

JULY-AUGUST 2001
NUMBER 215

TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD
NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

TR NEWS

Evaluating Bridge Health

*California's
Diagnostic
Tool*

Also:

Transit Safety on Track

Asphalt for the Ages

Concrete's Next Century

Mines Below Highways

Value Engineering Rewards

TR NEWS

features articles on innovative and timely research and development activities in all modes of transportation. Brief news items of interest to the transportation community are also included, along with profiles of transportation professionals, meeting announcements, summaries of new publications, and news of Transportation Research Board activities.

TR News is produced by the Transportation Research Board Reports and Editorial Services Office

Nancy A. Ackerman, Director
Javy Awan, Managing Editor
Kristin C. Motley, Assistant Editor

TR News Editorial Board

Neil F. Hawks, Chairman
Nancy A. Ackerman
Joseph A. Breen
Walter J. Diewald
Frederick D. Hejl
Timothy Hess
Stephen F. Maher
Stephan A. Parker
A. Robert Raab

Transportation Research Board

Robert E. Skinner, Jr., Executive Director
Mark R. Norman, Director,
Technical Activities
Stephen R. Godwin, Director,
Studies and Information Services
Marcia A. Appel, Director,
Administration and Finance
Robert J. Reilly, Director,
Cooperative Research Programs
Neil F. Hawks, Director, Special Programs

TR News (ISSN 0738-6826) is issued bimonthly by the Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20418. Internet address: www.TRB.org.

Editorial Correspondence: By mail to the Reports and Editorial Services Office, Transportation Research Board, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20418, by telephone 202-334-2972, or by fax 202-334-3495.

Subscriptions: North America: 1 year \$55.00; single issue \$9.50. Overseas: 1 year \$70.00; single issue \$13.00. Inquiries or communications concerning new subscriptions, subscription problems, or single-copy sales should be addressed to the Business Office at the address below, or telephone 202-334-3216, fax 202-334-2519. Second-class postage paid at Washington, DC.

Postmaster: Send changes of address to *TR News*, Transportation Research Board, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20418.

Notice: The opinions expressed in articles appearing in *TR News* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Transportation Research Board. The Transportation Research Board and *TR News* do not endorse products of manufacturers. Trade and manufacturers' names appear in an article only because they are considered essential to its object.

Printed in the United States of America.

Copyright © 2001 Transportation Research Board. All rights reserved.

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE

- 2 Letters
- 28 Research Pays Off
Dave Bachman
Rumble Strips: Finding a Design for Bicycles and Motor Vehicles
- 30 Profiles
Infrastructure problem-solver Wesley S. C. Lum; attorney and transportation research administrator Elaine E. Joost
- 32 News Briefs
High-speed sealift fleet, intermodal transportation database, National Transportation Week art, Boston bridge project, and more.
- 36 TRB Highlights
CRP News, 39
- 40 Calendar
- 42 Bookshelf
TRB Publications, 42

L E T T E R S

Highway Safety Design: A Systems Approach

In their article, "Designing To Improve Highway Safety" (*TR News*, January–February 2001, pp. 50–51), Samuel C. Tignor and Ron Pfefer use the term "systems." I hope the term will be applied broadly in the work of their committees, the Joint TRB Subcommittee on International Human Factor Guidelines for Road Systems Design and the Joint TRB Subcommittee on the Highway Safety Manual.

For instance, will the committees begin with a narrow approach and incorporate traditional assumptions, or will they consider as variables all the significant factors contributing to crash, injury, and fatality levels? A systems approach should include the following issues:

1. Driver licensing. Anyone can get—and keep—a motor vehicle operator's permit; many operate motor vehicles without a valid permit. Suggest actions to get unqualified and bad drivers off the road and keep them off.

2. Vehicle code. Many crashes result from a mindset that "I've got the right-of-way, so I am not required to slow, yield, or stop." Most operators do not know, understand, or care that the vehicle code does not give anyone the right-of-way, but defines who must yield the right-of-way under various circumstances. Consider proposing changes to the vehicle code to hold all parties responsible for doing whatever is necessary to avoid crashes.

3. Enforcement. Many engineers say the problem is that the laws aren't enforced. Still, most drivers treat the speed limit as something to pass through when starting up or slowing down—no one travels at the speed limit. The lack of effective speed enforcement anywhere in the United States is a major contributing factor in the 41,000 motor vehicle deaths that occur each year. Advocate for more effective enforcement, not more "forgiving" roadways.

4. Design speed, posted speed, and operating speed. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials' Green Book and similar state references base design speed on functional classification, but give scant attention to the compatibility of motor vehicle speeds with adjacent land uses and activities. Engineers also use outdated tables and formulas to establish geometric designs. As a result, streets and highways not only accommodate but encourage drivers to exceed the posted speed limit—by 50 percent or more on neighborhood and collector streets and by 30 percent or more on controlled-access freeways. Consider proposing a requirement for professional engineers to certify that a design will result in an 85th percentile speed of no more than 5 mph above the posted speed limit on neighborhood and collector streets as well as on urban arterials.

We must stop allowing the kind of behavior by motor vehicle operators that is killing our children, our parents, our friends, and our neighborhoods. Forgiving highways will not protect people from bad drivers and poorly designed roadways.

—Bill Wilkinson
National Center for Bicycling & Walking



RUMBLE STRIPS

Finding a Design for Bicycles and Motor Vehicles

DAVE BACHMAN

Dave Bachman is Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager, Bureau of Highway Safety and Traffic Engineering, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, Harrisburg.

The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PENNDOT) researched milled rumble strip patterns that are safe and effective for bicyclists as well as motorists on nonfreeway roads—a difficult task, since the needs of each group differ. Although bicyclists want to cross the rumble strip safely and comfortably with minimal vibration, motorists want sufficient vibration and sound to warn that the vehicle is drifting from the travel lane.

Problem

Roads that are open to bicycles—the majority of the highway network—need rumble strips designed to meet the conflicting needs of motorists and bicyclists. Used mainly on urban and rural freeways, rumble strips have reduced crashes and fatalities by 20 to 50 percent.

One reason rumble strips have not been implemented on nonfreeway roads is that they can be uncomfortable for bicyclists to ride over and can cause loss of control of the bicycle—a serious safety issue. Although bicyclists usually travel on the shoulder outside of the rumble strip, they occasionally need to cross it, for example, to make a left turn or to avoid debris.

Solution

Developing a Model

After an assessment of PENNDOT's rumble strip pattern, 25 alternatives were developed and evaluated, and a simulation model was devised and validated. The simulation model indicated that 4-inch-wide (102-mm) grooves would provide the smoothest ride for bicyclists. However, the cutting head on the milling machine used by PENNDOT is a fixed diameter, which means that there is a linear relationship between width and depth of cut. Four-inch cuts would have meant an unacceptably shallow cut. Therefore, 4-inch (102-mm) grooves were not considered further. All of the patterns used the same groove length, between 16 and 17 inches (406 and 432 mm).

Testing the Rumble Strips

The five highest ranked test patterns and PENNDOT's current standard (Table 1) were installed at a test facility for field experiments. Volunteers rode four different bicycle models—mountain, touring, hybrid, and tandem—over the test rumble strip patterns at various speeds and angles (see photo, next page). Vertical acceleration (up and down movement by the bicyclist) and pitch angular acceleration (before and after rocking experienced by

TABLE 1 Rumble Strip Configurations Tested

Test Pattern	Rumble Strip Dimensions, inches (mm)			Performance for Bicyclists	Vehicle Sound Difference dB(A) (Rank)	
	Groove Width	Gap between Grooves	Groove Depth	Composite Score (Rank)	55 mph (88 km/h)	45 mph (72 km/h)
*1	7 (180)	5 (130)	0.5 (13)	0.97 (#6)	23.7 (#1)	11.6 (#2)
2	5 (130)	7 (180)	0.5 (13)	0.50 (#3)	18.5 (#2)	10.0 (#4)
3	5 (130)	7 (180)	0.375 (10)	0.12 (#2)	16.1 (#3)	6.8 (#5)
4	5 (130)	6 (150)	0.5 (13)	0.66 (#5)	16.0 (#4)	15.2 (#1)
5	5 (130)	6 (150)	0.375 (10)	0.50 (#3)	13.9 (#5)	10.9 (#3)
6	5 (130)	7 (180)	0.25 (6.3)	0.003 (#1)	13.0 (#6)	6.3 (#6)

*PENNDOT's current standard.

the bicyclist) data were collected and compared for each pattern. The bicyclists rode on an 8-inch (203-mm) white line over each pattern to measure the effect of the grooves on handling and control, and the researchers recorded the percentage of time spent off the line. The bicyclists rated the comfort and control for each pattern by marking a graphical scale from very uncomfortable to very comfortable.

Rating the Test Patterns

The researchers normalized the scores for each experiment to a scale of 0 (best) to 1 (worst) and averaged the scores to obtain composite scores (Table 1). Test Pattern 1 was clearly the worst from the bicyclist's perspective; conversely, Patterns 6 and 3 were the best and second best. Patterns 2 and 5 had the same composite score, with Pattern 2 doing better on the acceleration tests, and Pattern 5 doing better on the subjective ratings. Pattern 4 did well on the white line test but poorly on the others.

To assess each rumble strip pattern's auditory effect on inattentive or drowsy motorists, the maximum sound level in a vehicle was measured when the vehicle drove over the patterns. The difference between the maximum sound level and the ambient sound level when driving on a smooth pavement was determined (Table 1).

Vertical and pitch angular accelerations also were measured, but were not found useful. Previous research had found that rumble strips producing 4 dB(A) increases above the ambient noise can be readily detected by motorists who are awake (1), but there are no data indicating the sound level difference necessary to alert a drowsy motorist.

For higher speed roads, near 55 mph (88 km/h), Pattern 3 was the best balance between the competing needs of motorists and bicyclists. It was the second-best pattern for bicyclists and the third-best for motorists. Pattern 6, the best for bicyclists, was not chosen because it provided the least sound difference to motorists.

For lower speed roads, near 45 mph (72 km/h), Pattern 5—the third-best pattern for both bicyclists and motorists—was recommended. The two best patterns for bicyclists generated less than 7 dB(A) sound above the ambient level, which was not deemed to be sufficient to rouse drowsy motorists.

Application

PENNDOT will install pilot rumble strips designed from Patterns 3 and 5 on nonfreeway routes across Pennsylvania this year. Installation is only on roadways with shoulders at least 6 feet wide, so that there is sufficient room for bicyclists to travel outside of the rumble strip. If these pilot installations are well



received by the bicycle community, additional installations will follow.

Volunteer bicyclist tests rumble strip pattern at various speeds and angles.

Benefits

PENNDOT's goal is to reduce crashes and fatalities by 10 percent. Run-off-the-road motor vehicle crashes on nonfreeway facilities make up a significant portion of crashes and fatalities. Although data are not yet available to estimate the reduction in crashes and fatalities due to nonfreeway rumble strips, the success of rumble strips on freeways is a good prediction of performance.

Effectively designed rumble strips also may improve bicyclist safety by providing a buffer between motor vehicles and bicycles and by reducing the number of motor vehicles infringing on the bicyclists' part of the shoulder.

Reference

1. Watts, G. R. The Development of Rumble Areas as a Driver-Alerting Device. In Supplementary Report 291, Transportation and Road Research Laboratory, 1977.

For more information contact Michael Bonini, Research Division, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, 400 North Street, 6th Floor, Harrisburg, PA 17120-3789 (telephone 717-772-4664, email mbonini@dot.state.pa.us).

EDITOR'S NOTE: Appreciation is expressed to Ray Derr, Transportation Research Board, for his efforts in developing this article.

Suggestions for "Research Pays Off" topics are welcome. Contact G. P. Jayaprakash, Transportation Research Board, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20418 (telephone 202-334-2952, e-mail gjayapra@nas.edu).