Addressing Bicycle-Vehicle Conflicts with Alternate Signal Control Strategies

Edward J. Smaglik, Ph.D., P.E. (NAU) Sirisha Kothuri, Ph.D. (PSU – PI)

Work funded by NITC, the National Institute for Transportation and Communities Portland State University









# **Right Hook Conflict**











# **Project Objectives**



- Assess the safety and efficiency impacts of various signal timing treatments that currently exist for right-hook bicycle-vehicle conflicts on all users
  - Traditional phasing
  - LBI
  - Exclusive Phasing
  - Split LBI (Emerging treatment)
- Field implementation of Split LBI treatment and evaluation of impacts







# Motivation



- Intersection design treatments exist
  - Colored pavement markings
  - Enhanced curb radii
  - Signage
  - Protected intersections
- Limited research on signal control treatments







# Methodology



- Comprehensive Review of Conflict Treatments and Practitioner Survey
- SITL Simulation of Alternate Control Treatments
- Deployment and Field Data Collection

Split LBI Implementation in NYC









# **Project Milestones**

- Literature Review and Practitioner Survey
- SITL Simulation of Alternate Control Treatments
- Identification of Field Deployment Sites
  - Phoenix
  - Portland
  - NYCDOT
- Field Deployment of Split LBI/LBI ✓
- Analysis of Field Deployment Data -
- Final Report
- Guidance Document









# Leading Bike Interval (LBI)





Source: Mass DOT









# **Split Leading Bike Interval**



Source: Mass DOT









### **Exclusive Bike Phase**



dashes

denote

conflicts



Source:



green interval yellow change interval red clearance interval red interval



# **Mixing Zone**

Source: Mass DOT

NORTHERN ARIZONA

UNIVERSITY



## **Field Evaluation**



- Initial Intent: Observe sites before/after LBI or Split LBI addition to develop quantitative guidance
- What actually happened: We analyzed video of a variety of sites and provided mostly qualitative guidance
- Metrics:
  - "Incident" Calculated Time Difference (Threshold  $\leq 5s$ )
  - PET Value
  - Time Since Bicycle Green
  - Speed
  - Evasive Action Taken
    - Braking
    - Swerving
    - Changing Lanes
    - etc...











- Post Encroachment Time is "the time from the end of encroachment to the time that the through vehicle actually arrives at the potential point of collision"
- A minimum value of PET of 2 seconds would achieve safety benefits, and a PET of less than 2 seconds would result in an interaction and a risk of a collision at signalized intersections (Tang and Kuwahara, 2011; Hurwitz et al. 2015).







## How is it calculated?

AR

UNIVERSITY









# **Severity Metrics**

PET Value	Severity
≤ 1.5 s	Very Dangerous Interaction
1.5 s < x ≤ 3s	Dangerous Interaction
3s < x ≤ 5s	Mild Interaction
x > 5s	No Interaction







### **Example Video Reduction**









### **Time stamp**

		A 4 A	0.01		
321	I GP(	87418	107.4	1 W	1127
		0.10	0.51		

File View Play Navigate Favorites Help



801.635 2

2.892

Υ

1.696

#### NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

2

1 07

08

09

10

11

12

13



3.671

0.05

6.17

9.032



### **Calculated Time Difference**

#### GP040020.MP4

File View Play Navigate Favorites Help



	A	В	C	D	E	F	G	Н		J	~
	Candidate Event	Time Stamp	Time	Incident?	PET Value	Elapsed Time For	0 110 1	a 11 11	Time Since	Collision if	
1	[1=B, 2=MV]	[mmss.000]	Difference	[Calculated	[s]	Speed Measurement [s]	Speed [fps]	Speed [mph]	Bicycle Lane	No	
07	1	206.364	4.866		4.009	1.188	11.01	7.51		Ν	
08	1	208.147	3.083	Y	1.869	1.415	9.24	6.30		Ν	
09	2	211.23				17.974	1.85	1.26	19.245		
10	2	706 862				3.013	11.03	7.52			Con a
11	1	710.814	3.952	Y	0.147	3.433	3.81	2.60	46.982	Y	
12	1	758.743				1.014	12.90	8.80		N	
13	2	801.635	2.892	Y	1.696	5.071	9.05	6.17	9.032		
	1966 - 1976 - 1976 - 1976 - 1976 - 1976 - 1976 - 1976 - 1976 - 1976 - 1976 - 1976 - 1976 - 1976 - 1976 - 1976 -	7	1.								

#### Paused [H/W] NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSIT



07:10.814 / 1 :26.045



### **PET Value**

🛗 GP040020.MP4

File View Play Navigate Favorites Help



	Candidate Event	Time Stamp	Time	Incident?	PET Value	Elapsed Time For	C 1 [C]	C 1 [	Time Since	Collision if	
1	[1=B, 2=MV]	[mmss.000]	Difference	[Calculated	[s]	Speed Measurement [s]	Speed [Ips]	Speed [mpn]	Bicycle Lane	No	
07	1	206.364	4.866		4.009	1.188	11.01	7.51		Ν	
08	1	208.147	3.083	Y	1.869	1.415	9.24	6.30		N	1
09	2	211.23				17.974	1.85	1.26	19.245		
10	2	706.862				3.013	11.03	7.52			N.
11	1	710.814	3.952	Y	0.147	3.433	3.81	2.60	46.982	Y	
12	1	758.743				1.014 07:	<u>13.766 - 07:1</u>	3.619 <mark>8.00</mark>		N	
13	2	801.635	2.892	Y	1.696	3.671	9.05	6.17	9.032		
			17							NO.	











👼 GP040020.MP4

File View Play Navigate Favorites Help

						3.08 ft 3.24 ft				
Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	1	J	
lidate Event	Time Stamp	Time	Incident?	PET Value	Elapsed Time For	Canad [fead]	Canad Lamb	Time Since	Collision if	
B, 2=MV]	[mmss.000]	Difference	[Calculated	[s]	Speed Measurement [s]	speed [Ips]	speed [mph]	Bicycle Lane	No	
1	206.364	4.866		4.009	1.188	11.01	7.51		Ν	
1	208.147	3.083	Y	1.869	<sub>1.415</sub> <mark>13.08 f</mark>	<mark>t / 3.443 s</mark>	6.30		N	
2	211.23				17.974	1.85	1.26	19.245		ES/
2	706.862				3.013	11.03	7.52			AN AN

758.743 801.635 2.892 Y 1.696

Υ

0.147

3.952

#### NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

1

1

2

•

710.814

С

12

13



3.433

1.014

3.671

3.81

12.90

9.05

2.60

8.80

6.17

46.982

9.032



8

Υ

Ν



### **Time since Bicycle Green**

👼 GP040020.MP4

File View Play Navigate Favorites Help



	А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	-
	Candidate Event	Time Stamp	Time	Incident?	PET Value	Elapsed Time For	0 100 1	0 11 11	Time Since	Collision if	
1	[1=B, 2=MV]	[mmss.000]	Difference	[Calculated	[s]	Speed Measurement [s]	Speed [fps]	Speed [mph]	Bicycle Lane	No	
07	1	206.364	4.866		4.009	1.188	11.01	7.51		N	×
08	1	208.147	3.083	Y	1.869	1.415	9.24	6.30		N	
09	2	211.23				17.974	1.85	1.26	19.245 <mark>07:</mark>	<u> 13.619 –</u>	06:23.882
10	2	706.862				3.013	11.03	7.52			A CONTRACTOR
11	1	710.814	3.952	Y	0.147	3.433	3.81	2.60	46.982	Y	
12	1	758.743				1.014	12.90	8.80		N	
13	2	801.635	2.892	Y	1.696	3.671	9.05	6.17	9.032		
		- 133 33 FF FF1								NO.	

NOR-Paused (H/W) ARIZONA









### **Data Overview**

Interception		Before		After			
Intersection	Treatment	Date	Hours	Treatment	Date	Hours	
1 <sup>st</sup> Ave and 61 <sup>st</sup> St	-	-	-	Split LBI	3/16/2017	10:30 am – 7:30 pm	
2 <sup>nd</sup> Ave and 74 <sup>th</sup> St	-	-	-	Mixing Zone	5/18/2017	8 am – 7 pm	
6 <sup>th</sup> Ave and 23 <sup>rd</sup> St	Concurrent with LPI	6/7/2017	8 am – 7 pm	Split LBI	2/20/2017	7 am – 6 pm	
12 <sup>th</sup> and Campbell	Concurrent	9/12/2017 - 9/16/2017	8 am – 8 pm	LBI	9/19/2017 – 9/25/2017	8 am – 8 pm	
Grand and Multnomah	-	-	-	Mixing Zone	7/10/2017	7 am – 7pm	









# **Summary of Data Analysis**

Location	Treatment	Hours	Total # of Bicycles	Total # of Motor Vehicles	Total Incidents	% Total Incidents	Near Misses	# of Collisions without Evasive Action
1 <sup>st</sup> Av and 61 <sup>st</sup> St	Split LBI	8:57	1166	1619	445	38.16	11	197
2 <sup>nd</sup> Av and 74 <sup>th</sup> St	Mixing Zone	11:00	1425	1206	253	17.75	4	57
6 <sup>th</sup> Av and 23 <sup>rd</sup> St	LPI	10:00	1952	1034	433	22.18	8	147
6 <sup>th</sup> Av and 23 <sup>rd</sup> St	Split LBI	11:00	1300	773	221	17.00	0	46
Grand and Multnomah	Mixing Zone	11:00	352	1143	76	21.59	0	4









# Split LBI









# 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 23<sup>rd</sup> St **Geometry (Split LBI)**

ARIZON







# 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 23<sup>rd</sup> St (Split LBI)



**Ideal Conditions** 









# 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 23<sup>rd</sup> St (Split LBI)



Interactions









# 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 23<sup>rd</sup> St (Split LBI) Summary



Number of Bicycles	1300
Number of Motor Vehicles	773
Number of Incidents	221
Percentage of Incidents Based on Number of Bicycles	17.00%
Near Misses	0
Number of Collisions if No Evasive Action Taken	46







# 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 23<sup>rd</sup> St Elapsed Time since Green









# Split LBI – Overall Findings



- With a Split LBI, the risk is shifted to the stale green
- Conflicts are significantly higher at 1<sup>st</sup> Ave and 61<sup>st</sup>
  St compared to 6<sup>th</sup> Ave and 23<sup>rd</sup> St.
  - Higher levels of turn volumes
  - Downhill grade
  - Crossing pedestrians impact (?)
- What can we do?
  - Increase the lead interval
  - Coordinate with adjacent signals, so that most bicycles go through the lead interval (bicycle green wave)
  - When turn volumes are high, separate the phases











#### NORTHERN ARIZONA



# 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street Geometry









# 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street (w/ LPI)



Start of Cycle









# 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street (w/ LPI)



Multiple Bicycles and Vehicles Interact









# 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street (w/ LPI) Summary



Number of Bicycles	1952
Number of Motor Vehicles	1034
Number of Incidents	443
Percentage of Incidents Based on Number of Bicycles	22.18%
Near Misses	8
Number of Collisions if No Evasive Action Taken	147







# 6<sup>th</sup> Ave and 23<sup>rd</sup> St (Before)Severity Summary









# 6<sup>th</sup> Ave and 23<sup>rd</sup> St (w/ LPI) Elapsed Time Since Green








# 6<sup>th</sup> Ave and 23<sup>rd</sup> St (Before) Notes - Concurrent with LPI



- Taxi drivers park on the bicycle lane often to pick up people causing bicycles to go around them
- Massive queue build up in every cycle
- Bicycles start moving during the pedestrian walk phase
- Right turning vehicles back up the queue due to not having an exclusive turning lane, and waiting on pedestrians to cross.







# 12<sup>th</sup> St & Campbell (LBI)















#### **Camera View**



CAMPBELL-12ST 09-06-2016 08:47:07







# 12<sup>th</sup> St & Campbell

- Controller settings
  - Intersection runs coordinated 24/7
  - Campbell St on 8s recall for all data to force interaction
  - Before data:
    - Bike indication comes on with concurrent green, but not leading
    - Collected week of 9.12.16
  - After data:
    - 5s Leading Bike Interval when bike detected
    - Collected week of 9.19.16







# 12<sup>th</sup> St & Campbell Results

#### • No LBI:

- 86 bikes over 5 days
- No incidents or conflicts

#### • LBI

- 74 bikes over 7 days
- No incidents or conflicts
- Citizen video
  - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YUzL1R0-kCg











# Which Strategy to Choose?









# Ranking of Strategies by Vehicular Efficiency



Concurrent Phase Mixing Zone Split LBI LBI Exclusive Bike Phase









# **Strategy desirability by Vehicle Turning Volumes**













# **Conclusions / Recommendations**



- Concurrent timing is best suited for low bicycle and low turning vehicle volumes
  - Right hook potential exists throughout green
- LBI / Split LBI are suitable when bike / turning vehicle volumes are medium-high
  - Split LBI is more efficient, but requires additional signage without RTOR prohibition
  - Right hook potential moved towards stale green
  - Bike coordination can further reduce this risk







# **Conclusions / Recommendations**



- Exclusive Bike Phase is recommended with high bicycle and high motor vehicle volume
  - Delay is greatest, but conflicts removed
- Mixing Zones
  - Application is unclear from this work
  - Previous work showed come confusion by users
  - May be best suited for medium-low volumes (bike and vehicle)







# **Future Work**



- Supplement surrogate safety data with crash data for further investigation into safety impacts of treatments
- Determine volume thresholds for application of various treatments (currently working on this)
- Examine gap acceptance of cyclists in various cities, and its relation to safety perception
- Quantify impact of pedestrian volumes on strategies







# Thank you! Questions?































# **Survey Respondents**

UNIVERSITY







# **Awareness of Split LBI**













# Simulation









## **Simulation notes**



- Software in the Loop with ASC/3 controller
- Geometry adjustment

AR





# **Simulation notes**



• Data was collected by Quality Counts 9.22.15

- Ped volumes not coded for directions
- Bike volumes extremely low

% Bikes	Number of Bikes	In at 119 <sup>th</sup> (EB)	In at 130 <sup>th</sup> (WB)
1%	36	18	18
2%	71	36	36
3%	17	53	53
4%	143	71	71
5%	178	89	89
6%	214	17	17
7%	250	125	125
7%	250	125	125
8%	285	143	143
9%	321	160	160
10%	357	178	178









# **Study Intersection Phasing**



B) SE 122nd







# LBI, Vehicle Delay (Phase 6)



Manam	Bicycle Volume as Percent of Mode Share, Delay (secs)										
	ient and Case	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%	7%	8%	9%	10%
	Base Case Delay	25.3	25.5	25.9	25.8	26.0	26.4	26.6	26.6	26.9	27.5
Through	LBI Delay	30.0	29.9	30.4	30.3	30.7	31.0	31.3	31.3	31.2	32.1
	% Difference	19%	17%	17%	18%	18%	17%	18%	18%	16%	17%
	Base Case Delay	22.2	22.6	22.9	23.3	23.4	24.2	24.8	25	25.4	26.5
Right Turn	LBI Delay	26.3	26.6	26.9	27.2	27.6	27.9	28.8	28.4	28.1	29.4
	% Difference	19%	18%	18%	17%	18%	16%	16%	13%	11%	11%







# LBI, Bicycle Delay (Phase 6)



Management and Care		Bicycle Volume as Percent of Mode Share, Delay (secs)									
	ient and Case	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%	7%	8%	9%	10%
	Base Case Delay	17.8	18.8	17.3	18.1	20.5	20.1	21.1	23.6	25.1	22.5
Through	LBI Delay	18.1	18.7	16.9	18.7	21.0	20.4	20.9	24.3	25.1	22.6
	% Difference	2%	-1%	-2%	4%	2%	1%	-1%	3%	0%	1%
	Base Case Delay	2.2	7.0	5.9	8.6	10.4	10.4	12.1	13.2	16.4	13.1
Right Turn	LBI Delay	2.2	7.1	6.0	8.2	10.8	9.9	11.7	14.2	16.4	14.3
	% Difference	0%	2%	1%	-5%	4%	-4%	-4%	8%	0%	5%







#### Split LBI, Vehicle Delay (Phase 2)



Manager			<b>Bicycle Volume as Percent of Mode Share, Delay (secs)</b>								
	ient and Case	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%	7%	8%	9%	10%
	Base Case Delay	17.2	17.2	17.3	17.4	17.3	17.5	17.5	17.7	17.7	17.8
Through	LBI Delay	17.4	17.4	17.5	17.7	17.5	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.9	17.9
	% Difference	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%
	Base Case Delay	5.15	5.18	5.26	5.39	5.43	5.71	5.97	5.99	6.18	6.23
Right Turn	LBI Delay	5.55	5.66	5.71	5.99	5.84	6.7	6.22	6.49	6.49	6.7
	% Difference	8%	915	9%	11%	8%	6%	4%	8%	5%	8%







#### Split LBI, Bicycle Delay (Phase 2)



Manager 1 Care			<b>Bicycle Volume as Percent of Mode Share, Delay (secs)</b>								
	ient and Case	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%	7%	8%	9%	10%
	Base Case Delay	22.2	21.5	20.4	21.4	21.2	22.8	24.2	24.9	22.9	24.8
Through	LBI Delay	23.3	23.3	21.1	22.6	22.4	24.4	26.0	26.1	25.4	26.6
	% Difference	5%	8%	3%	5%	6%	7%	7%	5%	11%	7%
	Base Case Delay	8.0	8.0	7.4	11.9	11.1	13.1	12.4	13.9	11.8	13.7
Right Turn	LBI Delay	2.2	4.8	7.8	10.7	13.2	14.0	14.9	14.7	15.5	16.2
	% Difference	-72%	-40%	6%	-10%	-19%	7%	20%	6%	32%	18%







#### **Exclusive Bike Phase** Vehicle Delay



Movement	<b>Base Case (sec)</b>	EBP (sec)	% Difference
EB TH	17.2	21.68	26%
EB RT	5.15	5.52	7%
EB LT	62.5	74.52	19%
WB TH	22.28	21.23	-16%
WB RT	22.16	19.26	-13%
WB LT	52.23	56.25	8%
SB TH	34.12	35.15	3%
SB RT	6.12	6.7	-1%
SB LT	54.81	65.81	20%
NB TH	37.1	37.64	1%
NB RT	7.4	7.77	5%
NB LT	53.1	54.74	3%







#### **Exclusive Bike Phase Bicycle Delay**



Movement	Base Case (sec)	EBP (sec)	% Difference
EB TH	22.17	45.63	16%
EB RT	8.2	6.1	-25%
EB LT	42.65	85.46	100%
WB TH	17.75	44.65	152%
WB RT	2.15	14.29	565%
WB LT	29.29	40.77	39%
SB TH	33.29	30.62	-8%
SB RT	0	0	-
SB LT	0	0	-
NB TH	35.36	25.72	-27%
NB RT	3.22	3.26	1%
NB LT	54.62	50.66	-7%









# **Mixing Zone**









# 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and 74<sup>th</sup> Street (Mixing Zone)











# 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and 74<sup>th</sup> Street (Mixing Zone)



Start of Cycle









# 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and 74<sup>th</sup> Street Mixing Zone Summary

•••••	
•	

Number of Bicycles	1425
Number of Motor Vehicles	1206
Number of Incidents	253
Percentage of Incidents Based on Number of Bicycles	17.75%
Near Misses	4
Number of Collisions if No Evasive Action Taken	57







# 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and 74<sup>th</sup> Street Severity Summary



Severity	Total Incidents of Specified Severity	Percentage of Total Incidents
Very Dangerous Interaction	95	37.5%
Dangerous Interaction	93	36.8%
Mild Interaction	54	21.3%
No Interaction	11	4.3%







# 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave and 74<sup>th</sup> St Elapsed Time Since Green









# 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and 74<sup>th</sup> Street Mixing Zone Notes



- Bicycles and Vehicles were heavily influenced by pedestrian behaviors at this site
  - Pedestrians tend to wait in the crosswalk for a walk phase
  - Pedestrians walked along the bicycle lane and jay walked often
- A good amount of vehicles merged into the mixing zone at the last second







# Grand and Multnomah Mixing Zone









#### **Grand Ave and Multnomah St**



Bicycle goes around bus








#### **Grand Ave and Multnomah St**



Multiple Vehicles in queue







## Grand Ave and Multnomah St Mixing Zone Summary



Number of Bicycles	352
Number of Motor Vehicles	1143
Number of Incidents	76
Percentage of Incidents Based on Number of Bicycles	21.59%
Near Misses	0
Number of Collisions if No Evasive Action Taken	4







## Grand Ave and Multnomah St Severity Summary



Severity	Total Incidents of Specified Severity	Percentage of Total Incidents
Very Dangerous Interaction	22	28.9%
Dangerous Interaction	22	28.9%
Mild Interaction	25	32.9%
No Interaction	7	9.2%







### Grand and Multnomah Elapsed Time Since Green









## Grand Ave and Multnomah St Mixing Zone Notes



- Bus stop at this location causes bicycles to wait behind the bus until it moves rather than going around it
- Bicycles tend to move towards the middle of the mixing zone rather than staying adjacent to the sidewalk
- A good amount of vehicles tend to merge into the mixing zone at the last second







# Mixing Zone - Overall Findings



- % Conflicts at the mixing zone at both locations were comparable.
- Confusion observed in the mixing zone scenario
  - Previous research by Monsere et al. found that only 63% of the bicycles correctly used the mixing zone.





