CARE Weather-Fatality Relationship Update Applied to 2016 and 2018 Data

CY2014-2018 Source Data

David B. Brown, PhD, P.E. brown@cs.ua.edu

June 25, 2019

Table of Contents

Introduction, Background and Project Approach	1
Summary of Findings	2
Practical Conclusions and Recommendations from the Analysis	3
Appendix – CARE IMPACT Results Severity Comparisons: Majority Dry Days vs. Majority Wet Days Primary Contributing Circumstances: Dry Days Fatal Crashes vs All in Year Estimated Speed at Impact Dry Days Fatal Crashes vs All in the Year	4 5 7 9

Introduction, Background and Project Approach

The purpose of this report is to update the quantitative relationships between wet weather (and resulting wet pavement) on crash frequency and severity that were original reported in a Power Point presentation in 2014:

http://www.safehomealabama.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Weather-9Jan2014-TRCC-v06-WComp-v04-v07.pdf

These findings were updated in a report CARE Weather-Fatality Relationship Update dated May 6, 2019 that used 2014-2018 data, and it can be accessed here:

http://www.safehomealabama.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Weather-Combine-Binder1.pdf

This previous update was accomplished by subdividing 2018 days into those that were primarily dry and those primarily wet. This was done by creating two cross-tabulations of daily (month by day of the month) for exclusively wet crashes and for exclusively dry crashes. The average numbers of all crashes (wet and dry) was calculated to be 437 crashes per day for the 2014-2018 reporting period. Half of this number rounded up was 219, and this number was used to determine if any particular day was majority wet or majority dry, or what we will call just "wet days" or "dry days" for shorter terminology.

The objective of this second update is to determine the degree to which the dramatic increase in fatal crashes in CY2016 (illustrated in **bold** in the cross-tabulation below) was affected by weather. To do this the exact same approach used to assess the 2018 data was applied to the 2016 data.

🚦 CARE 10.2.0.8 - [Crosstab Results - 2014-2018 Alabama Integrated Crash Data] - 🗆 🔿											
🖡 <u>F</u> ile <u>D</u> ashk	ooard <u>F</u> ilters	<u>A</u> nalysis <u>C</u> rosstal	<u>L</u> ocations	<u>T</u> ools <u>W</u> indow	<u>H</u> elp	-	ðх				
2014-2018 Alabama Integrated Crash Data V All records (do not apply a filter)											
Suppress Zero Va	; Row: Crash Severity										
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	TOTAL					
Fatal Injury	742 0.56%	800 0.53%	996 0.64%	860 866 0.55% 0.54%		4264 0.56%					
Incapacitating Injury	6016 4.50%	6530 4.36%	6109 3.91%	5580 3.55%	5225 3.27%	29460 3.89%					
Non- Incapacitating Inju	10027 7.50%	11155 7.44%	11604 7.42%	11676 7.43%	11870 7.43%	56332 7.45%					
Possible Injury	12056 9.02%	13681 9.13%	14945 9.56%	15003 15077 9.55% 9.44%		70762 9.35%					
Property Damage Only	100688 75.33%	113556 75.77%	118614 75.87%	119478 76.05%	122401 76.67%	574737 75.96%					
Unknown	4130 3.09%	4156 2.77%	4069 2.60%	4507 2.87%	4216 2.64%	21078 2.79%					
TOTAL	133659 17.66%	149878 19.81%	156337 20.66%	157104 159655 20.76% 21.10%		756633 100.00%					

Summary of Findings

A filter was created of the wet and dry days for each of the years (2016 and 2018) that enabled a comparison to be made between wet and dry days for each year in terms of total crashes and fatal crashes per day. The following is a summary of the findings:

General Overall Parameters from 2014-2018:

- Overall number of crashes per day (2014-2018): 437.
- Number of crashes to qualify for a majority dry or wet day = 437/2 = 219 (rounded up).
- Some days that did not have 219 crashes could not be classified as either majority wet or dry, so the sum of the two "usable days" does not add to 365.

Analysis for 2018:

- Number of wet and dry days in 2018:
 - 48 wet days
 - 300 dry days (total of 348 useable days)
- Average number of crashes per day for 2018:
 - On Wet days: 344
 - On Dry days: 356
 - \circ Increase number of crashes on dry days = 3.5%
- Total number of fatal crashes in 2018
 - On Wet days: 78
 - On Dry days: 608
- Average number of fatal crashes per day in 2018:
 - On Wet days: 1.625
 - On Dry days: 2.027
 - \circ Increase average number of fatal crashes on dry days = 24.7%
- Estimate of the 608 dry day fatal crashes that would be saved *if all days were wet days* = 150 fatal crashes = about 25% of the 608 fatal crashes.

Corresponding Analysis for 2016:

- Number of wet and dry days in 2016:
 - o 35 wet days
 - 323 dry days (totals 358 useable days)
- Average number of crashes per day for 2016:
 - On Wet days: 312
 - On Dry days: 360
 - \circ Increase number of all crashes on dry days = 13.2%
- Total number of fatal crashes in 2016
 - On Wet days: 55
 - On Dry days: 811
- Average number of fatal crashes per day in 2016:

- On Wet days: 1.571
- On Dry days: 2.511
- \circ Increase average number of fatal crashes on dry days = 59.8%
- Estimate of the 811 dry day fatal crashes that would be saved *if all days were wet days* = 485 fatal crashes = 59.8% of the 811 fatal crashes.
- If 2016 had the same number of wet days as 2018 (48 instead of the 35 that it had), it would have saved 1.598 fatal crashes per day or 1.598*13 = about 21 fatal crashes over the entire year.

Practical Conclusions and Recommendations from the Analysis

It could be reasoned that we cannot control the weather, so what good is the analysis given above. This reasoning is fallacious in that there are countermeasures that can be brought to bear other than that of controlling the weather. Consider the following:

- Increased enforcement on dry weather days, especially when the weather has been dry for several days. It has been shown that a characteristic known as *speed adaption* occurs when drivers get used to the higher speeds and fail to realize the risks. It can be expected that such might occur over a long period of time in which the weather has not served to slow them down.
- Increased perception of officer presence on dry days. It is the perceived possibility of getting stopped that slows drivers down as opposed to actually getting stopped, since a relatively small number of speeders actually get apprehended. Even slowing the average speed of travel down by 5 MPH could have a dramatic effect on reducing the number of crashes as well as the severity when a crash occurs.
- Concentrated enforcement on extreme speeders. The exact cut-off points and locations might be established by research, since it is reasonable that enforcement will be more effective at the times and places where extreme speeds are encountered, as opposed to just a few MPH over the speed limits. The eCite system might be a database that can be processed to find the locations where extreme speeding takes place.
- Education on the consequences of increasing speed by 10 MPH, and the potential benefits of the incremental reduction of speeds. Some graphical demonstrations might be of use to illustrate the effect that a 10 MPH increase in impact speed has on doubling the probability of any crash resulting in at least one fatality.
- Increased penalties for higher speeds. To some extent the increased fines and points for speeding in excess of 15 MPH is a step in the right direction. However, the speeds we are seeing are much in excess of 15 MPH over the speed limit, and some sanctions should be considered for revoking the license as soon as it is judicially and administratively possible when speeds exceed a given limit (such as 90 MPH). It is expected that this would have an overall effect on reducing speeds since many drivers are not aware of their specific speed when it gets this high.

Appendix – CARE IMPACT Results

Three further IMPACT analyses for each of the two years (2016 and 2018) were performed to pinpoint the primary cause of the increases in fatality crashes in dry weather:

- 1. Comparisons of severity for the wet and dry days;
- 2. Comparisons of Primary Contributing Circumstances for wet and dry days;
- 3. Comparisons of Speeds of Impact for the wet and dry days; and
- 4. Replication of each of these done for 2018 again for 2016.

Note: 2018 analyses will be given first since that year is more indicative of what can be expected in the immediate future. Compare the results of the 2016 against the 2018 analyses to determine any difference between these two time periods. Discussions will be given beneath the IMPACT output displays.

Severity Comparisons: Majority Dry Days vs. Majority Wet Days

2018 Severity Comparison



Odds ratios show that the increase in the proportion in wet weather of both Fatal and Incapacitating Injury crashes was over 20% above that which would be expected if the dry weather proportion were in effect. The only severity classification that is under-represented was Property Damage Only, which accounted for over three quarters of the crashes.

2016 Severity Comparison

🖡 CA	ARE 10.2.	0.8 - [IMP/	ACT Result	ts - 2014-201	8 Alabam	a Integrated	d Crash Da	ta - 2016 Maj	Dry Pvmn	t Days vs	. 2016 AND	Wet Pvmnt Days]	_		×
E E	ile <u>D</u> a	shboard	<u>F</u> ilters	<u>A</u> nalysis	<u>I</u> mpact	<u>L</u> ocations	s <u>T</u> ools	<u>W</u> indow	<u>H</u> elp					-	ъ×
¢?	2014-20	18 Alabama	a Integrated	Crash Data		~	201	6 Maj Dry Pvr	nnt Days			~ 9	1/ 1/2	2014 \sim	12/31/20
Order	r: Max Ga	in	∼ De	scending	~	Suppres	s Zero-Val	ued Rows		Significa	ance: Over l	Representation	Thresh	old: 2.	D 🚖
C025	: Crash S	everity		Subse Frequence	et Sub cy Perce	set ent I	Other Frequency	Other Percent	Odds Ratio	; ;	Max Gain	C025: Crash Se	verity		
•	Fatal Inj	ury		81	11	0.70	55	0.50	1.	387*	226.200				
	Incapad	itating Inju	ry	482	27	4.16	369	3.38	1.	230*	903.521				
	Non-Inc	apacitating	g Injury	887	75	7.64	821	7.52	! 1	.017	145.524				
	Possible	Injury		1134	46	9.77	1132	10.36	0	.943	-690.256				
	Property	Damage (Only	8751	13	75.34	8328	76.24	0	.988	-1036.419				
	Unknow	'n		278	B0	2.39	219	2.00	1.	194*	451.431	Sort by Sum of N	Max Gain		
	🗋 🕼 🞯 🎜														
	2014-2018 Alabama Integrated Crash Data - Filter = 2016 Maj Dry Prvmt Days vs. 2016 AND Wet Prvmt Days C025: Crash Severity 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0														

The results for 2016 are quite comparable to those for 2018, with a major exception. The degree of over-representation in the fatal injury classification is about twice that of the 2018 results. This indicates a greater proportion of fatal crashes than in 2018. The severe injury classification has about the same over-representation, as given by the Odds Ratios.

Primary Contributing Circumstances: Dry Days Fatal Crashes vs All in Year

2018 PCC Comparisons for Categories with at Least 5 Occurrences

🖡 CA	RE 10.2.0.8 - [IMPACT Results	s - 2014-2018 Ala	abama Integra	ated Crash Dat	ta - 2018 and D	ry Pavement A	and Fatal Crash	es AND Not Prim	ar —		×
🖡 Ei	le <u>D</u> ashboard <u>F</u> ilters	<u>A</u> nalysis <u>I</u> mp	oact <u>L</u> ocati	ons <u>T</u> ools	<u>W</u> indow	<u>H</u> elp				-	₽ ×
6 2	2014-2018 Alabama Integrated (Crash Data	~	201	8 and Dry Pave	ment And Fatal (Crashes	~ 9	1/ 1/201	I4 ~ 12	2/31/20
Order:	Max Gain 🗸 Des	cending	V V Supp	oress Zero-Val	ued Rows	Signit	ficance: Over	Representation	✓ Threshold	: 2.0	*
C015:	Primary Contributing Circum	stance Subset Frequency	Subset Percent	Other Frequency	Other Percent	Odds Ratio	Max Gain 👻	C015: Primary	Contributing C	ircumsta	ance
•	Over Speed Limit	79	14.42	2077	2.42	5.962*	65.749				
	DUI	74	13.50	4112	4.79	2.821*	47.765				
	E Aggressive Operation	60	10.95	2686	3.13	3.501*	42.863				
	E Ran off Road	58	10.58	3676	4.28	2.473*	34.547				
	E Improper Crossing	35	6.39	212	0.25	25.877*	33.647				
	E Crossed Centerline	32	5.84	1996	2.32	2.513*	19.265				
	Traveling Wrong Way/Wro	22	4.01	697	0.81	4.947*	17.553				
	Failed to Yield the Right-of	13	2.37	392	0.46	5.198	10.499				
	E Over Correcting/Over Ste	15	2.74	1624	1.89	1.448	4.639				
	E Fatigued/Asleep	17	3.10	2779	3.24	0.959	-0.730				
	Improper Passing	6	1.09	1339	1.56	0.702	-2.543				
	E Distracted by Use of Elec	6	1.09	1347	1.57	0.698	-2.594				
	E Ran Stop Sign	7	1.28	1537	1.79	0.714	-2.806				
	E Other - No Improper Driving	9	1.64	1860	2.17	0.758	-2.867				
	E Failed to Yield Right-of-W	12	2.19	3015	3.51	0.624	-7.236				
	E Other Improper Action	6	1.09	2608	3.04	0.361	-10.639				
	Defective Equipment	5	0.91	2527	2.94	0.310	-11.122				
	E Ran Traffic Signal	12	2.19	4385	5.11	0.429	-15.976				
	E Other Distraction Inside th	6	1.09	3538	4.12	0.266	-16.573				
	E Failed to Yield Right-of-W	29	5.29	7363	8.57	0.617*	-17.976				
	E Failed to Yield Right-of-W	16	2.92	6398	7.45	0.392	-24.819				
	Unseen Object/Person/Ve	20	3.65	9872	11.49	0.318*	-42.984				
	Improper Lane Change/Use	9	1.64	8894	10.35	0.159	-47.744	Sort by Sum o	f Max Gain		
0	i 🚳 🖉									🗌 Displa	lay Filt
			2	2014-2018 Alab	ama Integrated	Crash Data					
			(C015: Primary	Contributing Cir	cumstance					
	15										
									_		
	ਨੂ 10								_		
	enbe										
	Ë 5										
					lan 1						
	0	E Improper Ci	rossing	E Fatiques	1/Asleep	E Failed t	to Yield	E Failed to Y	ïeld		
			-			Right-of-Way fr	rom Driveway	Right-of-Way from	Stop Sign		
	C015: Primary Contributing Circumstance										

It is no exaggeration to say that speed is *always* a factor in fatal crashes. Of those that are over-represented by more than 2.0 (red background), most are related to excessive speeds.

🖡 CA	RE 10.2.0.8 - [IMPACT Results	- 2014-2018 A	labama Integra	ated Crash Dat	a - 2016 Maj D	ry Pvmnt Days	AND Fatal Cra	shes AND Not P	rim —		
E Ei	le <u>D</u> ashboard <u>F</u> ilters	<u>A</u> nalysis <u>I</u> m	pact <u>L</u> ocati	ons <u>T</u> ools	<u>W</u> indow	<u>H</u> elp				_ 8 ×	
8	2014-2018 Alabama Integrated	Crash Data	~	201	6 Maj Dry Pvmn	t Days AND Fata	al Crashes	~ 9	1/ 1/201	4 ~ 12/31/20	
Order	Max Gain 🗸 Des	cending	V Supp	oress Zero-Valu	ued Rows	Signit	ficance: Over	Representation	✓ Threshold:	2.0	
C015:	Primary Contributing Circum	stance Subset Frequency	Subset Percent	Other Frequency	Other Percent	Odds Ratio	Max Gain	C015: Primar	y Contributing Ci	rcumstance	
•	Over Speed Limit	95	13.93	2411	2.41	5.770*	78.536				
	DUI	107	15.69	4380	4.39	3.577*	77.090				
	E Aggressive Operation	66	9.68	2445	2.45	3.953*	49.304				
	E Ran off Road	70	10.26	3423	3.43	2.995*	46.625				
	E Improper Crossing	32	4.69	198	0.20	23.667*	30.648				
	E Crossed Centerline	32	4.69	1964	1.97	2.386*	18.588				
	Traveling Wrong Way/Wro	22	3.23	707	0.71	4.557*	17.172				
	E Fatigued/Asleep	31	4.55	2687	2.69	1.689*	12.651				
	Pedestrian Under the Influe	9	1.32	40	0.04	32.949	8.727				
	E Not Visible	9	1.32	54	0.05	24.407	8.631				
	E Ran Stop Sign	17	2.49	1355	1.36	1.837	7.747				
	E Over Correcting/Over Ste	18	2.64	1532	1.53	1.721	7.538				
	E Wrong Side of Road	6	0.88	78	0.08	11.265	5.467				
	Improper Passing	9	1.32	1294	1.30	1.019	0.164				
	E Other - No Improper Driving	9	1.32	1751	1.75	0.753	-2.957				
	E Other Distraction Inside th	15	2.20	3526	3.53	0.623	-9.078				
	E Other Improper Action	6	0.88	2727	2.73	0.322	-12.622				
	Defective Equipment	5	0.73	2592	2.60	0.282	-12.700				
	E Ran Traffic Signal	16	2.35	4234	4.24	0.553	-12.913				
	E Swerved to Avoid Vehicle	10	1.47	3702	3.71	0.396	-15.280				
	E Failed to Yield Right-of-W	30	4.40	7224	7.23	0.608*	-19.331				
	Driving too Fast for Conditions	12	1.76	4830	4.84	0.364	-20.983				
	E Failed to Yield Right-of-W	17	2.49	6400	6.41	0.389	-26.704				
	Unseen Object/Person/Ve	26	3.81	9877	9.89	0.385*	-41.447				
	Improper Lane Change/Use	5	0.73	7626	7.64	0.096	-47.076				
	Followed too Close	8	1.17	22815	22.84	0.051	-147.798	Sort by Sum	of Max Gain		
00) (🖉 🖉							,	[Display Filt	
			:	2014-2018 Alab	ama Integrated	Crash Data					
				C015: Primary	Contributing Cir	cumstance					
	30										
		L.L.	ba.B				aad	da	.1.1		
		E Improper Cros	sing	E Not Visible	i Im	Other - No proper Driving	E Sw Avoid	erved to Vehicle	Improper Lane Change/Use		
JI	C015: Primary Contributing Circumstance										

2016 PCC Comparisons for Categories with at Least 5 Occurrences

The over-represented PCCs for 2016 are essentially identical to those for 2018, and they are heavily influenced by Speed, DUI or a combination of the two. Improper Crossing refers to pedestrian fatalities in the Subset Frequency column. Pedestrian Under the Influence accounts for 9 fatal crashes in 2016, but was less than 5 in 2018.

Estimated Speed at Impact Dry Days Fatal Crashes vs All in the Year

2018 Impact Speed Comparisons

🖡 CA	RE 10.2.0.8 - [IMPA	ACT Results	s - 2014-2018 A	labama Integr	ated Crash Dat	ta - 2018 and D	ry Pavement A	And Fatal Crash	nes AND Not CU	Esti —		\times
🖡 Ei	le <u>D</u> ashboard	<u>F</u> ilters	<u>A</u> nalysis <u>I</u> n	npact <u>L</u> ocat	ions <u>T</u> ools	Window	<u>H</u> elp				-	₽ ×
6 9	2014-2018 Alabama	Integrated	Crash Data	~	201	8 and Dry Pave	ment And Fatal	Crashes	~ 💡	1/ 1/201	4 ~ 12	/31/20
Order:	Max Gain	~ Des	cending	🗸 🖂 Sup	press Zero-Val	ued Rows	Signi	ficance: Over	Representation	✓ Threshold	2.0	÷
C224:	CU Estimated Sp	eed at Impa	ct Subset Frequency	Subset Percent	Other Frequency	Other Percent	Odds Ratio	Max Gain	C224: CU Est	timated Speed a	t Impact	
•	1 to 5 MPH		9	2.09	12744	15.07	0.139	-55.955				
	6 to 10 MPH		13	3.02	9083	10.74	0.281	-33.295				
	11 to 15 MPH		11	2.55	6134	7.25	0.352	-20.264				
	16 to 20 MPH		10	2.32	4507	5.33	0.435	-12.972				
	21 to 25 MPH		8	1.86	4027	4.76	0.390	-12.525				
	26 to 30 MPH		13	3.02	4170	4.93	0.612	-8.254				
	31 to 35 MPH		7	1.62	4952	5.86	0.277	-18.240				
	36 to 40 MPH		11	2.55	4583	5.42	0.471	-12.359				
	41 to 45 MPH		22	5.10	7369	8.71	0.586*	-15.559				
	46 to 50 MPH		29	6.73	3717	4.40	1.531*	10.055				
	51 to 55 MPH		65	15.08	5790	6.85	2.203*	35.489				
	56 to 60 MPH		30	6.96	2746	3.25	2.143*	16.004				
	61 to 65 MPH		58	13.46	3164	3.74	3.597*	41.873				
	66 to 70 MPH		53	12.30	3681	4.35	2.825*	34.238				
	71 to 75 MPH		25	5.80	812	0.96	6.041*	20.861				
	76 to 80 MPH		23	5.34	527	0.62	8.563*	20.314				
	81 to 85 MPH		10	2.32	147	0.17	13.347	9.251				
	86 to 90 MPH		8	1.86	108	0.13	14.533	7.450				
	91 to 95 MPH		5	1.16	22	0.03	44.590	4.888				
	96 to 100 MPH		14	3.25	79	0.09	34.769	13.597				
	Over 100 MPH		7	1.62	35	0.04	39.239	6.822	Sort by Sum	of Max Gain		
00) 🗞 🖉										Displ	ay Filt
					2014-2018 Alab	ama Integrated	Crash Data					
					C224: CU Es	timated Speed	at Impact					
	20										_	
	> 15					- 1						
	10										_	
	Line and Lin				_	▙						
	5			11				hL.	Lan	.1.		
	0		21 to	25 MPH	46	to 50 MPH		71 to 75 MPH	I	96 to 100 MPH		
					C224: (CU Estimated S	peed at Impact					

Note especially the extreme speeding categories (above 80 MPH). Dry day fatalities had 44 (about 10%) crashes in those categories, while the control group had less than 1%. The probability of a crash being fatal doubles (approximately) for every 10 MPH increase in impact speeds.

🔋 CARE 10.2.0.8 - [IMPACT Results - 2014-2018 Alabama Integrated Crash Data - 2016 Maj Dry Pvmnt Days AND Fatal Crashes AND Not CU E... File Dashboard Filters <u>A</u>nalysis <u>I</u>mpact Locations <u>T</u>ools <u>W</u>indow <u>H</u>elp 2016 Maj Dry Pvmnt Days AND Fatal Crashes 2014-2018 Alabama Integrated Crash Data 12 Order: Max Gain Descending Suppress Zero-Valued Rows Significance: Over Representation \sim C224: CU Estimated S Subset Subset Other Other Odds Max Frequency Percent Frequency Percent Ratio Gain 0.126 -83.373 1 to 5 MPH 12 2.26 14824 17.96 6 to 10 MPH 17 9708 -45.458 3.20 11.76 0.272 11 to 15 MPH 12 2.26 6400 7.75 0.291 -29.176 7 4812 0.226 -23.959 16 to 20 MPH 1.32 5.83 5 0.94 4255 0.183 21 to 25 MPH 5.16 -22.375 0.067 26 to 30 MPH 2 0.38 4647 5.63 -27.897 31 to 35 MPH 5268 6.38 0.354 -21.893 12 2.26 36 to 40 MPH 19 3.58 4849 5.88 0.609 -12.197 41 to 45 MPH 5.27 0.592* 28 7353 8.91 -19.307 46 to 50 MPH 36 6.78 3615 4.38 1.548* 12.742 82 15.44 7.20 2.144* 43.758 51 to 55 MPH 5944 50 3.36 2.799* 32.134 56 to 60 MPH 9.42 2777 61 to 65 MPH 57 10.73 3005 3.64 2.948* 37.667 66 to 70 MPH 72 13.56 3487 4.22 3.209* 49.566 71 to 75 MPH 34 6.40 701 0.85 7.539* 29.490 76 to 80 MPH 29 5.46 467 0.57 9.652* 25.995 81 to 85 MPH 12 2.26 163 0.20 11.443 10.951 86 to 90 MPH 15 2.82 122 0 15 19 110 14 215 91 to 95 MPH 6 1.13 26 0.03 35.869 5.833 96 to 100 MPH 14 2.64 71 0.09 30.648 13.543 Over 100 MPH 10 1.88 40 0.05 38.858 9.743 Sort by Sum of Max Gain 📋 🕼 🐟 🖉

1/ 1/2014

Threshold:

-

2.0 🜲

 \times

đх

12/31/2

2016 Impact Speed Comparisons



As seen from a comparison of the charts and the red background items in the table (those with more than double their expected proportions, these results are quite comparable. Again in 2016, the impact speeds in excess of 80 MPH play a large part, in this case with 58 (as opposed to 44 in 2018). Clearly, the drier weather in 2016 led a great number of drivers to exceed the speed limits and also participate in extremely risky behaviors.