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NCHRP is...
A state-driven national program

- The state DOTs, through AASHTO’s Standing Committee on Research...
  - Are core sponsors of NCHRP
  - Suggest research topics and select final projects
  - Help select investigators and guide their work through oversight panels
NCHRP delivers...
Practical, ready-to-use results

• Applied research aimed at state DOT practitioners
• Often become AASHTO standards, specifications, guides, manuals
• Can be directly applied across the spectrum of highway concerns: planning, design, construction, operation, maintenance, safety
A range of approaches and products

- Traditional NCHRP reports
- Syntheses of highway practice
- IDEA Program
- Domestic Scan Program
- Quick-Response Research for AASHTO
- Other products to foster implementation:
  - Research Results Digests
  - Legal Research Digests
  - Web-Only Documents and CD-ROMs
NCHRP Webinar Series

- Part of TRB’s larger webinar program
- Opportunity to interact with investigators and apply research findings.
Sponsoring Standing Committee

- TRB Committee on Roundabouts (ANB75)
- Upcoming webinar:
  - “The Marriage of Roundabouts and Access Management”
  - Monday, September 26, 2016
  - 2:00p-3:30p Eastern/11:00a-12:30p Pacific
Today’s First Presenter

• Overview of Synthesis Results
  Alek Pochowski, Kittelson & Associates, Inc.
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Introduction

• The intent of the synthesis is:
  ▪ Be a useful reference to agencies that are creating or updating roundabout and/or intersection control policies
  ▪ Provide updated information about current roundabout practices

Approach

Literature Review

Survey

Case Examples
Literature Review

- Approximately 3,200 roundabouts in the United States by 2013
- Compares to approximately 50 roundabouts as of mid-1997 identified in *Synthesis of Highway Practice 264: Modern Roundabout Practice in the United States*
- Roundabouts are now found in every State and the District of Columbia
- In general, roundabouts have been constructed at an increasing rate per year
Literature Review

- Single-lane roundabouts have consistently been the most prominent type of roundabout constructed
- The ratio of multilane roundabouts to single-lane roundabouts has increased slightly over the last decade

Cumulative Percent of Known Roundabouts by Type in the United States
Literature Review

- Roundabout policy information updated from 2010 study
- Agency policies, guidance, and practices regarding the selection and design of roundabouts vary across the United States
- Several states have adopted ICE (Intersection Control Evaluation) policies allowing a more proactive method for evaluation

Summary of Statewide Roundabout Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Type</th>
<th>No. of States</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of Roundabout Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>No policy or mention of roundabouts from the state DOT. Consequently, the state neither encourages nor discourages roundabouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow</td>
<td>The state allows the consideration of roundabouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>The state encourages the consideration of roundabouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>The state requires the evaluation of a roundabout alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>The state requires the evaluation of a roundabout, and justification when a roundabout is not the preferred alternative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results

- A questionnaire was sent to the 52 AASHTO member departments
- Responses were received from 40 States
- Of the 40 States who responded to the questionnaire for this effort, 38 States have a roundabout in operation on the state highway network
- By comparison, the 1998 Synthesis identified only nine State agencies with a roundabout in operation, under construction, or in design as of 1997
Survey Results

Number of Responses Indicating the Frequency of the Use of Primary Reasons for the Selection of Roundabouts
Survey Results

- States provided planning-level cost estimates (screening or feasibility level estimates) for mini-, single-lane, and multilane roundabouts

### Planning Level Cost Estimate (screening or feasibility level estimate) by Roundabout Type as Reported by State Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roundabout Type</th>
<th>Mini-roundabout</th>
<th>Single-lane roundabout</th>
<th>Multilane roundabout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$249,000</td>
<td>$1,296,034</td>
<td>$2,048,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of State Agencies Developing Types of Public Outreach Material as Reported by State Agency
Survey Results

Operational Performance Models Reported by State Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Reporting State Agencies Using Model</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM 2010 Model</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base HCM 2010 Model</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 2010 Model calibrated to local conditions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 2010 Model calibrated to non-local conditions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDRA Standard Model</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDRA Standard Model with Environment Factor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDRA Standard Model without Environment Factor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Equations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Equations uncalibrated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Equations calibrated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsimulation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Because States were allowed to select more than one operational performance model, there is some overlap in the number of States using each type of performance model.
## Safety Analysis Procedures Reported as Used by State Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Analysis Procedure</th>
<th>Reporting State Agencies Using Safety Analysis Procedure</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our state does not typically estimate or predict safety at roundabouts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Highway Safety Manual</em> predictive methodology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash modification factors or crash reduction factors (uncalibrated)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash modification factors or crash reduction factors (calibrated to local conditions)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Institute for Highway Safety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State agency-specific procedure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results

State Agency Use of *NCHRP Report 672* as Reported by State Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of <em>NCHRP Report 672</em> to Provide Design Guidance</th>
<th>Reporting Number of State Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>NCHRP Report 672</em> is the only source of design guidance.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material from other sources supplements <em>NCHRP Report 672</em></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our state has developed guidance to supplement <em>NCHRP Report 672</em></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our state uses material from other sources, and does not use, or rarely uses, <em>NCHRP Report 672</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our state has developed separate guidance and does not use, or rarely uses, <em>NCHRP Report 672</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results

Roundabout Design Life Criteria Reported As Used by State Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design-Life Criteria</th>
<th>Reporting State Agency Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case-by-Case Basis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Design Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Design Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Duration</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Reporting States Indicating Roundabout Design Life Used by State Agencies with a Fixed Design-Life Duration

Reported State Agency Use of a Phased Implementation Approach to Multilane Roundabouts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Agency Use of a Phased Implementation Approach to Multilane Roundabouts</th>
<th>Reporting Number of State Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results

• Half of the reporting States indicated their State agency had developed design-vehicle guidance.

• Several States simply guide designers to use a large tractor-trailer truck (WB-67) design vehicle, and a few other States are currently in the process of developing guidance for the accommodation of large vehicles.
### Survey Results

#### Illumination Standard/Guidance Reported as Used by State Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illumination Standard/Guidance</th>
<th>Reporting State Agencies Using Particular Illumination Standard/Guidance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO Roadway Lighting Design Guide</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>NCHRP Report 672</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IES Design Guide for Roundabout Lighting)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Specific Standard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• A significant amount of new material, including this synthesis, has been developed since the publication of *NCHRP Report 672*

• The production of a third edition of *Roundabouts: An Informational Guide* would help to disseminate this updated information to practitioners.
Conclusions

• Several State agencies expressed a desire to identify and disseminate strategies for limiting the cost to install roundabouts.

• Cost factors including maintenance of traffic during construction, the use of curb-and-gutter sections, and illumination were expressed as opportunities for more research.

• Identifying particular applications, such as interchange ramp terminals, where roundabouts may have additional cost benefits would be beneficial for States looking to maximize the cost-effectiveness of roundabouts.
Conclusions

• States are searching for ways to ensure roundabouts and other intersection forms are evaluated using state-of-the-practice methods and measures.

• A comparison of rate of implementation among states with different roundabout policies and particularly Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) policies may shed more light on the effectiveness of such policies.
Conclusions

- Additional research on the effectiveness of public outreach strategies could be helpful to identify strategies and prioritize resources towards strategies that have been shown to have successful outcomes, and help alleviate pushback against roundabouts
Conclusions

• The majority of States are now using a phased implementation approach in the design of roundabouts

• However, there is limited before/after data related to the planned expansion of roundabouts

• Research on best practices for planning and funding the expansion, along with managing traffic during reconstruction, could be helpful to State agencies
CASE STUDIES AND STATE DOT PERSPECTIVE

September 19, 2016

Andrew Paul
SELECTION OF DOTs FOR CASE STUDIES

• Criteria
  ▪ A mix of early adopter and more recent adoption states
  ▪ Known leaders in the roundabout field
  ▪ A geographic mix of states
  ▪ Preference given to panel member states
  ▪ Preference given to states who have participated in similar interviews in the past to allow for a comparative review.
What state DOTs we talked to?
CASE EXAMPLES OF ROUNDABOUT PRACTICES

- Roundabout Selection
- Modifications to Existing Roundabouts
- Phased Roundabout Implementation
- Design Vehicle Accommodation
- Accelerated, Low-Cost Roundabouts
- Effective Practices
CASE EXAMPLES OF ROUNDABOUT PRACTICES

• Roundabout selection - How does a DOT select an intersection type?
  ▪ The interviews suggest that a policy, directive, or guide suggesting or mandating that a roundabout be considered as an option also drives the selection of roundabouts
CASE EXAMPLES OF ROUNDABOUT PRACTICES

- Modification to existing roundabouts –
  - Most of the modifications to date involved reducing the number of lanes because of excess capacity at the roundabout.
- Kanas DOT
CASE EXAMPLES OF ROUNDBOUT PRACTICES

• Modification to existing roundabouts – Washington State DOT
  - At two locations, WSDOT reduced the capacity of multilane roundabouts to minimize minor crash patterns.
  - By reducing the number of lanes on the approach to the roundabout, it was able to reduce the number of points where crashes can occur.
CASE EXAMPLES OF ROUNDABOUT PRACTICES

• Phased roundabout implementation
  ▪ At least five of the seven states interviewed have modified roundabouts by reducing capacity.
  ▪ All seven DOTs are now actively attempting to size their roundabouts for immediate and near future vehicle demand.
  ▪ Georgia and Maryland, will open the roundabout as a single-lane roundabout if that configuration is expected to be sufficient for approximately 10 years.
CASE EXAMPLES OF ROUNDABOUT PRACTICES

• Phased roundabout implementation – Maryland SHA
• Design vehicle accommodation
  ▪ Roundabout design vehicle selection is similar to other intersection control
  ▪ WSDOT determines the specific movements larger vehicles are expected to make at an intersection, and designs its roundabouts to accommodate large vehicles on those movements.
  ▪ WSDOT recently modified its truck apron height from three inches to two inches in certain applications.
  ▪ GDOT tracks the routes of oversize/overweight vehicles statewide, and is able to determine the types of vehicles likely to traverse the proposed roundabout, and the movements the large vehicles are expected to make at the intersection.
CASE EXAMPLES OF ROUNDABOUT PRACTICES

- Accelerated, low-cost roundabouts
CASE EXAMPLES OF ROUNDABOUT PRACTICES

• Accelerated, low-cost roundabouts
  ▪ These projects typically include pavement markings and signs, with a budget of $200,000 to $300,000

FIGURE 36 Accelerated low-cost roundabout installation at the intersection of SR-11/SR-124/Galilee Church Road in Jackson County, Georgia. Source: Zehngraft (50).
CASE EXAMPLES OF ROUNDABOUT PRACTICES

• Effective practices
  ▪ ICE
  ▪ Strict enforcement of the policy
  ▪ Retrofitting Rotaries
  ▪ State-specific roundabout design guidance