

# Central Florida Safety Strategic Plan

## Getting to Zero Checklist



April 2026



## Introduction

Welcome to the District 5 Getting to Zero checklist. These lists aim to prompt consideration of items that can be potentially overlooked when scoping a project and can make all the difference in achieving Target Zero.

Target Zero is a statewide initiative to reduce the number of transportation-related serious injuries and deaths across Florida to ZERO. Target Zero is taking evolutionary steps to improve how Florida connects, interacts, plans, designs, operates, and maintains its transportation system.

The Department of Transportation's focus on communities, as well as utilization of a Safe System Approach, can be found throughout this Getting to Zero checklist. The premise of the Safe System Approach is that humans make mistakes, but design choices and determinations can significantly improve the outcomes when crashes do occur by reducing the forces involved in each crash.

### SAFE SYSTEM APPROACH: CORE PRINCIPLES

- **Death and serious injuries are unacceptable.** The foundation of the safe system approach is the belief and conviction that no one should die or be seriously injured on our roads.
- **Humans make mistakes.** The transportation system should be designed to accommodate human mistakes. No mistake should be fatal.
- **Humans are vulnerable.** Designs should acknowledge human vulnerabilities.
- **Responsibility is shared.** We all have a part to play in reducing and preventing crashes.
- **Safety is proactive.** We shouldn't wait until crashes happen to act and mitigate risks.
- **Redundancy is crucial.** We should build safety nets into the transportation system so that if one part fails, the other parts still protect people.



The prompt lists are designed to encourage thinking beyond the way it's always been done to where we begin to ask, "Have I provided a safe transportation experience for all users regardless of their mobility choice?" While these lists are not all-inclusive, the hope is that users will consider the issues raised and adjust their practices or design as much as practical within their constraints to facilitate zero fatalities and serious injuries across Florida.



## *HOW TO USE THIS CHECKLIST:*

This checklist is intended for use by individuals across all roles and disciplines and should be applied during the project scoping phase for roadway and transportation infrastructure projects. Its purpose is to integrate safety considerations early and consistently by encouraging users to evaluate project locations through the lens of the Safe System approach, with the overarching goal of Getting to Zero.

The checklist is organized into three sections:

1. Pre-Site Visit

This section is to be completed prior to visiting the project location. It contains three checklists that require coordination, use of data or technology, and the review of existing information that is useful to know before you visit the project location. Questions are formatted as either Yes/No questions or fields for entering relevant information. Completing this section establishes a baseline understanding of existing conditions and prepares users to approach the site visit with an informed perspective of potential safety concerns.

2. Site Visit (Field Review)

The second section is to be completed during a site visit and includes seven checklists that are formatted with Yes/No questions, with space to provide additional context or observations if necessary. Conducting this review in the field allows users to directly observe existing conditions and make informed, accurate, context-sensitive assessments. This structured field review supports consistency and thoroughness while further embedding safety considerations into project scoping decisions.

3. Post-Site Visit

This section is to be completed after the site visit. Rather than prompting additional questions, this section provides space for reflection and synthesis of the information gathered throughout the process. Users are encouraged to identify patterns, highlight critical safety issues, and document actionable insights. This section is intended to support informed decision-making by translating observations into preliminary safety-focused considerations or recommendations that may be carried forward into project scoping, discussions, and subsequent phases of project development.

## Safety Considerations

The engineer of record is responsible for evaluating the unique safety challenges for all applicable users within the project area. This includes on-site evaluations and reviews of behavior, risks, and surrogate safety measures.

Understanding the anticipated users of the facility is key—both during construction, when considering workers, and after completion, when evaluating the final condition for all users. The high-level checklists below, which are not all-inclusive, highlight potential user groups to consider during field reviews and subsequent context-sensitive design processes:

- Pedestrians
- Bicyclists
- Motorcyclists
- Micromobility users
- Transit vehicles and users
- Freight vehicles



## Getting to Zero Checklist

- Aging road users
- Children
- Vehicles
- Maintenance professionals

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) takes a context-sensitive approach to planning, designing, and operating roadways on the state highway system outside of its limited access facilities. To understand the design and operations that would create a context-sensitive design for the given roadway, FDOT refers to the context classification of the roadway and the various criteria based on that classification. The resulting roadway is one that provides for the various mobility needs of the users expected on that facility from a context-sensitive design approach.

The identified improvement opportunities should be coordinated as part of the project scoping process in addition to what was potentially identified in desktop safety reviews or any other safety studies used for the project's development and incorporated into the project file via the preliminary project report for reference throughout the project's life.



Pre-Site Visit  
(Complete Prior to Site Visit)



## Existing Conditions

Documenting certain existing conditions will allow for the best use of the following checklists. Please use the space below to document all the prompted field conditions for a project location.

**FPID and Project Description:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Location:** \_\_\_\_\_

1. Describe existing typical sections: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Is roadway divided/undivided? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Posted speed limit: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Design speed: \_\_\_\_\_
5. 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed (if known): \_\_\_\_\_
6. Average daily traffic (ADT): \_\_\_\_\_
7. Context Classification: \_\_\_\_\_
8. Curb and gutter present? \_\_\_\_\_
9. Type of curb and gutter (if present): \_\_\_\_\_
10. Sidewalk present? \_\_\_\_\_
11. Is sidewalk offset from back of curb (if present?): \_\_\_\_\_
12. Bicycle facilities present? \_\_\_\_\_
13. Is there existing or planned public transportation services along the corridor? \_\_\_\_\_
14. Is the project located on a designated or commonly used route to school? \_\_\_\_\_
15. Is this corridor a priority route for emergency response? \_\_\_\_\_
16. Is there existing lighting? \_\_\_\_\_
17. Condition of signing/pavement markings? \_\_\_\_\_
18. Evidence of ponding or drainage issues? \_\_\_\_\_
19. Are there any pavement condition concerns? \_\_\_\_\_
20. Are there any visual obstructions/sight distance concerns? \_\_\_\_\_
21. Is project located on a high injury network? \_\_\_\_\_
22. Is project located on an designated freight route? \_\_\_\_\_
23. What percentage of daily trips are attributable to heavy vehicles? \_\_\_\_\_



## Crash Data

Crash trends help identify where crashes are occurring and reveal patterns in how they happen, along with potential contributing factors. By analyzing the types and frequency of crashes, this checklist can help target specific issues and guide design considerations that address the root causes.

For each item, select “Yes,” “No,” or “N/A” based on the specific conditions of your project. Your responses should be informed by either field observations, or research and documentation. If you select “Yes” for any item, use the space at the bottom of the page to provide additional details, context, or notes as needed.

**YES | NO | N/A**

- 1. Has crash data been collected for the latest five-year period from Signal Four Analytics?
- 2. Are there any fatalities or serious injury crashes identified?
- 3. Are there any pedestrian or bicycle fatalities or serious injury crashes identified?
- 4. Are any segments/intersections within the project limits identified as High Crash in the latest five-year period?
- 5. Have crash trends (for example speed, failure to yield, use of drugs/alcohol, wrong-way driving) been identified? If yes, please explain in the space provided below.
- 6. Do any crashes mention hydroplaning?
- 7. Are a high number of crashes occurring during adverse weather conditions?
- 8. Are a high number of crashes occurring during nighttime hours?
- 9. Are any intersections or curves ideal candidates for the implementation of high friction surface treatment due to a history of run off the road crashes?
- 10. Are there any identified safety solutions to address/mitigate types of crashes occurring?
- 11. Are there any known near-miss locations or available near-miss data within the project limits?

**LIST DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS BASED ON CRASH DATA AND FIELD OBSERVATIONS:**



## Public Outreach

Considering public and stakeholders input during the scoping process is important because local users have valuable insights into the area’s unique needs and challenges. Their feedback helps ensure the design addresses real concerns such as safety and accessibility. Additionally, incorporating public feedback leads to solutions that better serve everyone.

For each item, select “Yes,” “No,” or “N/A” based on the specific conditions of your project. Your responses should be informed by either field observations, or research and documentation. If you select “Yes” for any item, use the space at the bottom of the page to provide additional details, context, or notes as needed.

**YES | NO | N/A**

- 1. Have any public awareness campaigns taken place near the project limits?
- 2. Are there any identified solutions to address/mitigate safety concerns from the community?
- 3. Has outreach to local partners taken place regarding Vision/Target Zero?
- 4. Are there any identified safety solutions based on feedback from local partners regarding safety concerns?
- 5. Has the local FDOT Operations office been contacted about safety issues in the project limits?
- 6. Will there be any future changes in land use that would necessitate safety enhancements?
- 7. Has coordination been completed with project stakeholders (transit agency, school officials)?
- 8. Has coordination been completed with emergency responders?
- 9. Are there any considerations for traffic control devices and traffic calming treatments based on emergency response operations?
- 10. Are there any local jurisdiction standards or requirements that would shape or inform potential solutions to be proposed?
- 11. Have a wide range of users had the opportunity to be involved in the public outreach completed for this corridor/intersection?

**LIST DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS AND ADDITIONAL COORDINATION NEEDS BASED ON PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK:**



Site Visit  
(Complete During Site Visit)



## Pedestrian Facilities

Identifying design considerations for improvements to pedestrian facilities is essential for enhancing safety and accessibility. Well-designed infrastructure—such as sidewalks, crosswalks, and curb ramps—helps prevent fatalities and serious injuries while supporting people of all ages and abilities.

For each item, select “Yes,” “No,” or “N/A” based on the specific conditions of your project. Your responses should be informed by either field observations, or research and documentation. If you select “Yes” for any item, use the space at the bottom of the page to provide additional details, context, or notes as needed.

**FPID and Project Description:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Location:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Audit date:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Start time:** \_\_\_\_\_ **AM | PM** **End time:** \_\_\_\_\_ **AM | PM**

**YES | NO | N/A**

- 1. Do existing sidewalks meet FDM criteria for minimum width, separation from roadway, cross slope, longitudinal slope, etc.?
- 2. Do existing curb ramps meet ADA requirements?
- 3. Are there vehicular operating characteristics that create special concerns for pedestrians (i.e. high speeds, heavy volume of trucks, right turn on red, etc.)?
- 4. Are there known specific pedestrian populations that need to be accommodated in this area (elderly, school children, blind, wheelchairs, etc.)?
- 5. Are sidewalk gaps present?
- 6. Do any obstructions exist in the existing sidewalks where minimum unobstructed sidewalk widths are not met?
- 7. Are there intersections with a design that promote high-speed right-turn movements that create problems for crossing pedestrians?
- 8. Do any drop-offs exist that would require shielding, railing, or regrading of slopes?
- 9. Are there any locations where midblock crossings or pedestrian refuges exist or would be needed?
- 10. Is the spacing between existing controlled pedestrian crossing locations appropriate for the roadway context classification and surrounding land uses?
- 11. Are pedestrian and bicycle conflicts with vehicles minimized at intersection locations through geometric improvements (corner radii reductions, bulbouts, corner islands), providing signage such as R10-15A (turning vehicles stop for pedestrians) signs at intersection approaches, and signal timing strategies (protected left turns, right-turn on red restrictions)?
- 12. Are there school zones along the corridor? Are the signing and pavement markings designed according to the current Speed Zoning Manual?



## Pedestrian Facilities – Continued

YES | NO | N/A

- 13. If on-street parking exists or is proposed, do any sight distance concerns exist at any intersections or pedestrian crossing locations?
- 14. Are pedestrian crossings adequately illuminated, particularly at high-risk or high-volume locations?
- 15. Is there a high frequency of driveways and access points along the study corridor that can create crossing conflicts for pedestrians?

**LIST DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS TO IMPROVE PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES:**



## Bicycle Facilities

Well-designed bicycle facilities protect cyclists from vehicle traffic, reducing the risk of crashes and injuries. Identifying design considerations for bicycle infrastructure during project scoping helps ensure that effective safety measures are implemented.

For each item, select “Yes,” “No,” or “N/A” based on the specific conditions of your project. Your responses should be informed by either field observations, or research and documentation. If you select “Yes” for any item, use the space at the bottom of the page to provide additional details, context, or notes as needed.

YES | NO | N/A

- 1. Are design/posted speeds consistent with the target speed and level of multimodal activity in the area?
- 2. Are existing bicycle lanes designated with bicycle lane messages per FDM Chapter 223 (Bicycle Facilities) requirements?
- 3. Can the typical section of the roadway be optimized to better allocate roadway space to accommodate all roadway users and bicycle skill levels?
- 4. Is there connectivity to bicycle facilities outside of the project limits?
- 5. Are there multipurpose sidewalks, such as a shared-use paths or cycle tracks?
- 6. Are there any trails, greenways, or bike boulevards on the intersecting local roadways along the corridor that may require additional crossing treatments?
- 7. Is there a need for green-colored pavement markings to be evaluated to enhance and more clearly define bicycle/vehicle conflict areas?
- 8. Do drainage inlets present wheel snagging hazards for bicycles?
- 9. Does the existing roadway footprint accommodate bicycle keyholes between the through and adjacent right turn lanes?
- 10. Are bicycle paths continuous and have adequate transitions been provided?
- 11. Are there vehicular operating characteristics that create special concerns for bicycles (i.e. high speeds, heavy volume of trucks, right turn on red, etc.)?
- 12. Are bicyclists riding on the sidewalks when designated bike lanes are present?
- 13. Are there existing paved shoulders not marked as bike lanes?
- 14. Are intersection approaches designed to reduce bicycle/vehicle conflicts (e.g., protected intersections, bike boxes, signal phasing) where appropriate?
- 15. Are existing bicycle facilities adequately maintained to address debris, surface conditions, and other hazards that may increase crash risk?

**LIST DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS TO IMPROVE BICYCLE FACILITIES:**



## Public Transit Access

Considering public transit access during project scoping and design is crucial because it improves connectivity and accessibility, while enhancing overall safety by minimizing conflicts between public transit users and other roadway users.

For each item, select “Yes,” “No,” or “N/A” based on the specific conditions of your project. Your responses should be informed by either field observations, or research and documentation. If you select “Yes” for any item, use the space at the bottom of the page to provide additional details, context, or notes as needed.

YES | NO | N/A

- 1. Can transit users of all ages and abilities safely access and depart from transit stops?
- 2. Is there sidewalk connectivity from bus stops to existing sidewalks?
- 3. Do transit stops meet ADA criteria?
- 4. Are transit stops placed in useful locations (close to signalized intersections, designated crossing locations, pedestrian generators such as schools, parks, etc.)?
- 5. Can transit stops be moved closer to crossing locations?
- 6. If midblock pedestrian crossings are used, do they have median refuge (if applicable) and the appropriate warning devices?
- 7. Are transit stop amenities present to provide comfort/safety to waiting passengers (benches, shelters, shade, etc.)?
- 8. Are transit stops properly lit?
- 9. Will sufficient landing areas be provided to accommodate public transit users and allow through/bypassing pedestrian traffic?
- 10. Do bus bays exist in the corridor?
- 11. Has the project been developed in cooperation and coordination with the transit agency?
- 12. Are there any school bus stop locations (preschool, elementary, middle, high school) within the area?
- 13. Are there flooding concerns at existing bus stops (due to low-level areas and drainage swales)?

**LIST DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS TO IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSIT ACCESS:**



## Signing and Pavement Markings

Well-maintained and properly designed pavement markings, along with clear and visible signage, deliver important information and warnings that enable drivers and other road users to make safer decisions. Identifying potential improvements helps increase awareness, reduce confusion, and prevent crashes, creating a safer and more reliable transportation facility for everyone.

For each item, select “Yes,” “No,” or “N/A” based on the specific conditions of your project. Your responses should be informed by either field observations, or research and documentation. If you select “Yes” for any item, use the space at the bottom of the page to provide additional details, context, or notes as needed.

YES | NO | N/A

- 1. Do crosswalks exist at all stop-condition streets and driveways?
- 2. Are designated midblock crossings well marked, and do they provide signage alerting drivers?
- 3. Are existing crosswalks along the corridor 6’ or wider?
- 4. Are existing crosswalks along the corridor high visibility?
- 5. If railroad crossings exist along the corridor, are proposed railroad dynamic envelope pavement markings incorporated?
- 6. Have acceleration tapers been reviewed for removal to enhance safety by reducing poor gap selection choices and maintaining defined paths for bicyclists?
- 7. Have wrong-way driving countermeasures been included as part of the signing and pavement marking design?
- 8. Are there prohibited turning movements at intersections?
- 9. Does the geometric design of intersections discourage restricted movements or are the prohibitions through only signing and pavement markings?
- 10. Are the existing posted speed limit signs consistent with the existing land use context along the corridor?
- 11. Are pavement markings retroreflective or night-time/wet-weather visible?
- 12. Are speed feedback signs (e.g., dynamic speed display signs) or other speed management markings currently present along the corridor?

**LIST DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS TO IMPROVE SIGNING AND PAVEMENT MARKINGS:**



## Access Management

Identifying and implementing access management strategies early in the design process can help reduce conflicts, improve visibility, and create a more predictable and efficient driving environment, ultimately improving safety for all road users.

For each item, select “Yes,” “No,” or “N/A” based on the specific conditions of your project. Your responses should be informed by either field observations, or research and documentation. If you select “Yes” for any item, use the space at the bottom of the page to provide additional details, context, or notes as needed.

**YES | NO | N/A**

- 1. Are driveways too close to another connection based on the standard requirements for driveways set by FAC 14-97.003?
- 2. Do historical crash patterns identify the need to verify or modify the median plan (high percentage left-out turning movement crashes or pedestrian/bicycle crashes)?
- 3. Are there median openings that should be closed or restricted to improve safety and operations on this corridor?
- 4. Are vehicle queues from a nearby intersection spilling back and blocking access to an unsignalized driveway?
- 5. Are there median openings that can be modified to increase the safety of the corridor by incorporating offset left-turn lanes?
- 6. Would traffic separators in Two Way Left-Turn Lanes be beneficial without limiting parcel access and help manage speeds?
- 7. Have driveways been reviewed for freight mobility and pedestrian safety?
- 8. Can driveways be reduced or consolidated for multiple parcel use?
- 9. Do existing median openings and driveways provide safe, direct crossings for pedestrians and bicyclists?

**LIST DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS TO IMPROVE ACCESS MANAGEMENT:**



## Traffic Control Devices

Identifying the need to optimize traffic control devices during the scoping process helps ensure the project includes considerations that enhance visibility, improve traffic flow, and provide road users with clear and timely guidance. These improvements can significantly reduce crashes, particularly at intersections and other high-risk areas.

For each item, select “Yes,” “No,” or “N/A” based on the specific conditions of your project. Your responses should be informed by either field observations, or research and documentation. If you select “Yes” for any item, use the space at the bottom of the page to provide additional details, context, or notes as needed.

YES | NO | N/A

- 1. Has the appropriate signal timing and phasing been considered to assist in achieving the desired target speed while accommodating all roadway users?
- 2. Do existing signal heads have retroreflective backplates that contribute to reducing rear-end crashes?
- 3. Can a five-section permissive-protected operation be replaced by a four-section flashing yellow arrow operation to reduce left-turn collisions?
- 4. Do all significant changes in alignment have appropriate advance warning signs?
- 5. Will any landscaping, poles, utilities, or cabinets create possible sight obstructions to any traffic control devices?
- 6. Are current pedestrian timings for crossings adequate?
- 7. Are Leading Pedestrian Intervals being utilized?
- 8. If a fire station exists on the corridor, does it have an emergency signal that has preemption?
- 9. Has consideration been given to how traffic calming may affect access and response times for fire vehicles, ambulances, and police vehicles, recognizing the importance of these emergency services?
- 10. Has an Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) been conducted to assess intersection safety treatments such as roundabouts or other intersection controls?
- 11. Are red-light running cameras, school zone speed enforcement cameras, or other emerging technologies currently in use along the corridor?

**LIST DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS TO IMPROVE TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES:**



## Construction

Considering safety during construction is essential because construction zones create temporary and potentially hazardous conditions for all road users. Prioritizing safety during this phase helps prevent crashes, protect workers and the public, and ensure the project progresses efficiently and responsibly.

For each item, select “Yes,” “No,” or “N/A” based on the specific conditions of your project. Your responses should be informed by either field observations, or research and documentation. If you select “Yes” for any item, use the space at the bottom of the page to provide additional details, context, or notes as needed.

YES | NO | N/A

- 1. Will the posted speeds and work zone speeds be the same during construction?
- 2. Are any schools or significant pedestrian/bicycle generators present or near the project limits?
- 3. If schools are present, will construction affect school bus operations or drop off/pick up locations?
- 4. Are any special accommodations needed during construction to maintain pedestrian/bicycle access?
- 5. Are all roadway users (vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, motorcyclists, etc.) given clear direction on how and where they are to operate during each phase of construction?
- 6. Were the construction work zones coordinated with transit agencies regarding bus stops and operations during active work periods?
- 7. Are there any identified impacts to railroads with the potential for traffic queuing on the tracks to occur?
- 8. Will Smart Work Zone technologies and/or design strategies be implemented to maintain safe operating speeds through the work zone (e.g., taper lengths, lane widths, temporary barriers or crash cushions, and enforcement coordination)?
- 9. Are Motorist Awareness System (MAS) devices required?
- 10. Is this an Emergency Shoulder Use corridor?
- 11. Is temporary highway lighting needed?
- 12. Will construction activities create any ponding issues that will require temporary drainage?
- 13. Will traffic signal operation and detection be affected by construction activities?
- 14. Will traffic control/law enforcement officers be required at signalized intersections?
- 15. Are appropriate accommodations planned to ensure safe, accessible travel for people with disabilities during construction?

**LIST SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS DURING CONSTRUCTION:**



Post-Site Visit  
(Complete After Site Visit)





5. Priority Recommendations for Project Scoping

6. Coordination Needs (e.g., Florida Department of Transportation, local jurisdictions, transit providers, emergency services)

7. Additional Notes / Context