

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Civil Engineering Theses, Dissertations, and  
Student Research

Civil Engineering

---

Fall 10-24-2014

# A New Decision Making Approach for Indirect Left Turn Treatments by Utilizing Decision Assistance Curves

Sunil Gyawali

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, sunil.gyawali@huskers.unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/civilengdiss>



Part of the [Civil Engineering Commons](#)

---

Gyawali, Sunil, "A New Decision Making Approach for Indirect Left Turn Treatments by Utilizing Decision Assistance Curves" (2014). *Civil Engineering Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research*. 73.  
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/civilengdiss/73>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Civil Engineering at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Civil Engineering Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

A NEW DECISION MAKING APPROACH FOR INDIRECT LEFT TURN  
TREATMENTS BY UTILIZING DECISION ASSISTANCE CURVES

by

Sunil Gyawali

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of  
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska  
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements  
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Civil Engineering

Under the Supervision of Professors Aemal J. Khattak and Anuj Sharma

Lincoln, Nebraska

October, 2014

A NEW DECISION MAKING APPROACH FOR INDIRECT LEFT TURN  
TREATMENTS BY UTILIZING DECISION ASSISTANCE CURVES

Sunil Gyawali, Ph.D.

University of Nebraska, 2014

Advisers: Aemal J. Khattak and Anuj Sharma

This study developed decision assistance curves (DAC) for unconventional intersections, including median U-turns (MUT), continuous flow intersections (CFI), and jughandle intersections, based on their operational performance relative to a conventional intersection. An economic analysis was performed to compute the net present value (NPV) of benefits and the benefit to cost ratio (B/C) with the development of a spreadsheet tool. The DAC classified the region of optimal performance of isolated unconventional intersections. For 5% left turn traffic conditions, MUT was warranted for all volume criteria. For 10% and 15% left turn traffic conditions, jughandle was warranted for the major street approach traffic volumes greater than or equal to 2200 vph, and greater than 1800 vph, respectively. However, the warranty decreased with the increase of minor streets for all of the conditions except at balanced and nearly balanced conditions under 10% left turn traffic. For 10% and 15% left turn traffic conditions with an unbalanced flow, CFI was warranted for major street approach traffic volumes greater than or equal to 2200 vph, and greater than 1800 vph, respectively. The warranty expanded with the increase of minor street approach traffic volumes. The standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted was warranted for minor street approach traffic volumes less than 200 vph and the major street approach traffic volumes of 700 vph to 1350 vph. The high presence of trucks favored the use of CFI. Additionally, a case

study performed on a 24-hour rural pattern volume indicated the highest NPV of benefits and the highest B/C related to new MUT construction. Though the MUT-retrofit had the highest NPV, since the construction cost of MUT-retrofit was high, a jughandle-retrofit was found to have the highest B/C. In this manner, the developed method provided an integrated decision support system utilizing both operational performance and economic aspects as an improved method over the current practice. Some possible extensions of study were also recommended as further studies.

## DEDICATION

To my parents Laxman and Sita Jnawali, and to my beloved wife Bandita Parajuli who inspired me to pursue a Ph. D.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisors Dr. Aemal J. Khattak and Dr. Anuj Sharma for their valuable guidance and support. Dr. Anuj Sharma not only provided me the valuable guidance on this research from beginning to end but also developed the code to run HCS with Excel for this research. The research work of this nature would never have been completed without Dr. Anuj Sharma's supervision.

I would like to thank Dr. Eric Thompson and Dr. Calvin Garbin for serving on my committee and guiding me on this research. Thanks to all the professors in the Transportation Engineering, Computer Science, Industrial Engineering, and Mathematics departments with whom I took courses. The knowledge gained on these courses played a vital role in conducting this research. Similarly, thanks to Professor William M. Sampson from MCTrans, University of Florida (UFL) for his help.

I would like to thank the research sponsors: Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR) and Mid-America Transportation Center (MATC). I am grateful to the MATC business center staff: Laviania Thandayithabani, April Edwards, Christopher LeFrois, and Larissa Sazama for their willingness to help me many times.

Thank you to my research team Mo Zhao, Wei Lei, Shuo Wang, and Chenhui Li for being very cooperative with me. I would also like to thank my fellow students: Yifeng Chen, Zifeng Wu, Shefang Wang, and Myungwoo Lee. Lastly, I would like to thank all my Nepalese fellows in UNL for their encouragement and willingness to help me.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION .....	III
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	IV
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	V
LIST OF FIGURES.....	XI
LIST OF TABLES .....	XIV
INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVE.....	1
1.1 General Background .....	1
1.2 Study Intersections.....	2
1.2.1 Median U-Turn (MUT).....	2
1.2.2 Continuous Flow Intersection (CFI) .....	3
1.2.3 Jughandle .....	4
1.2.4 Standard Signalized Intersection with Left Turn Permitted along Major Street .....	5
1.3 Problem Statement .....	6
1.3.1 Lack of Transferability and Failure to provide an Integrated Decision Support System .....	7
1.3.2 Based on too Simplistic Performance Measures.....	8
1.3.3 Need of Accountancy of Cost and Benefit .....	8
1.4 Context of Study .....	9
1.5 Objectives .....	11

1.6 Contributions.....	11
1.7 Dissertation Organization .....	13
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	15
2.1 Existing Tools to Evaluate Unconventional Intersections .....	15
2.1.1 Intersection Design Alternative Tool (IDAT).....	15
2.1.2 Alternative Intersection Selection Tool (AIST).....	16
2.1.3 Capacity Analysis and Planning of Junctions (CAP-X) .....	17
2.2 Operation and Safety Performance Related to Median U-Turn (MUT).....	18
2.2.1 Median Opening and Operation Related to U-Turn Maneuver .....	18
2.2.1.1 Estimation of U-Turn Capacity and Delay .....	20
2.2.1.2 Effect on Traffic Flow .....	25
2.2.2 Weaving of Right Turn Followed by U-Turn (RTUT) Maneuver and Optimal Location of Median Opening.....	27
2.2.2.1 Weaving of Right Turn Followed by U-Turn (RTUT) Maneuver.....	28
2.2.2.2 Optimal Location of Median Opening .....	30
2.2.3 Operational Performance of MUT .....	32
2.2.3.1 Travel Efficiency of MUT .....	33
2.2.3.2 Capacity and Delay Efficiency of MUT .....	37
2.2.4 Safety Performance of MUT.....	45
2.3 The Operation and Safety Performance Related to Continuous Flow Intersections (CFI) .....	53



2.3.1 Operational Performance of CFI.....	53
2.3.1.1 Travel Efficiency of CFI.....	54
2.3.1.2 Capacity and Delay and Other Operational Efficiency of CFI.....	54
2.3.2 Safety Performance of CFI and Effect of Signing and Markings.....	63
2.4 The Operation and Safety Performance Related to Jughandles.....	66
2.4.1 Operational Performance of Jughandles.....	69
2.4.2 Safety Performance of Jughandles.....	74
2.5 Summary of Literature Review about the Performance of Unconventional Intersections.....	76
2.6 Economic Aspects of Unconventional Intersections.....	77
2.6.1 Construction Cost.....	77
2.6.2 Delay Pricing.....	79
2.6.3 Price of Fuel and Emissions.....	79
2.6.4. Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) and Benefit Cost (B/C) Ratio of Unconventional Intersections.....	80
2.7 Brief Summary of Inferences obtained from Literature Review Chapter.....	81
STATE OF PRACTICE.....	82
3.1 Missouri Department of Transportation (MODOT).....	82
3.2 Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT).....	83
3.3 Iowa Department of Transportation (IOWA DOT).....	84
3.4 Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT).....	84

3.5 Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) .....	84
3.6 North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) .....	85
3.7 New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) .....	85
3.8 State Highway Administration, Maryland (SHAM).....	88
3.9 Brief Summary of Inferences obtained from Current State of Practice .....	88
OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS .....	89
4.1 Levels and Magnitude of Fixed and Variable Parameters .....	89
4.1.1 Fixed Parameters.....	89
4.1.2 Variable Parameters .....	91
4.2 Estimation of Delay .....	92
4.2.1 Standard Signalized Intersection.....	92
4.2.2 MUT.....	94
4.2.3 CFI .....	97
4.2.4 Jughandles.....	99
4.2.5 Standard Signalized Intersection with Left Turn Permitted along Major Street .....	102
4.2.6 Delay Results for Median Openings of MUT and Crossovers at Minor Streets of Jughandles from HCS 2010 <sup>®</sup> Streets .....	103
4.2.7 Delay for Median Openings of MUT and Crossovers at the Minor Street of a Jughandle Based on Queuing Theory .....	105
4.2.8 Delay and LOS at Signalized Intersections .....	107

4.2.9 HCS Batch Run.....	112
4.3 Estimation of Fuel Consumption .....	112
4.4 Estimation of Emissions .....	114
4.5 Brief Summary of Chapter.....	115
SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS .....	117
5.1 Decision Assistance Curves (DAC) - Classification .....	117
5.1.1 Clusters .....	117
5.1.2 Application of Classifier and Development of the Equations for DAC .....	118
5.1.3 Discussion on Developed DAC .....	128
5.2 Decision Assistance Curves (DAC)-Contour .....	142
5.2.1 Contour Plots for Difference in Left Turn Delay.....	142
5.2.2 Contour Plots for Difference in Total Intersection Delay.....	147
5.2.3 Delay Performance Information for Projected Volumes from Contour Plot .....	152
5.3 Brief Summary of Chapter.....	155
ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.....	156
6.1 Marginal Agency Cost .....	156
6.2 Marginal User's and Non-User's Benefit and their Monetization.....	159
6.3 Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA).....	161
6.4 Development of a Spreadsheet Tool to Perform Life Cycle Cost Analysis ..	163

6.5 A Case Study of LCCA using SILCC.....	164
6.6 Brief Summary of Chapter.....	166
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION .....	167
7.1 Conclusion .....	167
7.2 Recommendation .....	173
REFERENCES .....	175
APPENDIX A DAC PLOTS AND GROWTH CURVES .....	194
APPENDIX B EXAMPLE USE OF DAC .....	415
APPENDIX C COST .....	426

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 A typical median U-turn.....	3
Figure 1.2 A typical continuous flow intersection.....	4
Figure 1.3 A typical R/R jughandle .....	5
Figure 1.4 A typical standard signalized intersection with permitted left turns at major street.....	6
Figure 4.1 Phases and lane configuration of standard signalized intersection .....	93
Figure 4.2 Equivalent phases and lane configuration of MUT considered in network coding in HCS 2010 <sup>®</sup> Streets.....	97
Figure 4.3 Equivalent phases and lane configuration of CFI considered in network coding in HCS 2010 <sup>®</sup> Streets.....	100
Figure 4.4 Equivalent phases and lane configurations of jughandle considered in network coding in HCS 2010 <sup>®</sup> Streets.....	101
Figure 4.5 Phases and lane configuration of standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along major street.....	103
Figure 4.6 Screen shot of a part of HCS 2010 <sup>®</sup> Streets result for median opening of MUT.....	104
Figure 4.7 HCM method of computing delay and LOS for Actuated Signal adopted from HCM 2010.....	108
Figure 5.1 Example scatter plot showing clusters at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=2% .....	119
Figure 5.2 Representative DAC at low LTP (BF=0.6, LTP = 5%, TP = 10%) .....	133

Figure 5.3 DAC for unconventional intersection at BF=0.5, LTP=10% and TP=2% .....	134
Figure 5.4 DAC for unconventional intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=10% and TP=5% .....	135
Figure 5.5 DAC for unconventional intersection at BF=0.5, LTP=15% and TP=2% .....	136
Figure 5.6 DAC for unconventional intersection at BF=0.6, LTP=15% and TP=10% ...	137
Figure 5.7 DAC for unconventional intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=15% and TP=10% ...	138
Figure 5.8 DAC for unconventional intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=15% and TP=2% .....	139
Figure 5.9 DAC for unconventional intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=15% and TP=5% .....	140
Figure 5.10 DAC for unconventional intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=15% and TP=10% .	141
Figure 5.11 Contour plot for critical left turn delay difference between MUT and standard signalized intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=10% .....	144
Figure 5.12 Contour plot for critical left turn delay difference between jughandle and standard signalized intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=10% .....	145
Figure 5.13 Contour plot for critical left turn delay difference between standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along major street and standard signalized intersection at BF=0.5, LTP=5%, TP=2% .....	146
Figure 5.14 Contour plot for total intersection delay difference between MUT and standard signalized intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=10% .....	148
Figure 5.15 Contour plot for total intersection delay difference between CFI and standard signalized intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=10% .....	149
Figure 5.16 Contour plot for total intersection delay difference between jughandle and standard signalized intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=10% .....	150

Figure 5.17 Contour plot for total intersection delay difference between standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along major street and standard signalized intersection at BF=0.5, LTP=5%, TP=2% .....	151
Figure 5.18 Delay savings for projected volumes (case study: MUT total intersection delay different at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=10%).....	154
Figure 6.1 Volume pattern for a rural road .....	165

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Operational performance of MUT (Part I).....	38
Table 2.2 Operational performance of MUT (Part II) .....	39
Table 2.3 Operational performance of MUT (Part III) .....	40
Table 2.4 Operational performance of MUT (Part IV).....	41
Table 2.5 Operational performance of MUT (Part V) .....	42
Table 2.6 Safety performance of MUT (Part I) .....	51
Table 2.7 Safety performance of MUT (Part II).....	52
Table 2.8 Operational performance of CFI (Part I) .....	58
Table 2.9 Operational performance of CFI (Part II).....	59
Table 2.10 Operational performance of CFI (Part III).....	60
Table 2.11 Operational performance of CFI (Part IV) .....	61
Table 2.12 Safety performance of CFI (Part I).....	67
Table 2.13 Safety performance of CFI (Part II).....	68
Table 2.14 Operational performance of jughandle (Part I).....	72
Table 2.15 Operational performance of jughandle (Part II) .....	73
Table 2.16 Safety performance of jughandle .....	75
Table 2.17 Cost of unconventional intersections .....	78
Table 3.1 State of practice (Part I).....	86
Table 3.2 State of practice (Part II).....	87
Table 4.1 Base critical headway values from HCM 2010 Exhibit 19-10 .....	98



Table 4.2 Base follow up headway values from HCM 2010 Exhibit 19-11 .....	98
Table 4.3 Fuel consumption (gallons) per minute of delay by vehicle type based on the AASHTO Red Book (2010).....	113
Table 4.4 Fuel consumption related to operating speed .....	114
Table 4.5 Relationship between fuel consumption and emissions .....	115
Table 5.1 Performance evaluation of classifier.....	121
Table 5.2 Equations of DAC (Part I) .....	122
Table 5.3 Equations of DAC (Part II).....	123
Table 5.4 Equations of DAC (Part III).....	124
Table 5.5 Equations of DAC (Part IV) .....	125
Table 5.6 Equations of DAC (Part V).....	126
Table 5.7 Equations of DAC (Part VI) .....	127
Table 5.8 Total major street approach traffic volume range for optimality of standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along the major street.....	129
Table 6.1 Unit prices of item considered in estimation of construction quantities (Part I).....	157
Table 6.2 Unit prices of item considered in estimation of construction quantities (Part II) .....	158
Table 6.3 Computed marginal cost of unconventional intersections .....	160
Table 6.4 Unit prices of items.....	161
Table 6.5 LCCA result for case study.....	166

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVE

#### 1.1 General Background

The prevalent problem of traffic congestion has caused the waste of billions of gallons of fuel, time, and money (Grant, Bowen, Day, Winick, Bauer, Chavis & Trainor, 2011). The 2012 Urban Mobility Report stated that the cost of traffic congestion was \$121 billion in 2011. This estimation was based on the travel delay of 5.5 billion hours, 2.9 billion gallons of wasted fuel, the production of 56 billion pounds of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), and truck congestion costs of \$27 billion. In addition, about 40-50% of all non-recurring congestion was associated with traffic incidents, and for every dollar of congestion costs, the related crash cost was \$1.84 in large cities (Crashes vs. Congestion- What's the cost to Society, 2008). This scenario reflects a strong need for measures to mitigate traffic congestion. Highway intersections are key components of the transportation network, and they experience significant traffic congestion due to the competing needs of the traffic on different intersection approaches. Conventional measures to reduce highway traffic congestion may not be sufficient to alleviate existing adverse traffic conditions at intersections. Therefore, there is a need to investigate the development and implementation of unconventional intersection designs in order to cope with the congestion issue by overcoming the inefficiency of conventional intersections and maintaining better traffic mobility.

## **1.2 Study Intersections**


This study was an attempt to investigate the use of the following three types of unconventional intersections also known as indirect left turn intersections: median U-turn (MUT), continuous flow intersection (CFI), and jughandle, a standard signalized intersection with a left turn permitted along a major street, to assess their usefulness in different traffic volume conditions.

A common feature of these three types of unconventional intersections is the treatment of the left turn maneuver, diverting left turning traffic from through traffic. This process can be effective at easing the operation of an intersection system by redistributing demands over sub-intersections and the core intersection, and by reducing the cycle length of the traffic signal. The key objective is to eliminate the protected left turn phase on the approaches to ameliorate signal operation, which can potentially minimize intersection delay.

### **1.2.1 Median U-Turn (MUT)**

The median U-turn (MUT), as shown in figure 1.1, is comprised of one signalized intersection and two median crossovers or openings. The median openings, depending on the situation, can be STOP controlled or signal controlled. The signalized intersection is only used for major and minor street through movements, and hence operates with a two phase signal. The left turning traffic move with through movement through the signalized intersection, then divert towards the exclusive left turn lane at the median openings, and finally perform a U-turn. This kind of geometric and signal configuration is expected to improve the intersection by reducing delay, stops, and conflicts, providing better

progression for the through traffic on the major street, and increasing the capacity of the intersection (Hummer, 1998(A); Techbrief: Synthesis of Median U-Turn Intersection Treatment, 2007).




**Figure 1.1** A typical median U-turn

### 1.2.2 Continuous Flow Intersection (CFI)

The continuous flow intersection (CFI) shown in figure 1.2 is comprised of five intersections, including one main signalized intersection and four other signalized crossover intersections. Left turning traffic is diverted through a displaced left turn lane 300-400 feet ahead of the intersection and merged with the minor street at crossover intersections. Hence, the main signalized intersection is only for through traffic and operates with two signal phases. This kind of geometric and signal configuration is

expected to reduce delay, travel time, fuel consumption, and pollution (Techbrief: Displaced Left-Turn Intersection, 2009).




**Figure 1.2** A typical continuous flow intersection

### 1.2.3 Jughandle

Jughandle intersections use ramps to divert left-turning vehicles from the main street. Left turns from the minor street are allowed. The signalized intersection operates for through vehicles from the major street, through vehicles from the minor street, and left-turning vehicles from the minor street. The crossovers are generally YIELD controlled. The FHWA Tech Brief on Traffic Performance of Three Typical Designs of New Jersey Jughandle Intersections (2007) mentioned three types of jughandles: (1) forward/forward (F/F), (2) forward/reverse (F/R), and (3) reverse/reverse

(R/R). Figure 1.3 depicts a typical R/R jughandle. A jughandle is expected to reduce delay and increase the capacity of an intersection (TechBrief: Traffic Performance of Three Typical Designs of New Jersey jughandle Intersections, 2007).




**Figure 1.3** A typical R/R jughandle

#### **1.2.4 Standard Signalized Intersection with Left Turn Permitted along Major Street**

This is a minor deviation on a standard signalized intersection. In this intersection, the left turn movements along the major street are permitted (figure 1.4). This intersection is included in the study to test if the intersection's operation can be improved

by removing the protected left turn phase along major streets in order to judge the possibility of avoiding the implementation of unconventional intersections.



**Figure 1.4** A typical standard signalized intersection with permitted left turns at major street

### **1.3 Problem Statement**

From the literature review and current state of practice included in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 of this dissertation, it can be inferred that a reliable decision support system is needed for the selection of optimal types of unconventional intersection treatments. Some

of the major problems identified on the current status of studies is described in the following section.

### **1.3.1 Lack of Transferability and Failure to provide an Integrated Decision Support System**

The literature review indicates that there are a lot of studies that deal with micro-simulation based performance analysis of unconventional intersections (Goldbat, Mier and Fredman, 1994; Hummer and Boone, 1995; Dorothy, Maleck and Nolf, 1997; Topp and Hummer, 2005; Pittasringkam, 2005; Tarko, Inerowicz, Lang and Villwock, 2008; Tarko, Azam and Inerowicz, 2010; Kivlins and Naudzuns, 2011; Chang, Lu and Xiangfeng, 2011; Chowdhury, 2011; Smith, 2011; El Esawey and Sayed, 2014). These studies have compared the magnitude of performance measures like delay, travel time, number of stops, etc., with the conventional intersection on certain criteria of volumes, lane configurations, and controls. They quantified the benefits of unconventional intersections based on the comparison of performance measures. Firstly, there is always a transferability problem with pure micro-simulation based results and also with the statistical models developed based on micro-simulation to transfer them to a new situation because of issues like the need of re-calibration, the need of excessive time for performing simulation, and reporting the decision choice for a large set of data. Secondly, these studies were performed like case specific studies, and they failed to provide any integrated general decision support system for different types of unconventional intersections providing some specific thresholds.



### **1.3.2 Based on too Simplistic Performance Measures**

While planning for the implementation of unconventional intersections, the decision-making criteria to select an appropriate alternative, while considering limiting factors such as traffic volumes, truck percentage, geometry, etc., plays a very important role. At present, few decision assistance tools are available that perform planning-level analysis and are capable of providing a hierarchical order of unconventional intersections based on their performance. The literature indicates that these tools use critical lane volume analysis (CLV) to evaluate the performance of intersections in the form volume to capacity (V/C) ratio (Asokan, Bared, Jagannathan, Hughes, Cicu and Illota, 2010; Kirk, Jones and Statmatadias, 2011; Stamatiadis, kirk, Agrawal and Jones, 2011; Stamatadias, Kirk and Agrawal, 2012; Sangster and Rakha, 2014). The drawback for such tools is that the volume to capacity ratio is a very simplistic performance measure. It does not take into account other factors like travel delay. The volume to capacity ratios are not easily understood by decision makers or the general public, and hence cannot be effectively used to communicate the results. Also, the volume to capacity ratios cannot be monetized to perform a benefit to cost analysis for the selected unconventional intersections.

### **1.3.3 Need of Accountancy of Cost and Benefit**

The accountancy of the cost and benefit aspect during the decision-making process for the selection of a suitable unconventional intersection is very necessary. This area is also neglected in the existing method of evaluating unconventional intersections. It could be that a certain type of unconventional intersections for a given situation may

have some operational or safety benefits, but the cost of implementation is so high that its use may not be economically justified. Some studies have used the cost and benefit aspect and have calculated the benefit to cost (B/C) ratio or the net present value of cost (NPV) (Boddapatti, 2008; Martin, Islam, Best and Sharma, 2012). However, they either dealt with certain types of intersections only or used a combined form of unconventional treatments for specific situations. The methods of these studies do not suffice for the purpose of developing a decision support system for broad conditions.

#### **1.4 Context of Study**

As mentioned in section 1.2, this study included only three types of unconventional intersections: MUT, CFI, and jughandle, and a standard signalized intersection with a left turn permitted along a major street. The study considered only fully actuated signal control operations on all of these intersections, including a simple standard signalized intersection. Pedestrians were not included in this study, but this study methodology can be easily extended to explicitly account for operational impacts of pedestrians. Furthermore, this study was limited to full MUT with no left turns at the signalized intersection and un-signalized (STOP controlled) median openings, a signalized CFI with a single controller, and a jughandle with un-signalized (YIELD controlled) crossovers. The study analyzed a rural intersection with a four-lane major street and two-lane minor streets. A tool was developed to work on multiple sets of criteria so that it can be applicable for any locations. The methodology developed from this study can be easily extended for different conditions of volumes, different types of intersections, and urban settings.

Highway Capacity Software (HCS) was used in this study to compute the performance of multiple intersections. The benefits of using HCS as a screening tool are listed below.

1. HCS is faster than micro-simulation in generating estimates of performance measures.
2. HCS is based on multiple studies conducted throughout the United States. HCS uses results from these studies to generate appropriate calibration factors to calibrate itself for existing operating conditions. As an example, the gap acceptance threshold for heavy vehicles can be selected from the appropriate table to model given field conditions. These thresholds are a result of multiple validation and calibration studies.
3. HCS produces several important performance measures, such as delay and stops, which can be easily understood and monetized.

This study used the operational performance analysis in the development of DAC as well as in the development of tools for economic analysis. The past studies have indicated that unconventional intersections have less conflict points than standard signalized intersections, and they do not pose any major safety concerns for traffic and pedestrians. This conclusion can be inferred from the literatures included in Chapter 2 of the dissertation, such as “Information and Geometric Design Guidance Regarding Boulevards, Directional Crossovers, and Indirect (‘Michigan’) Left Turns” (1995), Kach (1992), FHWA Techbrief: Displaced Left-turn Intersection (2009), Jagannathan and Bared (2005), Jagannathan, Gimbel, Bared, Hughes, Persuad and Lyon (2006), etc.

Additionally, intersection safety in itself is a very vast area of study and could be considered as a separate topic of study. In this backdrop, this dissertation limited its scope on operational performance only.

### **1.5 Objectives**

The study carried the following specific objectives:

1. Evaluate the operation of three unconventional intersections such as MUT, CFI, and jughandle, and deviation of standard signalized intersections macroscopically.
2. Develop decision assistance curves that can provide decision support for the selection of suitable intersection types and the quantification of the performance for the selected intersections under defined volume criteria
3. Monetize the benefits and costs, and perform an economic analysis based on marginal costs associated with each intersection type in comparison to a standard signalized intersection
4. Develop a spreadsheet tool that can operate under a user's defined criteria and provide decision assistance for the selection of a suitable unconventional intersection type

### **1.6 Contributions**

With an objective to build a reliable decision support system for unconventional intersections, this study featured some uniqueness in the present trend of relevant studies and thrived to contribute more in this sector. These features are described in detail as follows:

1. A distinct and new approach in the existing trend of study

This study adopted clustering methods (Discriminant Analysis) to classify the intersections according to the optimal performance on the grid of major and minor street approach traffic volumes. This is a first time that the Discriminant Analysis is used in the study of unconventional intersections. Furthermore, the development of contour plots in the meshgrid of volumes to indicate the delay benefits or loss (trends and specific values) of intersections for any volumes is also a new concept. It is evident from the literature review included in Chapter 2 that this kind of methodology has never been applied on any of the past studies regarding unconventional intersections.

2. Development of decision assistance curves (DAC) as a decision support system for decision makers

This study was focused on developing DAC using a measure of effectiveness computed from a macro level of analysis. DAC are capable of allocating suitable alternatives according to the performance for any criteria of volume. At the same time, the contour plots can provide the delay loss or saving for that selected alternative for any volume condition. Hence, the decision maker can obtain assistance in selecting the alternative as well as quantifying the loss or benefit at any volume condition for a selected intersection. These kinds of curves have never been developed so far by any of the studies related to unconventional intersections.

### 3. Consideration of cost and benefit

This study considered the cost and benefit aspect with the inclusion of operational benefits or costs, construction costs, and operation and maintenance costs throughout the life cycle period of an intersection. The economic analysis was incorporated on the spreadsheet tool “SILCC,” which is capable of performing LCCA to provide the NPV and B/C of each alternative based on marginal values of cost and benefits. The integrated tool will avail users with an economic performance from which intersections can be categorized according to the hierarchy of cost effectiveness. Some literatures have used the cost based approach on the selection of alternatives (Boddapatti, 2008; Martin et al., 2012). However, Bodapatti (2008) was focused on MUT and its deviations, and Martin et al. (2012) has done more engineering analysis for specific projects comprised of combinations of alternatives. There are no studies which have integrated all of the aspects to provide an economic performance in terms of NPV benefits or the B/C ratio separately for CFI, MUT, and Jughandle, so that the hierarchical order of performance can be developed under a multiple set of criteria as SILCC does.

#### **1.7 Dissertation Organization**

This dissertation is organized into eight chapters. This chapter, “Introduction and Objectives,” deals with the general background of unconventional intersections, the problem statement, the scope, and the objectives and contribution of the study. Chapter 2 contains a review of related past studies regarding the operation, safety, and cost of unconventional intersections. Chapter 3 deals with the condition of existing practices,

especially the guidelines for the implementation of unconventional intersections and related costs. Chapter 4 deals with an operational analysis of these unconventional intersections. Chapter 5 is concerned with the delay sensitivity of these unconventional intersections with respect to multiple volume conditions. Chapter 6 deals with an economic analysis, including cost estimation, the monetization of cost, a life cycle cost analysis, and the development of a spreadsheet tool. Chapter 7 is the last chapter, which is comprised of a conclusion based on the study's findings and recommendations for further research.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter is focused on the description of past studies, their methods of evaluation, and their performance related to the development and implementation of unconventional intersections based on a literature review. The literature review is comprised of three major components: (1) the description of existing tools to evaluate unconventional intersections, (2) their performance in terms of operation and safety, and (3) costs related to unconventional intersections. Limited by the scope of this study, the focus is on the MUT, CFI, and jughandle unconventional intersections.

#### **2.1 Existing Tools to Evaluate Unconventional Intersections**

An extensive search found that there are three types of tools developed for evaluating unconventional intersections including MUT, CFI, and jughandle. The following sections detail the names and descriptions of these tools.

##### **2.1.1 Intersection Design Alternative Tool (IDAT)**

This tool was developed by a research team at the University of Kentucky. It is available for download from the CATS lab website at the Kentucky Transportation Centre upon registration. The main purpose of this tool is to provide decision assistance for engineers and planners for the selection of alternative designs based on capacity constraints (Kentucky Transportation Centre, accessed 2014). The program accepts input of peak-hour traffic and pedestrian volumes, and can work for 12 different alternative designs including CFI, MUT, and jughandle. It evaluates intersections in terms of right-of-way, safety, and ability to accommodate access management techniques (Kentucky



Transportation Centre, accessed 2014). A detailed description is also provided in a paper by Stamatiadis et al. (2012) and in a report by Stamatiadis et al. (2011). The operational evaluation procedure has utilized critical lane volume analysis (CLVA) or critical movement analysis (CMA) (Stamatiadis et al., 2011; Stamatadias et al., 2012; Kirk et al., 2011). CMA for signalized intersections represents the sum of the critical volumes assigned for each signal phase of that intersection (Kirk et al., 2011). For two-way stop control, it uses the critical approach traffic volume, which is equivalent to critical volume for signalized intersections. The threshold for a particular intersection is fixed based on the plot of intersection control delay and critical volume. The critical thresholds determined for signalized intersections was 1,400 vph (vehicles per hour), 1,200 vph for all way stop control, 900 vph for two way stop control, and 1,000 vph for roundabouts (Kirk et al., 2011).

### **2.1.2 Alternative Intersection Selection Tool (AIST)**

The AIST was developed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in 2009. The tool used the CLVA approach to approximate the capacity as the sum of critical movements at an intersection per lane based on input of peak hour volumes (Asokan, Bared, Jagannathan, Hughes, Cicu and Illota, 2010). The tool can evaluate six types of intersections: (1) conventional intersections, (2) displaced left turn or continuous flow intersections (partial and full), (3) restricted crossing U-turns, (4) median U-turns (partial and full), (5) quadrant roadway intersections, and (6) roundabouts. The tool was later updated and expanded to include additional alternatives and was renamed the

Capacity Analysis for Planning of Junctions (CAP-X) (Alternative Intersections by John Sangster, accessed on 2014).

### **2.1.3 Capacity Analysis and Planning of Junctions (CAP-X)**

The CAP-X was developed by the FHWA in partnership with the Transportation Systems Institute at the University of South Florida in 2011. It is the updated form of AIST. The tool is available for download from the Transportation System Institute (TSI) website upon registration. Sangster and Rakha (2014) have done extensive analysis of the CAP-X tool and consider it a highly functional planning level tool. However, they have emphasized this tool's need for validation. Sangster and Rakha (2014) have also documented the formulation of critical sum equations used in the tool and have demonstrated the operational limitations of intersections as predicted by this tool. The critical sum method determines the most governing movement at any time during a signal cycle, which sums the demands for critical movements in the sequence and determines a total value for demand at intersections in vehicles per hour per lane. This software is capable of assessing six different intersection designs and five different interchange designs, including CFI and MUT. The authors indicated that CAP-X does not apply adjustment factors for lane utilization or adjustment factors for saturation flow rate for turning movements, and doesn't allow variability in the end time of opposing left turn phases. The authors also stated that CAP-X software does not include jughandle intersections. Similarly, the authors indicated that CAP-X neglects the additional volumes added by the minor street left-turn movements.

From above literatures about existing tools for unconventional intersections, it can be inferred that these tools used a critical lane volume analysis method to analyze the performance of unconventional intersections. Furthermore, it can be also observed that these tools have not used the cost and benefit aspect of these intersections. The currency and efficiency of these tools can be improved by going more in-depth into the performance analysis part and using the effect of the cost and benefit aspect in the selection criteria of the intersections.

## **2.2 Operation and Safety Performance Related to Median U-Turn (MUT)**

As described in the preceding chapter, the two-legged MUT is comprised of a core signalized intersection and two median openings. The left turning vehicles from minor and major streets weave toward the exclusive left turn lane to approach the median opening and finally perform a U-turn. The traffic operational phenomenon regarding this maneuver, and the safety and operational performance of the system, are described in detail in the following subsections.

### **2.2.1 Median Opening and Operation Related to U-Turn Maneuver**

The two-legged MUT is constructed with two median openings along the major street. The MUT can be implemented with signalized or un-signalized openings (Techbrief: Synthesis of MUT Intersection Treatment, 2009). To avoid stopping on the through lane, the exclusive left-turn lanes are provided in advance of the median openings (AASHTO Green Book, 2011). The width of the median depends on the type of U-turn maneuver and type of vehicle. The values are provided in the AASHTO Green Book (2011) and a Michigan DOT report, "Information and Geometric Design Guidance

Regarding Boulevards, Directional Crossovers, and Indirect (‘Michigan’) Left-Turns.”

The median on a four-lane arterial should have a width of 60 ft. to accommodate a tractor-semitrailer combination of trucks as the design vehicle (AASHTO Green Book, 2011; Rodgers, Ringert, Koonce, Bansen, Nguyen, McGill, Stewart, Sugget, Neuman, Antonucci, Hardym, and Courage, 2004). The minimum design of the median openings are also provided in the AASHTO Green Book (2011) and MDOT guidelines. The U-turn opening will benefit from signalization if the geometry is perfect and signal progression can be maintained. If the geometry is not perfect, stop signs work best for U-turn openings (Dorothy, Maleck and Nolf, 1997). The signal at the median opening should accommodate a maximum queue to avoid spill overs (Rodgers et al., 2004). The provision of median openings along the segment between intersections helps to maintain the good capacity and level of service of downstream signalized intersections, rather than making vehicles U-turn from downstream signalized intersections (Guo, Liu, Liu and Deng, 2011). There will be less delay experienced if U-turns are allowed through median openings before downstream signalized intersections as opposed to direct left turns. Drivers prefer making right turns, followed by U-turns (RTUT), at median openings rather than signalized intersections (Liu, Lu, Pirinccioglu and Sokolow, 2006). It also helps to reduce travel time (Liu and Lu, 2007). Although a study (Kai, Ning and Chendong, 2007) mentioned that the application of an exclusive left turn lane at the median opening may not be good in some conditions, such as when there is a slow operating speed and high volume, it cannot be omitted because of its safety aspect (Chen, Qi and

Liu, 2014). The existing method to evaluate median openings and the U-turn maneuver are described based on past literature.

### 2.2.1.1 Estimation of U-Turn Capacity and Delay

The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM, 2010) has adopted Harder's model as a procedure to estimate the capacity of minor stream movement at an un-signalized, two way stop controlled (TWSC) intersection. In Harder's model, the capacity of minor movement is expressed as a function of conflicting flow rate, critical gap, and follow-up time for minor movement. The model is expressed below (HCM, 2010).

$$C_{p,x} = \frac{V_{c,x} e^{-\frac{v_{c,x} t_{c,x}}{3600}}}{1 - e^{-\frac{v_{c,x} t_{f,x}}{3600}}} \quad (2.1)$$

Where,

$C_{p,x}$  = Potential capacity of movement x (veh/h),

$V_{c,x}$  = Conflicting flow rate for movement x (veh/h),

$t_{c,x}$  = Critical headway for minor movement (s), and

$t_{f,x}$  = Follow-up headway for minor movement x (s).

The HCM (2010) also provides the method to compute the critical gap and follow-up time. The critical gap depends on the base critical headway, the adjustment factors for heavy vehicles and heavy vehicle percentage, the adjustment factor for grade

and percent grade, and the adjustment for intersection geometry. Similarly, the follow-up time depends on the base follow-up time and the adjustment factor for heavy vehicles and heavy vehicle percentage. The HCM offers the tables to provide base critical headway and base follow-up headway values for TWSC.

Studies (Liu, John, Hu and Sokolow, 2008; Liu et al., 2006; Al Maseid, 1999) have utilized this concept when determining the capacity of the U-turn maneuver at median openings. In this context, Al Maseid (1999) used empirical and gap acceptance approaches to estimate the capacity of U-turn openings. He collected data in the country of Jordan in two sets: first, for capacity estimation models, and second, for critical gap and move up time models. He developed linear and exponential capacity models, where capacity was a function of conflicting flow. He also expanded his linear model to account for the flow per lane. Al Maseid developed a delay equation where the total delay was the function of the conflicting flow and a linear model for critical gap, which was the function of the average total delay and the conflicting traffic stream. In the move up time model, the move up time was the function of average total delay. The equations are expressed as follows (Al Maseid, 1999):

$$C = 1,545 - 790 e^{\frac{q}{3600}} \quad (2.2)$$

$$TD = 6.6 e^{\frac{q}{1,200}} \quad (2.3)$$

Where,

C = Capacity of U-Turn movement (vph),

$q$  = Conflicting traffic flow (vph), and

TD = Average total delay for U-Turning vehicles at median opening(s).

Al Masaeid (1999) compared the capacity from his equation with the capacity from Siegloch's equation (based on gap acceptance approach). The results were similar with a 95% confidence level. However, other literature (Liu, 2006; Liu et al., 2008) has criticized these equations for use in the U.S., because that study was based on data collected in Jordan. Similarly, Liu (2006) and Liu et al. (2008) estimated the potential capacity for U-turn movement at median openings on multilane highways by performing an estimation of the critical gap and follow-up time for U-turning passenger cars at median openings. They collected data from six selected median openings in Tampa Bay, Florida. The critical gap for U-turns was estimated by using the maximum likelihood method and the follow-up time predicted by the linear regression equation developed in this study. The capacity estimation was done using Harder's equation. The mean critical headways were estimated as 6.9 and 6.4 s for narrow median openings (median nose width  $\leq 21$  ft. m) and wide median openings (median nose width  $\geq 21$  ft) openings (Liu, 2006; Liu and Lu, 2007; Liu et al., 2008). The study found that median width is a significant parameter affecting capacity, such that the U-turn movement on wide medians has a larger potential capacity than a U-turn movement with narrow median openings. The study further tested Harder's models with the capacity obtained from field data using Kyte's method (Kyte, Clemow, Mahfood, Lall and Khisty, 1991). The results showed that Harder's model provided reasonable capacity estimates for U-turn movements at

median openings. Later in 2012, Liu, Qu, Yu, Wang, and Cao also developed a VISSIM simulation model for U-turns at un-signalized intersections. They collected behavioral features such as priority rule, lane selection, and turning speed of U-turns from field studies at ten sites. They compared the capacity calculated from a calibrated VISSIM model with the HCM method and field-measured capacity. They found that the VISSIM simulation yielded mean absolute percentage errors of 17.6% and 20.7% for four-lane and six-lane roadways, respectively.

Recently, Obaidat and Elayan (2013) studied gap acceptance behavior of drivers at four U-turn openings in four-lane divided highways in Jordan, and developed models. The first model was developed to estimate the time gap accepted by drivers. In the model, the time gap accepted by drivers was the function of the driver's age, gender, and waiting time. The second model was developed to estimate the probability of accepting the gap. In this model, the turning choice was the function of accepted gap lengths, driver's age, driver's gender, and waiting time. The models showed that the accepted gap length decreased with waiting time and the presence of a male driver. It increased with the presence of an older age group. The turning function decreased with the presence of a young age group, but increased with the length of gap, waiting time, and presence of male drivers. In the same context, Yang (2002) studied the capacity estimation of U-turn movements at median openings using CORSIM to quantify the relationship between the capacity and conflicting flow rate for the U-turn maneuver. The study showed that there is an exponential relationship between the potential capacity and conflicting traffic volumes. The obtained relationship was consistent with the curves drawn based on the



HCM 2000. The number of through lanes increased the U-turn capacity. Although the quantitative effects were not provided, the study also mentioned that distance between the U-turn bay and a downstream intersection has effect on potential capacity. Similarly, Jenjiwattanakul, Sano, and Nishiuchi (2013) evaluated the HCM 2010 gap acceptance model and proposed the adjustment method based on a volume to capacity ratio. They adjusted the potential capacities by increasing the capacity of one stream and decreasing the capacity of the other stream, so that the volume to capacity ratio of conflicting traffic and U-turn traffic was equal. They plotted a graph showing field capacity against the capacity estimated by the gap acceptance model, and against the capacity adjusted by balancing the volume to capacity ratio. They found that these were equivalent. The capacity estimation by the gap acceptance model was found to be systematically overestimating or underestimating the field capacity. Shihan and Mohammed (2009) used a U-SIM model to investigate the effect of five parameters: (1) gap acceptance behavior, (2) gap forcing behavior, (3) effect of opposing and advancing turning flow, (4) difference between left turn and U-turn behavior, and (5) median storage lanes. The median opening was of the bi-directional type. The result showed that with the increase in the U-turn percentage of the opposing traffic stream, the delay of U-turning vehicles in the advancing approach decreases. The study mentioned that gap forcing behavior may persist in median U-turns. This result will have an effect on safety and traffic performance. The total delay, average delay, and average queue length per vehicle were found to be positively affected by increased flow levels. The study mentioned that the U-

turn maneuver is more complicated than the left turn maneuver because the drivers need larger gaps to complete the maneuver.

Al-Omari and Al-Akhras (2014) developed a delay model for un-signalized MUT at suburban four-lane divided highways. They collected data during the a.m., noon, and p.m. peak periods on sunny days with dry pavement conditions. The developed model for average turning traffic stop delay (s/veh) showed that turning traffic volume and conflicting traffic volume are significant parameters in predicting the delay. Both parameters have a positive effect on the log value of delay. Regarding the use of different U-turn capacity models, Aldian and Taylor (2001) studied the suitability of traffic models to calculate U-turn capacity. They estimated gap acceptance and move-up time by reducing field data. They tested the capacity with five different models: Tanner's formula, the National Association of Australian State Roads Authorities' (NAASRA) model, the random platoon Tanner's formula, the modified random platoon Tanner's formula, and Siegloch's method. Using the Chi-square test between estimated capacity and the observed capacity, they found that the Tanner's formula can very reliably determine U-turn capacity.

#### 2.2.1.2 Effect on Traffic Flow

Regarding the effect of U-turns on traffic, Ben-Edigbe, Rahaman, and Jailani (2013) conducted a study about kinematic waves to estimate and compare volume and density per directional flow at and before midblock facilities. They collected volume, headway, speed, and vehicle type data for eight weeks for both directional flows at two sites in Malaysia. Based on empirical analysis of the collected data, they concluded that

because of the speed reduction, traffic flow rate will precede kinematic waves. Traffic safety is correlated to kinematic waves, and significant positive kinematics were found at the exit lanes. The U-turning movement at midblock induces shockwaves. Rahaman, Ben-Edigbe, and Hassan (2012) studied the extent of traffic shockwave velocity propagation induced by U-turn facilities on roadway segments, and estimated traffic shockwave velocity propagations for U-turn lanes. The results indicated that the shockwaves produced due to deceleration and diverging are less severe than the shockwaves produced by acceleration and merging. They indicated that shockwaves produced by U-turn facilities can cause traffic crashes. Similarly, Combidino, and Lim (2010) modelled U-turn traffic flow using a cellular automata model called Nagel Schrekenberg (NaSch), which is based on microscopic control of car speed and driver behavior. They also checked the model prediction against empirical observations of U-turn traffic. In conclusion, the authors mentioned that U-turns promote the interaction of cars. Although some studies have shown that U-turns provide decreased congestion and increased flow compared to left turns, this study suggested that this could be possible only if there is low car flow and less lane changing maneuvers. At high traffic densities, U-turns make the situation worse instead of reducing congestion. The study recommended using lane separators as a measure to promote minimal traffic interactions. Cellular automaton was also used by Fan, Jia, Li, Tian, and Yan (2013) to study the characteristics of traffic flow at non-signalized T-shaped intersections with U-Turn movements. They found that the average control delay is a good practical means of measuring the performance of an intersection. If the inflow rate is high, U-turns can

increase both the range and degree of congestion. U-turn movements in different directions have an asymmetric effect on traffic conditions. Similarly, Carter, Hummer, Foyle, and Philips (2005) studied the operational and safety effects of U-turns at standard signalized intersections. They measured vehicle headway in an exclusive left turn lane at 14 signalized intersections. The regression analysis of saturation flow data showed a 1.8% saturation flow rate loss for every 10% increase in U-turn percentage in the left turn lane. There was an additional 1.5% saturation loss for every 10% increase in U-turns if the U-turning movement was opposed by right turn overlap from the cross street. A study has also indicated that a full median opening is less safe than a directional median opening, but will produce less delay than a directional median opening (Qi, Chen, Liu, and Wang, 2014).

### **2.2.2 Weaving of Right Turn Followed by U-Turn (RTUT) Maneuver and Optimal Location of Median Opening**

The left-turning vehicle from the cross street in MUTs requires multilane changing after it enters the main street and before it U-turns from the median opening. This process is called weaving, and the entire movement is called right turn followed by U-turn (RTUT) (Zhou, Lu, Yang, Dissanayake, and Williams, 2002). RTUT is comprised of following four steps (Zhou et al. 2002):

1. Stopping at a cross street, waiting for a gap, and turning right when a gap is available;
2. Accelerating into the through lane, weaving to the left turn lane, and deceleration to stop at U-turn;

3. Waiting for suitable gap to make U-turn; and
4. Accelerating to get to the operating speed of through vehicles.

The optimal location of the median opening from the main signalized intersection is specified as 660 ft. (AASHTO Green Book, 2011). MDOT advises that the optimal spacing of a median opening from the main intersection is 660 ft.  $\pm$ 100 ft. (Information and Geometric Design Guidance Regarding Boulevards, Directional Crossovers, and Indirect [‘Michigan’] Left-Turns, accessed 2014; Hughes, Jagannathan, Sengupta, and Hummer, 2010). Hughes et al. (2010) mentions that the longer the spacing distance of the median opening with respect to the main intersection, the higher the travel time, but there will be less of a probability of main road queues blocking the median opening. A long distance will allow more time for the driver to see and read signs. Hence, there should be a tradeoff between the disadvantage due to additional travel time and the advantage due to the prevention of a spillback effect with the main intersection. The operational aspects related to the weaving associated with the RTUT maneuver and the optimal location of the median opening as presented by past literature are described in detail in following subsections.

#### 2.2.2.1 Weaving of Right Turn Followed by U-Turn (RTUT) Maneuver

The weaving maneuver in urban and sub-urban arterials where signal spacing is less than 2.0 miles differs from freeway weaving, as the traffic flow is dominated by platoons and interruptions from traffic signals (Zhou, Hsu, Lu, and Wright, 2003). Hence, RTUT is executable on the availability of acceptable gaps between platoons, and only random arrivals or stragglers may be affected by RTUT (Zhou et al., 2003). Weaving

speed is positively correlated with weaving length (Zhou et al., 2003). The models developed by Shahia and Choupanib (2009) indicate that the weaving speed of U-turning vehicles is positively affected by free flow speed, weaving length, and volume ratio, which is the ratio of the flow rate of vehicles that move freely in every lane to the flow rate of vehicles that are subjected to an access specific lane. Similarly, the weaving time of U-turning vehicles is affected positively by weaving length and total volume of weaving section, and negatively affected by volume ratio and free flow speed. The delay effect of RTUT as modelled by Zhou et al. (2002) indicates the significance of the two-directional through traffic flow rate, split, and flow rate of RTUT. Likewise, total volumes, RTUT volumes, split, and speed limit affect travel time. Travel time is negatively correlated with speed limit. It is also in agreement with a travel time model developed by Liu and Lu (2007), which indicates that the travel time at weaving sections while making a RTUT increased with offset and decreased with speed. Liu and Lu (2007) also indicate that the travel time is less on four-lane roadways than six or more lane roadways. Zhou et al. (2002) also related drivers' selection of the RTUT maneuver against direct left turning with an empirical relationship, which indicated that it is affected positively with a combination of left-turn inflow rate and major road through traffic flow rate, but negatively affected by a split. The study also indicated that travel time performance for the RTUT maneuver is better compared to that of a direct left turn under moderate and high traffic volumes. Drivers prefer to use the RTUT maneuver rather than make a direct left turn under moderate to high traffic volumes (Zhou et al. 2002). In the same context, Lu, Dissanayake, Zhou, Yang and Williams (2001) found that

the RTUT maneuver increased with the major traffic flow rate and left turn flow rate from major roads. Based on empirical models developed using data collected from ten sites, delay and travel time related to the RTUT maneuver were found to be less than that related to direct left turns. There was less speed reduction on the major street due to RTUT as opposed to a direct left turn, and the running time of RTUT was found to increase linearly with weaving distance. The before and after study conducted by Lu et al. (2001) indicated 15-22% less delay related to RTUT when RTUT was forced by placing directional median openings downstream instead of allowing them for direct left turning. A similar conclusion was obtained in a study by Yang and Zhou (2004), which indicated that for a higher through volume, the delay and travel time would increase at a faster rate for a direct left turn rather than a RTUT movement. The same study also indicated that RTUT movement can perform better for a wide range of traffic conditions. In an attempt to evaluate U-turns as an alternative to a direct left turn, Liu et al. (2006) found that the RTUT maneuver at a median opening produced 24 seconds less delay than a direct left turn for 6-8 lane roadways. The average running time of a RTUT depends on the offset between the driveway and the downstream median opening, and decreases with the speed limit of the major road. The percentage of drivers selecting RTUT increases with the upstream through traffic, left turn volume from the major street, and total left-turning volume at the driveway.

#### 2.2.2.2 Optimal Location of Median Opening

The optimal weaving length minimizes the average waiting delay of the U-turning vehicle at the median opening. This is possible when a RTUT vehicle arrives at a median

opening at the time the last vehicle in the platoon of opposite traffic passes the median opening (Zhou et al., 2003). A deterministic model that estimates the optimal weaving length as developed by Zhou et al. (2003) is expressed below:

$$L = \frac{-(1 - .082\Delta t + \frac{21.5}{v}) + \sqrt{(1 - 0.082\Delta t + \frac{21.5}{v})^2 + 7.05 \frac{\Delta t}{v}}}{\frac{0.164}{v}} \quad (2.4)$$

Where,

L= Optimal weaving length,

$\Delta t$  = Term expressed as a function of offset of upstream and downstream signal timing,

whole section length, distance between driveway and upstream signalized

intersection and posted speed limit, and

v = speed limit.

The above equation indicates that the optimal weaving length is governed by (1) the offset of signal timing between upstream and downstream signals, (2) the distance between upstream and downstream signalized intersections, (3) the distance between the subject driveway and the upstream signalized intersection, and (4) the posted speed limit.

For a RTUT maneuver, Lu, Pirinccioglu, and Pernia (2005) related the offset distance between driveway exits and downstream U-turn median openings to crash and conflict rates. The developed model in the study indicated a positive correlation between



the location of the median opening and the crash rate. The details of this literature will be dealt in the safety literature review of MUT. Similarly, Liu and Lu (2007) evaluated the offset of a U-turn bay and upstream driveway based on crash data analysis and travel time analysis. Based on safety and operational performance, the study identified the minimum offset for a U-turn bay located at median opening as 350 ft. and 450 ft. for four-lane and 6-8 lane roadways.

### **2.2.3 Operational Performance of MUT**

The major objective behind the implementation of unconventional intersection treatments, including MUT, is the expected improvement of the operation of existing conventional intersections (Hughes et al., 2010). MUT is thought to have more operational benefits compared to other intersections, but under specific traffic conditions. For example, Hummer (1998-B) mentioned that MUT is applicable in arterials as an intersection treatment for low-to-medium left turns from the arterial, low-to medium left turns from a minor street, any minor street through volume, and at the availability of minimum right of way 30 ft. wide. In this context, this subsection discusses the operational performance of MUT compared to conventional intersections or other unconventional intersections, the criteria and conditions of traffic parameters at which the MUT operates at a better level, and the condition and criteria at which MUT cannot be a good alternative based on the literature review. Review notes of prominent literature that is directly related to operational performance of MUT are shown in table 2.1, table 2.2, table 2.3, table 2.4, and table 2.5.

### 2.2.3.1 Travel Efficiency of MUT

In this subsection, the performance of MUT in terms of travel time, stops, and average network speed are discussed based on past literature. In this context, Hummer and Boone (1995) studied the travel efficiency of MUT by comparing its travel time performance with conventional intersections and other unconventional intersections, such as a continuous green T-intersection (CGT) and Bowtie in terms of travel time and percentage of stops and stop delay. The study indicated that MUT is more travel efficient at a through volume range between 400 and 700 vph. The MUT displayed superior performance in terms of overall travel time and stops in terms of through volume, but at the expense of travel time and stopped delay for left-turning traffic, which were inferior to a conventional intersection. Boone and Hummer (1995) validated the use of CORSIM for an operational performance evaluation of MUT using a larger saturation flow rate as a calibrating parameter. The travel time and delay obtained from the simulation matched satisfactorily with observed site value. Later, Reid and Hummer (1999) used CORSIM to compare the performance of a MUT with signalized median openings to a superstreet and a conventional two way left turn lane (TWLTL) design. The MUT decreased the system travel time by 17.25% as compared to a conventional intersection, and the average speed of an arterial was found to be 24.74% faster than a conventional intersection. However, the average number of stops per vehicle increased by 5.56%. Compared to a superstreet, MUT performed better in terms of average speed and average number of stops per vehicle. However, the system travel time was slightly higher than that of superstreet. Again in 2001, Reid and Hummer compared the performance of seven unconventional

intersections, including a MUT with conventional intersections. He considered seven intersections comprised of these major and minor street configurations: 4x4 (2 nos.), one 4x2 (1 nos.), 6x4 (1 nos.), 6x2 (1 nos.), and 8x4 (2 nos.). Compared to conventional intersections, the most MUT could reduce the total time was 27.94%. However, MUT increased the total time in some intersections, and the highest increase of all seven intersections was 8.57%. Similarly, the highest average percent of stops that MUT could decrease compared to conventional intersections was 20.97%, however, it increased the highest average percent of stops in some intersections, the highest being by 28.4%. This result clearly shows that MUT can perform better in terms of travel efficiency, but not in terms of stops compared to conventional intersections. Similarly, Henderson and Statamatiadis (2001) studied the travel efficiency of MUT along a principal urban arterial in Kentucky. The study used CORSIM to evaluate different alternatives, including signal optimization for the existing intersection, the addition of a lane, and the implementation of MUT. A set of four intersections were studied for the implementation of MUT, and the results indicated a significant improvement on the operation of the network. Considering the whole system, speed increased by 2.4 mph and the move to total time ratio increased to 0.41. The MUTs were implemented at an additional two intersections, resulting in a total system-wide effect of a speed increase of 3.6 mph and a move to total time ratio increase by 26% (0.44).

The travel efficiency of MUT was also praised in a study by Bared and Kaisar (2002). They compared a partial MUT where direct left turns from minor streets were allowed with a conventional intersection that had single and dual left turn lanes. The

study found an abrupt rise in travel time savings, from 10 to 40 s/vehicle with 600 vph entering the flow with 10% left turns compared to a conventional intersection with a single left turn lane. The travel time saved by MUT rose to 60 s/vehicle for 20% left-turning volume at 600 vph entering flow compared to a conventional intersection with a single left turn lane. The travel time saved by MUT was smaller at a total entering flow of 5500 vph to 6600 vph, but larger saving starts from 6600 vph for 20% left-turning volume as compared to a conventional intersection with dual left turn lanes. The average travel time for U-turning traffic was 20 s/veh to 30 s/veh higher because of circuitous movement. The average proportion of stops was 20% to 40% lower for MUT for 10% left-turning traffic and for 20% left-turning traffic. A noticeable reduction starts at about 4,500 vph, compared to a conventional intersection with a single left turn lane. Similarly, a report developed for the Community Planning Association (COMPASS) of Southwest Idaho (2008) indicated that MUT can reduce travel time by 2% to 20% during non-peak hour traffic and 6% to 21% during peak hours. However, the performance of MUT for stop varies with 20% reduction to 70% increment during non-peak hours and 30% increment during peak hours. Tarko et al. (2010) indicated that MUT lowered travel time significantly compared to a conventional intersection at saturated condition. Similarly, Kivlins and Naudzuns (2011) indicated that MUT could reduce the vehicle waiting time by 73%. They also indicated that the left turn lanes on an arterial intersection of a MUT intersection can produce a 90% shorter congestion length at the end of green signal phase than a conventional intersection.

A study (Martin, Islam, Best, and Sharma, 2012) also evaluated MUT in combination with other alternatives. That particular study, about the US 290 Corridor, led to the development of three alternatives. Alternative 1 was a combination of MUT, CFI, and traditional improvements, such as the addition of lanes. Alternative 2 was the combination of MUT and CFI. Alternative 3 was combination of MUT, CFI, and a superstreet. They used a VISSIM simulation to calculate project annual delay savings and travel time for the existing year 2010 and the future years 2015 and 2020. The results showed that Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 have significant travel time savings during the peak hour: 50% and 45% for year 2010, 45% and 30% for year 2015, and 28% and 33% for year 2020. Similarly, Pirdavani, Brijs, Bellmans and Wets (2011) estimated travel time and compared it with conventional intersections. They used a raised U-turn facility that restricted a left turn from the major street, and through and left from minor street movements. They modelled travel time based on several scenarios of the offset distance of the U-turn with a signalized intersection, traffic volume on minor and major approaches, as well as left turn percentages using AIMSUN. The results indicated that travel time for the U-turn facility for the through maneuver was always less compared to a conventional intersection. However, for left-turning vehicles on the major street, the travel time for the U-turn facility was slightly higher than a conventional intersection, but it was still less for left-turning vehicles from the minor street. Regarding the MUT with a signalized median opening, Dorothy et al. (1997) found that for 10% of left-turning volumes, MUT with a signalized median opening had lower travel time by 20 s/vehicle,

40 s/vehicle, and 150 s/vehicle at 30%, 50% and 70% mainline saturation, respectively, than two way left turn lanes.

### 2.2.3.2 Capacity and Delay Efficiency of MUT

The reduction in the signal phases at the core intersection of MUT is explained as the reason it has an increased capacity compared to a conventional intersection (FHWA Tech brief: Synthesis of MUT Intersection Treatment, 2009). Savage (1974), and Synthesis of MUT Intersection Treatment (2007) indicated that the use of directional median openings can increase the capacity by 20%-50%. Jagannathan (2007) also stated that MUT on four or six-lane roads increases the intersection capacity by 20% to 50% more than a two-way left turn lane intersection.

Hughes et al. (2010) mentioned that MUT can increase the throughput 15% to 40% more than conventional intersections. Similarly, the Community Planning Association (COMPASS) of Southwest Idaho (2008) indicated that MUT can increase capacity by 50% or more compared to a conventional double left turn intersection. Similarly, Zhao, Ma, Head, and Yang (2014) measured the improvement in intersection capacity with five types of MUT with signalized median openings, including (1) a MUT with left turn prohibition from the major street, (2) a MUT with left turn prohibition from the minor street, (3) a through movement prohibition from the minor street, (4) a left turn prohibition from the major street and through movements from the minor street (5) a left turn and through movement prohibition from the minor street and (6) a left turn prohibition from the major street and through movements from the minor street. All the MUTs performed better than a conventional intersection, especially under high traffic

**Table 2.1** Operational performance of MUT (Part I)

Literature	Intersection Type	Delay	Speed	Stop	Travel Time
Hummer and Boone (1995)	MUT	Stopped delay for left turning traffic increased		Less for through traffic but high for left turning traffic.	Travel efficient at through volume range 400 to 700 vph. Travel time performance of left turning traffic was inferior to conventional intersection.
Reid and Hummer (1999)	MUT		Average speed increased by 24.74%	Average number of stops increased by 5.56%	System travel time is decreased by 17.25%.
Reid and Hummer (2001)	CFI, jughandle, MUT Tested for two 4 X 4, one 4 X 2, two 6 X 4, one 6 X 2 and one 8 X 4 lane configurations of major and minor street			The highest average percentage of stops that MUT could decrease compared with conventional intersection was 20.97%. However, it increased the average percentage of stops in some intersection and the highest increment of all 7 intersections was by 28.4%.	The highest total time that MUT could decrease compared with conventional intersection was 27.94%. However, it increased the total time in some intersection and the highest increment of all 7 intersections was by 8.57%.

**Table 2.2** Operational performance of MUT (Part II)

Literature	Intersection Type	Intersection Capacity with respect to Conventional Intersection	Stop	Travel Time
Bared and Kaisar (2002)	MUT (with minor street left turning allowed)		The average proportion of stops was 20 to 40% lower for MUT for 10% and 20% left turning traffic and for 20% left turning noticeable reduction started at about 4,500 vph compared to conventional intersection with single left turn lane.	The travel time saving rised from 10 to 40 s/vehicle for 10% left turning volume at 600 vph entering flow than ordinary intersection with single left turn lane.
				The travel time saving increased to 60 s/vehicle for 20% left turning volume at 600 vph entering flow than ordinary intersection with single left turn lane.
				The travel time saving was smaller at total entering flow of 5500 vph to 6600 vph and larger saving starts from 66,00 vph for 20% left turning volume than ordinary intersection with dual left turn lane.
				Average travel time for U-Turning traffic was 20 to 30 s/veh higher because of circuitous movement.
COMPASS (2008)	MUT, CFI, jughandle	MUT can increase 50% or more capacity than a comparable double left turn	MUT operates with 20% reduction to 70% increment during non-peak hours and 2% reduction to 30% increment during peak hours	Travel time can be reduced by 2-20% during non-peak hours and by 6-21% during peak hours



**Table 2.3** Operational performance of MUT (Part III)

Literature	Intersection Type	Intersection Capacity with respect to Conventional Intersection	Delay	Travel Time
Dorothy et al. (1997)	MUT			For 10% left-turning volumes, MUT with signalized median opening has lower travel time by 20 s/vehicle, 40 s/vehicle and 150 s/vehicle at 30%, 50% and 70% mainline saturation, respectively than two way left turn lanes.
Jagannathan (2007)	MUT	MUT on four lanes and six lanes increases the capacity of the intersection by 20 to 50% than two way left turn lane.		
Savage (1974) and Synthesis of MUT Intersection Treatment (2009)	MUT	MUT can increase the corridor capacity by 20 to 50%.		
Hilderbrand (2007) Thesis	MUT, CFI, jughandle		At major street volumes 1000, 2000 and 3000 vph and minor street volumes 626 vph, MUT reduced delay by 82, 98 and 99%, respectively.	

**Table 2.4** Operational performance of MUT (Part IV)

Literature	Intersection Type	Intersection Capacity with respect to Conventional Intersection	Delay	Travel Time
Tarko et al. (2010)	CFI, jughandle and MUT		At total intersection volume from the range 1,000 vph to 3,000 vph, the intersection delay range related to a conventional intersection was 25 to 70 s/veh and the intersection delay range related to MUT was 20 to 55 s/veh.	MUT lowered travel time significantly than conventional intersection at saturated condition.
Hughes et al. (2010) (FHWA AIIR)	CFI, jughandle, MUT	MUT increased throughput of 15 to 40% than conventional intersection.		
Autey et al.(2010)	MUT		MUT with un-signalized median opening performs better or at least equivalent to signalized MUT.	
			For light volumes (up to 1100 vph), un-signalized MUTs performance is very good on balanced condition.	
			Both MUTs with signalized and un-signalized median opening can't accommodate heavy left turning volume and high approach traffic volume.	
Kivlins and Naudzuns (2011)	MUT	MUT ensures good intersection capacity for left turning traffic flows on both arterial and cross street.	MUT ensures 73% less vehicle waiting time than arterial.	

**Table 2.5** Operational performance of MUT (Part V)

<b>Literature</b>	<b>Intersection Type</b>	<b>Intersection Capacity with respect to Conventional Intersection</b>	<b>Delay</b>	<b>Travel Time</b>
El Esawey and Sayed (2011a), El Esawey and Sayed (2011b)	MUT	The capacity of MUT intersection was about 8% to 10% higher than that of the conventional intersection.		

demand. The average and highest improvements in capacity were 21% and 62.6%, respectively. The study also concluded that type 3 and type 4 MUTs are not good MUT alternatives.

A study by Henderson and Stamatiadis (2001) about the implementation of MUT along a principal urban arterial in Kentucky indicated that the average and total delay time for the whole system decreased by 28% and 24% with the implementation of MUT at four intersections. Again, with the implementation of MUT on two additional intersections, the average delay and total delay were decreased by 36% and 32%, respectively. Martin et al. (2012) found that the delay savings for the peak hour, when calculated for the existing year 2010 and using the MUT/CFI alternative, was 61%, and the delay savings for the MUT/CFI/superstreet alternative was 65%. Further, the savings for the MUT/CFI alternative and MUT/CFI/superstreet alternative for 2015 was 49% and 45%, respectively. Finally, the delay savings calculated for 2020 for these alternatives were 23% and 17%, respectively. In his thesis, Hilderband (2007) indicated that at major street volumes of 1000, 2000 and 3000 vph and minor street volumes of 626 vph, MUT reduced delay by 82%, 98% and 99%, respectively. Tarko et al. (2010) indicated that at total intersection volume from the range 1,000 vph to 3,000 vph, the intersection delay range related to conventional intersections was 25 to 70 s/veh, and the intersection delay range related to MUT was 20 to 55 s/veh. A study by Autey, Sayed, and El Esawey (2010) indicated that un-signalized MUTs exhibit lower delay than signalized MUTs, but neither could accommodate an approach traffic volume of more than 1500 vph with 20%

left turn traffic for a balanced traffic flow. They mentioned that the un-signalized MUTs are the best choice for light volumes (up to 1100 vph) for balanced traffic flow conditions. They concluded that the un-signalized MUT will always perform better than or at least equivalent to signalized MUT for both balanced and un-balanced traffic flow conditions. For unbalanced traffic flow conditions, they also mentioned that both type of MUT can accommodate only light to moderate traffic volumes. They are not recommended for heavy left turning traffic conditions.

El Esawey and Sayed (2011a) and El Esawey and Sayed (2011b) assessed the performance of two types of MUT against the conventional four legged intersection. Type 1 MUT prohibits left-turning traffic only from major and minor streets and is pre-timed signal controlled at the core intersection. Type 2 MUT prohibits all movement of the minor street and the left turn only movement of the major street. The core intersection is not controlled with a signal. They used Synchro to optimize the signal and VISSIM for simulation, and tested the performance of the three intersections, including a conventional intersection under balanced and unbalanced traffic flow conditions in terms of average intersection control delay and overall capacity of the intersection. The result indicated that Type 1 MUT performed better than Type 2 MUT. Type 2 MUT was beneficial only in very low demand approach traffic volumes and left turning volumes. The capacity of Type 2 MUT was lower than a conventional intersection by 27% under balanced volume conditions. However, the capacity of Type 1 MUT with signalized and un-signalized median openings was 8% to 10% higher than a conventional intersection.

Under unbalanced conditions, the Type 2 MUT exhibited higher delays in most cases except at a very light volume for the cross street. Type 1 MUT outperformed all other intersections in terms of exhibiting the lowest delay. For two traffic conditions with 20% and 30% left turning traffic, Type 1 MUT with un-signalized median openings reduced delay from 3 to 6 s/veh to 8 s/veh. Similarly, Topp and Hummer (2005) compared the operations between traditional MUT designs at median openings along an arterial to the new MUT design that has median openings on the minor street. They used CORSIM for the simulation. The results found that the MUT with median openings at the cross street provides better operation in terms of stops, total time, and delay for most of volume combinations. They mentioned that the cross street can better accommodate left turns from a median opening because of the capacity available due to low volume. This also decreases the likelihood of stopping and queue interference with heavy traffic flow.

#### **2.2.4 Safety Performance of MUT**

A MUT intersection possesses a total of 16 conflict points, including 12 merging/diverging conflict points, 0 crossing (left turn) conflict points, and 4 other crossing points, compared to four-legged standard signalized intersection, which has 32 conflict points (Kivlins and Naudzuns , 2011). This indicates that MUT should have safety benefits compared to conventional intersections. In this section, the safety performance of MUT is described based on past studies. The literature review notes from prominent literature that deals directly with MUT-related safety are shown in table 2.6 and table 2.7.

“Information and Geometric Design Guidance Regarding Boulevards, Directional Crossovers, and Indirect (‘Michigan’) Left Turns” (1995) indicated that MUTs result in a reduction of 60.6% total crashes, 74.6% injury crashes, 17.1% rear end crashes, 95.5% angle crashes, and 60.6% sideswipe crashes. Similarly, Kach (1992) did a comparative crash study between directional (MUT) and bi-directional signalized intersections with an objective to establish directional crossovers as a safety treatment. He studied about 15 directional signalized intersections and 30 bi-directional signalized intersections. The study identified key types of crash reduction for signalized directional intersections: angle straight by 53.1%, rear end left turn by 9.3%, sideswipe opposite by 0.3%, and head-on left turn by 35.4%. However, the treatment increased some crashes as fixed object by 7% and rear end by 91.4%. In sum, the total crash reduction was 48.91%, and total crash gained was 21.8%. The equivalent overall crash reduction was 27.11%. The result of the study showed significant reduction in total, angle and right turn, and left turn collisions. Similarly, the result also indicated significant reduction in fatal and injury collisions. Based on analysis of data collected data over 115 median openings including 105 median openings in urban arterials and 12 median openings in rural arterials, Potts, Harwood, Torbic, Richard, Gluck, Levinson, Garvey, and Ghebrial (2004) estimated average of 0.41 U-Turn plus left-turn accidents per median openings per year in urban arterial and 0.2 accidents per median opening per year in rural arterial. U-Turns represent 58% of the total median opening movement and the left turn represents 42% of the median opening movement. The study found no major safety concern on the un-

signalized median opening. The study also found existence of major road angle collision, major road rear end collision, cross street collision, and other or unknown collision. In terms of MUT median opening, the cross street collision is not applicable.

Mallah (2011) developed guidelines for the full opening median treatment at an un-signalized intersection using predicted conflict rate as the safety measures. They collected segment geometric data, traffic volumes and traffic conflict data. They calculated conflict rates both from observations and from the model prediction. In the developed conflict rate models, the prediction of direct left turn conflict was positively governed with major road traffic volume in one direction, major road traffic volume in the opposite direction, the direct left turn volume, left turn in driveway volume and left turn in opposite driveway volume. Similarly, Qi et al. (2014) investigated the operational and safety impacts of directional median openings on urban roadways with the help crash analysis and simulation-based study. They found from the crash analysis that full median openings pose more safety and operational hazards, and hence should be avoided. To maintain good safety conditions, a sufficient median width is very necessary. From the simulation study, it was found that when a full median opening is converted to a directional median opening, crossing conflicts will be greatly reduced, but there will be a slight increase in lane change conflict. In his dissertation, Liu (2006) evaluated the operational effects of U-turn movement on multilane roadways by gathering the crash histories of 179 roadway segments in central Florida. In order to complete the RTUT movement, the types of crashes during weave as explained by the study were angle/right



turn crashes, sideswipe crashes, and rear end crashes. The study found that the crash rate at weaving sections decreases with the increase of the separation distance and travel time. Carter et al. (2005) analyzed the crashes of 78 intersections, 24 of which had problems with U-turns. No collisions were found in 65 sites. The remaining 13 sites had 0.33 to 3 collisions/year. U-turn collisions were high for the sites with dual left turn lanes, protected right turn overlap, or high left turn and conflicting right turn traffic.

Pirinccioglu, Lu, Liu, and Sokolow (2006) evaluated the safety of RTUT on four-lane arterials at signalized and un-signalized median openings by collecting data from 16 sites. Nine types of conflict were used; five of them were related to RTUT and four of them were related to direct left turns. The study at signalized intersections indicated that a direct left turn produced two times more conflict per hour than RTUT, but the conflict rate that takes volume into account was 5% higher for RTUT than direct left turns. RTUT-related conflicts were less severe than direct left turn related conflicts. The study at median opening sites indicated 10% more direct left turn related conflict per hour than RTUT-related conflicts. The conflict rate (per 1,000 vph), which takes traffic volumes into account, was 62% higher for RTUT than direct left turn. RTUT-related conflicts were less severe than direct left turn related conflicts. Lu et al. (2005) did a safety evaluation of RTUT and direct left turns at signalized intersections by comparing traffic conflicts. Nine types of conflict were studied, and five of them were related to RTUT movements while the rest related to direct left turns. They used two types of conflict rates: conflict per hour and conflicts per thousand vehicles. The comparison showed

RTUT generates three times less conflicts than direct left turn in terms of conflict per hour. The conflict rate per volume showed that RTUT had 35% less conflicts than the direct left turn on six- or eight-lane roads. Overall severity related to RTUT conflicts were 37% lower than that of the direct left turn. Regarding conflict modeling, Agarwal (2011) estimated pedestrian safety at intersections using simulations and SSAM. He found that the conflict patterns of MUT intersections are similar to that of conventional signalized intersections.

Xu (2001) studied the safety effects of RTUT at directional median openings by conducting a before-and-after period crash analysis. The study found that RTUT can reduce the total number of crashes by 24% and injury/fatality crashes by 32% compared to direct left turns for six-lane divided arterials. Liu and Lu (2007) evaluated the offset of U-turn bays and upstream driveways based on crash data analysis and travel time analysis. The crash analysis was performed over 179 selected roadway segments, and travel time data was collected at 29 selected sites in Tampa Bay, Florida. The study mentioned that RTUT-related crashes involve angle/right turn crashes, sideswipe crashes, and rear end crashes. The model developed for crash rates on four-lane and 6-8 lane roadways (crashes/mvm) indicated that the crash rate will increase if the U-turn bay is located at a signalized intersection rather than a median opening. The crash rate was significantly affected by the offset between the driveway and U-turn bay. Based on safety and operational performance, the study also identified the minimum offset for U-turn bays located at a median opening as 350 ft. and 450 ft. for four-lane and 6-8 lane

roadways. The minimum offsets were 500 ft. and 750 ft. for a U–turn at a signalized intersection on 6-8 lane roadways.

Mauga and Kaseko (2010) evaluated the safety effect of access management features in the midblock section while considering two types of median treatments: raised medians and two-way left turn lanes. The study indicated that each reduction of one median opening per mile resulted in a crash reduction of 4.7%. There has also been a study about the safety effects of length of left turn lanes at un-signalized median openings. In this context, Chen et al. (2014) developed a relationship between crash modification factors and relative length of left turn lane at un-signalized median openings with respect to the AASHTO Greenbook. The relation showed that the shorter the length of left turn lane, the higher the crash modification factor.

The public perception of the use of MUT was studied by Strickland (2012). On the basis of public comments received by the Cobb County Department of Transportation (CCDOT), the majority of the public have accepted the MUT design. However, there were some comments against the use of MUT, which were people who were either skeptical about the innovative intersection strategy or did not like the additional distance the left turning traffic have to travel due to the MUT design. The author concluded his study by emphasizing the need to educate the general public about these new designs.

**Table 2.6** Safety performance of MUT (Part I)

Literature	Alternative Intersection	Safety Performance
“Information and Geometric Design Guidance Regarding Boulevards, Directional Crossovers, and Indirect (‘Michigan’) Left Turns” (1995)	MUT	Reduction in total crash was 60.6%.
		Reduction in injury crash was 74.6%.
		Reduction in rear end crash was 17.1%.
		Reduction in sideswipe crash was 95.5% and 60.6% of sideswipe crashes.
Kach (1992)	MUT	Reduction in angle straight was 53.1%.
		Reduction in rear end left turn crash was 9.3%.
		Reduction in sideswipe opposite crash was 0.3%.
		Reduction in head on left turn crash was 35.4%.
		Increment in fixed object crash was 7%.
		Increment in rear end crash was 91.4%.
		The total crash reduction was 48.91%, total crash gained was 21.8% and the equivalent overall crash reduction was 27.11%.
Potts et al. (2004)	MUT Median Opening	Average of 0.41 U-turn plus left-turn accidents per median openings per year in urban arterial and 0.2 accidents per median opening per year in rural arterial were estimated. U-turns represent 58% of the total median opening movement and the left turn represents 42% of the median opening movement.
Carter et al. (2005)	MUT Median Opening	U-turn collisions were high for the sites with dual left turn lanes, protected right turn overlap, or high left turn and conflicting right turn traffic.

**Table 2.7** Safety performance of MUT (Part II)

Literature	Alternative Intersection	Safety Performance
Pirinccioglu et al. (2006)	MUT Median Opening	The study at signalized intersection indicated that direct left turn produce two times more conflict per hour than RTUT. RTUT-related conflicts were less severe than direct left turn related conflicts. The study at median opening sites indicated 10% more direct left turn related conflict per hour than RTUT related conflicts. The conflict rate (per 1,000 vph) was 62% higher for RTUT than direct left turns.
Lu et al. (2005)	MUT (RTUT Movement)	The comparison showed RTUT generates 3 times less conflicts than direct left turn in terms of conflict per hour than direct left turn. In terms of conflict rate considering volume, RTUT showed 35% lower conflict than direct left turn on six or eight lane roads. Overall severity related to RTUT conflicts were 37% lower than that of direct left turn.
Xu (2001)	MUT (RTUT Movement)	RTUT reduced the total crash by 24% and injury/fatal crash by 32% than direct left turn for six lane divided arterials.
Mauga and Kaseko (2010)	Median opening	
Chen et al. (2014)	Median Opening	Shorter the length of left turn lane higher is the crash modification factor.

## **2.3 The Operation and Safety Performance Related to Continuous Flow**

### **Intersections (CFI)**

As described in preceding chapter, the CFI operates with one main intersection and four other crossover intersections. All the intersections are signalized. The operational and safety effect brought by reduced traffic signal phases, the provision of the displaced left turn lane, and the effect of the whole system are described in the following subsections.

#### **2.3.1 Operational Performance of CFI**

Like other unconventional intersections, CFI is applied as an intersection treatment to improve safety and operation. However, the extent of improvements is based on certain traffic conditions. For example, according to the alternative selection criteria developed by Hummer (1998-B), when based on left turn volume from urban and suburban arterials, CFI is applicable for all traffic volume conditions of left turns from arterials, left turns from minor streets, minor street through traffic, and the availability of two 40 ft. by 300 ft. right-of-way rectangles. In this context, this subsection deals with the operational performance of CFI compared to conventional intersections or other conventional intersections under different criteria or conditions. The review notes of prominent literature that are directly related to the operational performance of CFI are shown in table 2.8, table 2.9, table 2.10, and table 2.11.

### 2.3.1.1 Travel Efficiency of CFI

Travel efficiency represents travel time, average speed, and stops related to the operation of CFI. In this context, Tarko et al. (2008) studied the safety and operational impacts of unconventional intersections. They used VISSIM for operation performance evaluation. The study showed that at total intersection volume levels of 1730 vph, 2250 vph, and 3110 vph, CFI reduced stops by 35.56%, 7.5%, and 60.17%, respectively. Reid and Hummer (2001) compared the travel time of unconventional intersections, including CFI, by performing a simulation with traffic signals with optimal cycle length using peak hours, off peak hours, and peak hours with 15% added volume levels. The unconventional intersections were found to have lower travel time than conventional designs. Similarly, Yang, Chang, Rahwanji, and Lu (2013) studied CFI to identify queue spillback locations and develop a set of planning stage models. They also compared the operational performance of CFI to that of conventional intersections. The reductions in total travel time (hour) were 15.1% and 14.7% in the morning and evening peaks. The average number of stops per vehicle was reduced by 6.3% and 7.8% at the morning and evening peaks.

### 2.3.1.2 Capacity and Delay and Other Operational Efficiency of CFI

Goldbat et al. (1994) studied the effectiveness CFIs operating under multiphase actuated control. They used a TRAFNETSIM simulation model to compare both conventional and unconventional designs. The result showed that CFI performed better than conventional intersections at capacity, when the demand exceeded capacity, and

with the presence of heavy left-turners such that they required left turn protection. It was found that the demand of 2000 vph on each approach exceeded the capacity of conventional designs by 20%. The capacity of CFI was exceeded on all approaches at a demand level of 3000 vph, but the capacity at this demand level was 50% higher than that of conventional intersection. A similar type of conclusion was reached by Berkowitz, Mier, Walter, Bragd (1997) in a study of CFI, which indicated that CFI can accommodate 50% more traffic than a conventional three-legged intersection design at a demand level of 3,000 vph. Simulations showed that CFI delay was 1/5 of conventional intersection delay. Mean speed of CFI was approximately twice the speed at conventional intersection. The signal efficiency increased by at least 80% and fuel consumption and emissions were reduced by 1/3 or more. "Techbrief: Displaced Left turn Intersection" (2009) indicated that a full CFI can increase 30% throughput over a conventional intersection under fully balanced opposing flow in mainlines, and 25% throughput with unbalanced main line volumes. For partial CFI, the increase in throughput was 10% for unbalanced flows and 20% for balanced flows.

The delay reduction capabilities of CFIs as assessed by Pitaksringkam (2005) using VISSIM simulation modeling concluded that queue and delay could be decreased by 64% and 61% respectively during PM peak hours as compared to conventional intersections. Cheong et al. (2008) assessed the operational performance of CFI, parallel flow intersections (PFI), and upstream signalized crossover (USC) intersections. The average delay comparison of through only and left-turn only traffic concluded that CFI



outperformed other intersections except for some traffic conditions. For example, in balanced conditions, the average delay of through traffic for PFI was smaller than CFI under low traffic volume (1000 vph) conditions, and almost similar under a moderate traffic volume level (1500 vph). Liu, Zhang, and Yang (2012) studied CFI for urban roads, evaluating CFI with a VISSIM simulation. In terms of delay, CFI reduced 42% to 86% delay with respect to conventional intersections. The CFI through vehicle queue length decreased by 28% to 83%, and the left-turning queue length decreased from 36% to 6%. Under high or oversaturated traffic status, the traffic benefits of the CFI tended to be steady. Similarly, in their study about integrated computer system analysis, selection, and evaluation of unconventional intersections, Chang et al. (2011) developed well-calibrated VISSIM simulation models of CFI and diverging diamond interchange (DDI). They assessed operational performance under various constraints and traffic conditions, and concluded that the average intersection delay for both CFI and DDI depended on the congestion level of each sub-intersection and the ratio of maximum queue length to available bay length. Jagannathan and Bared (2004) also studied the design and operational performance of three types of CFI, including crossovers on all approaches (Type A), crossovers on the major street approach (Type B) and crossovers on one approach of the major street (Type C), over a wide distribution of traffic flow conditions under pre-timed signal settings. The result of the study found a 48% to 50% delay reduction for Type A, 58% to 71% delay reduction for Type B and 19% to 90% delay reduction for Type C. El Esawey and Sayed (2007) compared the performance of four

legged CFI and upstream signalized crossover (USC). They found that CFI has a higher capacity than conventional intersections by 90%. Similarly, USC has a 50% higher capacity than conventional intersections. Taberno and Sayed (2006) did a performance comparison of upstream signalized crossovers with a conventional intersection using VISSIM and found that USC can handle high traffic volumes with low overall delay.

Kaisar, Edara, Rodriguez, and Chery (2011) compared the performance of a signalized and un-signalized roundabout, a continuous flow intersection (CFI), and parallel flow intersection (PFI) as alternatives to the conventional four legged intersection. They used AIMSUN and VISSIM models to evaluate these intersections under three different level of volume; low, medium, and high entrance volumes. The CFI produced the lowest delay at medium (3,000 vph to 4,000 vph) and high (4,500 vph to 6,000 vph) volumes. The roundabout performed well at low (1,000 vph to 2,500 vph) volume. However, the overall performance was still better with CFI over all alternatives as it maintained level of service (LOS) C throughout all volume levels. Chang et al. (2011) developed deterministic queuing models for CFI and DDI. They also found that for CFI or DDI, the average intersection was dependent on the congestion level of each sub-intersection and the ratio of the maximum queue length to available bay length at each bottle-neck location. They categorized the level of impacts of queue on intersection delay at different locations. For example, for a two legged CFI, the prioritized queue locations were: (1) the through queue between the main and crossover intersection, (2) the left turn queue between the main and crossover intersection, (3) the left turn queue at

**Table 2.8** Operational performance of CFI (Part I)

Literature	Intersection Type	Stop	Travel Time
Reid and Hummer (2001)	CFI and other types of Unconventional Intersections		The unconventional intersections were found to have lower travel time than conventional designs.
Tarko et al. (2008)	CFI	At total intersection volume levels of 1730 vph, 2250 vph and 3110 vph, CFI reduces stop by 35.56%, 7.5% and 60.17%	
Yang et al. (2013)	CFI	The average number of stops per vehicle was reduced by 6.3% and 7.8% at morning and evening peak times.	The reductions in total travel time (hour) were 15.1% and 14.7% in the morning and evening peak times.

**Table 2.9** Operational performance of CFI (Part II)

Literature	Intersection Type	Intersection Capacity with respect to Conventional Intersection	Delay and Queue	Speed	Fuel Consumption and Emissions
Glodbatt et al. (1994)	CFI	At demand level of 2000 vph, approach exceeded the capacity of conventional design by 20%.	The delay of CFI was 1/5 of conventional intersection.	Mean speed was approximately twice the speed at conventional intersection.	Fuel consumption and emissions were reduced by 1/3 or more.
		At the demand level of 3000 vph, but the capacity of CFI was 50% higher than conventional intersection.			
		Signal efficiency increased at least by 80%.			
FHWA Displaced Left turn Intersection (2009)	CFI	Full CFI can increase 30% throughput over conventional intersections under fully balanced opposing flow in mainlines and 25% throughput with unbalanced main line volumes. For partial CFI, the increase in throughput is 10% for unbalanced flows and 20% for balanced flows.			
Pitaksringkam (2005)	CFI		Queue and delay could be decreased by 64% and 61% respectively during PM peak hour as compared to those of unconventional intersection.		

**Table 2.10** Operational performance of CFI (Part III)

Literature	Intersection Type	Intersection Capacity with respect to Conventional Intersection	Delay and Queue	Fuel Consumption and Emissions
Liu et al. (2012)	CFI		CFI reduced 42 to 86% delay with respect to conventional intersection. The through vehicle of queue length decreases by 28 to 83% and left turning queue length of CFI decreases 36 to 6%.	
Jagannathan and Bared (2004)	CFI (Type A: Crossovers on all approaches, Type B: Crossovers on major street approach, Type C: Crossover on one approach of major street		Type A: Reduction in delay was 48 to 50%, Type B: Reduction in delay was 58 to 71%, Reduction in delay in Type C: 19 to 90%	
El Esawey and Sayed (2007)	CFI and Upstream Signalized Crossover (USC)	CFI has higher capacity than conventional intersections by 90%.		
Autey et al. (2013)	MUT, CFI, Upstream Signalized Crossover (USC) and Double Crossover Intersection (DXI)	CFI showed 99% higher capacity than conventional intersection where as USC and DXI showed 50%.		
Yang et al. (2013)	CFI		The performance comparison between CFI and conventional intersections showed 34.2% reduction in average delay per vehicle (sec) in morning peak and 35.1% in afternoon peak.	CFI was found helpful in view point of fuel consumption and vehicle emission.

**Table 2.11** Operational performance of CFI (Part IV)

<b>Literature</b>	<b>Intersection Type</b>	<b>Intersection Capacity with respect to Conventional Intersection</b>	<b>Delay and Queue</b>	<b>Fuel Consumption and Emissions</b>
Park and Rakha (2010)	CFI			CFI could result in energy savings of 5% (from VISSIM) and 11% (from INTEGRATION), respectively. The decrease in HC, CO, and NOx emissions ranged from 1% to 6%.

each crossover intersection, and (4) the through and left turn queue on the conventional legs. Autey, Sayed, and El Esawey (2013) studied four unconventional intersections: MUT, CFI, USC and DXI. The CFI outperformed all the intersections under most balanced and un-balanced volume levels. CFI showed 99% higher capacity than conventional intersections. USC and DXI had about 50% more capacity than conventional intersections. The impact of increasing the left turning volume was more prominent in conventional intersections than these unconventional intersections.

Carroll and Lahusen (2013) developed a deterministic model to study the operational effects of CFI. The model showed that a displaced left turn lane (DLTL) plays a vital role in the optimal design of CFI. Some other non-geometric elements, like speed, also have an effect on operation, but not as much as a DLTL. DLTL also controls the maximum available signal phase time of left-turning movement. Traffic volume demand is a major control over DLTL length. The authors expressed that the deterministic models can provide a more accurate and time effective result in finding the optimal design for DLTL. Yang et al. (2013) studied CFI to identify queue spillback locations and develop a set of planning stage models. They developed four equations for four types of queue at full CFI with deterministic equations and using a simulation experiment. Using experimental data, they also identified the correlation between the total delay and queue length (QL) ratio at each critical location. The mean and variance of average delay grows exponentially when the average QL ratio increased. The QL ratio is the ratio of bay length to queue length. Average delay increases linearly with the

increase of total demand. Under a high congested volume, the critical lane volume could be a more reliable indicator of delay than total volume. Type 1 queue was the through queues at the major intersection. Type 2 queue was the left-turn queues at the crossover intersection. Type 3 queue was the left-turn queues at the major intersection. Type 4 queue was the through queues at the crossover intersection. They used the QL ratio to identify queue spillback locations. The performance comparison between CFI and conventional intersections showed a 34.2% reduction in average delay per vehicle (sec) in the morning peak hours and 35.1% in the afternoon peak hours.

The CFI is also helpful from the viewpoint of fuel consumption and vehicle emission. A study by Park and Rakha (2010) indicated that the use of CFI could result in energy savings of 5% (from VISSIM) and 11% (from INTEGRATION). In the case of emissions, the decrease in HC, CO, and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions ranged from 1% to 6%. This study also indicated that CFI reduced fuel use and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions at both low and high demand levels of left-turn movements.

### **2.3.2 Safety Performance of CFI and Effect of Signing and Markings**

The two-legged CFI possesses 30 conflict points compared to 32 conflict points in a conventional intersection (FHWA Techbrief: Displaced Left-turn Intersection, 2009). Hence, it can be thought that CFI would reduce crashes. This section includes a safety-related literature review about CFI. The review notes from prominent literature related to the safety performance of CFI are also shown table 2.12 and table 2.13.



A safety study of CFI in Baton Rouge indicated a 24% reduction in total crashes and a 19% reduction in fatal and injury crashes (FHWA Techbrief: Displaced Left-turn Intersection, 2009). In terms of the service of unconventional intersections to pedestrians, Jagannathan and Bared (2005) studied CFI in terms of design methodologies for pedestrian access and related pedestrian signal timings. They conducted simulations for pedestrian traffic performance of three CFI models, optimized timing for vehicular traffic. Case A was the four-legged CFI model, Case B was the two-legged CFI model, and Case C was the three-legged CFI with a displaced left turn at one side of the major street. The result from the simulation indicated that the maximum average delay experienced by any pedestrian while crossing the intersection legs with a speed of 4 ft/s were 37 s, 46 s, and 44 s for Case A, Case B, and Case C, respectively. The maximum average delay per stop experienced by pedestrians while crossing the intersection legs with a speed of 4 ft/s were 15 s, 28 s, and 26 s, which are equivalent to LOS B, C, and C for Cases A, B, and C, respectively. The maximum average delay for pedestrians for diagonal crossing across two legs of CFI at a speed of 4 ft/s were 34 s, 55 s, and 26 s for Case A, Case B, and Case C, respectively. The average delay per stop for pedestrians crossing diagonally across two legs of the CFI at a speed of 4 ft/s were 11 s, 20 s, and 18 s, which are equivalent to LOS B for Case A, Case B, and Case C, respectively. All pedestrians were serviced within two cycles of signal timing for all cases. Yahl (2013), in his thesis, studied the safety effects of CFI through a before-and-after study. Data from five sites in four different states were used for study using the naïve method, the naïve

with traffic factors method, and the comparison group method. The results indicated a decrease in collisions in Baton Rouge, LA, but there was an increase in collisions in the after period for the rest of the test sites. From the overall site analysis, it was found that fatal and injury collisions, rear end, and sideswipe collisions increased, while angle and other collisions decreased. The study also recommended that agencies should consider using CFI as a congestion treatment, although the safety effects are negative or neutral. The study recommended adjusting the design elements of CFI to minimize the additional crashes.

A safety study conducted by Park and Rakha (2010) regarding CFI indicated that a large number of unsafe maneuvers during the early use of CFI could be due to drivers' unfamiliarity. The study showed a 50% reduction in unsafe maneuvers by the end of first year of use. The researchers have suggested implementing a proper signing plan and information campaign as a solution to this problem. The AASHTO Green Book (2011) has suggested the use of signing, visual cues, and education to provide guidance for intersection users. Similarly, in Thomson and Hummer's study (2001) about the safe implementation of unconventional intersections, they emphasized signing plans and efficient public information campaigns as a measure to fulfill the ad-hoc and priori expectancy of the drivers to maintain safety. Similarly, Inman (2009) conducted a simulator study to compare alternative signing and marking options. Three strategies for navigation signing were evaluated: overhead signing and two different ground-mounted sign alternatives. The results showed that the ground-mounted signing treatment that

included a “Keep Left” advance sign was as effective as an overhead navigation sign. FHWA (2008) has published a summary report regarding the evaluation of sign and marking alternatives for displaced left turn (DLT) lane intersections with three main purposes. The first purpose is to “inform recommendations for signing DLT crossovers,” the second is to “inform recommendations for mitigation of stop line overruns on minor street approaches to DLTS,” and the third is to see “the extent to which naive drivers are able to navigate a DLT for the first time.” The study concluded that advance signing is important and that overhead signing may not be more effective than ground-mounted signs. It does not mean that overhead signs should not be considered; it means that in some cases ground-mounted signs could be sufficient. The report mentioned that minor street approaches to DLT were not the problem. There were KEEP CLEAR markings applied, but whether the absence of overruns was due to this sign or not was not certain. The study mentioned that there was no driver confusion when drivers confronted the DLT for the first time.

#### **2.4 The Operation and Safety Performance Related to Jughandles**

As described in preceding chapter, the jughandle operates with one main intersection and two other crossover intersections. Reverse/reverse (R/R) jughandles have reverse ramps to divert left-turning vehicles. The main intersection is signalized and the crossovers are YIELD controlled. The operational and safety effect brought by this intersection modification are described in following subsections.

**Table 2.12** Safety performance of CFI (Part I)

Literature	Alternative Intersection	Safety Performance and Behavior
Techbrief: Displaced Left- turn Intersection (2009)	CFI	The two legged CFI possess 30 conflict points compared 32 conflict points in a conventional intersection. A safety study of CFI in Baton Rouge indicated 24% reduction in total crashes and 19% reduction in fatal and injury crashes.
Jagannathan and Bared (2005)	CFI, Case A: 4-legged CFI, Case B: 2-legged CFI, Case C: 3-legged CFI	The maximum average delay experienced by pedestrian while crossing the intersection legs with speed 4 ft/s were 37, 46 and 44 s for Case A, Case B, and Case C, respectively.
		The maximum average delay per stop experienced by pedestrian while crossing intersection legs with speed 4 ft/s were 15, 28 and 26 s which are equivalent to LOS B, C and C for Case A, Case B, and Case C, respectively.
		The maximum average delay for pedestrian for diagonal crossing across two legs of CFI at speed of 4 ft/s were 34, 55 and 26 s for Case A, Case B, and Case C, respectively.
		The average delay per stop for pedestrian for diagonal crossing across two legs of CFI at speed of 4 ft/s were 11, 20 and 18 s which are equivalent to LOS B for Case A, Case B, and Case C, respectively.
Park and Rakha (2010)	CFI	There were large numbers of unsafe maneuver during the early use of CFI. The study showed 50% reduction in unsafe maneuvers by the end of first year of use.
Yahl (2013)	CFI	The study found that fatal and injury collisions, rear end and sideswipe collisions were increased. The angle and other collisions were decreased.

**Table 2.13** Safety performance of CFI (Part II)

Literature	Alternative Intersection	Safety Performance and Behavior
Thomson and Hummer (2001)	CFI	The safe implementation of unconventional intersections emphasized on signing plans and efficient public information campaigns as a measure to fulfill the adhoc and priori expectancy of the drivers to maintain safety.
AASHTO (2011)	CFI	AASHTO suggests the need of signing, visual cues, and education to provide guidance for intersection users.

### 2.4.1 Operational Performance of Jughandles

Jughandles are thought to be suitable as an intersection treatment for high volume arterials with moderate to low left turning volume (Toolbox on Intersection Safety and Design, 2004; Hummer, 1998; Rodgers et al., 2004). It is applicable for all volumes of minor street through traffic. Hummer and Reid (1999) further added that jughandles were suitable for arterials with high through volume, moderate to low left turn volume, narrow right of way, and the distances between signals should be long so that additional right-of-way and other costs for the ramp do not exceed the savings. The extent of performance was based on certain traffic conditions that are discussed below based on the information provided by past literature. The review notes of prominent literature that are directly related to the operational performance of jughandles are shown in table 2.14 and table 2.15.

Rodegerdts et al. (2004) indicated that jughandles have potential to reduce the overall travel time, but they do not reduce travel time and stops for left-turning vehicles compared to conventional intersections. “Techbrief: Traffic Performance of Three Typical Designs of New Jersey Jughandle Intersections” (2007) indicated that the delay reduction capability of jughandles depend on the type of configuration and geometrics. The result showed that the forward/forward (F/F), reverse/reverse (R/R), and forward/reverse (F/R) jughandles will reduce the average intersection delays compared to conventional intersections by 15-35%, 20-40%, and 25-40%, respectively. Similarly, they

have higher intersection capacities compared to conventional intersections for saturated conditions in the range of 20-25%, 25-30% and 25-40%. Jughandles performed well in terms of travel time and number of stops per vehicle compared to conventional intersections only for near saturated conditions. The vehicular capacity of left turn volumes in the major road decreases with ramp offsets such that offset length reduction from 450 ft. to 230 ft. reduces the left-turn capacity on the major road approach by approximately 30%. The performance of jughandles may depend on the control of crossovers as well. In this context, Chowdhury (2011) evaluated a New Jersey jughandle intersection (NJI) with and without pre-signals. The study indicated that NJI with pre-signals can improve operations under high volume conditions without degrading the condition at low volume. The NJI without pre-signals performed slightly better than NJI with pre-signals and conventional intersections under low overall volume condition. The NJI alternative with pre-signals increased intersection capacity by 45% over conventional intersections. Both types of NJI reduced HC, CO, and NO emissions from conventional intersections. Regarding fuel consumption, the mileage per gallon on average were 13.8, 14.7 and 14.8 for conventional intersections, NJI without pre-signals, and NJI with pre-signals, respectively. Regarding the use of jughandles to improve arterial corridor congestion, Furtado, Tencha and Devos (2003) did a study on suitable methods for the improvement of McKnight Boulevard in Calgary for medium term (2015) and long term (2038) under certain sets of constraints. They studied six alternatives for improvement, including a jughandle ramp at key intersections. The

analysis showed that the implementation of a jughandle (4 & 6 lanes) can improve existing conditions and perform better than a conventional six-lane alternative in terms of travel time, signal delay, average speed, and LOS at AM and PM peak hour conditions for eastbound and westbound through traffic along McKnight Boulevard. The signal delay, travel time, and average speed were 139 s, 265 s, and 20 km/h, respectively, for the eastbound AM peak hour in existing conditions. Similarly, the signal delay, travel time, and average speed were 140 s, 287 s, and 23 km/h, respectively, for the westbound PM peak hour. With the implementation of a jughandle (four lanes) in the year 2015, signal delay, travel time, and average speed will be 33 s, 126 s, and 43 km/h, respectively, for the eastbound PM peak hour; and 45 s, 154 s, and 42 km/h for the westbound PM peak hour. The same performance measures will be 46 s, 140 s, and 39 km/h for the eastbound PM peak hour; and 38 s, 147 s, and 44 km/h for the westbound PM peak hour, in the year 2038 with the implementation of a jughandle (six lanes). These values were better than the conventional six-lane alternative. Similarly, the LOS at year 2038 achieved through the use of a jughandle at 4th Street West were C and B, compared to F and D with the conventional alternative for AM and PM peak hours. The LOS at Center Street were B and B with a jughandle, compared to F and E for a conventional alternative for AM and PM peak hours, respectively. Similarly, the LOS at Edmonton Trail were B and B with a jughandle, compared to F and E for a conventional alternative for AM and PM peak hours.



**Table 2.14** Operational performance of jughandle (Part I)

Literature	Intersection Type	Intersection Capacity with respect to Conventional Intersection	Delay and Queue	Travel Efficiency	Fuel Consumption and Emissions
Rodegerdts et al. (2004)	Jughandle			Jughandles do not reduce stops for left turning vehicles compared to conventional intersections. They have potential to reduce the overall travel time but they do not reduce travel time as compared to the conventional intersections.	
Techbrief: Traffic Performance of Three Typical Designs of New Jersey jughandle Intersections (2007)	Jughandle : Forward/Forward (F/F), Reverse/Reverse (R/R) and Forward/Reverse (F/R)	Jughandles have higher intersection capacities compared to conventional intersections for saturated conditions in the range 20-25% (F/F), 25-30% (R/R) and 25-40% (F/R). The vehicular capacity of left turn volumes on the major road decreases with ramp offsets such that offsets length reduction from 450 ft. to 230 ft. reduces the left-turn capacity on the major road approach by approximately 30%.	Jughandles reduce the average intersection delays compared to conventional intersections by 15-35% (F/F), 20-40% (R/R), and 25-40% (F/R), respectively.	Jughandles performed well in terms of travel time and number of stops per vehicle compared to conventional intersections only for near saturated conditions.	

**Table 2.15** Operational performance of jughandle (Part II)

<b>Literature</b>	<b>Intersection Type</b>	<b>Intersection Capacity with respect to Conventional Intersection</b>	<b>Delay and Queue</b>	<b>Travel Efficiency</b>	<b>Fuel Consumption and Emissions</b>
Chowdhury (2011)	New Jersey jughandle Intersection (NJJI) with and without pre-signals	The NJJI alternative with pre-signals increases intersection capacity by 45% over conventional intersection.			NJJI reduce HC, CO and NO emissions than conventional one. Regarding fuel consumption, the mileage per gallon in an average were 13.8, 14.7 and 14.8 for conventional, NJJI without pre-signals and NJJI with pre-signals respectively.

### 2.4.2 Safety Performance of Jughandles

A study (Jagannathan et al., 2006) indicated that a four-legged signalized intersection with two forward jughandle ramps has a total of 26 conflict points. The four-legged signalized intersection with one forward and one reverse jughandle ramps has a total of 25 conflict points, and the four-legged signalized intersection with two reverse jughandle ramps has total of 24 conflict points. Smith (2013) indicated that a forward ramp intersecting the cross street plus a forward ramp curving left to intersect the mainline jughandle would produce 20 diverge/merge conflicts, 4 crossing (left) conflicts, and 4 crossing (angle) conflicts to total about 28 conflicts, compared to the 32 conflicts of conventional four-legged intersection and 26 conflicts of a Type A jughandle.

Jagannathan et al. (2006) indicated that conventional intersections had more head-on, left turn, fatal plus injury, and property damage only crashes compared to NJJIs. Within jughandles, the reverse/reverse jughandle was found to have the lowest rate of angle and left turn crashes per million vehicle miles. The forward jughandles were found have the highest overall rate of crashes per million vehicle miles travelled, which was about 1.3 to 1.4 times the other two types, forward-reverse jughandle and reverse-reverse jughandle.

There were significant differences in pedestrian injuries between conventional intersections and NJJIs. Agarwal (2011) developed a conflict model concerning pedestrian safety for signalized and un-signalized intersections using a Surrogate Safety Assessment Model (SSAM) to quantify the conflicts. For a F/F jughandle, separate models were developed for ramp sections and intersections. For the ramp, the pedestrian

**Table 2.16** Safety performance of jughandle

Literature	Alternative Intersection	Safety Performance and Behavior
Jagannathan et al. (2006)	Jughandles	A four-legged signalized intersection with two forward jughandle ramps has total of 26 conflict points. The four-legged signalized intersection with one forward and one reverse jughandle ramps has total of 25 conflict points, and the four-legged signalized intersection with two reverse jughandle ramps has a total of 24 conflict points.
		The reverse-reverse jughandle was found to have lowest rate of angle and left turn crashes per million vehicle miles. The forward jughandles were found have highest overall rate of crashes per million vehicle miles travelled, which was about 1.3 to 1.4 times the other two types, F/R jughandles and R/R jughandle. There were significant differences in pedestrian injuries between conventional intersections and NJJIs.
Smith (2013)	Jughandles	The forward ramp intersecting the cross street plus forward ramp curving left to intersect the mainline jughandle would produce 20 diverge/merge conflicts, 4 crossing (left) conflicts, and 4 crossing (angle) conflicts, to a total about 28 conflicts compared to 32 conflicts of conventional four-legged intersection and 26 conflicts of a Type A jughandle.
Agarwal (2011)	Jughandles	For jughandle (F/F), separate models were developed for ramp section and intersection. For the ramp, the pedestrian vehicle conflict was found to be positively affected by turn percentage, and conflict volume. Similarly, the pedestrian vehicle conflict for jughandle intersections was found to be positively affected by conflict volume, number of lanes, and turn percentage. The minor approach was found to have more pedestrian vehicle conflicts.

vehicle conflict was found to be positively affected by the turn percentage and conflict volume. Similarly, the pedestrian vehicle conflict for jughandle intersections was found to be positively affected by conflict volume, number of lanes, and turn percentage. The minor approach was found to have more pedestrian vehicle conflicts. The review notes from prominent literature related to the safety performance of jughandles are shown table 2.16.

### **2.5 Summary of Literature Review about the Performance of Unconventional Intersections**

From the literature review about the performance of unconventional intersections, it can be inferred that all three types of intersections have superior performance in the view point of operation and safety compared to unconventional intersection. However, the degree of performance was found largely dependent on the volume condition, movement type, and their individual types. Particularly, the operational performance of MUT was very good overall, but at the cost of the performance of its left turn movements compared to conventional intersections as well as other types of unconventional intersections. The performance of MUT was not always superior to other intersections regarding number of stops. Similarly, the performance of CFI was better than other intersections, especially under high traffic condition and when the flow on different approaches was not balanced. Under low traffic conditions, CFI could be outperformed by other types of unconventional intersections. Similarly, the performance of a jughandle was good under high overall volume conditions and low left turn volume conditions.

Overall, the literature indicated that the unconventional intersections are safer than conventional intersections.

## **2.6 Economic Aspects of Unconventional Intersections**

This section includes a review of literatures related to construction cost and its related elements, delay pricing and pricing of fuel consumption and emissions. The information from these literatures is utilized for the economic analysis that is described in a later chapter of this dissertation.

### **2.6.1 Construction Cost**

In their paper, Berkowitz et al. (1997) have indicated that the cost of CFI was \$638,000 based on a site in Mexico; \$6,000,000 based on a site on Brooklyn, NY; and \$4.4 million based in Baton Rouge, LA. The preliminary analysis by KLD associates and Francisco Mier indicated that the cost of a CFI is three times the cost of a conventional intersection. COMPASS of Southwest Idaho (2008) mentioned that the total cost of CFI was \$8.55 million based on a site in Salt Lake City, including construction costs of \$4 million, construction engineering cost of \$300,000, a preliminary engineering cost of \$1 million, and a right of way cost of \$3.25 million. Hildebrand (2007) indicated in his thesis that the estimated cost of a CFI was \$5,221,064.02, which was 49% higher than the estimated cost of a conventional intersection. He indicated that the cost of a jughandle was \$3,238,125, which was 7.3% lower than a conventional intersection. He also indicated that the cost of MUT was \$4,681,201.11, which was 34.1% higher than a conventional intersection. The “Intersection Improvement Study Phase 2 Report” from

the Town of Cary indicated a total MUT project cost of \$3.9 million. In his thesis, Boddapati (2008) indicated that the cost of an un-signalized MUT crossover was \$951,818 based on bid prices of the Missouri Department of Transportation in the year 2007. A summary of the cost of unconventional intersections collected from different sources are presented in table 2.17.

**Table 2.17** Cost of unconventional intersections

Intersection Type	Source	Cost of Construction
CFI	Berkowitz et al. (1997)	\$638,000 (in Mexico)
		\$6,000,000 (Brooklyn, NY)
		3 times the conventional intersection (Preliminary analysis by KLD Associates and Francisco Mier)
		The total cost of CFI was \$4.4 million (Baton Rouge, LA)
	COMPASS (2008)	The total cost of CFI was \$8.55 million (Salt Lake City) including construction cost of \$4 million, construction engineering cost of \$ 300,000, preliminary engineering cost of \$1 million, and right of way cost of \$3.25 million.
Hilderband (2007)-Thesis	The estimated cost of CFI was \$5,221,064.02 (49.% higher than conventional)	
Jughandle	Hilderband (2007)-Thesis	The cost of jughandle was \$3,238,125 (7.3% lower than conventional).
MUT	Hilderband (2007)-Thesis	The MUT costs \$4,681, 201.11 (34.1% higher than conventional).
	Intersection Improvements Study Phase 2 report (Town of Cary)	Project cost of MUT was \$3.9 Million.
	Boddapati (2008)	The cost of un-signalized median U-turn cross over was \$951,818 based on bid prices of MODOT for year 2007.

### 2.6.2 Delay Pricing

The price of delay is a governing factor for the estimation of monetized intersection operational benefit or cost. Price of delay varies on the locations and time. In this context, the prices estimated by Kawamura (1999) for urban areas based on the data collected in California by interviewing the truck drivers were \$23.4/hr and \$32/hr. From a similar study based on California, Brownstone, Ghos, Golob, Kazimi and Amelsfort (2002) estimated the median value of driver willingness to pay to reduce commute time as approximately \$30/hr for morning peak hour. In a study about performance evaluation of CHART (Coordinated Highways Action Response Team), Chang, Liu, Lin and Zhou (2003) have used average delay price as \$ 14.34/hour. It was a study based on Maryland. Similarly, the 2012 Urban Mobility report has indicated the average cost of time as \$16.79/hr.

### 2.6.3 Price of Fuel and Emissions

Regarding the price of fuel, the American Automobile Association (AAA), in its website about fuel gauge report, indicated the unit prices of diesel and petrol averaged throughout the year 2012 for Nebraska as \$3.704 /gallon for petrol and \$3.956/gallon for diesel. The unit price of CO<sub>2</sub> indicated by 2010 Annual Supplement to National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Handbook published by the U.S. Department of Energy was \$0.02/kg. Similarly, a technical paper by Bishop, Stedman, Peterson, Hosick and Guenther (1993) indicated the unit price of CO as \$200/ton. Muller and Mendelson



(2009) indicated the unit prices for  $\text{NO}_x$  and  $\text{VOC}_s$  as \$180/ton/year and \$250/ton/year considering median damage cost.

#### **2.6.4. Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) and Benefit Cost (B/C) Ratio of Unconventional Intersections**

Very little literature (Boddapati, 2008; Martin et al., 2012) was found dealing with economic analysis of unconventional intersections considering their future performance. Additionally, these studies were more concerned with particular type of unconventional intersection or the set of unconventional intersections for a particular project. In this context, Boddapati (2008) did a life cycle cost analysis of type 2 median crossover, MUT with signalized crossover and MUT with unsignalized crossover, to calculate the annual equivalent costs for a 20-year life cycle period. He considered travel time cost as the user's cost. Based on annual equivalents, he found that type 2 median crossover was good for a low volume major street. An unsignalized MUT was found to be good for medium volumes. A signalized MUT was found to be good for higher volumes. Similarly, Martin et al. calculated benefit–cost on three alternatives comprising of unconventional intersections: (i) a combination of MUT, CFI, and traditional improvements as addition of turn lanes, etc, and (ii) a combination of MUT and CFI. He considered construction costs and delay savings related to alternatives. They estimated B/C for existing year 2010, future year 2015, and future year 2020. They found that both alternatives had higher B/C than a no build condition.

## **2.7 Brief Summary of Inferences obtained from Literature Review Chapter**

In summary, the literature review of past studies provided the information about the principles used in existing tools to evaluate unconventional intersections, operational and safety performance of unconventional intersections, and the economic aspect of unconventional intersections. From the information about the principles used in existing tools, we realized that their method of analysis can be improved. The detailed operational analysis, computation of a monetizable measure of effectiveness, and the use of cost and benefit aspects in the evaluation of unconventional intersections would certainly improve the present level of methodology adopted for evaluation on these tools. It was also found that the economic aspect of unconventional intersections is still not well studied. This information suggested adoption of these aspects in this study. Similarly, on the performance aspect, the literature was found to be more concentrated on micro-simulation based operational evaluation and comparison of performance measures to differentiate the performance of unconventional intersections with conventional intersections or between different types of unconventional intersections. The performances of unconventional intersections are explained to be dependent on large range conditions. However, no literature was found to have developed any generalized decision criteria to select the most suitable intersection type out of several alternatives. This backdrop in past studies also supplied the clue for this study to look into this aspect.

## CHAPTER 3

### STATE OF PRACTICE

Email queries were sent to state agencies to collect information about existing research and practices pursued by different U.S. states, especially about guidelines for the implementation, related costs, and user's feedback concerning unconventional intersection treatments. This chapter includes a description of the information collected from different state agencies. The information is also tabulated in table 3.1 and table 3.2.

#### **3.1 Missouri Department of Transportation (MODOT)**

The responder from MODOT explained that the capacity- and turning movement-based decisions are the main criteria for the implementation of CFIs and jughandles. The responder also mentioned that they had success regarding the CFI designs in the St. Louis area, but were not sure of the reason behind the installation. MODOT has implemented ten median U-turns or J-turns to date. These were designed to tackle the angle crashes in their retrofit projects or four-lane designs. The before-and-after study indicated that there was a tremendous reduction in angle crashes, but an increase in sideswipe crashes with the use of MUT. MODOT's policy for the implementation of directional median openings with downstream U-turns (slight modification MUTs), is based on Section 233.2 At-Grade Intersection with Stop and Yield Control, and subsection 233.2.6 of the MODOT Engineering Policy Guide. The cost to install a J-turn (deviation of MUT) varied by location and geometry, but was about less than \$400,000 per intersection according to their experience with the Central District. These intersections include

lengthy acceleration and deceleration lanes as well. According to the responder, the feedback for jughandles was not positive. The responder also indicated that these designs were not well received by all and it would take time before they are accepted by the majority.

### **3.2 Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT)**

According to the responder from MDOT, Michigan did not use CFI or jughandle designs, and instead used the Michigan indirect left. MDOT had a detailed report about directional crossovers (MUTs), Michigan's preferred left turn strategy. According to the report, the capacity problem due to interlocking left turns within the bi-directional crossovers at major street intersections led to the concept of using directional crossovers. MDOT has implemented 700 directional crossovers on their state highway system. In terms of capacity, the study conservatively showed 20% to 50% capacity improvement. The report also included the detailed operational analysis, safety analysis, and the design of the directional left turn strategy. In terms of safety, a report from Michigan State University indicated a 31% crash reduction in the entire highway system and a 42% crash reduction in the places where bi-directional crossovers were replaced with directional crossovers. Overall, MDOT appears to have detailed documents about their implementation of MUT designs. The cost of construction, as indicated in the report for directional strategy, was \$120,000/pair.

### **3.3 Iowa Department of Transportation (IOWA DOT)**

IOWA DOT did not have any special policies regarding unconventional intersections. IOWA DOT tried to install MUTs, but could not due to public's reception of the proposal. The public expressed concerns that J-turns would bring new problems or continue to have the same crash problems as before. It could be dangerous for buses, as they make U-turns from median openings, and would not be helpful for roads that are used by semi-trailers.

### **3.4 Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)**

VDOT did not have special policies. It constructed a jughandle on Route 460. A jughandle was chosen because it could be constructed within the pre-existing VDOT right of way (ROW), and it improved the signal timing operation of the intersection. The bid estimate of the project was \$982,910, however, it included work associated with the closure of three additional cross-overs. The work that was included in the cost estimate, but was not related to the construction of the jughandle, was less than 10%.

### **3.5 Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC)**

The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) did not have a policy about the implementation of unconventional intersections. However, the Kentucky Transportation Center at the University of Kentucky has developed a design tool that helps determine the feasibility and lane configurations of different type of intersections. It did not have a cost estimate for intersections because they vary by location, size, and complexity.

### **3.6 North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT)**

North Carolina's general state of practice is to find anything that works to resolve traffic safety and operation problems. Their Congestion Management section reviews each project to determine the best operation for the corridor/intersection. There is no specific policy as projects are judged on an individual basis. However, they are looking to implement more superstreets on their critical corridors to maintain acceptable LOS and travel time. North Carolina does not consider jughandles for treatments anymore. North Carolina has not implemented CFIs, but is planning to implement them in near future. The responder indicated that NCDOT did not have any formal cost estimations. To retrofit existing intersections into superstreets, they estimated about \$1.2 million per single location, which includes two U-turn locations, the median treatment at the main intersection, and four signals. The public's opinion was generally negative before, and positive afterward.

### **3.7 New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT)**

Their practice is based on NYSDOT intersection design and policy stated by its Highway Design Manual Chapter 5: Basic Design. Section 5.9.1.3 states that unconventional intersections need special consideration and treatment and should be developed in consultation with the Regional Transportation Systems Operations Engineer. The layout, applicability, design features, safety performance, and operational performance are based on FHWA's Signalized Intersections: Informational Guide.

**Table 3.1** State of practice (Part I)

State Agencies	Contacted Persons	Intersection Types			Cost	User's Response
		CFI	MUT	Jughandle		
MoDOT	John P. Miller	Capacity and turning movement	Capacity analysis considering weaving movements (233.2.6, MoDOT Engineering Policy Guide)	Capacity and turning movement	Variation with location and geometry (J-turn: \$400,000 according to the experience in central district)	Not positive, takes time to be accepted by majority
MDOT	Imad Gedaoun	Not used	They have developed a guideline: Directional Crossovers, Michigan Preferred Left Turn Strategy	Not used	\$120,000/pair (MUTs)	N/A
NCDOT	James Dunlop	In plan to implement. No specific policy, general practice to resolve traffic safety and operational problems	Superstreets  No specific policy, general practice to resolve traffic safety and operational problem	Doesn't consider jughandle as treatment	No formal estimate is available.  Superstreet retrofitting: 1.2 million/intersection (2 U-turn locations, median treatment at main intersections and four signals)	Negative at the beginning but, positive afterwards
NYSDOT	Rick Wilder	Based on NYSDOT intersection design and policy stated by NYSDOT Highway Design Manual Chapter 5- Basic Design. Consultation with Regional Transportation Systems Operations Engineer.  The layout applicability, safety and operational performance are based on FHWA's Signalized Intersection: Informational Guide.			No standard cost for unconventional intersection. It depends on available right of way, number of lanes, local construction costs, whether or not closed design is needed and the work zone traffic control.	

**Table 3.2 State of practice (Part II)**

State agencies	Contacted Persons	Intersection Types			Cost	User's Response
		CFI	MUT	Jughandle		
IOWA DOT	John Narigon	N/A	Iowa DOT tried to seek place to install MUTs but it couldn't do that due to public's reception of the project.	The overall cost of proposed J-turn (a deviation of MUT) was \$557,300.	N/A	Public expressed their concerns that J-turn would bring new problems or continue to have the same crash problem as before. It could be dangerous for buses, as they do U-turn from median opening. It wouldn't be helpful for the roads that are used by semi-trailers.
VDOT	George T. Rogerson Jr.	N/A	N/A	No specific guidelines. VDOT constructed one jughandle because of availability of right of way. Additionally, it improved signal operation of intersection.	Bid estimate: \$982,910 (including work associated with closure of 3 additional crossovers)	No feedback. Assumption was made that public accepted the facility.
Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC)	Brent A. Sweger	No specific policy. University of Kentucky has developed a design tool that provides assistance in deciding the proper type of unconventional intersections.			N/A	Not known about MUT, CFI and jughandle. However, the public responses for roundabout and double crossover diamond interchange were positive.
State Highway Administration, Maryland (SHAM)	Minseo k. Kim	No specific policy. General criteria based on delay, v/c ratio, queue length, travel time, etc.), right of way, environmental impact, construction cost, engineering judgment and experience along with human factors knowledge in addressing any potential safety concerns.			N/A	N/A



Section 5.9.1.3 also states that jughandles are applied in the locations where operational and safety concerns preclude left turns from the median lane.

### **3.8 State Highway Administration, Maryland (SHAM)**

The State Highway Administration, Maryland reported that there is no specific policy about the implementation of unconventional intersections except the general criteria based on delay, volume to capacity ratio, queue length, right of way, environmental impact, construction cost, engineering judgment, and experience, along with human factors in addressing any potential safety concerns.

### **3.9 Brief Summary of Inferences obtained from Current State of Practice**

The current state of practice regarding the unconventional intersection indicated that the majority of states do not have specific guidelines for the implementation of unconventional intersection treatments. Most state DOTs were found to follow the method of practices of general signalized intersections, such as performing traffic engineering studies for specific locations to determine the feasibility, using engineering judgment, looking at the construction cost, etc. This information along with the information from literature review directed this study towards the remedy of deficiencies in the method of current studies and practices. The idea of developing a decision support system, as mentioned in the objective of this study, was generated looking at these deficiencies in existing studies and current state of practices.

## CHAPTER 4

### OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS

This chapter includes the procedure applied in the operational analysis of standard four-legged signalized intersections, standard four-legged signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street, and three types of unconventional intersections: MUT, CFI, and jughandle. The operational analysis includes the volume database creation, the use of HCS for delay estimation, and a subsequent estimate of fuel consumption and emissions, which are described in detail in the following sections.

#### **4.1 Levels and Magnitude of Fixed and Variable Parameters**

Prior to the computation of the measures of effectiveness (MoEs), it was necessary to consider the reasonable magnitude of fixed parameters that represented the local condition of Nebraska or standard practices in the U.S., and fix the level of variable parameters. The fixed parameters were speed and some specific geometric-related parameters. The variable parameters were volumes both of major streets and minor streets, truck percentages for both major streets and minor streets, the directional split for major streets, and the turn percentage of major streets.

##### **4.1.1 Fixed Parameters**

(A) Speed: Since this study is focused on rural roads, the operating speed at the intersections and crossovers were considered to reflect the speed condition of rural roads of Nebraska. The Nebraska Minimum Design Standards (2008) specify the design speed

of 60 mph for rural major arterials in the state highway system. Similarly, it has a specified design speed of 40 mph to 50 mph for rural other arterials, 40 mph to 50 mph for rural collectors, and 30 mph to 50 mph for rural local roads in the local roads and streets system. To represent these speed conditions of rural roads in Nebraska, the operating speed of major streets was fixed at 45 mph, and the operating speed of minor streets was fixed at 35 mph. The speed of traffic at the reverse ramp of the jughandle was kept fixed at 30 mph based on the study described in “Techbrief: Traffic Performance of Three Typical Designs of New Jersey Jughandle Intersections” (2007).

(B) Offset of Median Openings and Geometry related to Median Openings for MUT: The offset of median openings was fixed at 660 ft. based on the suggestion of past literature (AASHTO Green Book, 2011; “Information and Geometric Design Guidance Regarding Boulevards, Directional Crossovers, and Indirect [‘Michigan’] Left Turns”, 1995; Potts et al., 2004). The median width was kept fixed at 60 ft. to accommodate a tractor-semitrailer combination of trucks as the design vehicle as prescribed by past literature (AASHTO Green Book, 2011; Rodgerts et al., 2004).

(C) Offset of Crossovers for Jughandles: For jughandles, the offsets of crossovers were considered 170 ft. along major streets and 150 ft. along minor streets as shown in a typical diagram of the geometry of a R/R jughandle in “Techbrief: Traffic Performance of Three Typical Designs of New Jersey jughandle Intersections” (2007).

(D) Geometric Features of CFI: The offset of east and west crossovers were considered 350 ft. from the central signalized intersection. This was based on the study by Armstrong (2014).

#### **4.1.2 Variable Parameters**

(A) Volume: The bi-directional volume beginning from 50 vph to 2400 vph at the increment of 50 mph was considered. There were a total of 48 different bi-directional volume levels for the major street. For the minor street, one directional volume, from 25 vph to 250 vph, was considered at the increment of 25 vph. Since the split for the minor street was kept constant at 0.5, both directional volumes for the minor street were equal. There were ten different unidirectional volume levels for the minor street. Since the right turn movement was to be excluded from the analysis, no volume was generated for the right turn movements for all four intersections.

(B) Truck Percentage (TP): Three levels of truck percentage were considered: 2%, 5%, and 10%. The same truck percentages were considered for both major and minor streets.

(C) Balance Factor (BF): The balance factor is related to the ratio of approach traffic volume to total approach traffic volume. Three levels of balance factor along the eastbound direction of the major street were considered: 0.5, 0.6, and 0.7. The balance factor of the minor street was kept fixed at 0.5.

(D) Left Turn Percentage (LTP): Three levels of left turn percentage were considered for major streets, those being 5%, 10%, and 15%. The left turn percentage of the minor street was kept fixed at 5%.

Based on directional splits (balance factor) and turn percentage, an origin-destination (O-D) volume database for all volume combinations was constructed for all four types of intersections: a standard signalized intersection, MUT, CFI, jughandles, and a standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along the major street. The combination of all these levels of variable parameters produced a total of 12,960 combinations for each intersection.


## **4.2 Estimation of Delay**

Delay estimation was done using HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets version 6.5. The networks were coded to represent the whole system of each individual intersection. For example, MUT has two STOP controlled median openings and one central signalized intersection, CFI has four signalized crossovers and one central signalized intersection, and the jughandle has four crossovers, including two YIELD controlled crossovers and one central signalized intersection. The fully actuated signal control was assumed for all four intersection types. The details are described in following subsections.

### **4.2.1 Standard Signalized Intersection**

The standard signalized intersection consists of two through lanes, one exclusive left turn lane, and one exclusive right turn lane in an approach. Since the right turn movement was not considered for analysis, it was not included in the lane configuration

coding in HCS 2010<sup>®</sup>. The intersection operates under a fully actuated eight-phase signal control with protected left turn movements, as shown in figure 4.1. The maximum green times for all the movements were kept at 50 s, and minimum green times were left at the default 10 s. The yellow change time was changed to 3 s. The base saturation flow rate was kept at 1800 pc/h/ln. The speed was set to 45 mph for the major street and 35 mph for the minor street. Respective heavy vehicle percentages for each volume combination were set.



**Figure 4.1** Phases and lane configuration of standard signalized intersection

#### 4.2.2 MUT

The MUT consists of two through lanes and one exclusive right turn lane. Since the right turn movement was not considered for analysis, it was not included in the lane configuration coding in HCS 2010<sup>®</sup>. The central signalized intersection operates under fully-actuated two phase signal control, allowing through movement of the major and minor streets. The median openings are STOP controlled. During network coding in HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets, the un-signalized median opening was coded as equivalent to a signalized intersection, while a U-turn was coded as a permitted left turn (see fig. 4.2). This permitted left turning movement will try to sneak through the gaps of opposing traffic that were provided with continuous green time throughout the cycle. To return the volumes toward the direction of U-turns, a right turn lane (northbound for west crossover and southbound for east crossover) was introduced with an equal volume to the left turn lane. Since HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets does not support a single right turn lane, a same bound dummy through movement was added with zero volume. The right turn movements were allowed to turn right on red (RTOR). The central signalized intersection was coded as two phase signals. This coding technique was adopted from Armstrong (2014). However, unlike Armstrong's coding, the signal control was made fully actuated in this study. The maximum green times for all the movements were kept at 50 s and the minimum green times were left at the default 10 s. The yellow change time was changed to 3 s. The base saturation flow rate was kept at 1800 pc/h/ln. The speed was set to 45 mph for the major street and 35 mph for the minor street. The respective heavy vehicle percentages for each

volume combination were set. The input of the left turn equivalency factor was replaced by the approximate U-turn equivalency factor (Armstrong, 2014), which was calculated based on the effects of the radius of travel path using equation 4.1 from HCM 2010.

$$f_R = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{5.61}{R}} \quad 4.1$$

Where,

$f_R$ = U-Turn Equivalency factor = Adjustment factor to account for the effect of travel path radius

R= Radius of travel path

For median openings, the U-turn equivalency factor was calculated using a 60 ft. turn radius. The default values of critical headway and follow up headway for a permitted left turn were also replaced with values for U- turn movement calculated using the following equations from HCM 2010 for 0% grade and no adjustment factor for intersection geometry.

$$t_{c,x} = t_{c,base} + t_{c,HV}P_{HV} \quad 4.2$$

$$t_{f,x} = t_{f,base} + t_{f,HV}P_{HV} \quad 4.3$$

Where,

$t_{c,x}$ = critical headway,



$t_{c,base}$  = base critical headway,


$t_{c,HV}$  and  $t_{f,HV}$  = adjustment factor for heavy vehicles,

$P_{HV}$  = proportion of heavy vehicles for movement,

$t_{f,x}$  = follow up headway, and

$t_{f,base}$  = base follow up headway

The base critical headway for a U-turn from the major street can be obtained with table 4.1, based on HCM 2010. In this study, 6.9 s was chosen considering the narrow turn and four lanes. The adjustment factor for heavy vehicles for critical headway is 2 for a major street with two or three lanes in each direction (HCM 2010). The proportion of heavy vehicles for the movement corresponded to the truck percentage. Similarly, the base follow-up headway for U-turns can be obtained by table 4.2, which is based on HCM 2010. The adjustment factor for heavy vehicles for follow-up headway was 1 for a major street with two or three lanes in each direction (HCM 2010).



**Figure 4.2** Equivalent phases and lane configuration of MUT considered in network coding in HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets

#### 4.2.3 CFI

CFI is comprised of one central signalized intersection and four signalized crossovers. While coding the movements of east and west crossovers (see fig. 4.3), the left turns at crossovers were coded as right turns. Since HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets

**Table 4.1** Base critical headway values from HCM 2010 Exhibit 19-10

Vehicle Movement	Base Critical Headway (s)		
	Two Lanes	Four Lanes	Six Lanes
Left turn from Major	4.1	4.1	5.3
U-turn from Major	N/A	6.4 (wide)	5.6
		6.9 (narrow)	
Right turn from Minor	6.2	6.9	7.1
Through traffic on Minor	1-stage: 6.5	1-stage: 6.5	1-stage: 6.5
	2-stage, Stage I: 5.5	2-stage, Stage I: 5.5	2-stage, Stage I: 5.5
	2-stage, Stage I: 5.5	2-stage, Stage I: 5.5	2-stage, Stage I: 5.5
Left turn from Minor	1-stage: 7.1	1-stage: 7.5	1-stage: 6.4
	2-stage, Stage I: 6.1	2-stage, Stage I: 6.5	2-stage, Stage I: 7.3
	2-stage, Stage I: 6.1	2-stage, Stage I: 6.5	2-stage, Stage I: 6.7

**Table 4.2** Base follow up headway values from HCM 2010 Exhibit 19-11


Vehicle Movement	Base Follow-Up Headway (s)		
	Two Lanes	Four Lanes	Six Lanes
Left turn from Major	2.2	2.2	3.1
U-turn from Major	N/A	2.5 (wide)	2.3
		3.1 (narrow)	
Right turn from minor	3.3	3.3	3.9
Through traffic on Minor	4.0	4.0	4.0
Left turn from Minor	1-stage: 7.1	1-stage: 7.5	1-stage: 6.4

does not support a single right turn lane, a same bound dummy through movement was added with zero volume. Similarly, the left crossover movements at north and south crossovers were coded as right turn movement in the central signalized intersection. The

default value of the right turn equivalency factor in HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets was replaced with the left turn equivalency factor to compensate for the left and right turns trading roles. This coding technique was adopted from Armstrong (2014). However, unlike Armstrong's coding, the signal control was made fully actuated. The maximum green times for all the movements were kept at 50 s and minimum green times were left at the default 10 s. The yellow change time was changed to 3 s. The base saturation flow rate was kept at 1800 pc/h/ln. The speed was set to 45 mph for the major street and 35 mph for the minor street. Respective heavy vehicle percentages for each volume combination were set.

#### 4.2.4 Jughandles


The R/R jughandle has ramps forming crossovers at major and minor street segments. The ramps facilitate the flow of left turn traffic from major street approaches. The network coding of a jughandle intersection in HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets is shown in figure 4.4. The right turns from ramps at minor street crossovers were coded as permitted left turns. The tradeoff was made by setting the critical headway and follow-up time of permitted left turn movement as that of right turn movement. The critical headway and follow up times were calculated using equations 4.2 and 4.3, and the respective values of base critical headway and follow up times were chosen from tables 4.1 and 4.2. The base critical headway was chosen to be 6.9 s, as it was the movement that originated from a four-lane road, and the follow-up headway was chosen to be 3.3 s. To return the volume from permitted left-turn movements toward the original direction, right turn movements



**Figure 4.3** Equivalent phases and lane configuration of CFI considered in network coding in HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets

with equal volume were coded at both crossovers. Since HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets does not support a single right turn lane, a same bound dummy through movement was added with zero volume at both crossovers. The right turn movements at both crossovers were allowed to turn right on red (RTOR). The central signalized intersection was coded to operate with a three phase signal. For volume balancing purposes, both left turn movements from the major street were treated as RTOR movement at the central signalized intersection. The signal control was made fully actuated. The maximum green times for all the movements were kept at 50 s and minimum green times were left at the

default 10 s. The yellow change time was changed to 3 s. The base saturation flow rate was kept at 1800 pc/h/ln. The speed was set to 45 mph for the major street and 35 mph for the minor street. Respective heavy vehicle percentages for each volume combination were set.




**Figure 4.4** Equivalent phases and lane configurations of jughandle considered in network coding in HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets

#### 4.2.5 Standard Signalized Intersection with Left Turn Permitted along Major Street

There are some criteria that govern the need of left turn permission in signalized intersection. The Signal Timing Manual (Rodegerdts et al., 2008) has provided a chart that explains the potential need of left turn phase adopted from Manual of Traffic Signal Design (1999). Similarly, Asante, Ardekani, and Williams (1994) have developed plots that can identify the need of left turn permission based on left turn volume, opposing speed and number of opposing lanes. The standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted consists of one shared left turn and through lane, one through only lane, and one exclusive right turn lane in an approach. Minor street approach has same configuration as that of standard signalized intersection. Since the right turn movement was not considered for analysis, it was not included in the lane configuration coding in HCS 2010<sup>®</sup>. The intersection operates under a fully actuated eight-phase signal control with protected left turn movements, as shown in figure 4.5. The maximum green times for all the movements were kept at 50 s, and minimum green times were left at the default 10 s. The yellow change time was changed to 3 s. The base saturation flow rate was kept at 1800 pc/h/ln. The speed was set to 45 mph for the major street and 35 mph for the minor street. Respective heavy vehicle percentages for each volume combination were set. The critical headway and follow up times were calculated using equations 4.2 and 4.3, and the respective values of base critical headway and follow up times were chosen from tables 4.1 and 4.2 for left turn from major. The base critical headway was chosen to

be 4.1 s, as it was the movement that originated from a four-lane road, and the follow-up headway was chosen to be 2.2 s.



**Figure 4.5** Phases and lane configuration of standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along major street

#### 4.2.6 Delay Results for Median Openings of MUT and Crossovers at Minor Streets of Jughandles from HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets

Careful observation of the HCS output confirmed that there was an error in the HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets calculation of the delay at median openings and crossovers at the jughandle's minor street. As an example of this error, a screen shot of movement results



from HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets output for MUT is shown in figure 4.6. If we observe the capacity of westbound left movement as shown in the figure 4.6, it is higher than the saturation flow of the left turn lane, which is not true according to the original relationship between capacity and saturation flow. The problem was reported to the developer of HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets. The developer responded that it would be corrected in the next version of HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets.

Movement Group Results	EB			WB			NB			SB		
	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R
Approach Movement												
Assigned Movement		2		1	6			8	18			
Adjusted Flow Rate (v), veh/h		1051		71	1016							
Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate (s), veh/h/ln		1632		222	1632							
Queue Service Time (g <sub>s</sub> ), s		0.0		0.0	0.0							
Cycle Queue Clearance Time (g <sub>c</sub> ), s		0.0		0.0	0.0							
Green Ratio (g/C)		1.00		1.00	1.00							
Capacity (c), veh/h		3264		986	3264							
Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (X)		0.322		0.072	0.311							
Available Capacity (c <sub>a</sub> ), veh/h		17305		1941	17305							
Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (50th percentile)												
Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (50th percentile)												
Uniform Delay (d <sub>1</sub> ), s/veh		0.0		0.0	0.0							
Incremental Delay (d <sub>2</sub> ), s/veh		0.0		0.0	0.0							
Initial Queue Delay (d <sub>3</sub> ), s/veh		0.0		0.0	0.0							
Control Delay (d), s/veh												
Level of Service (LOS)												
Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS												
Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS												

**Figure 4.6** Screen shot of a part of HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets result for median opening of MUT

Since similar methods have been applied for delay calculation of both median openings and crossovers at the minor street of a jughandle, it was necessary to correct the delay for both locations. To calculate the delay at median openings and crossovers at the

minor street of a jughandle, a method based on queuing theory was applied, and is described in the following section.

#### **4.2.7 Delay for Median Openings of MUT and Crossovers at the Minor Street of a Jughandle Based on Queuing Theory**

The delay for the system comprised of Poisson arrivals and the Exponential service served by a single server can be computed by a M/M/1 queuing concept. The discrete random variable  $X(t)$  is said to have a Poisson distribution with a parameter of  $\lambda > 0$ , if the probability mass function (pmf) is given by the following expression (Hillier, Lieberman, Nag and Basu, 2010).

$$P\{X(t) = n\} = \left\{ \frac{\lambda^n \times e^{-\lambda}}{n!} \right\} \quad 4.4$$

Where,

$P\{X(t) = n\}$  = Probability mass function,

$\lambda$  = rate parameter, and

$n = 0, 1, 2, 3 \dots$

The expected value  $E(X)$  and variance  $\text{Var}(X)$  for the Poisson distribution are both equal to rate parameter  $\lambda$ . The random variable  $\lambda$  is said to have an exponential distribution with parameter if its probability density function (pdf) has the following expression (Banks, Carson II, Nelson and Nicol, 2009).

$$f(t; \lambda) = \lambda \times e^{-\lambda t} \quad 4.5$$

for  $t \geq 0$  and

$$f(t; \lambda) = 0 \quad 4.6$$

for  $t < 0$

The total system delay based on the M/M/1 concept is the sum of queue delay and the server's delays as expressed by the following equation (Hillier et al., 2010).

$$W_s = \frac{\lambda}{\mu \times (\mu - \lambda)} + \frac{1}{\mu} \quad 4.7$$

Where,

$W_s$  = Total system delay,

$\lambda$  =Arrival flow rate, and


$\mu$  = Departure flow rate

The departure flow rates for the median opening and crossover are the same as the capacity of the opening or ramp junction. This is based on opposing flow, critical gap, and follow-up headway as provided by the HCM 2010 equation (equation 2.1 of this dissertation) to compute capacity of stop-controlled movement using a gap acceptance model. The follow-up headway and critical gap were calculated based on HCM equations 19-30 and 19-31 (equations 4.2 and 4.3 of this dissertation) for the respective values of

U-turn movement at median openings of MUT and right turn movement at the crossovers of a jughandle.

#### **4.2.8 Delay and LOS at Signalized Intersections**

HCM 2010 has provided the stepwise flow chart for the delay and LOS calculation in exhibit 18-11 for a pre-timed and actuated signal. Figure 4.7 shows the procedure for an actuated signal. Step 1 to step 4 includes the calculations of adjusted flow rate and adjusted saturation flow rate. In this study, while using HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets, all the saturation flow rate adjustment factors were left at default values. Since effective green time and cycle length is not known at first for an actuated signal, the estimation of the green interval duration is an iterative process. This process is described in detail in “Chapter 31: Signalized Intersections: Supplemental” of HCM 2010. According to chapter 31, the initial estimate of green interval duration for a fully actuated signal is equal to the maximum green time. The process goes through several steps until it calculates the green extension time. Finally, it computes green interval duration from average phase duration through several steps after the green extension time is calculated. The process repeats until the difference between the estimated green interval duration and the computed green interval converges by less than 0.1 s. After reaching this convergence, the actual proportion of vehicles arriving during the green phase, the phase duration, and the volume to capacity ratio are calculated. Finally, delay and LOS are computed.



**Figure 4.7** HCM method of computing delay and LOS for Actuated Signal adopted from HCM 2010

The control delay for a given lane group is the sum of uniform delay ( $d_1$ ), incremental delay ( $d_2$ ), and initial queue delay ( $d_3$ ). HCM 2010 defines the uniform delay (equation 4.8) as the average delay per vehicle due to uniform arrivals, and incremental delay (equation 4.9) is the average delay per vehicle due to random arrivals.

The initial queue delay refers to unmet demand in the previous time period; it is 0 s/veh in this study.

$$d_1 = \frac{0.5 C (1 - g/C)^2}{1 - [\min(1, X) g/C]} \quad 4.8$$

$$d_2 = 900 T \left[ (X_A - 1) + \frac{8 k I X_A}{C_A T} \right] \quad 4.9$$

Where,

$C$  = cycle length,

$g$  = effective green time for lane group,

$X$  = volume to capacity ratio ( $v/c$ ) or degree of saturation for lane group,

$T$  = duration of analysis period (h),

$k$  = incremental delay factor that is dependent on controller settings,

$I$  = upstream filtering/metering adjustment factor,

$C_A$  = lane group capacity (veh/h), and

$X_A$  = lane group  $v/c$  ratio or degree of saturation.

Since the actuated signal phase has the ability to adapt its green interval duration to serve the demand on a cycle-by-cycle basis, the  $K$  factor should be taken into account for actuated signal operations, which is expressed in the following equations:

$$K = (1 - 2 K_{min}) \left( v/C_a - 0.5 \right) + K_{min} \leq 0.50 \quad 4.10$$

$$K_{min} = -0.375 + 0.354 PT - 0.0910 PT^2 + 0.0089 PT^3 \geq 0.04 \quad 4.11$$

$$C_a = 3600 \frac{g_a s N}{C} \quad 4.12$$

$$g_a = G_{max} + Y + R_C - l_1 - l_2 \quad 4.13$$

Where,

$C_a$  = available capacity for lane group served by an actuated phase (veh/h),

$K_{min}$  = minimum incremental delay factor,

$PT$  = passage Time,

$g_a$  = available effective green time,

$s$  = saturation flow rate,

$N$  = number of lanes,

$C$  = cycle length,

$G_{max}$  = maximum green interval,

$Y$  = yellow interval,

$R_C$  = red clearance interval,

$l_1$  = start-up lost time, and

$l_2$  = end lost time

The levels of service (LOS) were computed using LOS thresholds established for the automobile mode at signalized intersections listed in Exhibit 18-4 of the HCM 2010.

The operation involved in the permitted left turn movement in an exclusive lane is also provided in “Chapter 31: Signalized Intersections: Supplemental” of HCM 2010.

Two effective green times are associated with permitted left turn movement. These are the effective green time for permitted left turn operation ( $g_p$ ), and the effective green time associated with permitted left turn green time that is not blocked by an opposing queue ( $g_u$ ). The saturation flow rate for permitted left turn operation is provided in equation 31-97 of HCM 2010 can be expressed as follows:

$$S_p = \frac{v_0 e^{-v_0 t_{cg}/3600}}{1 - e^{-v_0 t_{fh}/3600}} \quad 4.14$$

Where,

$S_p$  = saturation flow rate of permitted left turn movement,

$v_0$  = opposing demand of flow rate,

$t_{cg}$  = critical Headway = 4.5 sec, and

$t_{fh}$  = follow up headway = 2.5 sec

This is adjusted with saturation flow rate adjustment factors to compute the saturation flow rate for lane groups with a permitted left turn operation in an exclusive lane. This saturation flow rate is ultimately used in the estimation of the capacity of permitted left turn operations in an exclusive lane.



#### **4.2.9 HCS Batch Run**

As mentioned in previous sections, the combinations of different levels of variable parameters created 12,960 total combinations for each of the four intersections. The network files were run in batch mode with the developed codes to compute delay. Ten random combinations were picked and run again manually as a quality check. The delay obtained from the manual run of networks was found to exactly match the delay obtained from the batch run aided by code.

#### **4.3 Estimation of Fuel Consumption**

The AASHTO Red Book (2010) provides a table that gives fuel consumption in gallons per minute of delay ( $gal_{c,min}$ ) by vehicle type, such as small car, big car, SUV, 2-axle single unit vehicle, 3-axle single unit vehicle, and combo, according to free-flow speed. This table was utilized for the computation of fuel consumption at intersections and crossovers. Six vehicle categories were combined to form two categories: cars and heavy vehicles. The  $gal_{c,min}$  of the car vehicle type is the average  $gal_{c,min}$  values of small cars, big cars, and SUVs. Similarly, the  $gal_{c,min}$  of heavy vehicles is the average  $gal_{c,min}$  values of 2-axle single unit vehicles, 3-axle single unit vehicles, and combos. Table 4.3 shows the  $gal_{c,min}$  of cars and heavy vehicles computed by this method. To compute fuel consumption, the delay (s/veh) for each intersection was separately converted to delay in vehicle minutes for cars and trucks. The vehicle minute delay of cars and trucks are multiplied with respective  $gal_{c,min}$  from table 4.3 to get fuel consumption by each vehicle

type. The free flow speeds were assumed to be 45 mph for the major street and 35 mph for the minor street.

**Table 4.3** Fuel consumption (gallons) per minute of delay by vehicle type based on the AASHTO Red Book (2010)

Free Flow Speed (mph)	Small Cars	Heavy Vehicles (Trucks)
20	0.02	0.12
25	0.02	0.16
30	0.03	0.19
35	0.03	0.23
40	0.03	0.26
45	0.04	0.30
50	0.04	0.34
55	0.05	0.37
60	0.06	0.41
65	0.06	0.45
70	0.07	0.49
75	0.08	0.53

A table in the AASHTO Red Book (2010) that provides the fuel consumption in gallons per mile for auto and trucks with respect to the operating speed was referenced to calculate fuel consumption from travel delay related to MUT and jughandles. Fuel consumption in gallons was estimated considering a 45 mph operating speed for MUT to travel from the intersection to median openings and vice versa, 30 mph for a jughandle

ramp, and 45 mph along the major street. The values from the AASHTO Red Book (2010) table are also in table 4.4.

**Table 4.4** Fuel consumption related to operating speed

Speed (mph)	Gallons per Mile	
	Autos	Trucks
5	0.117	0.053
10	0.075	0.316
15	0.061	0.254
20	0.054	0.222
25	0.05	0.204
30	0.047	0.191
35	0.045	0.182
40	0.044	0.176
45	0.042	0.170
50	0.041	0.166
55	0.041	0.163
60	0.040	0.160
65	0.039	0.158

#### **4.4 Estimation of Emissions**

This study estimated four major types of vehicular emissions: carbon monoxide (CO), oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), volatile oxygen compounds (VOCs), and carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>). Cobian, Henderson, Sudeshna, Nuworsoo, and Sullivan (2009) developed the factors to convert fuel consumption in gallons to gram units of emissions, like CO, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs. These factors are 69.9 gram/gallon for CO, 13.6 gram/gallon for NO<sub>x</sub>, and 16.2 gram/gallon for VOCs. Similarly, the U.S. Department of Energy has published a

document called “Instructions for Form EIA-1605: Voluntary Reporting of Greenhouse Gases” in 2007, which relates CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in grams with petrol and diesel fuel consumption. The conversion factor for petrol consumption to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is 17.59 gram/gallon, and the conversion factor for diesel consumption to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is 22.37 gram/gallon. The conversions are shown in table 4.5.

**Table 4.5** Relationship between fuel consumption and emissions

<b>Emissions</b>	<b>Relationship with Fuel Consumption</b>	<b>Source of Information</b>
CO	Fuel consumption (gallon) * 69.9 gram/gallon	Cobian et al. (2009)
NO <sub>x</sub>	Fuel consumption (gallon) * 13.6 gram/gallon	
VOCs	Fuel consumption (gallon) * 16.2 gram/gallon	
CO <sub>2</sub>	Fuel consumption (Petrol) (gallon)*17.59 gram/gallon + Fuel consumption (Diesel) (gallon)*22.37 gram/gallon	Instruction for form EIA-1605: Voluntary Reporting of Greenhouse Gases (2007)

#### **4.5 Brief Summary of Chapter**

In this chapter, the operational performance of all the study intersections was performed. The control delay for signalized crossovers was computed by batch processing the networks coded in HCS 2010<sup>®</sup> Streets and queueing theory was used for computing delay at unsignalized crossovers such as median openings of MUT and

north/south crossovers of jughandle. The fuel consumption was calculated utilizing the factors from AASHTO Red Book. Similarly, the emissions were calculated out of fuel consumption utilizing the conversion factors from different literature. As a final product, the delay, fuel consumption, and emissions were calculated for each Origin-Destination (OD). These performance measures were utilized in the economic analysis included in later chapters.

## CHAPTER 5

### SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

This chapter deals with the relative delay performance of unconventional intersections under different approach traffic volumes with respect to each other and standard signalized intersections. It includes descriptions of different types of plots used to develop decision assistance curves (DAC), which allocate the volume regions where the performance of each type of intersections can be optimal.

#### **5.1 Decision Assistance Curves (DAC) - Classification**

DAC refer to the boundary lines that allocate areas of optimal performance of unconventional intersections produced on plots with the major street and minor street approach traffic volumes on the X and Y axes. The development of DAC includes two steps described in the following subsections.


##### **5.1.1 Clusters**

The total intersection delay of all three unconventional intersections was compared with each other for all 12,960 combinations. The intersection producing the minimal delay was chosen for each combination. Since the minimal delay from the comparison was always less than the intersection delay of a standard signalized intersection, the standard intersection delay was excluded. The allowance for left turn permission is governed by some criteria. For this study, this criterion was fixed according to the plot developed by Asante et al. (1993). For two opposing lanes and a 45 mph opposing speed limit, the plots provided in Asante et al. (1993) indicated the limiting

condition of left turning vehicles as 35 vph. Hence, for a standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along the major street, the delay results for any case with one or both of major street left turn with volumes exceeding or equal to 35 vph were omitted. The group scatter plots were developed while taking the major street approach traffic volumes, minor street approach traffic volumes, and group based on four types of intersections that produced the minimal delay into account. The scatter plot showed the clusters of each intersection in reference to the X axis as the major street approach traffic volume and the Y axis as the minor street approach traffic volume. An example scatter plot showing the clusters of each unconventional intersection is shown in figure 5.1. In figure 5.1, the four intersections MUT, CFI, jughandle, and a standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along the major street are clustered in three different locations in the plot of major street approach traffic volume (X axis ) and minor street approach traffic volume (Yaxis).

### **5.1.2 Application of Classifier and Development of the Equations for DAC**

To separate the regions for the clusters developed as explained in section 5.1.1, the Quadratic Discriminate Analysis (QDA) was performed. The QDA was chosen over Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) because of three main reasons: (1) QDA allows more flexibility for covariance matrix for each class, (2) the boundary lines as observed from scatter plots were not linear, and (3) QDA classified the clusters very accurately, which can be observed from table 5.2. The DAC plots were done based on a QDA that defined the areas where the delay performance of each intersection was optimal. The



**Figure 5.1** Example scatter plot showing clusters at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=2%



equations for the DAC developed from QDA are shown in tables 5.2 through 5.7. These equations follow the form of equation 5.1.

$$Z = K + [X_1, X_2] \times L + [X_1, X_2] \times Q \times [X_1, X_2]^T \quad 5.1$$

Where,

Z= quadratic classifier,

K= constant,

L= linear coefficient matrix,

Q = quadratic coefficient matrix,

X<sub>1</sub> = total major street approach traffic volume, and

X<sub>2</sub> = total minor street approach traffic volume

The performance of the classifier was tested using the following performance table (table 5.1). The precision and accuracy were calculated using equations 5.2 and 5.3. The precision and accuracy of each classification are shown in tables 5.2 through 5.7. These six tables also show the re-substitution error, which is the difference between the original and predicted classification.

**Table 5.1** Performance evaluation of classifier

		<b>Conditions</b>	
<b>Classifier</b>	Prediction that a particular unconventional intersection is optimal	True prediction that a particular unconventional intersection is optimal	False prediction that a particular unconventional intersection is optimal.
	Prediction that a particular unconventional intersection is not optimal	False prediction that a particular unconventional intersection is not optimal	True prediction that a particular unconventional intersection is not optimal

*Accuracy*

$$= \frac{\text{Number of true predicted optimality} + \text{Number of true predicted non optimality}}{\text{Total numbers}} \quad 5.2$$

*Precision*

$$= \frac{\text{Number of true predicted optimality} + \text{Number of true predicted non optimality}}{\text{Number of true predicted optimality} + \text{Number of false predicted optimality}} \quad 5.3$$

**Table 5.2** Equations of DAC (Part I)

Coefficients				Combinations	Corresponding Figure in Appendix A	Corresponding Curves	Resubstitution Error	Precision and Accuracy		
K	L	Q						Precision (%)	Accuracy (%)	
3.34	-0.02	3.44E-05	-1.07E-04	BF=0.5, LTP=10 % and TP=2%	Figure A.4	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.008	99	99.17	
	-0.04	-1.07E-04	1.27E-03							
817.6	-0.69	1.44E-04	2.26E-05			Jughandle Threshold		0.008	100	99.17
	-0.11	2.26E-05	9.39E-06							
2.58	-0.02	4.13E-05	-1.27E-04	BF=0.6, LTP=10 % and TP=2%	Figure A.5	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.006	100	99.38	
	-0.06	-1.27E-04	1.48E-03							
652.70	-0.55	1.18E-04	9.22E-06			Jughandle Threshold		0.021	99	97.92
	-0.05	9.22E-06	6.82E-06							
6.90	-0.05	9.90E-05	-2.00E-04	BF=0.7, LTP=10 % and TP=2%	Figure A.6	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.002	100	99.79	
	-0.03	-2.00E-04	1.58E-03							
795.14	-0.67	1.40E-04	3.42E-05			Jughandle Threshold		0.01	99	98.96
	-0.17	3.42E-05	4.44E-05							
-746.32	0.64	-1.37E-04	7.86E-07			MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold		0.017	85	98.33
	0.00	7.86E-07	-5.50E-06							

**Table 5.3** Equations of DAC (Part II)

Coefficients				Combinations	Corresponding Figure in Appendix A	Corresponding Curves in Figure	Resubstitution Error	Precision and accuracy	
K	L	Q						Precision (%)	Accuracy (%)
0.97	-0.02	5.28E-05	-3.82E-05	BF=0.5, LTP=15 % and TP=2%	Figure A.7	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.015	99	98.54
	0.00	-3.82E-05	1.66E-04						
90.75	-0.08	1.73E-05	3.12E-06			Jughandle Threshold	0.008	99	99.17
	-0.02	3.12E-06	1.70E-06						
1.34	-0.03	9.29E-05	-7.39E-05	BF=0.6, LTP=15 % and TP=2%	Figure A.8	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.004	100	99.58
	0.00	-7.39E-05	2.49E-04						
934.23	-0.49	8.10E-05	1.00E-04			CFI Threshold	0.002	100	99.79
	-1.5	1.23E-04	1.00E-03						
96.69	-0.09	1.86E-05	5.62E-06			Jughandle Threshold	0.033	99	96.88
	-0.03	5.62E-06	7.65E-06						
2.27	-0.04	1.39E-04	-8.19E-05	BF=0.7, LTP=15 % and TP=2%	Figure A.9	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.002	100	99.79
	0.00	-8.19E-05	2.23E-04						
-110.91	0.10	-2.22E-05	5.84E-07			MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold	0.017	95	98.33
	0.00	5.84E-07	-1.88E-06						
240.24	-0.19	3.72E-05	2.24E-05			CFI Threshold	0.013	99	98.75
	-0.14	2.24E-05	4.67E-05						

**Table 5.4** Equations of DAC (Part III)

Coefficients				Combinations	Corresponding Figure in Appendix A	Corresponding Curves	Resubstitution Error	Precision and Accuracy	
K	L	Q						Precision (%)	Accuracy (%)
617.07	-0.52	1.11E-04	1.37E-05	BF=0.5, LTP=10 % and TP=5%	Figure A.13	Jughandle Threshold	0.006	100	99.38
	-0.07	1.37E-05	5.29E-06			LT-Permitted Threshold	0.008	99	99.17
3.34	-0.02	3.44E-05	-1.07E-04						
	-0.04	-1.07E-04	1.27E-03	BF=0.6, LTP=10 % and TP=5%	Figure A.14	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.006	100	99.38
4.52	-0.03	5.51E-05	-1.41E-04			Jughandle Threshold	0.019	99	98.13
	-0.03	-1.41E-04	1.35E-03						
466.64	-0.40	8.56E-05	5.29E-06	BF=0.7, LTP=10 % and TP=5%	Figure A.15	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.002	100	99.79
	-0.03	5.29E-06	5.78E-06			MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold	0.02	86	98.13
6.90	-0.05	9.90E-05	-2.00E-04						
	-0.03	-2.00E-04	1.58E-03	CFI Threshold	0.002	100	99.79		
-507.57	0.44	-9.45E-05	1.03E-06						
	0.00	1.03E-06	-3.73E-06	1007.05	-0.81	1.65E-04	4.01E-05	-0.29	4.01E-05

**Table 5.5** Equations of DAC (Part IV)

Coefficients				Combinations	Corresponding Figure in Appendix A	Corresponding Curves	Resubstitution Error	Precision and Accuracy		
K	L	Q						Precision (%)	Accuracy (%)	
0.97	-0.02	5.28E-05	-3.82E-05	BF=0.5, LTP=15 % and TP=5%	Figure A.16	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.015	99	98.54	
	0.00	-3.82E-05	1.66E-04			Jughandle Threshold				
80.05	-0.07	1.53E-05	2.85E-06		BF=0.6, LTP=15 %,TP=5 %	Figure A.17	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.0042	100	99.58
	-0.02	2.85E-06	1.98E-06				CFI Threshold			
1.34	-0.03	9.29E-05	-7.39E-05	BF=0.7, LTP=15 %,TP=5 %	Figure A.18	MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold	0.021	95	97.92	
	0.00	-7.39E-05	2.49E-04			LT-Permitted Threshold				
491.65	-0.26	4.14E-05	7.68E-05	BF=0.7, LTP=15 %,TP=5 %	Figure A.18	CFI Threshold	0.013	99	98.75	
	-0.82	7.68E-05	4.93E-04			MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold				
-72.87	0.07	-1.45E-05	-4.36E-07	BF=0.7, LTP=15 %,TP=5 %	Figure A.18	CFI Threshold	0.013	99	98.75	
	0.00	-4.36E-07	-2.66E-06			MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold				
2.06	-0.04	1.27E-04	-9.05E-05	BF=0.7, LTP=15 %,TP=5 %	Figure A.18	CFI Threshold	0.013	99	98.75	
	-0.01	-9.05E-05	3.62E-04			MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold				
194.09	-0.16	3.17E-05	1.72E-05	BF=0.7, LTP=15 %,TP=5 %	Figure A.18	CFI Threshold	0.013	99	98.75	
	-0.1	1.72E-05	2.08E-05			MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold				
-96.93	0.09	-1.95E-05	5.66E-07	BF=0.7, LTP=15 %,TP=5 %	Figure A.18	CFI Threshold	0.013	99	98.75	
	0.00	5.66E-07	-1.02E-06			MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold				

**Table 5.6** Equations of DAC (Part V)

Coefficients				Combinations	Corresponding Figure in Appendix A	Corresponding Curves	Resubstitution Error	Precision and Accuracy	
K	L	Q						Precision (%)	Accuracy (%)
3.34	-0.02	3.44E-05	-1.07E-04	BF=0.5, LTP=10% and TP=10%	Figure A.22	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.008	99	99.17
	-0.04	-1.07E-04	1.27E-03						
504.25	-0.43	9.05E-05	1.30E-05			Jughandle Threshold	0.017	99	98.33
	-0.06	1.30E-05	5.37E-06						
2.58	-0.02	4.13E-05	-1.27E-04	BF=0.6,L TP=10%, TP=10%	Figure A.23	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.006	100	99.38
	-0.06	-1.27E-04	0.0014813						
450.82	-0.39	8.34E-05	4.83E-06			Jughandle Threshold	0.023	99	97.71
	-0.03	4.83E-06	1.02E-05						
6.90	-0.05	9.90E-05	-2.00E-04	BF=0.7,L TP=10%, TP=10%	Figure A.24	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.002	100	99.79
	-0.03	-2.00E-04	1.58E-03						
802.58	-0.66	1.38E-04	2.47E-05			CFI Threshold	0.006	100	99.38
	-0.16	2.47E-05	5.20E-05						
-510.67	0.44	-9.54E-05	1.66E-06			MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold	0.017	88	98.33
	-0.01	1.66E-06	-8.65E-07						

**Table 5.7** Equations of DAC (Part VI)

Coefficients				Combinations	Corresponding Figure in Appendix A	Corresponding Curves	Resubstitution Error	Precision and Accuracy		
K	L	Q						Precision (%)	Accuracy (%)	
0.617	-0.02	5.04E-05	-4.64E-05	BF=0.5, LTP=15 % and TP=10%	Figure A.25	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.013	99	98.75	
	-0.01	-4.64E-05	2.16E-04			Jughandle Threshold	0.02	99	98.13	
78.35	-0.07	1.51E-05	3.23E-06		BF=0.6, LTP=15 % and TP=10%	Figure A.26	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.004	100	99.58
	-0.02	3.23E-06	3.52E-06				CFI Threshold	0.006	100	99.38
1.33	-0.03	9.29E-05	-7.39E-05			MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold	0.017	95	97.92	
	0.00	-7.39E-05	2.49E-04				0.0042	100	99.58	
314.8	-0.20	3.57E-05	4.51E-05	Figure A.27		CFI Threshold	0.017	99	98.33	
	-0.38	4.51E-05	1.88E-04			MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold	0.010	96	98.96	
-71.55	0.066	-1.45E-05	5.68E-07	BF=0.7, LTP=15 % and TP=10%	Figure A.27	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.0042	100	99.58	
	-0.001	5.68E-07	-2.53E-06			CFI Threshold	0.017	99	98.33	
1.96	-0.043	1.40E-04	-9.79E-05	MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold	0.010	96	98.96			
	0.008	-9.79E-05	2.45E-04		0.0042	100	99.58			
159.57	-0.13	2.75E-05	1.19E-05	BF=0.7, LTP=15 % and TP=10%	Figure A.27	CFI Threshold	0.017	99	98.33	
	-0.06	1.19E-05	1.04E-05			MUT+LT-Permitted Threshold	0.010	96	98.96	
93.16	-0.08	1.88E-05	-5.34E-07	BF=0.7, LTP=15 % and TP=10%	Figure A.27	LT-Permitted Threshold	0.0042	100	99.58	
	0.00	-5.34E-07	3.55E-07			CFI Threshold	0.017	99	98.33	



### 5.1.3 Discussion on Developed DAC

The QDA was used to develop the DAC for all 12,960 combinations under 27 combinations of three levels: of balance factor (BF), left turn percentage (LTP), and truck percentage (TP). Each combination of BF, LTP and TP comprises of 480 volume combinations including 48 volume levels of total major street volumes and 10 volume levels of total minor street volumes. Hence, there would be 27 combinations of BF, LTP and TP with each 480 volume combinations with the total of 12960 data sets. The obtained 27 plots with thresholds are included in Appendix A in figure A.1 to figure A.27. The example study on how to use DAC plots is included in Appendix C. The following patterns were observed from the DAC:

1. For a low percentage of left turns (5%), MUT performed optimally on all conditions of BF and TP under all levels of major street approach traffic volume and minor street approach traffic volume from a delay-saving standpoint. A standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along the major street performed optimally in very low minor street approach traffic volumes (less than or equal to 50 vph) in a linear fashion as shown in the figure 5.2. The range of major street approach traffic volumes where a standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along the major street appeared in the figures and are shown in table 5.8.
2. For a medium percentage of left turns (10%) and BF at 0.5 and 0.6, the threshold between MUT and a jughandle was found to be approximately between 2200 vph and 2400 vph of major street approach traffic volume. However, the threshold flared

toward the left to provide a wide area for the optimal region for the jughandle as minor street approach traffic volume increased. From this, it can be inferred that for this particular condition, a jughandle performed better at high major street volumes (greater than or equal to 2200 vph), and its performance increased further when the

**Table 5.8** Total major street approach traffic volume range for optimality of standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along the major street

<b>Combinations</b>	<b>Corresponding Figure in Appendix A</b>	<b>Total Major Street Approach Traffic Volume Ranges for Standard Signalized Intersection with LT-Permitted along Major Street (vph)</b>
BF= 0.5, LTP = 5%, TP = 2%	Figure A.1	900-1350
BF= 0.6, LTP = 5%, TP = 2%	Figure A.2	800-1100
BF= 0.7, LTP = 5%, TP = 2%	Figure A.3	700-950
BF= 0.5, LTP = 5%, TP = 5%	Figure A.10	900-1350
BF= 0.6, LTP = 5%, TP = 5%	Figure A.11	750-1100
BF= 0.7, LTP = 5%, TP = 5%	Figure A.12	650-950
BF= 0.5, LTP = 5%, TP = 10%	Figure A.19	850-1350
BF= 0.6, LTP = 5%, TP = 10%	Figure A.20	750-1100
BF= 0.7, LTP = 5%, TP = 10%	Figure A.21	700-950


- minor street approach traffic volume increased. Jughandle has good performance under high major street volume compared to MUT because the conflicting traffic for diverted left turning traffic of jughandle is the minor street traffic which is lower in volume than conflicting major street traffic for MUT. Under the presence high major street conflicting traffic, when the minor street traffic increases, it adds more left turning vehicles at median opening and hence delay at median openings will increase drastically. However, for jughandle, since minor street traffic doesn't add left turning vehicles, the delay will increase because of increment in conflicting minor street traffic volume but at much lower rate compared to MUT. That is why the optimal region of jughandle expands with the increasing minor street traffic at 10 % left turning condition at balance factors of 0.5 and 0.6. Still, the higher portion of the region was occupied by MUT, and there was no CFI region for this particular condition. Figure 5.3 represents this pattern. When the balance factor increased to 0.7 for the same left turn percentage (10%), CFI was introduced to the high major street approach traffic volume (greater than or equal to 2200 vph) and high minor street approach traffic volume region (greater than or equal to 250 vph), as shown by figure 5.4. From this, it can be inferred that high left turns on any major street approach traffic volume and high minor street approach traffic volume (greater than or equal to 250 vph) conditions favor the application of CFI.
3. For a high percentage of left turns (15%) and BF at 0.5, which represents the balance condition under which both approaches on the major street have the same volume of

traffic, the thresholds of the jughandle shifted toward the left, between 1800 vph to 2000 vph major street approach traffic volume. The threshold flared toward the left to provide a wide area for the optimal region for the jughandle as the minor street approach traffic volume increased. From this, it can be inferred that at a balanced condition, the jughandle performed better at high major street volumes (greater than 1800 vph) and performed even better when the minor street approach traffic volume increased. The reason behind this pattern is same as the reason behind the pattern at medium left turn percentage (15%) at balance factors of 0.5 and 0.6. Still, the higher portion of the region was occupied by MUT, and there was no CFI region at this particular condition. Figure 5.5 represents this pattern.


Similarly, when the BF increases from 0.5 to 0.6, the CFI was introduced in the region of high major street approach traffic volume (greater than 1900 vph) and high minor street approach traffic volume (greater than or equal to 350 vph). With a further increase in BF, from 0.6 to 0.7, the optimal region of CFI extended to low minor street approach traffic volume (50 vph). This can be visualized from figure 5.6 and figure 5.7. From this, it can be conferred that under high left turning volumes on both approaches, the unbalanced flow conditions also led to increased left-turning volume at a high major street approach traffic volume, which ultimately favored CFI to serve the high left-turning volume.

4. The performance of a standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted on the major street was found optimal only on very low total major street approach traffic


- volume and very low total minor street approach traffic volume for medium and high percentage of left turns. The volume ranges were a minimum of 150 vph to a maximum of 650 vph for the major street approach traffic and a minimum of 50 vph to a maximum of 100 vph for the minor street approach traffic under 10% left turn traffic conditions. Similarly, the ranges were a minimum of 50 vph to a maximum of 450 vph for the major street approach traffic and a minimum of 50 vph to a maximum of 200 vph for the minor street approach traffic under 15% left turn traffic conditions.
5. Effect of truck percentage was distinct only at a high left turn percentage (15%) and a high balance factor (0.7), where high truck percentage favors the increment of the optimal region of CFI. This is clear from figure 5.8, figure 5.9, and figure 5.10. The reason behind this is the high delay causation at median openings of MUT and north-south crossovers of jughandle due to large gap requirement for heavy vehicles. The delay is relatively low as CFI provides exclusive phase for left turning vehicles at crossover displaced left turn lane.
  6. From the plots, it can be conferred that the standard signalized intersection was never optimal under studied scenarios. This also implies for all the studied conditions, there exists at least one unconventional intersection or permitted left turn alternative that produces lower delay than conventional signalized intersection. However, it is imperative to look at cost aspect as well while making decision for selection. The cost aspect is included in chapter 6 of this dissertation.



**Figure 5.2** Representative DAC at low LTP (BF=0.6, LTP = 5%, TP = 10%)




**Figure 5.3** DAC for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.5$ ,  $LTP=10\%$  and  $TP=2\%$




**Figure 5.4** DAC for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.7$ ,  $LTP=10\%$  and  $TP=5\%$







**Figure 5.5** DAC for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.5$ ,  $LTP=15\%$  and  $TP=2\%$




**Figure 5.6** DAC for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.6$ ,  $LTP=15\%$  and  $TP=10\%$




**Figure 5.7** DAC for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.7$ ,  $LTP=15\%$  and  $TP=10\%$



**Figure 5.8** DAC for unconventional intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=15% and TP=2%



**Figure 5.9** DAC for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.7$ ,  $LTP=15\%$  and  $TP=5\%$



**Figure 5.10** DAC for unconventional intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=15% and TP=10%

## **5.2 Decision Assistance Curves (DAC)-Contour**

From DAC, it is possible to select the optimal choice among three unconventional intersections for any volume criteria. Furthermore, DAC was supplemented with additional information about how to obtain the amount of delay loss or benefit the optimal intersection would have for those volume criteria. This was done by developing two types of contour plots. The first type of contour plot was developed for the highest delay difference between the left turn movement of a standard signalized intersection, and three intersections, including MUT, jughandle, and standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street, in seconds per vehicle. The second type of contour plot was developed for all four intersections, indicating the total intersection delay difference with respect to a standard signalized intersection in seconds per vehicle. In case of contour, every intersection would have 12960 data sets for 27 combinations of BF, LTP, and TP with one combination comprising 480 volume combinations. Hence, one contour plot represents 480 volume combinations.

### **5.2.1 Contour Plots for Difference in Left Turn Delay**


MUT, jughandle, and standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street were chosen for these plots because the left turning traffic on a MUT and jughandle are expected to have higher delay due to additional travel delay and delay at crossovers. Similarly, a mixed effect is expected in the case of standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted. The plots were developed for the meshgrid of minor approach traffic volume (50 vph to 500 vph) and major approach traffic volume (50 vph to 2400 vph) for 27 combinations of the three levels: balance

factor, truck percentage, and left turn percentage. The two example plots at 0.7 BF, 15% LTP, and 10% TP are shown in figures 5.11 and 5.12 for MUT and jughandle, respectively. The example contour plot for standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street is shown in figure 5.13. The negative values of the contour represent the delay saving capability of unconventional intersections for left turns compared to a standard signalized intersection. The positive values of contour represent when unconventional intersections have higher delay than a standard signalized intersection.

The contour plots indicated that the left turn delay of critical left turn movement for MUT was always higher than that of a signalized intersection. The delay difference increased at a higher rate for higher major street approach traffic volumes. In the combinations with a high left turning volume, the left turn delay was exceptionally higher at high major approach traffic volumes, even reaching the condition of failure. The condition of failure occurred as the left-turning volumes exceeded the capacity of the U-turn openings. In figure 5.11, the condition of failure is indicated by a contour line designated with the value of 9999. All of the MUT contour plots are included in Appendix A of this dissertation.


Unlike MUT, the contour plot indicated that the critical left turn delay difference between jughandles and standard signalized intersections was less, and even negative, for higher major street and minor street approach traffic volumes, showing less delay or delay-saving conditions for left turn movements. As shown in figure 5.12, there are some circular areas enclosed with a contour of the same magnitude. These areas were formed






**Figure 5.11** Contour plot for critical left turn delay difference between MUT and standard signalized intersection at BF=0.7,

LTP=15%, TP=10%



**Figure 5.12** Contour plot for critical left turn delay difference between jughandle and standard signalized intersection at  
 BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=10%




**Figure 5.13** Contour plot for critical left turn delay difference between standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along major street and standard signalized intersection at BF=0.5, LTP=5%, TP=2%


when there was no change in delay for that particular volume condition within those areas. For this particular condition of BF, LTP, and TP, the distance between contours at the same intervals was less at high major street approach traffic volume regions than low major street approach traffic volumes, showing the delay change is rapid with the increase of major street approach traffic volume. All the contour plots for the jughandle are included in Appendix A of this dissertation. The contour plot of standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street indicated negative contour at a very low total major street approach traffic volume, which increased and turned to positive values with the increment of total major street approach traffic volume showing delay saving at very low major street volumes and delay loss when the volume increased. Since left turn permission is allowed for a limited number of left turn volumes depending on the number of lanes in the conflicting road and speed limit of conflicting vehicles, the plots are blank on the higher level of major street approach traffic volume.

### **5.2.2 Contour Plots for Difference in Total Intersection Delay**

Contour plots for the difference in total intersection delay were developed for all four intersections. The negative values of the contour represent the delay-saving capability of unconventional intersections and standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street compared to standard signalized intersections. The positive contour values represent unconventional intersections that have a higher delay than a standard signalized intersection. The example delay difference plots are shown in figures 5.14 through 5.17. The plots indicated that the delay saving capability of MUT decreased with an increasing major street approach traffic volume. Under the presence of




**Figure 5.14** Contour plot for total intersection delay difference between MUT and standard signalized intersection at  $BF=0.7$ ,  
 $LTP=15\%$ ,  $TP=10\%$




**Figure 5.15** Contour plot for total intersection delay difference between CFI and standard signalized intersection at  $BF=0.7$ ,

$LTP=15\%$ ,  $TP=10\%$



**Figure 5.16** Contour plot for total intersection delay difference between jughandle and standard signalized intersection at

BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=10%



**Figure 5.17** Contour plot for total intersection delay difference between standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along major street and standard signalized intersection at BF=0.5, LTP=5%, TP=2%



higher left turning volumes, the MUT system fails. The MUT intersection failure is depicted in the contour plot with a value of 999. The plots also indicated that the delay saving capability of CFI was good for a high major street approach traffic volume under the presence of a high minor street approach traffic volume.

The delay-saving capability of jughandles was also good for a higher major street approach traffic volume, but it decreased with a high minor street approach traffic volume. For that specific condition, the delay-saving capability of jughandles increased with minor street approach traffic volume for low to medium major street approach traffic volumes. The contour plot for standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street also showed delay saving for the provided condition. The plots are included in Appendix A of this dissertation. The example procedure for how to use DAC-classifier and DAC-contour for decision making about suitable intersections is provided in Appendix B.


### **5.2.3 Delay Performance Information for Projected Volumes from Contour Plot**

The contour plots in conjunction with the plot of projected volumes can be used to find delay savings information for projected volumes. This can be more clearly understood by referring to an example of MUT with the contours of total delay difference, shown in figure 5.18. This is a case when major and minor street approach traffic volumes are increasing at the rate of 2% annually. The growth rate curves for the growth rate of 1%, 2%, 3%, 4% and 5 % are also included in Appendix A. Let us consider a case with a major street approach traffic volume of 1600 vph and a minor

street approach traffic volume of 250 vph. Point A, which lies between the contours of magnitude -5 and -6, represents the particular delay savings of about 5.4 s/veh for the base year. Now, the delay savings for the projected volume, if both approach traffic volumes increase at the same rate of 2% annually, can be calculated by extending line OA. The delay savings for the projected volume for the 10th year can be estimated by locating point B in line OA, as shown in figure 5.18. B represents a delay savings of approximately 3.5 s/veh. Hence, the delay savings for the projected volumes of 1600 vph for the major street and 250 vph for the minor street for the 10th year is 3.5 s/veh. By projecting line OA to the contour of magnitude 999, which represents the failure case, it can be observed that if both volumes of approach keep increasing by 2%, MUT will fail in 15.5 years. If the rates of increment of major and minor street approach traffic volumes are different, it is necessary to use different projection plots.

It is possible to find the delay of any volume for any percentage of annual increments in minor street total approach traffic by projecting the line expressed by equation 5.4 originating from the base year point.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Slope of Projection Line} &= \frac{Y \times \left(1 + \frac{n}{100}\right) - Y}{X \times \left(1 + \frac{m}{100}\right) - X} \\ &= \frac{Yn}{Xm} \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$



**Figure 5.18** Delay savings for projected volumes (case study: MUT total intersection delay different at  $BF=0.7$ ,  $LTP=15\%$ ,  $TP=10\%$ )

Where,

X = total major street approach traffic volume for base year,

Y= total minor street total approach traffic volume for base year,

m = the annual percentage increment of major street approach traffic volume, and

n = annual percentage increment of minor street approach traffic volume

### **5.3 Brief Summary of Chapter**

This chapter explained the process in the development of DAC utilizing O-D delay obtained from the method as explained in the previous chapter. DAC were developed in the form of plots such as DAC-Classifier plots and DAC-Contour plots. These plots classified the optimal region of delay performance for each intersection as well as quantify the delay savings or loss related to them. This chapter also included the holistic pattern observed from those plots. These plots can act as decision support system during the selection of a suitable intersection. Additionally, this chapter described an easy use of graphical method for the calculation of operational benefits over the life of the intersection.

## **CHAPTER 6**

### **ECONOMIC ANALYSIS**

This chapter is comprised five major sections: (1) estimation of marginal agency cost, (2) monetization of marginal user's and non-user's benefits, (3) the life cycle cost analysis (LCCA), (4) the development of a spreadsheet tool to perform LCCA, and (5) a sample case study of LCCA using the spreadsheet tool. The outcome of this chapter will provide marginal net present value (NPV) and benefits to cost ratio (B/C) pertaining to the three unconventional intersections, which can serve as a basis for deciding the optimal alternative of unconventional intersections.

#### **6.1 Marginal Agency Cost**

The marginal agency cost includes both the marginal agency cost for new construction of unconventional intersections and retrofitting unconventional intersections over standard signalized intersections. The word "marginal" stands for the difference in quantity or cost due to the new construction of unconventional intersections or their retrofits with respect to standard signalized intersections. The marginal agency cost includes the costs of construction, preliminary engineering, and additional operation and maintenance.

The marginal construction quantities for new construction were estimated based on the additional pavement requirement, additional signals and installations with related accessories, and the additional right of way needed for new unconventional intersections as compared to standard signalized intersections. The construction quantities for retrofits

were estimated based on the additional pavement requirement, the removal of existing pavements, additional signals with their installations and related accessories, etc., needed while retrofitting standard signalized intersections. NDOR's latest "English Average Unit Price (AUP) Summary July 2012-June 2013," found on their website under Item History and Info, was referenced for unit price information. The items considered for the quantity estimates and the related unit prices are shown in table 6.1 and table 6.2. The unit price of land (\$4142.5/acre) was calculated by referencing the "United States Land Values 2012 Summary" (2012) published by the United States Department of Agriculture. The unit

**Table 6.1** Unit prices of item considered in estimation of construction quantities (Part I)

Standard item no.	Item	Unit	Rate (US \$)	Source of information
1101	Concrete Pavement Removal	SY	6.81	Average Unit Price (AUP), Summary July 2010-June 2013, NDOR (accessed on 2014)
3075.56	10" Doweled Concrete Pavement, Class 47 B-3500 (Including Median Opening)	SY	30.59	
1010	Excavation (1.5')	CY	3.26	
1122.01	Remove Concrete Median Surfacing (6' Median)	SY	5.90	
A724.01	Relocate Traffic Signal	Each	470.00	
A006.98	Vehicle Detector, Type TD-A Performed	Each	263.69	
A001.7	Pull Box, Type PB-7	Each	1,010.00	
A070.22	4 Inch Conduit in Trench	LF	5.91	
A072.20	4 Inch Conduit in Roadway	LF	7.83	
A077.26	16/C 14 AWG Traffic Signal Cable	LF	3.98	
A079.01	2/C #14 AWG Detector Lead-In Cable	LF	1.46	
7320.27	Traffic Sign and Post	Each	295.85	

price of real estate land (\$2,590/acre), cropland (\$4,480/acre), irrigable land (\$6,000/acre), and non-irrigable land (\$3,500/acre) were averaged. The preliminary engineering cost (PE) involves expenses for activities from planning to the final design of a project (Turochy, Hoel and Doty, 2001). According to Turochy et al. (2001), most state DOTs consider the PE cost to range from 5% to 20% of construction costs depending on the project size and scope. Remaining in that range, this study considered the PE cost to be 10% of the construction cost. Contingency was assumed to be 20% of the construction

**Table 6.2** Unit prices of item considered in estimation of construction quantities (Part II)

Standard item no.	Item	Unit	Rate (US \$)	Source of information
7500.22	Right Arrow Performed Pavement Markings	Each	420.00	Average Unit Price (AUP), Summary July 2010-June 2013, NDOR (accessed on 2014)
7500.25	Through and Left Arrow Performed Pavement Markings	Each	483.00	
3017.4	Concrete Class 47B-3000 Median Surfacing	SY	31.05	
A016.8	Mast Arm Signal Pole, Type MP-60	Each	8,500.00	
A504.81	Install Mast Arm Signal Pole	Each	3,700.00	
A 703.00	Relocate Mast Arm	Each	1,470.00	
A003.10	Traffic Signal, Type TS-1	Each	493.89	
A501.00	Install Traffic Signal, Type TS-1	Each	242	
7496.05	5" Yellow Permanent Pavement Markings	LF	0.19	
7495.55	5" White Permanent Pavement Markings	LF	0.4	
7495.12	12 " Yellow Permanent Pavement Marking Paint	LF	0.5	
N/A	Additional Land	Acre	4,142.50	USDA (2012)

cost with reference to Boddapati (2008). The unit price O&M for CFI was estimated based on the service requirement for additional signal heads, detectors, signal retiming costs, and power supply costs. Similarly for MUT and jughandle, the unit price of O&M was fixed based on the cost of landscaping the medians and areas enclosed by the reverse ramps. The agency costs were monetized by multiplying the quantities of each item by their respective unit prices. The computed marginal costs of all three unconventional intersections, considering new construction and retrofits, are shown in table 6.3. Since the marginal cost of the new construction of a standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along the major street is lower than that of a standard signalized intersection, it is shown as negative value. The marginal cost estimate tables for new construction and retrofits for all four intersections are included in Appendix C.

### **6.2 Marginal User's and Non-User's Benefit and their Monetization**

The user's benefit pertains to the savings due to the reduction in delay and fuel consumption when new unconventional intersections or standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street are constructed instead of signalized intersections, or a standard signalized intersection is retrofitted with an unconventional intersection or a standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along the major street. Similarly, the non-user's benefit pertains to the savings due to reduction in emissions when new unconventional intersections or standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street are constructed instead of signalized intersections, or a standard signalized intersection is retrofitted with an unconventional



**Table 6.3** Computed marginal cost of unconventional intersections

Intersection type	Construction Cost + Soft Cost including Contingency (US \$)		Operation and Maintenance Cost (US \$)	
	New construction	Retrofit	New construction	Retrofit
MUT	36,762.81	680,426.26	2,000	2,000
CFI	279,226.41	439,799.44	24,000	2,4000
Jughandle	64,551.15	64,635.13	2,000	2,000
Standard Signalized Intersection with Left Turn Permitted along Major Street	-10,334.96	1,393.21	0	0

intersection or with a standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along the major street. These are calculated by subtracting the amount of each item produced by a standard signalized intersection from the amount of each item produced by these intersections. If the deducted value is negative, it is called the cost or a negative benefit. Unit prices of each benefit were calculated by our own rate analysis or by referencing past literature. The unit price of time (price of delay) was considered as \$16.79/hour as provide by 2012 Urban Mobility report. The unit prices of diesel and petrol were calculated averaging the 2012 average gas price for Nebraska, provided by AAA's Fuel Gauge Report (petrol: \$3.704/gallon, diesel: \$ 3.956/gallons). The unit price of CO<sub>2</sub> (\$0.02/kg) was referenced from the 2010 Annual Supplement to National Institute of

Standards and Technology (NIST) Handbook published by the U.S. Department of Energy. The unit price of CO (\$200/ton) was referenced from a technical paper by Bishop et al. (1993). Similarly, unit prices for NO<sub>x</sub> (\$250/ton/year) and VOC<sub>s</sub> (\$180/ton/year) were referenced from Muller and Mendelson (2009) considering median damage cost. The unit prices are also listed in table 6.4. These marginal benefits were monetized by multiplying the quantities with respective unit prices.

**Table 6.4** Unit prices of items

Items	Unit prices	Source of Information
Delay	\$ 16.79/hour	2012 Urban Mobility Report
Petrol	\$ 3.704/Gallons	AAA's Fuel Gauge Report
Diesel	\$ 3.956/Gallons	
CO <sub>2</sub>	\$ 0.02/Kg	U.S. Department of Energy: NIST (2010)
CO	\$ 200/ton	Bishop et al. (1993)
NO <sub>x</sub>	\$ 250/ton/year	Muller and Mendelson (2009)
VOC <sub>s</sub>	\$180/ton/year	

### **6.3 Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA)**

The LCCA was performed on monetized agency, user's and non-user's marginal costs, to determine the net present value (NPV) and benefit to cost ratio (B/C) of the new

construction and retrofits of the unconventional intersections as well as standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street. The life cycle period of the retrofits was assumed to be 20 years and the discount rate was assumed to be 3% with no inflation for each year (Boddapati, 2008). The annual increase of traffic was considered 2% for major streets and 1% for minor streets. The delay for each projected volume for a 20-year period was estimated by batch running HCS 2010 Streets<sup>®</sup>. The respective fuel consumption and emissions and their annual costs were estimated. The operation and maintenance cost was assumed to be the same throughout the life cycle period. The NPV was estimated using the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{NPV of Total} \\
 & = \text{NPV of Benefits} - \text{NPV of O \& M Cost} - \text{Construction Cost} \\
 & - \text{PE Cost}
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Benefit to Cost Ratio (B/C)} \\
 & = \text{NPV of Benefits} / \{ \text{NPV of O \& M Cost} \\
 & + (\text{Construction Cost} \\
 & + \text{PE Cost}) \}
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{NPV of O \& M Cost} \\
 & = \left( \frac{1}{i} \right) \\
 & \times \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{(1+i)^N} \right\}
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{NPV of benefits} \\
 & = \sum_{N=0}^{20} P_N \\
 & \times \frac{1}{(1+i)^N}
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Where,

$N$  = life cycle period,

$i$  = discount rate (3%), and

$P_N$  = yearly negative or positive benefits

If any retrofits or new unconventional intersections failed due to high demand in any year throughout life cycle period, the NPV of those retrofits were calculated assuming a reduced life cycle period. The reduced life cycle period equals the time period up to which intersection operation is feasible. This case is applicable for MUT and jughandle because they were evaluated with M/M/1 queues, where the server's capacity should not be exceeded by demand. It is because the queuing system works until the utilization factor (ratio of demand and service capacity) remains less than 1.

#### **6.4 Development of a Spreadsheet Tool to Perform Life Cycle Cost Analysis**


This study developed a Microsoft Excel-based tool interfaced with HCS 2012<sup>®</sup> that can estimate a measure of effectiveness of operational performance, such as delay, fuel consumption, and emissions, and also can perform the life cycle cost analysis. The spreadsheet tool has four parts of operation: (1) the estimation of delay, fuel, and emissions in conjunction with HCS 2012<sup>®</sup>, as well as their projection for each year in the life cycle period of the intersections; (2) the marginal cost estimate of user's and non-user's benefits with respect to standard signalized intersections and monetization; (3) the estimation and monetization of construction costs, soft costs, and operation and

maintenance costs; and (4) a life cycle cost analysis to estimate the NPV of benefits and the corresponding B/C of MUT, CFI, jughandle, and standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street. This spreadsheet can function as a decision assistance tool to decide the best unconventional intersection design under a user's defined criteria. The tool is named as "SILCC" (Signalized Intersection Life Cycle Cost Analysis).

### **6.5 A Case Study of LCCA using SILCC**

For a case study, the volume pattern for rural roads was developed, following one of the 24-hour data patterns provided by Williams and Ardekani (1996). This pattern is shown in figure 6.1. The delay, fuel consumption, and emissions were estimated corresponding to the 24 hour volume data, using SILCC for the 20-year life cycle period and the specifications of 10% truck and 5% left turning traffic and the default annual increment in traffic (2% on the major street and 1% for the minor street). Additionally, the default lane configuration of a four-lane major street at 45 mph and a two-lane minor street with at 35 mph were considered. The construction estimate for retrofits and new construction for unconventional intersections along with standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street that were used were the same as those discussed in section 6.1. The corresponding default rates of items used were as mentioned in previous sections. SILCC provided the results from LCCA as displayed in table 6.5. The result indicated that MUT would have the highest NPV of the net benefits for both cases, but due to the high construction cost of a retrofit, the B/C is lower than that of a

jughandle. The ranking of alternatives for retrofits according to their B/C was found to follow the hierarchical order of (1) jughandle, (2) MUT, and (3) CFI. However for new construction, the ranking of alternatives according to B/C was found to follow the hierarchical order of (1) MUT, (2) jughandle, (3) CFI. All the unconventional intersections were found to have a B/C greater than 1, indicating that they were more beneficial than standard signalized intersections for this particular condition. Standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street were not applicable as one or both of left turn volumes along major street during 24 hr period exceeded limiting criteria of left turn permission.



**Figure 6.1** Volume pattern for a rural road

**Table 6.5** LCCA result for case study

Cases	LCCA Outcomes	MUT	CFI	Jughandle	Standard Signalized Intersection with Left Turn Permitted along Major Street
New Construction	Net Present Value (NPV) of Marginal Net Benefit (US \$)	4, 331, 748	313, 233	2, 255, 279	10, 335
	Marginal Benefit to Cost ratio (B/C)	66.12	1.49	24.91	0
Retrofits	Net Present Value (NPV) of Marginal Net Benefit (US \$)	3, 688, 084	152, 660	2, 255, 195	-1, 393
	Marginal Benefit to Cost ratio (B/C)	6.19	1.19	24.89	0

### **6.6 Brief Summary of Chapter**

This chapter explained the method of performing economic analysis and the development of SILCC utilizing the operational performance computed from the method explained in chapter 4. The quantity and cost associated with construction and operation were calculated as marginal values deducting the amount associated with standard signalized intersections. The monetization was done using standard unit prices of items from different literature sources. SILCC was used for the life cycle cost analysis. The life cycle cost analysis of a case study provided the hierarchical order of intersections.

## CHAPTER 7

### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter provides the conclusion based on the results obtained from the DAC pattern and economic analysis. It also describes some of the limitations of this study and recommends areas of further study.

#### 7.1 Conclusion

This study evaluated standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted along the major street and three types of unconventional intersections: MUT, CFI, and jughandle, comparing their performance with standard signalized intersections. The study at first assessed the intersections based on delay performance, and finally, performed the life cycle cost analysis over the operational benefits, operational cost, cost of construction, and cost of operation and maintenance. Based on delay performance, this study was able to define the DAC that distinguished the region of optimal performance for each type of unconventional intersection. Both graphical plots and thresholds equations were developed and are included in this dissertation. The overall analysis of DAC indicated that MUT is applicable for almost all levels of volume combinations of major and minor street approach traffic volume under the presence of low left-turning traffic (5%), except at some ranges of major street approach traffic volume under some low minor street volume ranges (700 vph to 1350 vph). Under medium to high left-turning traffic (10% and 15%), standard signalized intersections with permitted left turn along the major street performed optimally at low minor street volume (less than or equal



to 200 vph) and low major street volume (less than 650 vph). Under medium left turning traffic at balanced and nearly balanced conditions, and under high left-turning traffic at balanced only conditions, the jughandle performed optimally on high major street approach traffic volume (greater than or equal to 2200 vph for 10% LT and greater than 1800 vph for 15% LT), and its performance got better with increasing minor street approach traffic volume. Under medium to high left-turning traffic, CFI performed optimally for high major street approach traffic volume (greater than or equal to 2200 vph for 10% LT and greater than 1800 vph for 15% LT), and the optimal performance region expanded with increasing minor street approach traffic volumes. The jughandle performed optimally for high major street approach traffic volume (greater than or equal to 2200 vph for 10% LT and greater than 1800 vph for 15% LT) and the optimal performance region expanded with decreasing minor street approach traffic volume at unbalanced flow conditions. CFI's optimal region expanded as the flow became more unbalanced.

Furthermore, to provide flexibility for users to decide on the best unconventional intersection design under multiple sets of conditions, a spreadsheet tool, "SILCC," was developed. SILCC has the ability to estimate the operational performance measure, complete a cost estimate, and perform LCCA. For new construction, a sample case study performed on a 24-hour rural pattern volume indicated a higher NPV for operational benefits and a higher B/C related to MUT compared to all other intersections. However, since the construction cost of a MUT-retrofit is high, the jughandle-retrofit was found to

have the highest B/C, despite the fact that MUT had the highest NPV. The standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted was found not applicable for the provided volume condition.

In this manner, this study developed the decision support system, which can provide integrated decision criteria for unconventional intersections, and developed SILCC that accounts the cost and benefit aspects that were lacking in the existing decision assistance method. The integrated decision criteria provided the volume warrants for the studied unconventional intersections. The other specific conclusions reached by the study are detailed below:

1. The DAC developed based on delay performance favored the use of MUT for all combinations of total approach traffic volumes ranging from 50 vph to 2400 vph on the major street and 50 vph to 500 vph on the minor street under a low percentage of left-turning traffic (5%), except at some total major street approach traffic volume ranges under very low total minor street approach traffic volume, as shown in table 5.8.
2. For a medium percentage of left turns (10%) and BF at 0.5 and 0.6, the threshold between MUT and a jughandle was found to be between 2200 vph and 2400 vph of major street approach traffic volume. The optimal region for the jughandle increased as minor street approach traffic volume increased. When the balance factor increased to 0.7 for the same left turn percentage (10%), CFI was introduced to the high major street approach traffic volume

(greater than or equal to 2200 vph) and high minor street approach traffic volume region (greater than or equal to 250 vph).

3. For a high percentage of left turns (15%) and BF at 0.5, which represents the balance condition under which both approaches on the major street have the same volume of traffic, the thresholds of the jughandle shifted toward the left, between 1800 vph to 2000 vph major street approach traffic volume. The optimal region for the jughandle increased as the minor street approach traffic volume increased. From this, it can be inferred that at a balanced condition, the jughandle performed better at high major street volumes (greater than 1800 vph) and performed even better when the minor street approach traffic volume increased. When the BF increases from 0.5 to 0.6, the CFI was introduced in the region of high major street approach traffic volume (greater than 1900 vph) and high minor street approach traffic volume (greater than or equal to 350 vph). With a further increase in BF, from 0.6 to 0.7, the optimal region of CFI extended to low minor street approach traffic volume (50 vph). From this, it can be inferred that CFI performed better at high major and minor street approach traffic volumes, and the jughandle performed better at high major street approach traffic volumes and low minor street approach traffic volumes under unbalanced flow conditions.
4. The performance of standard signalized intersections with left turn permitted on the major street was only found to be optimal on very low major street

approach traffic volume and very low minor street approach traffic volume for a medium and high percentage of left turns. The volume ranges were a minimum of 150 vph to a maximum of 650 vph for major street approach traffic and a minimum of 50 vph to a maximum of 100 vph for minor street approach traffic under 10% left turn traffic conditions. Similarly, the ranges were a minimum of 50 vph to a maximum of 450 vph for major street approach traffic and a minimum of 50 vph to a maximum of 200 vph for minor street approach traffic under 15% left turn traffic conditions.

5. For the most of volume criteria for all conditions of flow balance, left turn percentage, and truck percentage, MUT was the preferred alternative. It was also found that the conventional signalized intersection with protected left turns was never optimal under studied scenarios. This implies that for all the studied conditions, there exists at least one unconventional intersection or permitted left alternative that produces lower delay than the conventional signalized intersection.
6. Effect of truck percentage was distinct only at a high left turn percentage (15%) and a high balance factor (0.7), where high truck percentage favors the increment of the optimal region of CFI.
7. Looking at the DAC plots in Appendix A and the DAC equations in tables 5.2 through 5.7 are recommended to gain an accurate understanding of the thresholds.

8. The above criteria are based on delay performance and limited to rural intersections with a four-lane major street at 45 mph and a two-lane minor street at 35 mph. However, this method can be extended for urban intersections as well. To account for the cost in decision making, the SILCC is recommended. Additionally, SILCC can provide a decision based on cost and operational benefits for any criteria that the user wants to assess; it can be used as a decision assistance tool.
9. Both the performance based decision support system and the cost based decision support system tested for low volume condition indicated MUT as most preferred alternative. However, the study also indicated that the marginal cost of MUT retrofit is quite higher than new construction. The economic study showed CFI retrofit expensive than new CFI but by lower degree as compared to MUT.
10. It should be noted that DAC and SILCC provide a decision support system to the decision maker only. It is a decision maker who decides based on prevailing volume condition according to his priorities such as budget allocation, type of treatments (new construction or retrofit), and whether importance is to be given to cost or performance, etc. There are several other factors that may also affect the decision besides the operational performance and cost factors. One of these factors could be the cutoff of access roads due to the implementation of unconventional intersection. It could be a major

hindrance to the local road users both in viewpoint of pedestrians and traffic mobility. Similarly, the availability of additional right of way can sometime be an issue too. Hence, the studied factors are the important factors but not all.

The decision maker shouldn't be limited on those factors only.

## **7.2 Recommendation**

As mentioned in the previous section, the DAC were developed for rural intersections with a four-lane major street at 45 mph and a two-lane minor street at 35 mph. However, this method can be extended for urban intersections as well and the flexibility to add more controlling variables is available. To use SILCC, the minimum requirement for users is that they should be familiar with the highway capacity manual. The modification of some of the factors also requires the knowledge and skill to run HCS 2010 Street<sup>®</sup>. Codes modification may be needed if SILCC is to be run with a different version than HCS-6.5. Some further studies based on the limitations of this study are recommended as following:

1. It is recommended that this study is extended to develop DAC for other conditions and intersections. Conditions may be intersections in an urban setting, more levels of truck factors, left turn percentage, and balance factor, as well as other types of unconventional intersections. Similarly, SILCC can be extended for other unconventional intersections. The use of the methodology developed for this study will reduce the time and effort of these kinds of studies.

2. A separate study can be conducted to capture the effect of fast growing traffic in future years to see if several alternatives could be optimal one at a time for certain periods in the whole analysis period.
3. It is recommended that a separate detailed study be conducted to develop a method to integrate the weight of all the priorities that a decision maker would consider to decide on an intersection based on the results obtained from the developed decision assistance tools. This would provide further support for the decision maker.
4. It is also recommended that a separate study be conducted to compute crash modification factors related to these intersection treatments and incorporate the safety benefits in the life cycle cost analysis included in SILCC.

## REFERENCES

AAA's Daily Fuel Gauge Report.

<http://fuelgaugereport.aaa.com/?redirectto=http://fuelgaugereport.opisnet.com/index.asp>. Accessed on August, 2013.

*A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), 2011.

Agarwal, N.K. *Estimation of Pedestrian Safety at Intersections using Simulation and Surrogate safety Measures*. College of Engineering, University of Kentucky, 2011.

Aldian, A. and M.A.P. Taylor. Selecting Priority Junction Traffic Models to Determine U-turn Capacity at Median Opening. *Proceedings of Eastern Asia Society for Transportation Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 2001, pp. 101-113.

Al-Masaeid, H. Capacity of U-Turn at Median Openings. *Institute of Transportation Engineers Journal*, Vol. 69, 1999, pp. 28-32.

Al-Omari, B.H and K.M.A. Al-Akharas. *Institute of Engineers Journal*, Vol. 84, No. 3, 2014, pp. 42-47.

Alternative Intersection. John Sangster.

<https://sites.google.com/site/trfcguy/Research/alternative-intersections>. Accessed on April, 2014.

Armstrong, M. *Integrating Alternative Intersections and Interchanges into HCS 2010*. University of Florida, 2014.



- Asante, S. A., S.A. Ardekani and J.C. Williams. Selection Criteria for Left-Turn Phasing and Indication Sequence. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 1421, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 1993, pp. 11-20.
- Asokan, A., J. Bared, R. Jagannathan, W. Hughes, F. Cicu and P.F. Illotta . Alternative Intersections Selection Tool-AIST. Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting 2010, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington D.C, 2010.
- Autey, J, T. Sayed and M. EL Esawey. Guidelines for the Use of Some Unconventional Intersection Designs. Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting 2010, Transportation Research Board of National Academies, Washington DC, 2010.
- Autey, J, T. Sayed and M. EL Esawey. Operational Performance Comparison of Four Unconventional Intersection Designs using Micros-Simulation. *Journal of Advanced Transportation*, Vol. 47, 2013, pp. 536-552.
- Banks, J., J.S. Carson II, B.L. Nelson and D.M. Nicol. *Discrete-Event System Simulation*. Prentice Hall, 2009.
- Bared, J. G and E.I. Kaisar. Median U-Turn Design as an Alternative Treatment for Left Turns at Signalized Intersections. *Institute of Transportation Engineers Journal*, Vol. 72-2, 2002, pp. 50-54.

- Ben-Edigbe, J., R. Rahman and N.F. Jailani. Effect of U-Turning Maneuvers at Midblock Facilities on Traffic Kinematics Waves. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, Vol. 13, No.4, 2013, pp. 602-608.
- Berkowitz, C.M., F. Mier, C.E. Walter, and C. Bragd. Continuous Flow Intersections: An Intelligent Transportation Solution. CD-ROM. Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1997.
- Bishop, G.A, D.H. Stedman, J.E. Peterson, T.J. Hosick and P.L. Guenther. A Cost Effectiveness Study of Carbon Monoxide Emissions Reduction utilizing Remote Sensing. *Journal of Air Waste Management Association*, Vol.43, 1993, pp. 978-988.
- Board of Public Roads Classifications and Standards. *Nebraska Minimum Design Standards: Counties, Municipalities, State*. Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR), 2008.
- Boddapati, P. *Comparative Study of Type 2 Median Crossover and Median U-Turns*. University of Missouri-Columbia, 2008.
- Boone, J.L., and J.E. Hummer. Calibrating and Validating Traffic Simulation Models for Unconventional Arterial Intersection Designs. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 1500, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 1995, pp. 184-192.

- Brownstone, D., A. Ghos., T.F. Golob, C. Kazimi, D.V. Amelsfort. *Drivers' Willingness to pay to reduce Travel Time: Evidence from San Diego I-15 Congestion Pricing Project*, 2002.
- Carrol. H. D. and D. Lahusen. Operational Effects of Continuous Flow Intersection Geometrics: A Deterministic Model. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 2348, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2013, pp. 1-11.
- Carter, D., J.E. Hummer, R.S. Foyle and S. Philips. Operational and Safety Effects of U-turns at Signalized Intersections. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation*, No. 1912, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington D.C., 2005, pp.11-18
- Chang, G.L., Y. Lu, P.W. Lin and N. Zhou. Performance Evaluation of CHART. State Highway Administration of Maryland, 2003.
- Chang, G.L., Y. Lu, and Y. Xiangfeng. *An Integrated Computer System for Analysis, Selection, and Evaluation of Unconventional Intersections*. Report No. SP909B4H, 2011.
- Chen, X., Y. Qi and Y. Lu. Safety Impacts of Using Short Left-turn Lanes at Unsignalized Median Openings. Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting 2014, Transportation Research Board of National Academies, Washington DC, 2014.

- Cheong, S., S. Rahwanji, and G.L. Chang. Comparison of Three Unconventional Arterial Intersection Designs: Continuous Flow Intersection, Parallel Flow Intersection, and Upstream Signalized Crossover. *IEEE*, 2008.
- Chowdhury, M.S. An Evaluation of New Jersey jughandle Intersection (NJI) with and without Pre-Signals. *Transportation and Development Institute Congress*, American Society of Civil Engineers, 2011, pp. 1245-1254.
- Cobian, R., T. Henderson, M. Sudeshna, C. Nuworsoo and E. Sullivan. Vehicle Emission and Level of Service Standards: Exploratory Analysis of the effects of Traffic Flow on Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions. In the TRB 88th Annual Meeting Compendium of Papers DVD, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2009.
- Combinido, J.S.L and M.T. Lim. Modelling U-turn Traffic Flow. *Physica A*, 389, 2010, pp. 3640-3647.
- Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS). *Innovative Intersections: Overview and Implementation Guidelines*. High Volume Intersection Study (HVIS), Vol. 1, 2008.
- Crashes vs. Congestion-What's the Cost to Society?* AAA, 2008.
- Dorothy, P.W., T.L. Maleck and S.E. Nolf. Operational Aspects of Michigan Design for Divided Highways. In Transportation Research Record: *Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 1579, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 1997, pp. 18-26.

- El Esawey, M., and T., Sayed. Comparison of Two Unconventional Intersection Schemes. Crossover Displaced Left-Turn and Upstream Signalized Crossover Intersections. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 2023, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2007, pp. 10-19.
- El Esawey, M., and T., Sayed. Operational Performance of the Unconventional Media U-Turn Design Using Micro-Simulation. Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting 2014, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington D.C, 2011(A).
- El Esawey, M., and T., Sayed. Operational Performance of the Unconventional Media U-Turn Design Intersection Design. *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering*, Vol. 38, 2011(B), pp.1249-1261.
- Energy Price Indices and Discount Factors for Life-Cycle Cost Analysis*. NISTIR 85-3273-27, National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce Technology Administration, Washington, D.C., 2012.
- Fan, H. Q, B. Jia, X.G. Li, J.F Tian and X.D Yan. Characteristics of Traffic Flow at Nonsignalized T-Shaped Intersection with U-Turn Movements. *The Scientific World Journal*, Vol. 2013, 2013, pp. 1-7.
- Furtado, G., G. Tencha and H. Devos. Unconventional Arterial Design: jughandle Intersection Concept for McKnight Boulevard in Calgary. Annual Conference and

Exhibition, The Transportation Association of Canada, City of St. John's Canada, 2003.

Goldbatt, R., F. Mier, and J. Friedman. Continuous Flow Intersections. *Institute of Transportation Engineers Journal*, Vol. 64, 1994, pp. 35-42.

Grant, M., B. Bowen, M. Day, R. Winick, J. Bauer, A. Chavis and S. Trainor. *Congestion Management Process: A Guidebook*. Report No. FHWA-HEP-11-011, US DOT, FHWA, 2011.

Guo, T., P. Liu, Y. Liu and W. Deng. Operational Impacts of Indirect Driveway Left-Turn Treatment at Signalized Intersections. International Conference for Chinese Transportation Professional (ICCTP), ASCE, 2011.

*HCM 2000, Highway Capacity Manual*. Transportation Research Board, Washington DC.

*HCM 2010, Highway Capacity Manual*. Transportation Research Board, Washington DC.

Henderson, S.M. and N. Stamatiadis. Use of Median U-turns to improve Traffic Flow along Urban Arterials. *Journal of the Transportation Research Forum*, Vol.40, No. 2, 2001, pp.137-145.

Hilderbrand, T.E. *Unconventional Intersection Designs for Improving Through Traffic Along with the Arterial Road*. Florida State University FAMU-FSU College of Engineering, 2007.

Hillier, F.S., G.J. Lieberman, B. Nag and P. Basu. *Introduction to Operation Research.*

McGraw Hill Education (India) Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2010.

Hughes, W., R. Jagannathan, D. Sengupta and J. Hummer. *Alternative*

*Intersections/Interchanges: Informational Report (AIIR).* Report No. FHWA-

HRT-090-060, U.S. Department of Transportation, 2010.

Hummer, J.E. and J.D. Reid. Unconventional Left turn Alternatives for Urban and

Suburban Arterials: An Update. Transportation Research Board Circular E-C019:

Urban Street Symposium, 1999.

Hummer, J. E. Unconventional Left –Turn Alternatives for Urban and Suburban

Arterials-Part One. *Institute of Transportation Engineers Journal*, Vol. 11, 1998

(A), pp. 26-29.

Hummer, J. E. Unconventional Left –Turn Alternatives for Urban and Suburban

Arterials-Part Two. *Institute of Transportation Engineers Journal*, Vol. 11, 1998

(B), pp. 101-106.

Hummer, J.E., and J.L. Boone. Travel Efficiency of Unconventional Suburban Arterial

Intersection Designs. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of*

*Transportation Research Board*, No. 1500, Transportation Research Board of the

National Academies, Washington, D.C., 1995, pp. 153-161.

Information and Geometric Design Guidance Regarding Boulevards, Directional

Crossovers, and Indirect (‘Michigan’) Left-Turns. <

<http://www.bqaz.org/pdf/parkway/Info%20and%20Geometric%20Design%20Guidance.pdf>> . Accessed on April, 2014.

Inman, W. V. Evaluation of Signs and Markings for Partial Continuous Flow Intersections. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 2138, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2009, pp. 66-74.

*Instruction for form EIA-1605: Voluntary Reporting of Greenhouse Gases*. Energy 473 Information Administrations (EIA), U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C., 2007.

Intersection Improvement Study-Phase 2 Report. Town of Cary, North Carolina.

<[http://www.townofcary.org/Departments/fdts/streetsandsidewalks/streetprojects/intersectionstudy/trafficstudy.htm#\\_Toc222721891](http://www.townofcary.org/Departments/fdts/streetsandsidewalks/streetprojects/intersectionstudy/trafficstudy.htm#_Toc222721891)> Accessed on June, 2014.

Jagannathan, R. Synthesis of the Median U-Turn Intersection Treatment, Safety, and Operational Benefits. 3rd Urban Street Symposium, Washington, 2007.

Jagannathan, R., and J.G. Bared. Design and Operational Performance of Crossover Displaced. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 1881, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2004, pp. 1-10.

Jagannathan, R., and J.G. Bared. Design and Performance Analysis of Pedestrian Crossing Facilities for Continuous Flow Intersections. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 1939,



- Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2005, pp. 133-144.
- Jagannathan, R., M. Gimbel, J.G. Bared, W.E. Hughes, B. Persuad and C. Lyon. Safety Comparison of New Jersey jughandle Intersections and Conventional Intersections. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 1953, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2006, pp. 187-200.
- Jenjiwattanakul, T., K. Sano and H. Nishiuchi. Capacity of U-Turn Junction at Midblock Opening on Urban Arterial Based on Balancing Volume-to-Capacity Ratio. Proceedings of the Eastern Asia Society of Transportation Studies, Vol. 9, 2013.
- Kach, B. *The Comparative Accident Experience of Directional and Bi-directional Signalized Intersections*. Michigan Department of Transportation, 2004.
- Kai, C., Z. Ning and Q. Chen-dong. Median Design Analysis in the Manner of U-turn Followed by Right-turn. *International Conference on Transportation Engineering*, 2007 pp.352-357.
- Kaisar, I. E., P. Edara, J.D. Rodriguez-Seda and S. Chery. A Comparison of Non-Traditional Intersection Designs using Microscopic Simulation. Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting 2011, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington D.C, 2011.
- Kawamura, Kazuya. *Commercial Vehicle Value of Time and Perceived Benefit of Congestion Pricing*. University of California, Berkley, 1999.

Kentucky Transportation Centre, Intersection Design Analysis Tool (IDAT).

<http://catslab.ukytc.com/idad> Accessed on April 23, 2014.

Kirk, A., C. Jones, N. Stamatidis. Improving Intersection Design Practices. In Transportation Research Record: *Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 2223, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2011, pp. 1-8.

Kivlins, R., and J.R. Naudzuns. Analysis of Unconventional Signalized At-Grade Intersections. *Scientific Journal of Riga Technical University*, Vol. 12, 2011, pp. 17-26.

Kyte, M., C. Clemow, N. Mahfood, B.K. Lall and C. J. Khisty. Capacity and Delay Characteristics of Two-Way Stop-Controlled Intersections. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 1330, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 1991, pp. 160-167.

*Land Values 2012 Summary*. United States Department of Agriculture, National Agriculture Statistics Service, 2012.

Liu, P. and J.J. Lu. Selection of the Optimal Location of a U-turn Bay for Vehicles making Right- turns Followed by U-turns. Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting 2007, Washington DC, 2007

- Liu, P., J. John, F. Hu and G. Sokolow. Capacity of U-turn Movement at Median Openings on Multilane Highways. *Journal of Transportation*, Vol. 134, No. 4, 2008, pp.147-154.
- Liu, P., J.J. Lu, F. Pirinccioglu and G. Sokolow. Operational Effects of U-turns as Alternatives to Direct Left–turns from Driveways or Side Streets –Some Research Findings in Florida. Transportation Research Board 85<sup>th</sup> Annual meeting, 2006.
- Liu, P., X. Qu, H. Yu, W. Wang and B. Cao. Development of a VISSIM Simulation Model for U-turns at Unsignalized Intersection. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, ASCE, Vol. 138, 2012, pp. 1333-1339.
- Liu, Pan. *Evaluation of the Operational Effects of U –turn Movement*. University of South Florida, 2006.
- Liu, Q., L. Zhang and W. Yang. A New Continuous Flow Intersection for Urban Road: Architecture, Design and Simulation. *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, Vol. 209-211, 2012, pp. 677-682
- Lu, J., S. Dissanayake, H. Zhou, X.K. Yang and K. Williams. *Operational Evaluation of Right Turns Followed by U-turns as an Alternative to Direct Left Turns*. University of South Florida, 2001.
- Lu, J.J., F. Pirinccioglu and J.C. Pernia. *Safety Evaluation of Right Turns Followed by U-turns at Signalized Intersection (6 or More Lanes) as An Alternative to Direct Left Turns Conflict Analysis*. University of South Florida, 2005.

- Mallah, M. Guidelines for Median Treatment at Urban Roadways to Solve Left Turn Movement. 1<sup>st</sup> International Conference in Access Management, 2011.
- Martin, A., R. Islam, M. Best and K. Sharma. Doing More with Less- Providing Innovative Mobility Solutions to TXDOT. ITE Technical Conference and Exhibit, 2012, CA, USA.
- Mauga, T. and Kaseko, M. Modelling and Evaluating Safety Impacts of Access Management Features in the Las Vegas, Nevada, Valley. In *Transportation Research Record, Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 2171, Transportation Research Board of National Academies, Washington DC, 2010, pp. 57-65.
- Muller, N. Z., Mendelsohn, R. Efficient pollution regulation: getting the prices right. *American Economics Review*, Vol. 99, No.5, 2009, pp.1714-1739.
- Nebraska Department of Road. Item History and Info. English AUP Summary July 2012- June 2013. <http://www.transportation.nebraska.gov/letting/bid-item-history-info.htm>. Accessed on March, 2014.
- Obaidat, T.I.A and M.S, Elayan. Gap Acceptance Behavior at U-turn Median Openings- Case Study in Jordan. *Jordan Journal of Civil Engineering*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 2013, pp. 332-341.
- Park, S., and H. Rakha. Continuous Flow Intersections: A Safety and Environment Perspective. IEEE, Annual Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems, 2010, pp. 85-90.

- Pirdavani, A., T. Brijs, T. Bellemans, and G. Wets. Travel Time Evaluation of a U-Turn Facility and ITS Comparison with a Conventional Signalized Intersection, 2010.
- Pirinccioglu, F., J.J. Lu, P. Liu and G. Sokolow. Right Turn from Driveways followed by U-turn on Four –Lane Arterials: Is it Safer than Direct Left Turn? In *Transportation Research Record, Journal of Transportation*, No. 1953. Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington DC, 2006, pp.172-179.
- Pitaksringkarn, J.P. Measure of Effectiveness for Continuous Flow Intersection: A Maryland Intersection Case Study, 2005.
- Potts, I.B, D.W. Harwood, D.J. Torbic, K.R. Richard, J.S. Gluck, H.S. Levinson, P.M. Garvey and R.S. Ghebrial. *Safety of U-Turns at Unsignalized Median Openings*. NCHRP Report 524. Transportation Research Board, 2004.
- Qi Y., X. Chen, G. Liu and Y. Wang. Operational and Safety Impacts of Directional Median Opening on Urban Roadways: a Case Study in Houston, TX. Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting 2014, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington D.C, 2014.
- R., Rahman, J. Ben-Edigbe and A. Hassan. Extent of Traffic Shockwave Velocity Propagations Induced by U-turn Facility on Roadway Segments. 25<sup>th</sup> ARRB Conference-Shaping the Future: Linking Policy, Research and Outcomes, Perth, Australia, 2012.

- Reid, J.D., and J.E. Hummer. Analyzing System Travel Time in Arterial Corridors with Unconventional Designs Using Microscopic Simulation. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 1678, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 1999, pp. 208-215.
- Reid, J.D., and J.E. Hummer. Travel Time Comparisons between Seven Unconventional Arterial Intersection Designs. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 1751, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2001, pp.56-66.
- Rodegerdts, L.A., J. Ringert, P. Koonce, J. Bansen, T. Nguyen, J. McGill, D. Stewart, J. Suggett, T. Neuman, N. Antonucci, K. Hardy, and K. Courage. *Signalized Intersection: Information Guide*. Publication FHWA-HRT-04-091, U.S. Department of Transportation, 2004.
- Roess, P.R., E.S. Prassas, and W.R. McShane. *Traffic Engineering*. Fourth Edition. Pearson, New Jersey, 2011.
- Sangster, J., and H. Rakha (2014). Implications of CAP-X: Operational Limitations of Alternative Intersections. Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting 2014, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington D.C, 2010.
- Savage, W.F. Directional Median Crossovers. *Traffic Engineering*, Institute of Traffic Engineers, Vol. 44, No. 11, 1974, pp.21-23.

- Schrank, D., B. Eisele and T. Lomax. *2012 Urban Mobility Report*. Texas A & M Transportation Institute, Texas A & M University System, 2012.
- Shahia, J. and A.A. Choupanib. Modeling the Operational Effects of Unconventional U-Turns at a Highway Intersection. *Transportmetrica*, Vol. 5-3, 2009, pp. 173-191
- Shihan, J.H. and H.K. Mohammed. Traffic System Studies at Median U-Turn in Baghdad City Employing U-SIM Model. *Journal of Engineering and Development*, Vol.13, No. 1, 2009, pp. 226-237
- Smith, D.P. Development of New jughandle Design for Facilitating High Volume Left Turns and U-Turns. Grove City College, 2011.
- Stamatadias, N., A. Kirk and N. Agarwal. Intersection Design Tool to Aid Alternative Evaluation. In *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Elsevier, Vol. 53, 2012, pp. 601-610.
- Stamatiadis, N., A. Kirk, N. Agrawal and C. Jones. *Improving Intersection Design Practices*. Report Number KTC-10-09/SPR-380-09-1F, Kentucky Transportation Centre, Frankfort, Kentucky, 2011.
- Strickland, K. Introducing the Median U-turn Intersection in Georgia. ITE Annual Meeting, 2012.
- Summary Report: Evaluation of Sign and Marking Alternatives for Displaced Left –Turn Lane Intersections*. Publication FHWA-HRT-08-071. U.S. Department of Transportation, 2008.

- Tabernerero, V. and T. Sayed. Upstream Signalized Crossover Intersection: An Unconventional Intersection Scheme. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, ASCE, Vol. 132, No. 11, 2006, pp. 907-911.
- Tarko A., M. Inerowicz, B. Lang and N. Villwock. *Safety and Operational Impacts of Alternative (Two –Volume Report)*. Report No. FHWA/IN/JTRP-2008/23. Indiana Department of Transportation, 2008.
- Tarko A., M. S. Azam and M. Inerowicz. Operational Performance of Alternative Types of Intersections –A Systematic Comparison for Indiana Conditions. 4<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Highway Geometric Design Valencia, Spain, 2010.
- Techbrief: Displaced Left-Turn Intersections*. Publication FHWA-HRT-09-055. U.S. Department of Transportation, 2009.
- Techbrief: Synthesis of the Median U-Turn Intersection Treatment*. Publication FHWA-HRT-07-033. U.S. Department of Transportation, 2007.
- Techbrief: Traffic Performance of Three Typical Designs of New Jersey jughandle Intersections*. Publication FHWA-HRT-09-055. U.S. Department of Transportation, 2007.
- Thompson, C.D., and J.E. Hummer. *Guidance on the Safe Implementation of Unconventional Arterial Designs*. Southeastern Transportation Centre, University of Tennessee at Knoxville, 2001.
- Toolbox on Intersection Safety and Design*. ITE, 2004.




- Topp, A. and J.E. Hummer. Comparison of Median U-turn Design Alternatives using Microscopic Simulation. Third International Symposium on Highway Geometric Design, 2005.
- Turochy, R.E., L.A. Hoel and R.S. Doty. *Highway Project Cost Estimating Methods used in the Planning Stage of Project Development*. Virginia Transportation Research Council (VTRC), 2001.
- User and Non-User Benefit Analysis for Highways*. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, 2010.
- Williams, C.J. and S.A. Ardekani. *Impacts of Traffic Signal Installation at Marginally Warranted Intersections*. Report No. 1350-1F, Texas Department of Transportation, 1996.
- Xu, L. Daniel B. Fambro Student Paper Award: Right Turns Followed by U-turns vs. Direct Left Turns: A Comparison of Safety Issues. *Institute of Engineers Journal*, Vol. 71, No. 11, 2001, pp.36-43.
- Yahl, M.E. *Safety Effects of Continuous Flow Intersections*. North Carolina State University, 2013.
- Yang, K.X. Capacity Estimation of U-turn Movements at Median Openings using Simulation. ITE Annual Meeting, 2002.
- Yang, K. X., G.L. Chang, S. Rahwanji and Y. Lu. Development of Planning –Stage Models for Analyzing Continuous Flow Intersections. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, ASCE, Vol. 139, 2013, pp. 1124-1132.


- Yang, K.X and H.G. Zhou. CORSIM-Based Simulation Approach to Evaluation of Direct Left Turn versus Right Turn Plus U-Turn from Driveways. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, ASCE, Vol. 130, 2004, pp. 68-75.
- Zhao, J., W. Ma, K.L. Head and X.Yang. Optimal Intersection Operation with Median U-Turn: A Lane Based Approach. Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting 2014, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington D.C, 2014.
- Zhou H., J.J. Lu, X.K. Yang, S. Dissanayakee, and K.M. Williams. Operational Effects of U-Turns as Alternatives to Direct Left Turns from Driveways. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 1796, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2002, pp. 72-79.
- Zhou H., P. Hsu, J.J. Lu and J.E. Wright. Optimal Location of U-Turn Median Openings on Roadways. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board*, No. 1847, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2003, pp. 36-41.

## APPENDIX A DAC PLOTS AND GROWTH CURVES


### A.1. Volume Threshold Plots




**Figure A.1:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.5$ ,  $LTP=5\%$  and  $TP=2\%$




**Figure A.2:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.6$ ,  $LTP=5\%$  and  $TP=2\%$




**Figure A.3:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.7$ ,  $LTP=5\%$  and  $TP=2\%$



**Figure A.4:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.5$ ,  $LTP=10\%$  and  $TP=2\%$




**Figure A.5:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at BF=0.6, LTP=10% and TP=2%




**Figure A.6:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=10% and TP=2%







**Figure A.7:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at BF=0.5, LTP=15% and TP=2%




**Figure A.8:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at BF=0.6, LTP=15% and TP=2%




**Figure A.9:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.7$ ,  $LTP=15\%$  and  $TP=2\%$



**Figure A.10:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at BF=0.5, LTP=5% and TP=5%



**Figure A.11:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at BF=0.6, LTP=5% and TP=5%



**Figure A.12:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at BF=0.7, LTP=5% and TP=5%






Figure A.13: Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at BF=0.5, LTP=10% and TP=5%



**Figure A.14:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.6$ ,  $LTP=10\%$  and  $TP=5\%$





**Figure A.15:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.7$ ,  $LTP=10\%$  and  $TP=5\%$







Figure A.16: Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at BF=0.5, LTP=15% and TP=5%




**Figure A.17:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.6$ ,  $LTP=15\%$  and  $TP=5\%$




**Figure A.18:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.7$ ,  $LTP=15\%$  and  $TP=5\%$




**Figure A.19:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at BF=0.5, LTP=5% and TP=10%



**Figure A.20:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.6$ ,  $LTP=5\%$  and  $TP=10\%$




**Figure A.21:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.7$ ,  $LTP=5\%$  and  $TP=10\%$




**Figure A.22:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.5$ ,  $LTP=10\%$  and  $TP=10\%$







**Figure A.23:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.6$ ,  $LTP=10\%$  and  $TP=10\%$




**Figure A.24:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.7$ ,  $LTP=10\%$  and  $TP=10\%$



**Figure A.25:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.5$ ,  $LTP=15\%$  and  $TP=10\%$



**Figure A.26:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.6$ ,  $LTP=15\%$  and  $TP=10\%$



**Figure A.27:** Volume thresholds for unconventional intersection at  $BF=0.7$ ,  $LTP=15\%$  and  $TP=10\%$

## A.2 Contour Plots for MUT

### A.2.1 Contour Plots for Critical Left Turn Delay Difference with Standard Signalized Intersection




Figure A.28 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5%, TP=2%




Figure A.29 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5%, TP=2%





Figure A.30 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5%, TP=2%





**Figure A.31** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=2%





Figure A.32 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10%, TP=2%



**Figure A.33** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10%, TP=2%






Figure A.34 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15%, TP=2%



**Figure A.35** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15%, TP=2%

(Note: 9999 represents failure condition of Median Opening)



**Figure A.36** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=2%

(Note: 9999 represents failure condition of Median Opening)




Figure A.37 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %






Figure A.38 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %







**Figure A.39** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %




**Figure A.40** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.41** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %




**Figure A.42** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %




**Figure A.43** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %

Note: 9999 represents failure condition of Median Opening



**Figure A.44** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %

(Note: 9999 represents failure condition of Median Opening)



**Figure A.45** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %

(Note: 9999 represents failure condition of Median Opening)






Figure A.46 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %







**Figure A.47** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %




**Figure A.48** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.49** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=10 %




**Figure A.50** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10 %, TP=10 %




**Figure A.51** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10 %, TP=10 %

(Note: 9999 represents failure condition of Median Opening)



**Figure A.52** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %

(Note: 9999 represents failure condition of Median Opening)




**Figure A.53** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %

(Note: 9999 represents failure condition of Median Opening)





**A.2.2. Contour Plot for Total Intersection Delay Difference between MUT and Standard Signalized Intersection**



**Figure A.55** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5%, TP=2%




Figure A.56 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5%, TP=2%




Figure A.57 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5%, TP=2%




Figure A.58 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=2%




Figure A.59 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10%, TP=2%






Figure A.60 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10%, TP=2%



**Figure A.61** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15%, TP=2%



**Figure A.62** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15%, TP=2%

(Note: 999 represents failure condition of Median Opening)









Figure A.64 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.65** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %





Figure A.66 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.67** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %




Figure A.68 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %





Figure A.69 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %









**Figure A.71** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %

(Note: 999 represents failure condition of Median Opening)




**Figure A.72** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %

(Note: 999 represent failure condition of Median Opening)



**Figure A.73** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.74** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %






Figure A.75 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.76** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=10 %



**Figure A.77** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10 %, TP=10 %





Figure A.78 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10 %, TP=10 %







**Figure A.80** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %

(Note: 999 represents failure condition of Median Opening)



## A.2. Contour Plots for Total Intersection Delay Difference of CFI with Standard Signalized Intersection




Figure A.82 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5%, TP=2%





Figure A.83 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5%, TP=2%



**Figure A.84** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5%, TP=2%






Figure A.85 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=2%



**Figure A.86** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10%, TP=2%





**Figure A.87** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10%, TP=2%




Figure A.88 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15%, TP=2%




Figure A.89 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15%, TP=2%







Figure A.90 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=2%



**Figure A.91** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.92** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.93** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %






Figure A.94 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %







**Figure A.95** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.96** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.97** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.98** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %




Figure A.99 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %





Figure A.100 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.101** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %




Figure A.102 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %







Figure A.103 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=10 %



**Figure A.104** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10 %, TP=10 %




Figure A.105 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10 %, TP=10 %




Figure A.106 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %





Figure A.107 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.108** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %

### A.3. Contour Plots Jughandle

#### A.3.1 Contour Plots for Critical Left Turn Delay Difference with Standard Signalized Intersection




Figure A.109 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5%, TP=2%










Figure A.111 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5%, TP=2%



**Figure A.112** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=2%



**Figure A.113** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10%, TP=2%




Figure A.114 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10%, TP=2%




Figure A.115 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15%, TP=2%






Figure A.116 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15%, TP=2%






**Figure A.118** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %







**Figure A.119** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.120** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.121** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.122** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %





Figure A.123 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.124** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %






Figure A.126 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %







Figure A.127 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.128** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %






Figure A.129 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.130** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=10 %



**Figure A.131** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10 %, TP=10 %





Figure A.132 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.133** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %




Figure A.134 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %






Figure A.135 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %

### A.3.2. Contour Plot for Total Intersection Delay Difference between Jughandle and Standard Signalized Intersection





Figure A.136 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5%, TP=2%



**Figure A.137** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5%, TP=2%





Figure A.138 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5%, TP=2%



**Figure A.139** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=2%




Figure A.140 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10%, TP=2%




Figure A.141 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10%, TP=2%




Figure A.142 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15%, TP=2%







Figure A.143 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15%, TP=2%



**Figure A.144** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=2%





Figure A.145 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.146** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %





Figure A.147 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.148** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %




Figure A.149 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %




Figure A.150 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %








Figure A.151 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.152** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.153** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %





Figure A.154 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.155** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %




Figure A.156 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %






Figure A.157 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=10 %




**Figure A.158** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10 %, TP=10 %





**Figure A.159** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.160** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %





Figure A.161 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.162** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %

## A.4 Contour Plots Standard Signalized Intersection with Left Turn Permitted along Major Street

### A.4.1 Contour Plot for Critical Left Turn Delay Difference between Standard Signalized Intersection with Permitted LT and Standard Signalized intersection




Figure A.163 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5%, TP=2%




Figure A.164 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5%, TP=2%





Figure A.165 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5%, TP=2%



**Figure A.166** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=2%











Figure A.169 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15%, TP=2%



**Figure A.170** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15%, TP=2%




Figure A.180 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=2%





Figure A.181 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.182** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %






Figure A.183 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5 %, TP=5 %








**Figure A.185** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %



**Figure A.186** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10 %, TP=5 %





**Figure A.188** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %




Figure A.189 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15 %, TP=5 %





Figure A.190 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.191** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %






Figure A.192 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5 %, TP=10 %




Figure A.193 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=10 %







Figure A.194 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.195** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.196** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %



**Figure A.197** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %





Figure A.198 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %

**A.4.2 Contour Plot for Total Intersection Delay Difference between Standard Signalized Intersection with LT-Permitted and Standard Signalized Intersection**



**Figure A.199** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5%, TP=2%








Figure A.200 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5%, TP=2%



**Figure A.201** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5%, TP=2%



**Figure A.202** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=2%









Figure A.204 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10%, TP=2%



**Figure A.205** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15%, TP=2%



**Figure A.206** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15%, TP=2%



**Figure A.207** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=2%






Figure A.208 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5%, TP=5%




Figure A.209 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5%, TP=5%





Figure A.210 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5%, TP=5%



**Figure A.211** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=5%






Figure A.212 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=10%, TP=5%





**Figure A.214** Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15%, TP=5%



**Figure A.215** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15%, TP=5%






Figure A.216 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15%, TP=5%






Figure A.217 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=5%, TP=10%



**Figure A.218** Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=5%, TP=10%



**Figure A.219** Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=5%, TP=10%




Figure A.220 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=10%, TP=10%






Figure A.222 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=10%, TP=10%




Figure A.223 Contour plot at BF=0.5, LTP=15%, TP=10%






Figure A.224 Contour plot at BF=0.6, LTP=15%, TP=10%






Figure A.225 Contour plot at BF=0.7, LTP=15 %, TP=10 %


#### A.4. The Growth Curves




**Figure A.226** Growth curves for growth rate of 1 %




**Figure A.227** Growth curves for growth rate of 2 %



**Figure A.228** Growth curves for growth rate of 3 %



**Figure A.229** Growth curves for growth rate of 4 %



**Figure A.230** Growth curves for growth rate of 5 %

## APPENDIX B EXAMPLE USE OF DAC

Consider three volume conditions of major street approach traffic volume at minor street approach traffic volume=150 vph

- (1) Major street approach traffic volume =200 vph
- (2) Major street approach traffic volume =1000 vph
- (3) Major street approach traffic volume= 2000 vph
- (4) Major street approach traffic volume= 2200 vph

In figure C.1, A represents the first condition; B represents the second condition, C represents the third condition, and D represents the fourth condition. From figure C.1, it is clear that A lies on the optimal performance zone of standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along major street, B lies on the optimal performance zone of MUT, C lies on the optimal performance zone of jughandle, and D lies on the optimal performance zone of CFI.

- If A is observed in figure B.2, it can be found located very near to contour of magnitude - 2.9. This indicates that the critical left turn delay of standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along major street is approximately 2.9 s/veh lower than that of a standard signalized intersection. If A is observed in figure B.3, it can be found located very near to contour of magnitude -3. This indicates that the total intersection delay of standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along major street is approximately 3 s/veh lower than that of a standard signalized intersection. It can be inferred that a standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted along major street



has lower total intersection delay as well lower critical left turn delay. It should be noted that DAC can be sued for standard signalized intersection with left turn permission only if they meet the left turn permission requirement.

- If B is observed in figure B.4, one can see it is located between the contours of magnitude 17 and 18. This indicates that the critical left turn delay of MUT is approximately 17.7 s/veh higher than that of a standard signalized intersection. Again, if A is observed in figure B.5, it can be found located between the contours of magnitude -4 and -4.5. This indicates that the total average intersection delay of MUT is approximately 4.1 s/veh lower than that of a standard signalized intersection. It can be inferred that MUT has lower total intersection delay than a standard signalized intersection, but at the expense of a higher left turn delay for critical left turn movements.
- If C is observed in figure B.6, it can be found located very near the contour of magnitude -1. This indicates that the critical left turn delay of jughandle is approximately 1 s/veh lower than that of a standard signalized intersection. Again, if B is observed in figure B.7, it can be found located between the contours of magnitude -4. This indicates that the total average intersection delay of a jughandle is 4 s/veh lower than that of a standard signalized intersection. It can be inferred that a jughandle has lower total intersection delay as well lower critical left turn delay.

- If D is observed in figure B.8, one can see that it lies between the contours of magnitude - 3.5 and -4. This indicates that the total intersection delay of CFI is lower than that of a standard signalized intersection by approximately 3.8 s/veh.

This information from DAC can help the planner to decide the optimal unconventional intersection, as well as quantify the respective benefits or costs related to delay savings.







Figure B.1 DAC at BF=0.7, LTP =15%, TP =10%




**Figure B.2** Contour plot for standard signalized intersection with LT-Permitted for critical left turn delay difference at  $BF=0.7$ ,  
 $LTP = 15\%$ ,  $TP = 10\%$




**Figure B.3** Contour plot for standard signalized intersection with LT-Permitted for total average intersection delay difference at  $BF=0.7$ ,  $LTP = 15\%$ ,  $TP = 10\%$



**Figure B.4** Contour plot for MUT for critical left turn delay difference at BF=0.7, LTP =15%, TP =10%




**Figure B.5** Contour plot for MUT for total average intersection delay difference MUT at BF=0.7, LTP =15%, TP =10%




**Figure B.6** Contour plot for jughandle for critical left turn delay difference at BF=0.7, LTP =15%, TP =10%





**Figure B.7** Contour plot for jughandle for average total intersection delay difference at BF=0.7, LTP =15%, TP =10%



**Figure B.8** Contour plot for CFI for average total intersection delay difference at BF=0.7, LTP =15%, TP =10%

## APPENDIX C COST

### C.1. Marginal Cost of New Construction

**Table C.1** Marginal cost of new construction of MUT

	<b>Standard item no.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Amount in US Dollars</b>
<b>Construction Cost</b>	3075.56	10" Doweled Concrete Pavement, Class 47 B-3500 (Including Median Opening)	399.6	SY	30.59	12, 223.76
	1010	Excavation (1.5')	199.8	CY	3.26	651.35
	A070.22	4 Inch Conduit in Trench	160.00	LF	5.91	945.60
	A077.26	16/C 14 AWG Traffic Signal Cable	500.00	Lf	3.98	1, 990.00
	7320.27	Traffic Sign and Post (STOP Sign, No RTOR and No Left Turn)	10.00	Each	295.85	2, 958.50
	N/A	Additional Land	2.296	Acre	4, 142.50	9, 509.87
<b>Subtotal</b>						28, 279.08
<b>Soft Cost</b>		Preliminary Engineering ( PE)	10% of Subtotal			2, 827.91
		Contingency	20 % % of Subtotal			5, 655.82
<b>Total Cost in US Dollar</b>						36, 762.81
<b>Additional O &amp; M Cost</b>		Landscaping of median	2	Per year	1,000	2, 000.00

**Table C.2** Marginal cost of new construction of CFI Part I

	<b>Standard item no.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Amount in US Dollars</b>
<b>Construction Cost</b>	3075.56	10" Doweled Concrete Pavement, Class 47 B-3500	2,064.6	SY	30.59	63,156.11
	1010	Excavation (1.5')	1,032.3	CY	3.26	3,365.3
	3017.4	Concrete Class 47B-3000 Median Surfacing	0	SY	31.05	0
	A016.8	Mast Arm Signal Pole, Type MP-60	8	Each	8500	68,000
	A504.81	Install Mast Arm Signal Pole	8	Each	3700	29,600
	A003.10	Traffic Signal, Type TS-1	10	Each	493.89	4,938.9
	A501.00	Install Traffic Signal, Type TS-1	10	Each	242	2,420
	A001.7	Pull Box, Type PB-7	12	Each	1010	12,120
	A070.22	4 Inch Conduit in Trench	300	LF	5.91	1,773
	A072.10	4 Inch Conduit in Roadway	432	LF	7.83	3,382
	A077.26	16/C 14 AWG Traffic Signal Cable	1,800	Lf	3.98	7,164
	A007.08	Vehicle Detector, Type TD-A Performed	40	Each	263.69	10,547.6
	A079.1	2/C #14 AWG Detector Lead-In Cable	500	LF	1.46	730
	7320.27	Traffic Sign and Post ( No RTOR and No Left Turn)	6	Each	295.85	1,775.1
	7500.25	Left Arrow Performed Pavement Markings	6	Each	483	2,898

**Table C.3** Marginal cost of new construction of CFI Part II

	Standard item no.	Item	Quantity	Unit	Rate	Amount in US Dollars
Construction Cost	7496.05	5" Yellow Permanent Pavement Markings	2, 800	LF	0.19	532
	N/A	Additional Land	0.58	Acre	4, 142.5	2, 386.98
<b>Subtotal</b>						214, 789.55
Soft Cost		Preliminary Engineering (PE)	10% of Subtotal			21, 478.95
		Contingency	20% of Subtotal			42, 957.91
<b>Total Cost in US Dollar</b>						279, 226.41
Additional O & M Cost		Additional Signal O and M (signal head, detectors, signal retiming, power supply, etc.)	4	Per year	6,000	24, 000

**Table C.4** Marginal cost of new construction of jughandle

	<b>Standard item no.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Amount in US Dollars</b>
<b>Construction Cost</b>	1010	Excavation (1.5')	652.68	CY	3.26	2, 127.74
	3075.56	10" Doweled Concrete Pavement, Class 47 B-3500	1, 305.36	SY	30.59	39, 930.96
	7320.27	Traffic Sign and Post (Yield Sign, No RTOR and No Left Turn)	8.00	Each	295.85	2, 366.80
	7495.55	5" White Permanent Pavement Markings	340.00	LF	0.40	136.00
	7496.05	5" Yellow Permanent Pavement Markings	1, 280	LF	0.19	243.20
	N/A	Additional Land	1.17	Acre	4, 142.50	4, 850.03
<b>Subtotal</b>						49, 654.73
<b>Soft Cost</b>		Preliminary Engineering (PE)	10% Subtotal			4, 965.47
		Contingency	20% of Subtotal			9, 930.95
<b>Total Cost in US Dollar</b>						64, 551.15
<b>Additional O &amp; M Cost</b>		Landscaping of area enclosed by reverse curves	2	Per year	1,000	2, 000.00

**Table C.5** Marginal cost of standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted

Construction Cost		Item	Quantity	Unit	Rate	Amount in US Dollars
	3075.56		10" Doweled Concrete Pavement, Class 47 B-3500	-363.00	SY	30.59
7320.27		Traffic Sign and Post (No Left Turn)	2.00	Each	295.85	591.70
<i>Subtotal</i>						-10, 512.47
Soft Cost		Preliminary Engineering (PE)	10% of Subtotal			59.17
		Contingency	20% of Subtotal			118.34
Total Cost in US Dollar						-10, 334.96

C.2. Marginal Cost of Retrofit**Table C.6** Marginal cost of MUT retrofit (Part I)

	Standard item no.	Item	Quantity	Unit	Rate	Amount in US Dollars
Construction Cost	1101	Concrete Pavement Removal	10, 778.1	SY	6.81	73, 398.86
	3075.56	10" Doweled Concrete Pavement, Class 47 B-3500 (Including Median Opening)	11, 910.3	SY	30.59	364, 336.08
	1010	Excavation (1.5')	5, 955.15	CY	3.26	19, 413.79
	1122.01	Remove Concrete Median Surfacing (6' Median)	2, 220	SY	5.9	13, 098
	A724.01	Relocate Traffic Signal	6	Each	470	2, 820
	A703.00	Relocate Mast Arm	4	Each	1470	5, 880
	A006.98	Vehicle Detector, Type TD-A Performed	24	Each	263.69	6, 328.56
	A001.7	Pull Box, Type PB-7	12	Each	1010	12, 120
	A070.22	4 Inch Conduit in Trench	160	LF	5.91	945.6
	A072.20	4 Inch Conduit in Roadway	432	LF	7.83	3, 382.56
	A077.26	16/C 14 AWG Traffic Signal Cable	500	Lf	3.98	1, 990
	A079.01	2/C #14 AWG Detector Lead-In Cable	250	LF	1.46	365

**Table C.7** Marginal cost of MUT retrofit (Part II)

	<b>Standard item no.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Amount in US Dollars</b>
	7320.27	Traffic Sign and Post (STOP Sign, No RTOR and No Left Turn)	10	Each	295.85	2,958.5
	7500.22	Right Arrow Performed Pavement Marking, Type 3	2	Each	420	840
	7500.25	Through and Left Arrow Performed Pavement Markings	6	Each	483	2,898
	7495.55	5" White Permanent Pavement Markings	4,000	LF	0.4	1,600
	7496.05	5" Yellow Permanent Pavement Markings	8,000	LF	0.19	1,520
	N/A	Additional Land	2.296	Acre	4142.5	9,509.87
<b>Subtotal</b>						523,404.82
<b>Soft Cost</b>		Preliminary Engineering (PE)	10% Subtotal			52,340.48
		Contingency	20% of Subtotal			104,680.96
<b>Total Cost in US Dollar</b>						680,426.26
<b>Additional O &amp; M Cost</b>		Landscaping of median	2	Per year	1,000	2000



**Table C.8** Marginal cost of CFI retrofit (Part I)

	<b>Standard item no.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Amount in US Dollars</b>
<b>Construction Cost</b>	1122.01	Remove Concrete Median Surfacing (6' Median)	2, 109	SY	5.9	12, 443.1
	3075.56	10" Doweled Concrete Pavement, Class 47 B-3500	3, 196.8	SY	30.59	97, 790.1
	1010	Excavation (1.5')	1, 598.4	CY	3.26	5, 210.78
	3017.4	Concrete Class 47B-3000 Median Surfacing	2, 386.5	SY	31.05	74, 100.8
	A016.8	Mast Arm Signal Pole, Type MP-60	8	Each	8500	68, 000
	A504.81	Install Mast Arm Signal Pole	8	Each	3700	29, 600
	A003.10	Traffic Signal, Type TS-1	10	Each	493.89	4, 938.9
	A501.00	Install Traffic Signal, Type TS-1	10	Each	242	2, 420
	A001.7	Pull Box, Type PB-7	12	Each	1010	12, 120
	A070.22	4 Inch Conduit in Trench	300	LF	5.91	1, 773
	A072.20	4 Inch Conduit in Roadway	432	LF	7.83	3, 382.56
	A077.26	16/C 14 AWG Traffic Signal Cable	1, 800	Lf	3.98	7, 164
	A006.98	Vehicle Detector, Type TD-A Performed	40	Each	263.69	10, 547.6
	A079.01	2/C #14 AWG Detector Lead-In Cable	500	LF	1.46	730
	7320.27	Traffic Sign and Post ( No RTOR and NO Left Turn)	4	Each	295.85	1, 183.4
	7500.25	Through and Left Arrow Performed Pavement Markings	4	Each	483	1, 932

**Table C.9** Marginal cost of CFI retrofit (Part II)

	<b>Standard item no.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Amount in US Dollars</b>
<b>Construction Cost</b>	7495.55	5" White Permanent Pavement Markings	3,800	LF	0.4	1,520
	7496.05	5" Yellow Permanent Pavement Markings	5,600	LF	0.19	1,064
	N/A	Additional Land	0.58	Acre	4,142.5	2,386.98
<b>Subtotal</b>						338,307
<b>Soft Cost</b>		Preliminary Engineering (PE)	10% Subtotal			33,830.7
		Contingency	20% of Subtotal			67,661.5
<b>Total Cost in US Dollar</b>						439,799
<b>Additional O &amp; M Cost</b>		Additional Signal O and M (signal head, detectors, signal retiming, power supply, etc.)	4	Per year	6,000	24,000

**Table C.10** Marginal cost of jughandle retrofit

	<b>Standard item no.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Amount in US Dollars</b>
<b>Construction Cost</b>	1010	Excavation (1.5')	652.68	CY	3.26	2, 127.74
	3075.56	10" Doweled Concrete Pavement, Class 47 B-3500	1, 305.36	SY	30.59	39, 930.96
	7320.27	Traffic Sign and Post (Yield Sign, No RTOR and No Left Turn)	8.00	Each	295.85	2, 366.80
	7495.55	5" White Permanent Pavement Markings	340.00	LF	0.40	136.00
	7496.05	5" Yellow Permanent Pavement Markings	1, 620	LF	0.19	307.80
	N/A	Additional Land	1.17	Acre	4, 142.50	4, 850.03
	<b>Subtotal</b>					
<b>Soft Cost</b>		Preliminary Engineering (PE)	10% Subtotal			4, 971.93
		Contingency	20% of Subtotal			9, 943.87
<b>Total Cost in US Dollar</b>						64, 635.13
<b>Additional O &amp; M Cost</b>		Landscaping of area enclosed by reverse curves	2	Per year	1,000	2, 000.00

**Table C.11** Marginal cost of standard signalized intersection with left turn permitted  
along major street.

		Item		Quantity	Unit	Rate	Amount in US Dollars
Construction Cost	7495.12	12 " Yellow Permanent Pavement Marking Paint for Cross Hatching to avoid Traffic on Previous Left Turn Lanes (@ 8 ' Centre to Centre)	On Previous Left Turn Lanes	960.00	LF	0.50	480.00
	7320.27	Traffic Sign and Post (No Left Turn)		2.00	Each	295.85	591.70
<b>Subtotal</b>							1, 071.70
Soft Cost		Preliminary Engineering (PE)	10%	of Subtotal			107.17
		Contingency	20%	of Subtotal			214.34
<b>Total Cost in US Dollar</b>							1, 393.21