# MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF STATE HIGHWAYS 

SIGNAL HEAD COLOR STUDY

Conducted Jointly by the

MDSE TRAFFIC DIVISION
TRAFFIC RESEARCH SECTION
and
THE CITY OF DETROIT
DEPARTMENT OF STREETS AND TRAFFIC
in Cooperation with the
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

LIBRA
michish diperment of state hoff. LAWSNO

May 1966
Lansing, Michigan

# MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF STATE HIGHWAYS 

## COMMISSION

Ardale W. Ferguson, Chairman
Charles H. Hewitt
Wallace D. Jun
Richard F, VanderVeen

State Highway Director . . . . . . . . . . . . . Howard E. Hill
Director of Engineering . . . . . . . . . . . . . John E. Meyer
Chief, Office of Design and Traffic. . . . . . . . G. J. McCarthy
Director of Traffic Division . . . . . . . . . . H. H. Cooper
Traffic Research Engineer. . . . . . . . . . . . Frank DeRose, Jr.
Report Prepared by . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Nejad Enustun
Statistical Analyses by . . . . . . . . . . . . . Earl Foh1
Page
SYNOPS IS ..... 1
STUDY PROCEDURES ..... 3
STUDY RESULTS ..... 16
CONCLUSIONS ..... 26
LIST OF TABULATIONS
Table 1: Accidents on Woodward Avenue ..... 5
Table 2: Woodward Avenue Signal Observance ..... 10
Table 3: Accidents on Grand River Avenue ..... 13
Table 4: Grand River Avenue Signal Observance ..... 17
Table 5: Summary of Results ..... 23
Table 6: Grand River Avenue Thru-on-Red Counts ..... 25
During Non-Congestion Periods
Table 7: Statistically Significant Changes ..... 27
Table 8: Study Results by Individual Intersections ..... 28

## SYNOPS IS

A difference between the specifications of the Michigan Department of State Highways and the City of Detroit for paint color used on the outside of traffic signal heads prompted the initiation of a study of the relative merits of dark green versus highway yellow color on signals. The study was conducted jointly by the two above mentioned administrations, and it was agreed that all the signals on Woodward and Grand River Avenues in Detroit, which were originally painted a dark green, would be painted in the regular yellow color as part of the study procedures. Both of these avenues are part of the state trunkline system within the city.

Signal observance surveys were taken at five intersections on Woodward Avenue and on six intersections on Grand River Avenue before and after changing the paint. In these sixhour surveys, vehicles going through the intersection illegally on red signal indication, entering the intersection on amber indication, and abnormal or panic stops were counted. Accident experience at all signalized intersections on each of the trunklines (30 intersections on Woodward Avenue and 58 on Grand River Avenue) were studied for a year before painting and a year after painting.

After analyses for statistical significance, the study results failed to provide conclusive evidence to favor either the dark green or the yellow color. The results that were considered statistically significant were: an increase in vehicles entering on red signal on Grand River Avenue after the signals were painted yellow, a decrease in abnormal stops on both trunklines, a decrease in total accidents on Woodward Avenue, and an increase in daylight right-angle accidents on Grand River Avenue. Even these statistically significant changes are believed to have other causative factors than signal head colors, which makes any evaluation of color in this study virtually impossible.

## STUDY PROCEDURES

Reason for the Study
The Michigan Department of State Highways specifications require that traffic signal heads be painted highwayyellow on the outside. The City of Detroit Department of Streets and Traffic, however, painted their signals a dark green color. This practice included signals on those city arteries which are part of the State Trunkline System that are maintained by the City through agreement with the Department of State Highways. In 1960, with the aim of obtaining uniformity throughout the trunklines, the Depart-m ment of State Highways requested that the signal heads be painted in the regulation yellow color. The City contended that their experience led them to favor the dark color because the lens colors were more readily visible against a dark signal-head color. The Department of State Highways believed, however, that it was more important that the motorist quickly note the presence of a traffic signal, at which range the relative visibility of lens colors against the signal background is not critical. These differing opinions were the reasons for initiating a study on the relative merits of the two colors.

The Department of State Highways and the City of Detroit Department of Streets and Traffic agreed to conduct, jointly, studies on Woodward Avenue, which is part of U.S. Route 10,
and on Grand River Avenue which is designated as Interstate Route 96 Business Spur. The study envisaged a before-andafter evaluation of the effects of changing the color of the paint from dark green to yellow. The two study parameters adopted were accident experience and drivers ${ }^{\text {p }}$ behavior and observance of the traffic signals.

## Woodward Avenue Study

There are two separate sections of Woodward Avenue in the City of Detroit, a third intermediate section falling within the limits of the City of Highland Park. For the accident part of the study, all the signalized intersections of this thoroughm fare within the City of Detroit were considered. There are 30 such intersections (Table 1). For the driver behavior and signal observance surveys 5 intersections were selected which were considered to be representative of the various traffic and environmental characteristics throughout the whole stretch of this city street. These intersections are State Fair Entrance, 6 Mile Road, Chicago (Fig, 1), Warren, and Montcalm (Fig. 2) 。

To compare the behavior of drivers at the five intersections before and after changing the color of the paint, surveys were made for a period of 6 hours $(9-11 A M, 12 N-2 P M$ and $2: 30=4: 30 \mathrm{PM})$ to count the number of vehicles that entered the intersection illegally during the red phase of the signals, the number that entered during the amber phase, and the number that made abnormal or panic stops both before the stop bars, which are

Table 1

ACCIDENT EXPERIENCE ON WOODWARD AVENUE BEFORE AND AFTER CHANGING SIGNAL-HEAD PAINT

| Location |  | Oct. 1,1959 through Sept. 30,1960 <br> (Signals Painted Green) |  |  | Jan. 1, 1961 through Dec. 31,1961 (Signals Painted Yellow) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Right-Angle Accidents |  | Total Accidents | Right-Angle Accidents |  | Total Accidents |
|  |  | Daylight | Dark |  | Daylight | Dark |  |
| er | ```State Fair Parking Lot Entr. State Fair + Bus Loop Golden Gate Savannah``` | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ 56 \\ 9 \\ 15 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & 56 \\ & 12 \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Merril Plaisance <br> McNichols ( 6 Mile Road) <br> Calvert-Trowbridge <br> Chicago-Arden Park | 2 11 2 4 | 2 1 0 1 | 25 50 12 23 | 1 9 1 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 31 \\ 41 \\ 8 \\ 20 \end{array}$ |
|  | Clairmount-Owen <br> Hazelwood-Holbrook <br> Euclid <br> Seward-Marston | 2 1 3 0 | 0 1 1 0 | 73 18 30 27 | 0 1 0 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73 \\ & 24 \\ & 25 \\ & 33 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Bethune <br> Grand Blvd. <br> Milwaukee <br> Baltimore | 0 3 2 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17 \\ & 76 \\ & 33 \\ & 33 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 6 \\ & 2 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 59 \\ & 29 \\ & 33 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Medbury-Antoinette <br> Kirby <br> Putnam-Farnsworth <br> Warren | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 30 \\ & 26 \\ & 57 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9 \\ 25 \\ 19 \\ 39 \end{array}$ |
|  | Forest <br> Canfield Alexandrine Mack-Davenport | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | 53 30 33 25 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 39 \\ 21 \\ 30 \\ -11 \end{array}$ |
|  | $\because$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Figure 2 - View of Signals at Intersection of Woodward and Montcalm Looking South from Winder Intersection
painted on the pavement, or after these bars. After the signal heads were painted yellow, these surveys were repeated. The results are indicated in Table 2. Trafific volume counts were also taken during these surveys.

The City of Detroit provided accident data for one year prior to changing the paint color and one year after. Comparison of the accident data is shown in Table 1.

Grand River Avenue Study
This phase of the study was started almost two years aftex the Woodward Avenue phase. For accident studies, all of the 58 signalized intersections on Grand River Avenue in Detroit were examined (Table 3). For the driver behavior and signal observance surveys, 6 intersections were selected to reflect the variations in the character of traffic and environment conditions along this trunkline. These intersections are McIntyre, Greenfield, Ward, Grand, Warren, and Second.

Driver behavior surveys similar to those taken on Woodward Avenue were conducted before and after painting the signals in the yellow color. The results indicated what seemed to be a big increase in the total number of vehicles going through on red signal after the painting. While there were 47 such vehicles during the "before" survey, 229 were reported for the "after" survey. This shed doubts on the accuracy of this first "after" survey. A possible reason for inaccuracy was that the survey takers probably were not properly instructed

Table 2
WOODWARD AVENUE
SIGNAL OBSERVANCE SURVEY

| Location | Survey <br> Period | Number of Cycles |  | Entering on Red |  | Entering on Amber |  | Abnormal Stops |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Signals } \\ & \text { Painted } \\ & \text { Green } \end{aligned}$ | Signals <br> Painted <br> Yellow | Signals <br> Painted <br> Green | Signals <br> Painted <br> Yellow | Signals Painted Green | Signals <br> Painted <br> Yellow | Signals Painted Green | Signals <br> Painted <br> Yellow |
| N.W. of State Fair Main Gate \#5 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{cl} 9 & -11 \mathrm{~A} \\ 12 \mathrm{~N} & -2 \mathrm{P} \\ 2: 30 & -4: 30 \mathrm{P} \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 141 \\ & 141 \\ & 112 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 140 \\ & 140 \\ & 110 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 13 \\ & 39 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10 \\ 2 \\ 11 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 271 \\ & 187 \\ & 150 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 118 \\ & 121 \\ & 103 \end{aligned}$ | 8 4 19 | $\begin{array}{r} 19 \\ 13 \\ 7 \end{array}$ |
|  | 6 hr . total | 394 | 390 | 65 | 23 | 608 | 342 | 31 | 39 |
| S.E. of State Fa Main Gate \#5 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 9 \\ 12 \mathrm{~N} \end{gathered} \mathbf{- 1 1 \mathrm { A }} \mathrm{2P}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 144 \\ & 138 \\ & 112 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 140 \\ & 140 \\ & 110 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 . \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 52 \\ 76 \\ 100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 28 \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 6 hr . total | 394 | 390 | 11 | 6 | 228 | 64 | 4 | 2 |
| N.W. of 6 Mile Rd. | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{cc} 9 & -11 \mathrm{~A} \\ 12 \mathrm{~N} & -2 \mathrm{P} \\ 2: 30-4: 30 \mathrm{P} \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 144 \\ & 144 \\ & 114 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 144 \\ & 144 \\ & 114 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ 4 \\ 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ 12 \\ 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 150 \\ 116 \\ 98 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 225 \\ & 117 \\ & 110 \end{aligned}$ | 5 0 3 | 1 1 9 |
|  | 6 hr . total | 402 | 402 | 23 | 36 | 364 | 452 | 8 | 11 |
| S.E. of 6 Mile Rd. | $\begin{array}{ll} 9 & -11 \mathrm{~A} \\ 12 \mathrm{~N} & -2 \mathrm{P} \\ \mathrm{e}: 30-4: 30 \mathrm{P} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 140 \\ & 142 \\ & 113 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 144 \\ & 144 \\ & 114 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 2 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 13 \\ 18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 67 \\ 61 \\ 105 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 88 \\ 131 \\ 227 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 6 hr . total | 395 | 402 | 6 | 33 | 233 | 446 | 6 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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WOODWARD AVENUE
SIGNAL OBSERVANCE SURVEY

| Location | Survey <br> Period | Number of Cycles |  | Entering on Red |  | Entering on Amber |  | Abnormal Stops |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Signals <br> Painted <br> Green | Signals <br> painted <br> Yellow | Signals Painted Green | Signals Painted Yellow | Signals Painted Green | Signals <br> Painted <br> Yellow | Signals <br> Painted <br> Green | Signals Painted Yellow |
| On Warren N.E. of Woodward | $\begin{gathered} 9-11 \mathrm{~A} \\ 12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{p} \\ 2: 30-4: 30 \mathrm{P} \\ 6 \mathrm{hr} . \text { total } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 134 \\ & 143 \\ & 109 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Not } \\ & \text { Available } \\ & " \\ & " \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 3 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 4 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 33 50 55 | $\begin{aligned} & 89 \\ & 84 \\ & 68 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ 10 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 8 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 386 | " | 8 | 9 | 138 | 241 | 32 | 11 |
| N.W. of Montcalm | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 9-11 \mathrm{~A} \\ 12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{P} \\ 2: 30-4: 30 \mathrm{p} \\ 6 \mathrm{hr} . \text { total } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 110 \\ & 116 \\ & 107 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 115 \\ & 116 \\ & 107 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 6 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 15 \\ 7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46 \\ & 51 \\ & 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52 \\ & 41 \\ & 33 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 333 | 338 | 11 | 30 | 126 | 126 | 4 | 1 |
|  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{cc} 9 & -11 \mathrm{~A} \\ 12 \mathrm{~N} & -2 \mathrm{P} \\ 2: 30 & -4: 30 \mathrm{P} \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 111 \\ & 118 \\ & 108 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 115 \\ & 116 \\ & 107 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 7 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ 15 \\ 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 60 \\ 111 \\ 72 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 108 \\ 145 \\ 50 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 6 hr . total | 337 | 338 | 15 | 39 | 243 | 303 | 5 | 4 |
| Totals for all Intersections |  | 4223 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Not } \\ \text { Available } \end{gathered}\right.$ | 180 | 265 | 2823 | 2957 | 166 | 96 |

Table 3
ACCIDENT EXPERIENCE ON GRAND RIVER AVENUE
BEFORE AND AFTER CHANGING SIGNAL-HEAD PAINT

| Location | Jan. 1, 1962 through Dec. 31,1962 <br> (Signals Painted Green) |  |  | Nov. 1,1963 through Oct. 31, 1964(Signals Painted Yeliow) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right-Angle Accidents |  | Total <br> Accidents | Right-Angle Accidents |  | Total <br> Accidents |
|  | Daylight | Dark |  | Daylight | Dark |  |
| McIntyre | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 14 |
| Lahser | 8 | 6 | 49 | 3 | 4 | 44 |
| Bentler | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trinity | 1 | 2 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 24 |
| Evergreen | 2 | 3 | 31 | 6 | 6 | 23 |
| Outer Drive | 5 | 3 | 31 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| Warwick | 2 | 0 | 22 | 2 | 1 | 16 |
| Fenkell-Southfield-Ashton | 4 | 2 | 49 | 2 | 3 | 25 |
| Biltmore-Lindsay | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 11 |
| $\omega$ St. Mary's | 0 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| $\omega$ Prevost | 1 | 0 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 18 |
| Greenfield | 5 | 4 | 51 | 8 | 2 | 70 |
| Whitcomb | 4 | 1 | 20 | 1 | 3 | 22 |
| Robson | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Hubbell | 2 | 2 | 13 | 8 | 1 | 26 |
| Freeland | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| Stansbury | 1 | 0 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 19 |
| Schaefer | 3 | 2 | 33 | 4 | 2 | 29 |
| Ward | 1 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 20 |
| Meyers | 1 | 0 | 19 | 6 | 1 | 24 |
| Birwood | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Wyoming | 6 | 4 | 32 | 6 | 4 | 37 |
| Ohio | 1 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 18 |
| Plymouth-Cloverlawn | 2 | 2 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 19 |
| Oakman | 0 | 1 | 52 | 1 | 2 | 59 |
| Detroit RR (Term) W. of Cloverdale | 3 | 2 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| American | 0 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 20 |
| Monica | 0 | 2 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 20 |
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and consequently made errors in their tally. It was decided to repeat the after phase of the signal observance survey. But, because the first survey was taken in November of 1963 , the repeat survey was postponed to the following Spring to be conducted under better controlled conditions.

The results of the signal observance surveys, comparing the "before" and the second "after" conditions, are shown in Table 4. Volume counts were also taken at these intersections for statistical evaluation of the results. Unfortunately, errors were made in the "before" volume counts for the southeastbound traffic northwest of Grand Boulevard. For this reason, signal observance survey data for this approach leg of the Grand Boulevard intersection have been excluded from the analyses of the results.

The City compiled accident data for the pexiod before the signals were painted yellow and for the two "after" periods as explained above. Table 3 includes only the second "after" period. The first "after" data indicate a total of 1440 accidents which is not much different from the total of 1418 obtained during the second period.

## STUDY RESULTS

## Woodward Avenue

Accident study and signal observance survey results are shown in Tables 1 and 2. These results have been analyzed statistically for significance of the indicated changes in the criteria examined.

Table 4
GRAND RIVER AVENUE
SIGNAL OBSERVANCE SURVEY
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GRAND RIVER AVENUE
SIGNAL OBSERVANCE SURVEY
S. E. of Ward
S. E. of Grand

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Survey } \\ & \text { Period } \end{aligned}$ | Number of Cycles |  | Entering on Red |  | Entering on Amber |  | Abnormal Stops |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Signals <br> Painted <br> Green | Signals <br> Painted <br> Yellow | Signals Painted Green | Signals <br> painted <br> Yellow | Signals Painted Green | Signals <br> Painted <br> Yellow | Signals Painted Green | Signals <br> Painted <br> Yellow |
| $\begin{array}{cc} 9 & -11 \mathrm{~A} \\ 12 \mathrm{~N} & -2 \mathrm{P} \\ 2: 30-4: 30 \mathrm{P} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 80 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 80 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 38 \\ 11 \\ 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 34 \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 4 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6 hr. total | 240 | 240 | 1 | 0 | 57 | 69 | 5 | 6 |
| $\begin{array}{ccc} 9 & -11 \mathrm{~A} \\ 12 \mathrm{~N} & - & 2 \mathrm{P} \\ 2: 30 & -4: 30 \mathrm{P} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 80 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 80 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 4 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 4 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 48 \\ 103 \\ 116 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 41 \\ 129 \\ 129 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 14 \\ 9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6 hr . total | 240 | 240 | 9 | 10 | 267 | 299 | 25 | 1 |
| $\begin{array}{cr} 9 & -11 \mathrm{~A} \\ 12 \mathrm{~N} & -2 \mathrm{P} \\ 2: 30-4: 30 \mathrm{P} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (80) \\ & (80) \\ & (80) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (80) \\ & (80) \\ & (80) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (2) \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (60) \\ & (40) \\ & (62) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (50) \\ & (53) \\ & (86) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (7) \\ (3) \\ (11) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (13) \\ & (21) \\ & (11) \end{aligned}$ |
| 6 hr . total | (240) | (240) | 0 | (2) | (162) | (189) | (21) | (45) |
| $\begin{array}{cr} 9 & -11 \mathrm{~A} \\ 12 \mathrm{~N} & -2 \mathrm{P} \\ 2: 30-4: 30 \mathrm{P} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 81 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 80 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9 \\ 0 \\ 24 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25 \\ 1 \\ 27 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33 \\ 2 \\ 76 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6 hr . total | 241 | 240 | 4 | 33 | 53 | 111 | 6 | 0 |

**Values for this approach leg are not included in the totals and in the statistical analyses
because the "before" volume counts were inaccurate
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GRAND RIVER AVENUE

## SIGNAL OBSERVANCE SURVEY

| Location | Survey <br> Period | Number of Cycles |  | Entering on Red |  | Entering on Amber |  | Abnormal Stops |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Signals } \\ & \text { Painted } \end{aligned}$ Green | Signals <br> Painted <br> Yellow | Signals Painted Green | Signals <br> Painted <br> Yellow | Signals <br> Painted <br> Green | Signals <br> Painted <br> Yellow | Signals Painted Green | Signals Painted Yellow |
| N.W. of Warren | $\begin{aligned} & 9-11 \mathrm{~A} \\ & 12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{P} \\ & 2: 30-4: 30 \mathrm{p} \\ & 6 \mathrm{hr} . \text { total } \end{aligned}$ | 115 120 107 | 114 120 108 | 0 | 0 1 1 | 30 10 20 | 9 24 21 | 5 1 3 | 3 5 7 |
|  |  | 342 | 342 | 0 | 2 | 60 | 54 | 9 | 15 |
| ${ }^{-} \text {S.E. of Warren }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9-11 \mathrm{~A} \\ & 12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{P} \\ & 2: 30-4: 30 \mathrm{p} \\ & 6 \mathrm{hr} . \text { total } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 114 \\ & 120 \\ & 107 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1150 \\ & 120 \\ & 108 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 18 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 18 \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 341 | 343 | 0 | 4 | 46 | 58 | 2 | 2 |
| N.W. of Second | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 9-11 \mathrm{~A} \\ 12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{P} \\ 2: 30-4: 30 \mathrm{P} \\ 6 \mathrm{hr} . \text { total } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 115 \\ & 120 \\ & 107 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 115 \\ & 120 \\ & 108 \end{aligned}$ | 3 1 3 | 4 1 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 36 \\ & 17 \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 31 \\ 8 \\ 24 \end{array}$ | 1 0 1 | 4 1 1 |
|  |  | 342 | 343 | 7 | 6 | 76 | 63 | 2 | 6 |
| S.E. of Second | $\begin{aligned} & 9-11 \mathrm{~A} \\ & 12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{P} \\ & 2: 30-4: 30 \mathrm{P} \\ & 6 \mathrm{hr} . \text { total } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 116 \\ & 120 \\ & 106 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 115 \\ & 120 \\ & 108 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \\ & 39 \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 50 \\ & 32 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 8 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 6 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 342 | 343 | 2 | 6 | 89 | 96 | 14 | 13 |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4-(Page 4)
GRAND RIVER AVENUE
SIGNAL OBSERVANCE SURVEY


The decrease in the total number of accidents from 898 to 798 is thus found to be statistically significant. According to this analysis, the average number of accidents per intersection before the color change was 29.93 , and reduced to 26.60. This decrease has a probability level between 0.02 and 0.03 . However, the City reported that this decrease, which is $11.1 \%$, is not much different from the $9.8 \%$ city-wide reduction during the same period.

It is reasonable to assume that the accident type which would be directly related to the inconspicuousness of a signal head color is the right angle collision. Also, daylight conditions are more meaningful than night time. An examination of the accident data is therefore made to single out the right-angle daylight accidents, and this shows a reduction from 53 to 39. But, a statistical analysis indicates that the level of probability is between 0.11 and 0.12 and that this reduction is not significant。

An inspection of Table 2, representing the results of the signal observance surveys, shows that there was an increase in the total vehicles entering the intersections on red signal after the paint change. However, this was statistically not significant (probability between 0.1 and 0.2). A similar and statistically insignificant $(P>0.9)$ increase is also found in the total vehicles entering on amber signal. The only statistically significant change (probability level between 0.02 and 0.05 ) in the signal observance survey was found in the number of abnormal stops.

A summary of the above changes and whether or not these are statistically significant is contained in Table 5.

## Grand River Avenue

Basic summaries of the study and survey results are shown in Tables 3 and 4. As explained under STUDY PROCEDURES, all "after" figures refer to the second time, since the first "after" data were considered inaccurate. Again, all numerical findings were analyzed for statistical significance.

An increase is observed from 1258 total accidents in 1962, before yellow paint was applied to the signals, to 1418 accidents for a one-year period after painting. This is an increase of 160 or $12.7 \%$ but statistically not significant ( $0.08>\mathrm{P}>0.07$ ). During this time, from 1962 to 1964 , increase in average daily traffic was $1.5 \%$ so that the traffic growth should not have much bearing on the increase in accidents. Of the total 58 intersections, 34 show increase in the "after" period, 18 show decrease and 6 show no change. There are some distinct areas along Grand River within which a great majority of the consecutive signalized intersections indicate worsening of the accident situation, with a few showing no change. There are three such areas: one from Ford Freeway to Maplewood, containing 9 intersections; another from Chicago to Monica, containing 8 intersections; and a third from Stansbury to St. Mary's, containing 8 intersections. These three areas are responsible for a total rise of 157 accidents. possible causes of these area-wide worsenings of the accident picture should

## Table 5

SUMMARY OF RESULTS USED IN EVALUATING THE EFFECT OF SIGNAL HEAD COLOR CHANGE

FROM GREEN TO YELLOW

| Criteria | On Woodward Avenue |  | On Grand | River Avenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signal Observance | Change | Statistical Significance | Change | Statistical Significance |
| Entering on Red | Increase | No | Increase | Yes |
| Entering on Yellow | Increase | No | Decrease | No |
| Abnormal Stops | Decrease | Yes | Decrease | Yes |

Accidents

| Total | Decrease | Yes | Increase | No |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right-Angle Daylight | Decrease | No | Increase | Yes |

perhaps be checked into, but this is considered outside the scope of the present study.

Again, if one may reason that rightmangle collisions during daylight would be a better indication of the effectiveness of signal head color, it is seen that such accidents have increased from 103 to 140. This is a rise of $36 \%$ and is statistically significant ( $0.02>\mathrm{p}>0.01$ ) . Exclusion from the before-andafter comparison those areas of distinct worsening as pointed earlier would leave 43 right-angle accidents during daylight in the "before" period and 61 in the "after". This would be a rise of 18 accidents or $42 \%$.

The results of the signa1-observance surveys indicate a rise in the total vehicles entering on red signal, from 47 in the "before" period to 97 in the "after". This change is found to be statistically significant ( $\mathrm{P}>0.000033$ ) . Red-signal violation southeast of Grand Boulevard alone has changed from 4 to 33. It is very probable that this had other causes. If this intersection were entirely eliminated from the comparison, red-signal violations "before" would be 43 and "after" would be 64.

Signal violation would be a better indicator of the effect of signal head color if the observance survey did not include congested traffic periods, because during these periods there arise situations where signal violations may somewhat be condoned due to long queues waiting to clear the intersection and vehicles

Table 6
GRAND RIVER AVENUE
COMPARISON OF "THRU-ON-RED" COUNTS DURING
NON-CONGESTION PERIODS

| Intersection | Direction | Hours When Volumes Are Less Than 50\% of Peak Traffic | Vehicles Going | Thru on Red |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Signals Painted Green | Signals Painted Yellow |
| McIntyre | S,E.Bound | 10-11 A | 1 | 1 |
|  | " | $12 \mathrm{~N}-1 \mathrm{p}$ | 1 | 2 |
|  | N.W. Bound | 9-11 A | 5 | 2 |
|  | " | $12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{P}$ | 2 | 5 |
| Greenfield | N.W. Bound | 9-11 A | 0 | 0 |
|  | " | $12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{P}$ | 0 | 1 |
|  | " | 2:30-4 P | 0 | 0 |
| Ward | S.E.Bound | 9-11 A | 0 | 0 |
|  | " | 12N-2 p | 0 | 0 |
|  | " | $2: 30-4: 30 \mathrm{p}$ | 1 | 0 |
|  | N.W. Bound | 9-11 A | 1 | 1 |
|  | , | $12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{p}$ | 4 | 4 |
|  | " | 2:30-4P | 1 | 3 |
| Trand | N.W. Bound | 9-11A | 2 | 9 |
|  | " | $12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{p}$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | " | 2:30-4 P | 2 | 14 |
| Warren | S.E.Bound | $10=11 \mathrm{~A}$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | " | $12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{p}$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | " | 2:30-4:30 P | 0 | 1 |
|  | N.W.Bound | 9-11 A | 0 | 3 |
|  | " | $12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{P}$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | " | 2:30-4p | 0 | 0 |
| Second | S.E. Bound | 1-2 P | 1 | 0 |
|  | N. W. Bound | 9-11 A | 0 | 1 |
|  | . ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | $12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{p}$ | 2 | 2 |
| On Second | N. Bound | 9-11 A | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | $12 \mathrm{~N}-2 \mathrm{p}$ | 0 | 1 |
|  | " | 2:30-4P | 0 | 2 |
|  |  |  | $21 \quad 23$ | 52 |

following each other with minimal headways. An attempt was therefore made to examine the situation if heavy traffic periods were excluded from the survey results. To do this, hourly approach volumes for each direction were inspected and those volumes which are higher than $50 \%$ of the peak hour volume (1964 counts) were discarded (see Table 6). The signalobservance data on hand is of course confined to the basic six hours, so that these results by no means reflect the entire off-peak periods. Under this condition, the number of vehicles going through on red signal before the signals were painted was 23 and increased to 52. This is not materially different from the results of the complete 6 -hour tally which showed a doubling in the number of violations.

Total change in the number of vehicles entering on amber signal indication was from 1401 to 1303. This decrease, however, was found to be statistically insignificant ( $0.26>\mathrm{P}>0.25$ ). The only statistically significant decrease was in the number of abnormal stops from 129 to $90(0.02>\mathrm{p}>0.01)$.

## CONCLUSIONS

Considering only those differences in the results of the before-and-after comparisons which are statistically significant, the criteria listed in Table 5 reduce to the following:

## Table 7

Statistically Significant Changes in Criteria for Evaluation of the Effect of Signal Color

Criteria
Changes After Painting Signals Yellow

1. Vehicles entering on red signal : Increased on Grand River Ave.
2. Abnormal stops at signals: Decreased on both avenues
3. Total accidents
: Decreased on Woodward Avenue
4. Daylight right-angle accidents : Increased on Grand River Ave.

The above results derive from total figures obtained for all the intersections where surveys were made. A further examination of the individual study-intersections was made, using the same criteria of signal observance and accident experience, to explore the possibility of detecting any revealing facts on the relative merits of the two colors for signal heads. This effort is presented in Table 8. If equal weight may be assigned to the five criteria selected, it is seen that on the Woodward Avenue intersections, 4 out of 5 intersections indicate greater number of decreases in the adverse criteria. On Grand River Avenue, however, all of the 6 intersections indicate greater number of increases in the adverse criteria. It should be remembered, of course, that there is a time lapse of almost two years between the "after" surveys on Woodward and Grand River Avenues, and this time factor may have made comparisons less reliable.

Under the general traffic conditions prevailing on the trunklines considered, the effect of other factors outweigh any small effect the color of the signals may have. For example, looking at the

Woodward Avenue

| Signals <br> Painted <br> Green | Signals <br> Painted <br> Yellow | Increase ( + ) <br> or | Increase (+) or <br> Decrease ( |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

State Fair Gate

| Vehicles entering on red | 76 | 29 | - |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| " $"$ amber | 836 | 406 | - |
| Abnormal stops |  | 35 | 41 |
| Total accidents | 56 | 56 | + |
| Right-angle daylight accid. | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |

6 Mile Road

| Vehicles entering on red | 29 | 69 | + |  |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $"$ | $"$ | amber | 597 | 898 |
| Abnormal stops |  | 14 | 12 | + |
| otal accidents | 50 | 41 | - |  |
| Right-angle daylight accid. | 11 | 9 | - |  |

## Chicago

| Vehicles entering on red | 18 | 30 | + |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $" \#$ | $"$ amber | 304 | 320 |
| Abnormal stops |  | 31 | 19 |
| Total accidents | 23 | 20 | + |
| Right-angle daylight accid. | 4 | 1 | - |
|  |  |  |  |

Warren

| Vehicles entering on red | 23 | 59 | + |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $" \#$ | $"$ amber | 579 | 663 |
| Abnormal stops |  | 45 | 8 |
| Total accidents | 57 | 39 | + |
| Right-angle daylight accid. | 2 | 5 | - |

## Montcalm

| Vehicles entering on red | 26 | 69 | + |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $"$ | $"$ | amber | 369 |
| onormal stops |  | 929 | + |
| Total accidents | 11 | 5 | - |
| Right-angle daylight accid. | 2 | 10 | - |

Table 8 - (Page 2)
Grand River Avenue


McIntyre

| Vehicles entering on red | 23 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $" \#$ | " amber |
| Abnormal stops |  |
| Total accidents | 44 |
| Right-angle daylight accid. | 9 |
|  |  |

Greenfield
$\begin{array}{clr}\text { Vehicles entering on red } & \text { " } & 1 \\ " & \text { amber } & 160\end{array}$
Abnormal stops 17
Total accidents 51
Right-angle daylight accid. 5

| 5 | + |
| ---: | ---: |
| 173 | + |
| 31 | + |
| 70 | + |
| 8 | + |

Ward

| Vehicles entering on red | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $" \#$ | $"$ | 10 | 368 |
| Abnormal stops |  | 30 | 7 |
| Total accidents |  | 10 | 20 |
| Rightangle daylight accid. | 1 | 2 | + |
|  |  |  | + |

Grand Boulevard

Right-angle daylight accid. $\quad 1$

| 33 | + |
| ---: | ---: |
| 111 | + |
| 0 | - |
| 82 | + |
| 3 | + |

Warren

| Vehicles entering on red | 0 106 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Abnormal stops | 11 |
| Total accidents | 39 |
| Right-angle daylight accid. | 3 |
| Second |  |
| Vehicles entering on red | 9 165 |
| Total accidents | 8 |
| Abnormal stops | 16 |
| Right-angle daylight accid. | 2 |


| 6 | + |
| ---: | ---: |
| 112 | + |
| 17 | + |
| 56 | + |
| 5 | + |


| 12 | + |
| ---: | ---: |
| 159 | - |
| 6 | + |
| 19 | + |

(*) Northwest-bound only
accident situation on Grand River Avenue, the statistically significant increase in the right-angle collisions during daylight may not in fact be significant at all for purposes of this study, considering the fact that right-angle collisions during dark hours also increased from 65 to 86 , and that the color or signal paint at night should not have any bearing whatever on being easily spotted. This would certainly indicate other major causes for accident aggravation than the effect of signal-head color.

Examining again the results in Table 7 and assuming equal weight for each of the criteria considered, there are 3 decreases, on both thoroughfares, against 2 increases. This may perhaps be interpreted as a favorable point for the yellow color. Considering all the available evidence, however, this study does not provide sufficient data to distinguish clearly between the merits of dark green and yellow paint on traffic signals on the two city trunklines.

It is a fact, of course, that yellow as a light-reflective tone is superior to dark green; and if it is agreed that, to a driver approaching an intersection from a distance, to be able to notice that a signal assembly exists at all is more important than to distinguish which lens indication is on, yellow color should be considered preferable. Further effort to prove this point by expanding the research so that statistically more reliable test parameters could be set up was not deemed justifiable, and it was decided to conclude the study.

