# ITE's Vision Zero Sandbox Design Competition

Dr. Gustavo de Andrade

The McTrans Center is represented in the University of Florida Transportation Institute (UFTI) team in ITE's Vision Zero Sandbox Challenge, which has been selected as one of two finalists for the Professional Competition category<sup>[1]</sup>. The McTrans/UFTI team will present their solutions to the judges and the attendees at a session in the Virtual Annual Meeting on Tuesday, July 20, 2021 from 4:00-5:30 p.m. EDT.

UF Transportation Institute UNIVERSITY of FLORIDA

This year's challenge goal was to develop a methodology that used automated conflict data to create lowcost solutions for a variety of intersections in Bellevue, Washington. The McTrans/UFTI team analyzed data on crashes and "near-misses" to identify the priority locations and to determine appropriate low-cost countermeasures for each location.

The HCS module Streets was used to estimate the expected impacts of these countermeasures on both safety and multimodal operational performance. For that end, a crash prediction module embedded in Streets was used, following recent UFTI research and development<sup>[2]</sup>. This model is able to predict the frequency of different crash types sensitive to signal timing and phasing scheme parameters, such as protected versus permitted phases, split phasing, all red time, and total cycle length. Along with other geometry characteristics, this model includes lane configuration as an input, the number of shared lanes versus dedicated lanes for each movement and left-turn storage area. The integrated methods allow for the evaluation of the tradeoff between safety and operational performance measures. The proposed set of countermeasures were able to reduce the predicted number of crashes by up to 29%. In some cases, the countermeasures aimed at enhancing safety did increase the intersection delay, affecting vehicle LOS, while in some cases it was possible to improve both safety and LOS by using more efficient signal phasing and timing. LOS for bicycles and pedestrian, as calculated by the HCM6 methodology implemented in Streets remained in good standards for all scenarios.

In the current HCS7 version, the safety tool can be found in the signal optimization section under Detailed Input Data on the Streets input screen. In the next release, a new report for the safety model will make it easier to present results and to compare the tradeoffs between safety and operations for intersection analysis.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>[1]</sup> https://www.transportation.institute.ufl.edu/2021/06/ufti-team-selected-as-finalist-for-ites-vision-zero-sandbox-design-competition/

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>[2]</sup> Andrade, G. R., L. Elefteriadou, M. Hadi, V. Khanapure (2020) Method for assessing effect of input parameters on multiobjective optimization of signal control *Journal of Transportation Engineering Part A Systems*, 146 (2)

<sup>[3]</sup> Andrade, G. R., Elefteriadou, L., Zhang, L. (2017) *Signal Timing Optimization with Consideration of Environment and Safety Impacts, Part B. Final Report.* Southeastern Transportation Research, Innovation, Development and Education Center (STRIDE), University of Florida

	LL						
alyst						-	
ency/Co	Intersection Data						
te				East-	West	Nort	th-South
e Period	Intersection Depth			200		200	
lysis Yea	Residential Area Use						
a File				EB	WB	NB	SB
neral	Presence of Mast Arm Signal Display			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
nber of Ca	Presence of Median Island			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	<b>v</b>	<b>v</b>
al Merge	Presence of Merge on exit side						
ed Vehick	Multimodal Input Data						
ath of Det	matimedal inpat data			EB	WB	NB	SB
unor Det	Presence of Bicycle Facilities						
ed Heavy	Presence of Upstream Bus Bay within 33	0 feet from stop bar					
ue Length	Presence of Upstream Parking within 33	) feet from stop bar					
eleration F	Calculation Data						
Thresho	K. %			10.0			
estrians P	Optimization Data						
ed Limit to	Optimization Data						
				Delav	% Si	afety %	Emissions
akers per	Waights %			Delay	,% Si	afety, %	Emissions,
akers per	Weights, %			33.3	, % Si 33	afety, % 3.3	Emissions, 33.3
akers per Ion Minim	Weights, %	Calculate Safety		Delay 33.3	, % Si 33 Calcula	afety, % 3.3 te Emissions	Emissions, 33.3
akers per Ion Minim Ion Maxin	Weights, % Safety Output	Calculate Safety		Delay 33.3	,% Si 33 Calcula	afety, % 3.3 te Emissions	Emissions, 33.3
akers per ion Minim ion Maxin on Dispe	Weights, % Safety Output A right angle, off-peak:	Calculate Safety		Delay 33.3 [ 1.21	,% Si 33 Calcula 1.21	afety, % 3.3 te Emissions 1.05	Emissions, 33.3
akers per xon Minim xon Maxin xon Dispe and Grov	Weights, % Safety Output A right angle, off-peak: A left-turn against, off-peak:	Calculate Safety		Delay 33.3 1.21 0.56	,% Si 33 Calcula 1.21 0.55	afety, % 3.3 te Emissions 1.05 0.41	Emissions, 33.3 1.09 0.41
akers per oon Minim oon Maxin oon Dispe and Grov iss Point	Weights, % Safety Output A right angle, off-peak: A left-turn against, off-peak: A rear-end, off-peak:	Calculate Safety		Delay 33.3 1.21 0.56 0.64	96 Si 32 Calcula 1.21 0.55 0.64	afety, % 3.3 te Emissions 1.05 0.41 0.32	Emissions, 33.3 1.09 0.41 0.32
akers per oon Minim oon Maxin oon Dispe and Grov ess Point cal Head	Weights, % Safety Output A right angle, off-peak: A left-turn against, off-peak: A rear-end, off-peak: A loss of control, off-peak;	Calculate Safety		Delay 33.3 1.21 0.56 0.64 0.22	% Si 33 Calcula 1.21 0.55 0.64 0.22	afety, % 3.3 te Emissions 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17	Emissions, 33.3 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17
akers per oon Minim oon Maxin oon Dispe aand Grov ess Point cal Head ow-Up He it-Turn E	Weights, % Safety Output A right angle, off-peak: A left-turn against, off-peak: A rear-end, off-peak: A loss of control, off-peak: A other	Calculate Safety		Delay 33.3 1.21 0.56 0.64 0.22 0.09	% Si 33 Calcula 1.21 0.55 0.64 0.22 0.09	afety, % 3.3 te Emissions 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17 0.09	Emissions, 33.3 1.0 0.4 0.3 0.1
akers per xon Minim xon Maxin xon Dispe and Grov ess Point cal Head ww-Up Hk tt-Turn Ei imum Tu	Weights, % Safety Output A right angle, off-peak: A left-turn against, off-peak: A rear-end, off-peak: A loss of control, off-peak: A other:	Calculate Safety		Delay 33.3 1.21 0.56 0.64 0.22 0.09	% Si 3: Calcula 1.21 0.55 0.64 0.22 0.09	afety, % 3.3 te Emissions 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17 0.09 0.0	Emissions, 33.3 1.0 0.4 0.3 0.1 0.0 0.0
akers per son Minim son Maxin son Dispe and Grov ess Point cal Head w-Up Hi t-Turn E mum Tu eleration	Weights, % Safety Output A right angle, off-peak: A left-turn against, off-peak: A rear-end, off-peak: A loss of control, off-peak: A other: A total, off-peak:	Calculate Safety		Delay 33.3 1.21 0.56 0.64 0.22 0.09 2.72	9% Si 33 Calcula 1.21 0.55 0.64 0.22 0.09 2.71	afety, % 3.3 te Emissions 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17 0.09 2.04	Emissions, 33.3 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17 0.05 2.04
akers per son Minim son Maxin son Dispe and Grov ess Poin cal Head sw-Up He tt-Turn El imum Tu eleration at-Turn S	Weights, % Safety Output A right angle, off-peak: A left-turn against, off-peak: A rear-end, off-peak: A loss of control, off-peak: A other: A total, off-peak: Total Crashes, 5 Years:	Calculate Safety		Delay 33.3 1.21 0.56 0.64 0.22 0.09 2.72 9.51	% % Si 33 Calcula 1.21 0.55 0.64 0.22 0.09 2.71	afety, % 3.3 te Emissions 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17 0.09 2.04	Emissions, 33.3 1.02 0.4 0.3 0.1 0.02 2.0-
akers per con Minim con Maxin con Dispe and Grov ess Point cal Head cw-Up Hi at-Turn Ei imum Tu eleration at-Turn Sj mization ude this Ir	Weights, % Safety Output A right angle, off-peak: A left-turn against, off-peak: A rear-end, off-peak: A loss of control, off-peak: A other: A total, off-peak: Total Crashes, 5 Years: Average Total Crashes:	Calculate Safety		Delay 33.3 1.21 0.56 0.64 0.22 0.09 2.72 9.51 1.90	% % Si 33 Calcula 1.21 0.55 0.64 0.22 0.09 2.71	afety, % 3.3 te Emissions 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17 0.09 2.04	Emissions, 33.3 1.0 0.4 0.3 0.0 1 0.0 2.0
akers per con Minim con Maxin con Dispe and Grov ess Point cal Head ow-Up He th-Turn Es imum Tu eleration tt-Turn Sj mization ude this It sective Func	Weights, % Safety Output A right angle, off-peak: A left-turn against, off-peak: A rear-end, off-peak: A loss of control, off-peak: A loss of control, off-peak: A other: A total, off-peak: Total Crashes, 5 Years: Average Total Crashes:	Calculate Safety	10Urrection EB	Delay 33.3 1.21 0.56 0.64 0.22 0.09 2.72 9.51 1.90	% S.       3:       Calcula       1.21       0.55       0.64       0.22       0.09       2.71	afety, % 3.3 te Emissions 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17 0.09 2.04 M	Emissions, 33.3 1.0 0.4 0.3 0.0 1 1 0.0 2.0 -
akers per con Minim con Maxin con Dispe and Grov ess Point cal Head ow-Up He t-Turn Ei imum Tu eleration tt-Turn S; mization ude this It ective Func le Length	Weights, % Safety Output A right angle, off-peak: A left-turn against, off-peak: A loss of control, off-peak: A loss of control, off-peak: A other: A total, off-peak: Total Crashes, 5 Years: Average Total Crashes: tion Percent Base FFS - Cycle Increment, s Safety and Emission	Calculate Safety Calculate Safety 100 Propulation Size 100 Crossover Probability, %	10 Direction EB	Delay 33.3 1.21 0.56 0.64 0.22 0.09 2.72 9.51 1.90	r         R           0.55         0.64           0.22         0.09           2.71         7	Afety, % 3.3 te Emissions 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17 0.09 2.04 M 02	Emissions, 33.3 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17 0.05 2.04
con Minim con Minim con Maxim con Dispe nand Grov cess Poin ical Head cow-Up Hi ht-Turn E dimum Tu zeleration ht-Turn Si mization ude this li ective Func le Length ts	Weights, % Safety Output A right angle, off-peak: A left-turn against, off-peak: A left-turn against, off-peak: A loss of control, off-peak: A other: A total, off-peak: Total Crashes, 5 Years: Average Total Crashes:	Calculate Safety Calculate Safety 100 Propulsion Size 100 Crossover Probability % 10 Crossover Probabi	10 Direction E8	Delay 33.3 1.21 0.56 0.64 0.22 0.09 2.72 9.51 1.90 L L D 0.02 0.1 0.71 0.91 0.72	r         R         0.05         0.04         0.22         0.09         2.71         0.05         0.8         0.02 </td <td>Afety, % 3.3 te Emissions 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17 0.09 2.04 M 02 97 97</td> <td>Emissions, 33.3 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17 0.05 2.04</td>	Afety, % 3.3 te Emissions 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17 0.09 2.04 M 02 97 97	Emissions, 33.3 1.05 0.41 0.32 0.17 0.05 2.04



## STAFF SPOTLIGHT Christian Breau

Software Developer

Strangely enough, while I graduated from the University of Florida with a master's degree in Civil / Transportation Engineering, I intended to look for a general Engineering job like anybody would. However, I joined McTrans as a developer instead, despite only taking three programming-related classes throughout college. Starting in middle school, my best friend and I decided to try designing our own games, but instead of learning coding traditionally, we did it through what I believe is the best way to learn: we took publicly available objects such as cars, doors, planes, etc. and tried to replicate and improve their code into our own objects, going line by line to understand how everything works. We picked up not only all the basics early but now we feel advanced enough to tutor our friends similarly interested in game or software development.

That experience led me to being a developer at McTrans, a unique experience that feels like a boon in more ways than one. With my equal blend of transportation and development experience, I can work on HCS or similar projects while gaining experience in both fields, whereas at most jobs I would only work with one field at a time. For example, I worked on NCHRP 15-57 (Chapter 38 of the Highway Capacity

Manual) while undertaking an assistantship at the University of Florida, but now that I have been coding it into HCS, I feel a deeper understanding of the methodology as I see it incorporated.

Despite starting my Master's, assistantships, and now work at McTrans in the midst of COVID, I do not feel like I lost any experience at all. Working with McTrans as a research assistant felt very structured and organized, with personal conversations through camera-enabled meetings and an easy-to-manage schedule with Asana. Now that I have joined full-time and we are back in the office, I feel a little out of my environment due to previously only working and studying remote, but the support of my co-workers has made the transition a lot easier.

# **Crash Cost by Crash Severity Reporting** in HSS

#### Dr. Karla Rodrigues-Silva

Estimating the cost of crashes due to the impact of a safety treatment has been challenging for decades. Most decisions are based on consideration of factors for which quantitative information converted into crash costs are frequently employed to justify economically roadway safety investments. Following these lines, the combination of crash prediction models of Highway Safety Manual (HSM) and crash costs has become a natural path on the quantification of safety benefits, as a result of road improvement to evaluate substantive safety.

According to the Federal Highway Administration, substantive safety is the actual long term or expected safety performance of a roadway. This would be determined by historical crashes over a long time to provide with high level of confidence the predicted/expected crashes of a location or highway.

Although we have established and accepted methods for the implementation of substantive safety, crash costs still may vary from one place to another, thereby impacting safety benefit-cost analysis (BCA). This customization may require establishing robust knowledge base tools that allows practitioners perform data-driven safety analyses of roads.

To support practitioners and researchers to combine crash analysis that directs to crashes cost, the Highway Safety Software has implemented parameters for Economic Analysis along with HSM Crash Prediction Models. Currently, the implementation is available for all facility types addressed in HSM. HSS allows inputting customized values on the GENERAL tab and the results of crash cost by severity are displayed on your choice of formatted and text report.

			Project Properties	
	Analyst		Jurisdiction	
	Agency			
	Date	10/30/2017		
	Empirical Bayes Analysis		Societal Crash Costs by Crash Severity	
	Facility Type	Rural Two-Lane		
	Area Type	Rural		
			Fatal/Injury, \$	158200
	Project-Level Parameters	V		
	Segment Common Parameters			
_	Economic Analysis Commor Para	ameters		
$\leftarrow$	Societal Crash Costs by Cra	sh Severity	Property Damage Only, \$	7400
Back	Fatal/Injury, \$	158200		
	Property Damage Only, \$	7400		

#### HSS Crash Cost by Crash Severity interface

#### **Economic Analysis (Predicted Crashes)**

Crash Severity	Per Crash Societal Crash Cost	Predicted Annual Crashes	Total Societal Crash Cost
Fatal and Injury (FI)	\$158,200.00	7.012	\$1,109,298.40
Property Damage Only (PDO)	\$7,400.00	16.990	\$125,726.00
Total	-	24.002	\$1,235,024.40

# Mixed-Flow Model: A More Accurate Estimate of Effects of Trucks and Grades in Freeways and Highways

#### Dr. Fabio Sasahara

For several decades, the Highway Capacity Manual has been applying the concept of Passenger Car Equivalents (PCE) to capture the effects of heavy vehicles in the traffic stream. These models assume heavy vehicles have different powertrain and acceleration characteristics and therefore one heavy vehicle would have a greater impact on traffic when compared to a passenger car.

#### However, the PCE factors may not be accurate when at least one of these conditions exist:

- · Significant presence of trucks in the traffic stream
- A long upgrade
- A combination of both factors above



The 6<sup>th</sup> Edition of HCM (2016) introduced the Mixed-Flow Model to address this issue in freeway basic segments and multilane highway. While the PCE approach assumes vehicle speeds are uniform across all vehicle types, the Mixed-Flow model calculates speeds for passenger cars and trucks individually, yielding more accurate results.

#### The required inputs for the Mixed-Flow Model include:

- Total percentage of trucks and the proportion distribution of Single-Unit Trucks (FHWA classifications 4-5) and Tractor-Trailer Trucks (FHWA classifications 6-13)
- Grade percentage (%) and length (mi)

For low percentages of trucks and mild upgrades, the results provided by the PCE methodology are comparable to the ones provided by the mixed-flow model. The HCM, however, does not provide a strict definition of what values of %HV and grade are considered significant to support a mixed-flow analysis.

### Therefore, the main question remains: Under what conditions should we consider using the mixed-flow model?

To illustrate the differences between PCE and Mixed-Flow outputs, a sample basic segment with the following characteristics is analyzed:

• Demand: 4,000 veh/h

- Free-Flow Speed: 65 mi/h
- 8% grade, with a 1-mile length
- Truck mix: 30% SUT, 70% TT

Several inputs of the % of heavy vehicles were tested using the Highway Capacity Software and the results comparing the results of both approaches are presented next:



Since this segment has a significant grade of 8%, differences can be noticed even at 1% heavy vehicles, as the mixed-flow model yields a 16% lower speed and a 6% higher density. As the percentage of heavy vehicle increases, the differences between the two methods also increase.

The Mixed-Flow model approach can be activated in HCS by checking the following box (make sure the terrain type input is set as "Specific Grade"):

Demand Data					
Demand, veh/h	4000		Peak Hour Factor	1.00	
Total Trucks, %	30.00		Single-Unit Trucks (SUT), %	m	
Tractor-Trailers (TT), %	30	]	Mored Flow Model	2	

Both results are provided in the HCS report so the user can compare both outputs and assess whether the differences are relevant:

Speed and Density				
Lane Width Adjustment (fLW)	•	Average Speed (S), mi/h	58.2	
Right-Side Lateral Clearance Adj. (fRLC)	•	Density (D), pc/mi/ln	36.0	
Total Ramp Density Adjustment	•	Level of Service (LOS)	E	
Adjusted Free-Flow Speed (FFSadj), mi/h	65.0			

(a) PCE - performance measures

Mixed-Flow Speed and Density				
Auto-Only Breakpoint (BPao), pc/h/ln	1400	Auto Travel Rate at Cap. (τ <sub>e,cap</sub> ), s/mi	133.9	
Mixed-Flow Breakpoint (BPmix), veh/h/ln	0.0	Auto Travel Rate 90% Cap. (TASOCAP), s/mi	106.7	
SUT Travel Rate at Cap. (TSUT.cop), s/mi	147.0	Speed Calibration at Cap. (Scalb,cap), mi/h	25.4	
SUT Travel Rate 90% Cap. (TSUT.90cop), s/mi	123.5	Speed Calib. 90% Cap. (Scalb, 90cap), mi/h	31.1	
TT Travel Rate at Cap. (TTT,cop), s/mi	189.8	Speed-Flow Curve Exponent (ф)	3.03	
TT Travel Rate 90% Cap. (τττ.90cap), s/mi	166.3	Mixed Traffic Flow Rate (vmk), veh/h/ln	1333	
Traffic Int. Term at Cap.(Δτικαφ), s/mi	47.73	Mixed-Flow Speed (Smix), mi/h	22.1	
Traffic Int. Term 90% Cap.(Δτπ.90cap), s/mi	24.25	Mixed-Flow Density (D=b), veh/mi/In	60.3	

#### (b) Mixed-Flow - performance measures

Engineering judgement is required to determine what is an acceptable difference in a case-by-case basis. Nevertheless, the Mixed-Flow model approach is not data intensive and can be easily performed in HCS. Therefore, a recommended practice is to always include this approach in your analysis if either grades or presence of trucks are significant.

## **2021** Upcoming Training Webinars

#### **Highway Capacity Analysis Webinars**

18 PDHs provided for each series Aug 02 - 06 1 - 5 PM ET

### **Highway Safety Analysis Webinars**

8 PDHs provided for each series Jul 13 - 14 1 - 5 PM ET

#### **HCS Hands-On Training**

8 PDHs provided for each series Aug 30 - 31 1 - 5 PM ET

### Ready to Register?

McTrans offers training for transportation professionals throughout the year. For additional information about courses, click <u>here</u>. Have questions or want more information? Send us an email at <u>mctrans@ce.ufl.edu</u>.

## **Stay Connected With Us!**



in

Tel: 1-800-226-1013 | Email: mctrans@ce.ufl.edu | Website: https://mctrans.ce.ufl.edu