed crashes and use a 10-year future analysis period. WisDOT will look further back than 5 years, especially when considering pedestrian and bicycle crashes, to help establish trends, but only apply the CMFs to data within that 5-year period.

Question: Is the methodology to combine CMFs project specific or same for all projects?

WisDOT uses the same methodology for all projects. This can be found in our manual ([link](#)).

Questions for NCDOT Presentation

Question: Who was the driver of getting a data-driven approach signed into law? What role did the DOT play?

Getting the data-driven approach (Prioritization) signed into law was dual-driven and required champions on the political side (NC Legislature) and technical side (NCDOT, especially NCDOT Management). There were strong supporters politically (including both sides of the “isle”) that wanted to see a change to how major projects were evaluated, selected, and funded. While simultaneously, it took strong leadership from NCDOT Management to put a team in place to make sure it was possible and for that team to get buy-in from the partners (MPOs, RPOs, and the rest of NCDOT support staff).

NCDOT was vital in proving that a prioritization process could be done successfully. This was accomplished by having “trial runs” that were accomplished prior to the Strategic Transportation Investments (STI) Law formally being adopted in 2013. Prioritization 1.0 (P1.0) and P2.0 were accomplished while the prior Equity Funding Formula was still the STIP funding law. P3.0 scoring were the first official results generated and used under the STI Law. This pre-work took lot of time with the partners through the Prioritization Workgroup to establish scoring criteria and processes that would be required to score the projects. NCDOT Management was vital in sharing the story and having the desire to move towards a data-driven approach which built confidence with our transportation planning partners (MPO/RPOs) and the political leaders. The relationships that were built during this process remain the backbone of NC successfully following the procedure and NCDOT getting acceptance of the outcomes that are generated through prioritization scoring.