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## PROJ ECTOVERVIEW

- Curves are roadway characteristic sthat a re highly signific ant in terms of highway safety.
- Many state DOTs lack data for many of the curves on their roadways.
- Often, curve data exists on ROW or construction plans. But this is not a form which is useful for conducting highway sa fety a nalysis or other uses.
- This project examined a technique for using GIS roadwa y centerline data for a utomating the process of identifying and characterizing horizontal curves.



## ROADWAY CURVES

- Roadway curves are design elements of roadways which serve as transition elements between two straight sections of roadway.
- There are two funda mental types of roadway curves:

- A vertic al curve providesa transition between two sloped roadways, allowing a vehicle to negotiate the elevation rate change at a gradual rate rather than a sharp cut." (2)
- There are two types:
- Sag Curve Change in grade is positive (valley)
- Crest Curve Change in grade is negative (hill)


## Horizontal Curves



- "A horizontal curve provides a transition between two tangent strips of roadway, allowing a vehicle to negotiate a tum at a gradual rate rather than a sharp cut." (1)
- There are a number of different categories for horizontal curves:
- Simple
- Spiral
- Compound
- Reverse


## HORIZO NTAL CURVATURE AND HIG HWAY SAFETY

The crash rate for horizontal c urves on 2-lane rural roads is $3 X$ higher than on tangent road segments (Glennon et al., 1985)

3/4 of c urve-related fatal crashes involve vehiclesleaving the roadway a nd striking fixed objects or overtuming
(FHWA, 2016)

More than 25 \% of fatalcrashesare associated with a horizontal curve (FHWA, 2016)

## HIG HWAY SAFETY

- Improving highway sa fety and reducing fatalities is a key objective for state DOTs
- High risk sectionsor roadway need to be identified a nd proitized. There are two general approaches:
- Crash a nalysis
- Use historic crash data to identify high risk roads
- traditional reactive approach
- Roadway analysis
- Use roadway characteristic salong with safety performance models to identify high risk roads
- Proactive approach
- Once the top priority high risk roads are identified countermeasurescan be implemented to reduce



# COUNTERMEASURES 

Aimed at Keeping the Vehicle in its Lane


Centerline Rumble Strips


Edge line Rumble Strips


Chevrons


High Friction Surface Treatment


Delineators


# COUNTERMEASURES 

Aimed at Minimizing the Adverse Consequences of Leaving the Roadway


Removing Roadside Fixed Objects


Crash Attenuation Bamiers


Shoulder Drop Off Elimination

Paving and / orWidening Shoulders

## TYPES OF HORIZONTAL CURVES



## Simple Curves

- Uniform tuming radius throughout
- Also known as circular arcs



## Compound Curves

- Two or more simple curves which are joined and tum in the same direction
- Most often used on interchange loops and ramps


Spiral Curve

- A curve where the radius is continuously getting longer or shorter.
- Spiral curves are generally used to provide a gradual change in curvature from a straight section of road to a curved section.



## Reverse Curve

- A reverse curve consists of two simple curves joined together and tuming is opposite directions.


## SUPERELEVATION

- A cartraveling around a curve hasa number of forces acting on it:
- Gravity
- Centrifugal Force - Tendency of an object following a curved path to fly a way from the center of curvature.
- Centripetal Force - The force that keeps an object moving with a uniform speed along a circularpath.
- The presence of superelevation on a curve allows some
 of the centripetal force to be countered by the ground, thus allowing the tum to be executed at a fasterrate than would be allowed on a flat surface.


## GEOMETRY OF A SIMPLE HORIZONTAL CURVE



## Parameters

- PC - Point of Curvature
- PT- Point of Tangency
- PI - Point of Intersection
- $\Delta$ - Central Angle or Deflection Angle
- R-Radius
- E - Extemal Distance
- MO - Middle Ordinate
- LC - Cord Length
- L-Curve Length (not labeled)
- Tangent Length


## EVOLUTION OF A ROAD



- Many of today's roads were once paths.
- Since these roads were not designed, often there is little or no information about va rious roadway characteristics such as horizontal curves and grade.


## ROADWAY PLANS

## When these data do exist, they typic ally reside on right of way or construction planswhich can be many decades old.



## DATA SOURCESTO IDENTIFY AND CHARAC TERIZE CURVES



Field Surveys


GPS Data


Satellite Imagery


GIS Data

## DIGITIZNG PA ROADWAYS

- Original Digitization (1:24,000 Ortho-photography)
- 35,000 person hours spanning 3 years
- Realignment (1:2,000 Ortho-photography)
- 33,000 person hours spanning 13 years
- Annual Maintenance
- 2,000 person hours / year



## PENNSYLVANIA'S ROAD NETWORK

| PENNSYLVANIA HIGHWAY SYSTEMS | LINEAR MILES | DVMT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| TOTAL SYSTEM | 120,039 | $273,648,047$ |
| Rural | 73,918 | $98,387,066$ |
| Urban | 46,121 | $175,260,981$ |
| FEDERAL AID SYSTEM | 28,221 | $229,268,160$ |
| National Highway System | 7,217 | $146,755,616$ |
| Interstate System | 1,867 | $67,904,906$ |
| NON-FEDERAL AID SYSTEM | 91,817 | $44,379,887$ |
| TOTAL STATE OWNED | 41,103 | $223,757,168$ |
| PennDOT Owned | 39,770 | $\mathbf{2 0 5 , 4 6 8 , 5 0 4}$ |
| Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission | 554 | $16,305,216$ |
| Other PA State Agencies | $\mathbf{7 7 9}$ | $1,983,448$ |
| TOTAL NON-STATE OWNED | $\mathbf{7 8 , 9 3 5}$ | $49,890,879$ |
| Total Local Municipal Owned | $\mathbf{7 8 , 1 2 0}$ | $47,025,412$ |
| Federal Agency Owned | 800 | $2,035,491$ |
| Toll Bridge/Ferry | 15 | $\mathbf{8 2 9 , 9 7 6}$ |



* 2014 Pennsylva nia Highway Statistic s


## STATE ROUTES AND SEG MENTS

## State Routes

- Are identified by a 4 digit number (e.g. SR 0030).
- State route number are unique within a county.
- 0001-0999 a re traffic routes
- 1000-4999 are fully conta ined within a county
- A route can be divided into a ny number of segments


## Segments

- Segments are continuous sections of roadway which are typic ally about a half mile in length.
- Segments increase in a north oreast bound direction typic ally in inc rements of 10
- Divided highways have segments in both directions. In the north or eastbound direction the segment number is even and in the opposite direction it is odd.
- The position along a segment is designated as an offset typic ally specified in feet.



## PENNDOTSLRS

Every position on a Pennsylvania roadway can be identified with an LRS Key.

## 01400900400348 <br> त्र $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{5}$ 0 <br> Route <br>  <br> $\overleftrightarrow{\psi}$ $\underset{\sim}{4}$ 0

## UNEAR REFERENC ING SYSTEM (LRS)

- A system of spatial referencing where objects (e.g., signs, guiderail), occurrences (e.g., crashes) or attributes (e.g., speed limit, traffic volume, pavement type) are located in terms of measurements along a linear feature.
- Collectively, these objects, occurrences and attributes are referred to as events.
- An LRS is used in linearnetworks such as roads, railways, waterways, oil and gaspipelines and power and data transmission lines.
- Dynamic segmentation is a powerful process made possible through the implementation of an LRS.


## NETWO RK LINEAR FEATURE (NLF)

A null segment is used to represent a discontinuity, or intemuption, in a road alignment.

The nomal order of precedence is Interstates, followed by U.S. Traffic Routes, then PA Traffic Routes, a nd finally, other state routes. Within each of these categories, generally the lower numbered route takes precedence


## APPROACH

The Hapry Path

Seo 1 Deconstruct the roadway feature into 2-vertice linear sections and foreach section determine its bearing angle with respect to due east $\left(\Phi_{B}\right)$.


## APPROACH

## The Hapry Path

## Step 2

A. For each section ( $n$ ), calculate the difference in the bearing angle for the section $\left(\Phi_{\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{n})}\right)$ in comparison to the bearing angle for the prorsection $\left(\Phi_{\mathrm{B}(n-1)}\right)$ and the bearing angle for the next section $\left(\Phi_{\mathrm{B}(n+1)}\right)$.
$B_{1}$ If the changes in bearing angle $\left(\Phi_{P}\right.$ and $\left.\Phi_{N}\right)$ both exceed a threshold value $\left(\Phi_{T}\right)$, flag the section as being part of a curve and indicate the direction of change.


## APPROACH

The Hapoy Path

Pass through the a rray and construct curve features from

## Step 3

 consecutive curve sections aggregating the changes in bearing angle to yield the central angle ( $\Delta$ ) and aggregating the length of the sections to determine curve length a nd NLF offsets for the start of the curve and the end of the curve.

## AUTOMATING THE APPROACH

## A custom Python toolbox in Arc GIS was developed which uses roadway centerline data to identify and characterize horizontal curves.

| Catalog | $\square \times$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| Location: HighwaySafety.pyt | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |

## CURVE DETECTIVE INTERFACE

- Curve Detective was written in Python.
- It can be added to ArcGIS as a custom tool.
- If an SR is not specified, the entire county will be processed.
- If a county isn't specified, the entire state will be processed.


## TOOL OUTPUT

The tool output is a horizontal curve feature class with the following attributes:

- Central Angle
- Radius
- Curve Length
- Direction of tum
- NLF ID
- NLF Begin Offset
- NLF End Offset



## STATEWIDE ANALYSIS



## CUMBERLAND COUNTY SR 0944 : SEG MENT 140



## CUMBERLAND COUNTY SR 0944 : SEG MENT 440




## VALIDATION OF RESULTS

- Curve data was manually extracted from ROW a nd Construction plans. Some challenges in doing this:
- Finding plans with curvature information
- Translating legislative route designationsto State Route designations
- Detemining segment - offset from project stationing designationsused on drawings
- Central angle, length and radius values were compared to the output of Curve Detector.
- Total number of curves compared was 35

Characteristic s of Selected Curves

| Parameter | Range |
| :--- | :---: |
| Central Angle | $8^{\circ}-102^{\circ}$ |
| Length | $114 \mathrm{ft}-1124 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Radius | $180 \mathrm{ft}-2953 \mathrm{ft}$ |

## VALDATION OF RESULTS

| Parameter | Avg \% Difierence (\%D) | SD | Histogram |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central Angle | -1\% | 6\% |  |
| Length | 2\% | 26\% |  |
| Radius | -3\% | 25\% |  |



## CURVE SPANNING SEGMENT BOUNDARIES

## POTENTIAL SOURC ES OF ERROR

- Identification of PC and PT
- Cord Length vs. Arc Length
- Spacing of Vertic es
- Inaccuracies in Centerline Data


| Parameter | Construction <br> Drawing | Curve <br> Detective |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Central Angle | $45.61^{\circ}$ | $46.95^{\circ}$ |
| Length | $480^{\prime}$ | $363^{\prime}$ |
| Radius | $603^{\prime}$ | $443^{\prime}$ |

## SPUTCURVES



Adams County SR 4008 Segment 0020-0030


Cumberland County SR 0977 Segment 0110-0120

## SUBJ ECTIVE DEC ISIONS



1929 C onstruction Drawing


## CRASH ANALYSIS

## Crash Data

- 2010-2014 (5 Years)
- 44,546 miles of roadway
- 449,081 crashes
- 5,224 fatalities
- 12,786 major injuries
- 49,567 moderate injuries
- 161,268 minor injuries
- 384 billion vehic le miles traveled



## CRASH RATES

Crash rates a re typic ally reported as crashes per million vehic le miles traveled.

## $R=\frac{C \times 100,000,000}{V \times 365 \times N \times L}$

R - Crash rate (crashes per million vehicle miles)
C - Total number of crashes
V - Traffic volume (AADT)
N - Number of years of data
L- Length of roadway in miles

## CURVE CRASH RATE ANALYZER



## CRASH RATES ANALYSIS 1

Analytic al Parameters:

- Roadway Type: 2 Lane Rural Roads
- Region: Statewide
- Crash Data Period: 2010-2014
- Injury types: All
- Road condition types: All
- Drivertypes: All
- Collision types: All
- Curve Central Angle: $\geq 10^{\circ}$

| Alignment | Curve | Straight |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Miles (billions) | 17.3 | 116.1 |
| Crashes | 31,560 | 90,622 |
| Crash Rate | 1.8262 | 0.7804 |

- Curve Radius: $\leq 2000^{\prime}$

Finding: Crash Rate on curves is 2.34 times the crash rate on roadway with a straight a lignment.

## CRASH RATES ANALYSIS 2

Fatal Crash Rates

Analytical Pa ra meters:

- Roadway Type: 2 La ne Rural Roads
- Region: Statewide
- Crash Data Period: 2010-2014
- Injury types: Fatal
- Road condition types: All
- Drivertypes: All
- Collision types: All
- Curve Central Angle: $\geq 10^{\circ}$

| Alignment | Curve | Straight |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Miles (billions) | 17.3 | 116.1 |
| Fatal Crashes | 1,899 | 4,516 |
| Crash Rate | 0.1099 | 0.0389 |

- Curve Radius: $\leq 2000$

Finding: Fatal crash rate on curves is 2.83 times the crash rate on roadway with a straight a lignment.

Conclusion: Not only are crashes more likely to occur on curves, crashes on curves a re more likely to result in fata lities.

## CRASH RATES ANALYSIS 3

Crash Rates for Older Drivers

Analytical Parameters:

- Roadway Type: 2 La ne Rural Roads
- Region: Statewide
- Crash Data Period: 2010-2014
- Injury types: All
- Road condition types: All
- Drivertypes: 75+
- Collision types: All
- Curve Central Angle: $\geq 10^{\circ}$

| Alignment | Curve | Straight |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Miles (billions) | 17.3 | 116.1 |
| Crashes (Driver 75+) | 1,236 | 4,792 |
| Crash Rate | 0.0715 | 0.0413 |

- Curve Radius: $\leq 2000$

Finding: For drivers over 75 , the crash rate on curves is 1.73 timesthe crash rate on roadway with a straight a lig nment.

Conclusion: While the crash rate fordrivers over 75 increases on curves it doesn't inc rease as much as it does for all drivers.

## CRASH RATES ANALYSIS 4

Slippery Conditions

Analytical Pa ra meters:

- Roadway Type: 2 La ne Rural Roads
- Region: Statewide
- Crash Data Period: 2010-2014
- Injury types: All
- Road condition types: Wet / Snow / Ice
- Drivertypes: All
- Collision types: All
- Curve Central Angle: $\geq 10^{\circ}$

| Alignment | Curve | Straight |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Miles (billions) | 17.3 | 116.1 |
| Crashes (Slippery Conditions) | 11,959 | 29,366 |
| Crash Rate | 0.6920 | 0.2529 |

- Curve Radius: $\leq 2000$

Finding: In wet or slippery conditions, the crash rate on curves is 2.73 times the rate on straight roadway a lignments. By comparison, in dry conditions the curve crash rate is 2.13 times the rate on straight road wa y a lignments.

C onc lusion: In wet or slippery conditions, the risk of a crash a long curved a lig nments inc reases more than it does a long straight a lignments.

## CRASH RATES ANALYSIS 5

Run Off Road Crashes

Analytical Pa ra meters:

- Roadway Type: 2 La ne Rural Roads
- Region: Statewide
- Crash Data Period: 2010-2014
- Injury types: All
- Road condition types: All
- Drivertypes: All
- Collision types: Run Off Road
- Curve Central Angle: $\geq 10^{\circ}$
- Curve Radius: $\leq 200{ }^{\prime}$

| Alignment | Curve | Straight |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Miles (billions) | 17.3 | 116.1 |
| Run Off Road Crashes | 22,265 | 47,871 |
| Percentage of Total | $71 \%$ | $53 \%$ |

Finding: A substantially higher percenta ge of crashes on c urves are due to the vehicle leaving the road than on straight roadway alignments.

## CRASH RATES ANALYSIS 6 <br> Head On Collisions

Analytical Pa rameters:

- Roadway Type: 2 La ne Rural Roads
- Region: Statewide
- Crash Data Period: 2010-2014
- Injury types: All
- Road condition types: All
- Drivertypes: All
- Collision types: Head On Collisions
- Curve Central Angle: $\geq 10^{\circ}$

| Alignment | Curve | Straight |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Miles (billions) | 17.3 | 116.1 |
| Head On Crashes | 1,134 | 2,485 |
| Percentage of Total | $3.6 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |

- Curve Radius: $\leq 2000$

Finding: A higher percentage of crashes on curves are due to head on collisions than on straight roadway a lignments.

## CRASH RATE VS. RADIUS



## POTENTIAL REFINEMENTS

- Adjustments to the algorithms to further minimize the occurrence of split curves.
- Extrapolate pre and post curve tangents to identify the PI and improve the estimate of the PC and PT.
- Develop a standard format of roadway centerline data as an input to the tool so that it could be more readily used by other state DOTs.


## CONCLUSIONS

- Extracting roadway horizontal curve data from roadway centerlines is very rapid and cost effective.
- The methodology can be applied to both state and local roadways since PennDOT hascenterline data for both. GPS data is not available for local roads.
- Comparisons with survey data is quite accurate. The average \%D for the central a ngle and radius were $1 \%$ and $-3 \%$ respectively.
- The standard deviation of the $\%$ was wor for central angle and $25 \%$ for the radius.
- An a nalysis of crash rates indic a ted:
- Crash rates increase substantially as the radius dec reases below 2000 feet.
- Roadway departure crashes are much more common on curves ( $71 \%$ vs. $53 \%$ )
- Crashes on curves are more likely to result in fatalities.
- Slippery conditions inc rease the risks on curves more than on straight roadway a lignments.
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## QUESTIONS



