



NCHRP 17-87

Guide to Pedestrian Analysis



Pedestrian Quality of Service Analysis

What is Quality of Service?

- QOS is “a description of how well a transportation facility or service operates from a traveler’s perspective” (HCM 6th Edition)
- The HCM uses level of service (LOS) as a way to describe QOS
 - One performance measure typically used as the “service measure”
 - Ranges of service measure values stratified into A (best) to F (worst) categories

Factors Influencing Pedestrian QOS

- Facility presence
- Facility condition
- Facility connectivity
- Perceived safety and security
- Comfort
- Delay
- Ability to travel at desired pace
- Wayfinding information, amenities
- Facility and adjacent land use aesthetics

Measuring Pedestrian QOS

- Surveys
- Operational measures
 - Speed, delay, density, etc.
- Pedestrian satisfaction measures
 - Pedestrian LOS (PLOS)
 - Pedestrian level of traffic stress (PLTS)
- Walkability measures



Group Exercise

Rate the Pedestrian Crossings

- Information provided:
 - Aerial and street-view images of each crossing
 - AADT
 - Driver yielding rate
 - Average delay to start crossing
- Each person in the group rates the existing crossing on an “A” (best) to “F” (worst) scale and writes their rating down on the provided form (no comparing notes!)
- Group picks a safety countermeasure, new initial crossing delay determined
- Re-rate crossing with the countermeasure



Measuring QOS

Operational Measures

- Can be directly measured in the field
- Often have motor vehicle counterpart measures
 - Speed, travel time
 - Person delay
 - Density/crowding
- Can relate to safety
 - Crowded sidewalk → people walking in the street
 - Long delays at signals → increased non-compliance with signals
- Can be incorporated into facility design
 - Sidewalk widths, for example

Satisfaction Measures

- Developed from surveys
 - “Walks for Science” (Florida PLOS)
 - Video labs (NCHRP 03-70/HCM)
 - Intercept surveys (NCHRP 17-87)
- Statistical modeling used to identify factors related to pedestrian satisfaction
- These factors can be field-measured and used as inputs to the model to predict pedestrian satisfaction

HCM Pedestrian LOS: Sidewalks

- Factors included
 - Traffic volumes, traffic separation & buffering
 - Facility width
 - Facility crowding
- Model predicts a “pedestrian LOS score” (lower = better), which can be converted into a LOS letter and/or compared to other modes’ LOS scores

HCM Pedestrian LOS: Intersections

- Factors included
 - Traffic volumes parallel to and turning across crosswalk
 - Parallel traffic speed
 - Pedestrian delay
 - Right-turn channelizing island presence
- Model predicts a pedestrian LOS score and letter

HCM Pedestrian LOS: Off-Street Paths

- Exclusive pedestrian facilities
 - Average pedestrian space
- Shared-use paths
 - Number of times per mile bicycles would meet or overtake an average pedestrian

Oregon DOT Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress

- Modeled after bicycle LTS
- Factors included
 - Sidewalks
 - Sidewalk width and condition
 - Separation and buffering from traffic
 - Traffic speeds, number of lanes
 - Land use
 - Crossings
 - Traffic volume, speed
 - Roadway functional class, number of lanes
 - Presence of median island, lighting, curb ramps
- PLTS rated on 1 (low/no stress) to 4 (high stress) scale

NCHRP 17-87: Uncontrolled Crossings

- Factors included
 - AADT
 - Delayed crossing
 - Function of traffic volume, crossing width, median presence, driver yielding
 - Safety countermeasure presence
 - Marked crosswalk, median island, RFFB
- Produces estimates of average pedestrian satisfaction & dissatisfaction, which can be converted into a LOS letter

NCHRP 17-87: Signalized Crossings

- No significant factors when reducing model to satisfied vs. dissatisfied
- Only significant factors with model using “very satisfied,” “satisfied,” and “(very) dissatisfied” were
 - Location (Portland vs. Chapel Hill)
 - Permitted left-turning volume across crosswalk
- Additional research needed
 - Treated intersections in the study were urban LPIs

Walkability

- Typically considers a broad range of factors
 - Facility as a transportation facility
 - Safety
 - Land use
 - Accessibility & connectivity
- Street-level walkability
 - For example, Pedestrian Environmental Quality Index
- Areawide walkability
 - For example, Pedestrian Index of the Environment