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## FOREWORD

This report is a summary of the Final Report TSD-RD-219-72 for the research project entitled Study of the Operational Aspects of One-Way and Two-Way Streets. The detailed report is 182 pages long, contains 41 figures, 62 tables, 27 appendices and 16 photographs, and provides a complete documentation of the project which was partly financed by Federal Highway Planning and Research funds. The purpose of the present summary report is to provide an opportunity for those individuals who cannot afford the time and attention required by the comprehensive report to get familiar with the project and its results.

The purpose of the study was to obtain quantitative data on the quality of traffic operation when state trunk lines through urban areas are converted to one-way operation because of need for extra capacity. Four Michigan cities, Lansing, Kalamazoo, Pontiac and Port Huron were selected for a before-and-after type of evaluation of a definite segment of their one-way system as each was prepared for and converted to one-way traffic.
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## DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDIES

## THE KALAMAZOO STUDY

The state trunk line sections through the City of Kalamazoo that were studied are I-94 BL and M-43 which cross the central business district in a general east-west direction. Before conversion to one-way operation, the two numbered routes shared Michigan Avenue for the major part of the section, and separated near the west end of the study area where M-43 followed Main Street to the west, and I-94 BL continued along Michigan Avenue which ran diagonally southwest. For the one-way operation, Kalamazoo Avenue, which is another east-west street three blocks north of the larger section of Michigan Avenue, was widened to carry the westbound trunk line traffic while Michigan carried the eastbound. This conversion was done on October 10, 1965.

Two sets of traffic surveys and accident data collection were done, one before and the other after the start of one-way operation. Volume counts were taken by 15 -minute periods for at least 48 hours at 105 stations dispersed in an area about 1.5 miles long and 0.7 mile wide. Time gaps in the traffic stream on Kalamazoo and on Michigan Avenues were measured at their intersections with Church Street during rush hours. The total numbers and sizes of these gaps were recorded. Turning movements were counted at two major intersections. Stoppage of left lanes caused by traffic waiting to make left turns at one of these intersections was also recorded. Speed-anddelay study runs were made by the floating car method along six routes, each approximately 1.5 miles long, on the trunk lines for determining total travel time and points and durations of all delays. Total travel time only was clocked on six cross streets which are situated in a general north-south direction and which intersect the one-way pair. Accidents were studied in the general area traversed by the one-way arteries, covering about one square mile.

## THE LANSING STUDY

The Lansing study area is within the northern fringe of the central business district and in-
cludes the street network along an east-west corridor 1.9 miles long and about 0.4 mile wide. Within this corridor, Saginaw Street and Oakland Avenue carry M-43 traffic. The study examines the two-way operation and two successive phases of the one-way operation along this state trunk line corridor. During the two-way phase Saginaw Street was the two-way artery. On January 31, 1965, after completion of widening and reconstruction of Jefferson Street and part of Oakland Avenue as far west as Logan Street, the initial phase of the one-way operation began. The new route, two blocks north of Saginaw in the eastern part of the study area and only one block north of Saginaw near the west, carried the westbound traffic; leaving only eastbound traffic on Saginaw east of Logan Street. During this phase Logan Street was the west terminal of the one-way system, and carried the westbound trunk line traffic south to Saginaw, and from there to the west the trunk line operated two-way.

The final phase of the operation started on May 13, 1969 after the construction of the rest of Oakland Avenue west of Logan, and a railroad bridge carrying Belt Line Railroad over reconstructed M-43 highway at west city limits. Near the bridge location, the one-way street system transitioned to a two-way, four-lane highway.

Traffic volume counts in Lansing were done similar to Kalamazoo, and 15 -minute counts were taken at 87 stations. Gap surveys were taken on Saginaw Street at its intersections with Seymour, Chestnut, Clayton-Carey, Westmoreland, Cawood and Durant. Turning movement counts were made at the intersections of Oakland and Logan, Saginaw and Verlinden. Delays caused by traffic waiting to turn left were also recorded at these intersections. Speed-and-delay test runs during peak traffic on Saginaw and Oakland were made between Belt Line Railroad on the west and Cedar Street on the east. Cross-street travel time runs were made on Washington, Capitol, Walnut, Pine, Logan, Jenison and Verlinden. Accident reports were studied on all streets in the study area. All surveys and studies were repeated for the three phases of the Lansing study.

## THE PONTIAC STUDY

The Pontiac study area is a 1.2 -mile corridor along US-10 BR northwest of the central business district. The effect of the change in operation was examined along the corridor for a width of about 0.3 mile. During the before phase, Oakland Avenue was a two-way state trunk line between its intersection with Cass Avenue-Montcalm Sireet and Wide Track Drive. During the after phase, Cass Avenue, two blocks to the southwest, was developed into a southeast-bound one-way state trunk line, and Oakland Avenue became oneway northwest-bound. The change to one-way was implemented on May 18, 1967. However, interconnection of traffic signals by electrical cables was delayed until April 5, 1968, and the "after" study was conducted subsequent to this date.

Survey procedures in Pontiac were similar to Kalamazoo and Lansing, except that instead of the cross-street travel-time runs, perpendicular to the study trunk lines, a closed loop run 1.2 miles long was made on the side streets and crossing the one-way pair. This was done as part of the speed-and-delay procedure along the state route. The speed-and-delay runs on Oakland had fos terminals Northview Street on the northwest, and Saginaw Street on the southeast. Runs on Cass Avenue also had Northview Street as one of the terminals, but Wide Track Drive was the southeast terminal. Each of these runs was 1.3 miles long.

Traffic volumes in the study area were taken at 59 stations. Gap surveys were conducted on Oakland Avenue at its intersection with Blaine, Cadillac and Florence Streets, and on Cass Avenue at Florence intersection. Turning-movements and stoppage of left lanes due to left turns were recorded at the intersections of Oakland Avenue with Cass-Montcalm, Johnson, and Alli-son-Baldwin Streets; and at the intersection of Cass Avenue and Johnson Street.

Accidents were also studied within the abovedescribed area. In addition, accidents along the
unchanged two-way section of Oakland Avenue between West Boulevard and Montcalm-Cass were studied for control purposes.

## THE PORT HURON STUDY

The change over to one-way traffic operation in Port Huron was basically different from the three other cities. In those cities an existing two-way state trunk line was converted to one-way, and a parallel street was used for the opposite direction. In Port Huron the old state trunk line was -abandoned to the city, and a new corridor approximately $3 / 4$ mile to the south was selected for the one-way pair.

During the two-way phase, M-21 followed Lapeer and Water Streets between 32nd Street to the west and Military Street to the east. This is a stretch of 1.8 miles, and is to the west of the central business district. The new one-way trunk line corridor is the Griswold-Oak pair, Griswold Street running westbound and Oak Street eastbound. The area is mainly residential. These two streets were widened and reconstructed. Oak Street was connected with Mitchell Street to the east, providing continuity on a straight alignment up to Military Street. The new one-way pair transitioned to the limited-access highway near the west city limits. The Griswold-Oak pair was opened to traffic on October 19, 1966.

Traffic volumes in Port Huron were recorded at 78 stations within three separate traffic corridors. The third corridor was the Union and Court Streets pair which already operated as a one-way city system even before the re-routing of the state trunk line. Gap surveys during peak periods were conducted only on Griswold Street at its intersections with 7 th, 16 th, 20 th and 22 nd Street. Turning-movement counts were taken at the intersections of Griswold Street with Military and 24 th. The speed-and-delay runs were made on Lapeer, and on the Griswold-Oak pair, in both directions, between 32nd Street and Military Street. The Lapeer route was 1.8 miles, and the
one-way route was 2.0 . Cross-street travel time data were taken only across the Griswold-Oak corridor on five north-south streets.

Accident study in Port Huron involved three traffic corridors. The Union-Court pair was in-
cluded for comparison, and accidents were recorded only on these two streets but did not include accidents on streets crossing this pair. Accident studies for the Lapeer and Griswold-Oak corridors, however, included accidents on the cross-streets one block north and one block south from the trunk lines.

## ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Quality of traffic service in general can be measured by the parameters of time, convenience, safety, distance and cost. The present study mainly deals with the first three. In an overall evaluation of a street system such as the ones examined in this project, the results are bound to reflect the effects of a whole set of conditions and circumstances in addition to the uni- or bidirectional character of the trunk line traffic. Optimum adjustment of traffic signals and other traffic control measures, temporal changes in the intensity and type of land use and in the age and social-group brackets of drivers using the facilities are but a few of these circumstances. This should be kept in mind in reviewing the results of the study.

## SPEED AND DELAY STUDY RESULTS

Table I contains results of speed and delay studies on principal routes in Kalamazoo. The westbound trips via Kalamazoo Avenue and Douglas Street gained 8.9 miles per hour in average overall speed during the morning peak with one-way operation. There were, on the average, 2.4 less stops during the same peak, and this shortened stopped-delay by 24 seconds per mile of travel. There were lesser but significant gains in the westbound direction also. The greatest savings in time, however, occurred on the westbound trip when compared to the former westbound traffic on the state trunk line through Michigan Avenue and Main Street. An average speed gain of 10.6 miles per hour was measured.

Table II is the corresponding evaluation for Lansing. Up to 4.8 miles per hour was gained in speed. There were modest but consistent reductions in stops and seconds of delay. Although speed increase was less than what was accomplished in Kalamazoo, the optimum progression speed of 30 m. p.h. was reached in Lansing.

Table III is for Pontiac. In this city although 3.0 to 3.7 miles per hour of speed increase has been realized on the southeastbound trips, a slight decrease was found during the morning peak in the northwestbound direction, with stopped delay
increasing by 16 seconds per mile. This adverse result is believed to arise because of inadequate capacity at the northwest transition point to twoway operation.

Table IV compares eastbound and westbound trip parameters on Lapeer Street with those on the new Griswold-Oak one-way pair in Port Huron. The average over-all speeds on the one-way streets range from 26.1 to $30.7 \mathrm{~m} . \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{h}_{\text {. as }}$ compared to 19.0 to 22.6 on the two-way street.

Table $V$ shows average change percentages in speeds, number of stops and delays in all of the four cities. It gives a quick picture of the comparative degree of accomplishment by the one-way projects in these cities.

There are some other consequences of the oneway operations which the present study cannot quantify. Among these are reductions in air pollution and traffic noise. These reductions result from a smoother flow of the traffic stream thereby minimizing engine exhaust pollutants and noise.

## CROSS-STREET SPEED STUDY RESULTS

To detect the possibility of having created any excessive delays on the cross-streets due to the one-way trunk line operations, cross-street travel time studies were made. Table VI lists average results obtained from these studies. In Kalamazoo, where no signals were added to those already in operation at certain intersections, there was an actual reduction in the over-all average. Slight increases in Lansing and Port Huron, due to the addition of signals to some intersections, is a sacrifice that can be afforded as a trade-off for even small gains in travel time on the trunk lines, since these gains benefit larger traffic volumes. Nevertheless, introduction of the new one-way trunk line pair has not resulted in delays of any objectionable duration on the cross-streets.

## RESULTS OF GAP STUDIES

Table VII indicates total numbers of gaps of

TABLE I
CITY OF KALAMAZOO
SPEED AND DELAY STUDY RESULTS
FOR PRINCIPAL ROUTES

|  |  | DURING TWO-WAY OPERATION |  |  |  |  |  | DURING ONE-WAY OPERATION |  |  |  |  |  | CHANGE IN: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ROUTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | ¢ | Via Kalamazoo-Douglas |  |  | 20.6 | 2.7 | 27 | Via | Kalama | ouglos | 29.5 | 0.3 | 3 | $\begin{gathered} +8.9 \\ (S) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -2.4 \\ (S) \end{gathered}$ | -24 |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | " | " | " | 20.2 | 2.9 | 28 |  | " | " | 26.2 | 1.0 | 11 | $\left[\begin{array}{l} +6.0 \\ (S) \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.9 \\ (S)^{-} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $-17$ |
|  | $\frac{\pi}{4}$ | " | " | " | 19.1 | 2.9 | 34 |  | " | ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 21.3 | 2.0 | 28 | + 2.2 | -0.9 | - 6 |
|  | ¢ | Via Main-Michigan |  |  | 19.7 | 2.0 | 29 | Via | Main - M |  | 22.4 | 1.6 | 23 | + 2.7 | -0.4 | - 6 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { c } \\ & 0 \\ & \text { Z } \end{aligned}$ | " | " |  | 18.7 | 3.0 | 36 |  | " |  | 20.8 | 1.6 | 25 | + 2.1 | $\begin{gathered} -1.4 \\ \hline \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | -11 |
|  | $\frac{ \pm}{4}$ |  | " |  | 16.6 | 3.8 | 45 |  | " |  | 20.4 | 1.8 | 30 | $\begin{gathered} +3.8 \\ (S) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -2.0 \\ (S) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | -15 |
| 0 <br> 5 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br>  | ¢ | Via Michigan-Main |  |  | 18.9 | 4.0 | 28 | Via | Kalama | ouglas | 29.5 | 0.3 | 3 | $\begin{gathered} +10.6 \\ (\mathrm{~S}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -3.7 \\ (S) \end{gathered}$ | -25 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\circ} \\ & \text { i } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | " | " | " | 17.4 | 4.0 | 34 |  | " | " | 26.2 | 1.0 | 11 | $\begin{aligned} & +8.8 \\ & (S) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -3.0 \\ (S) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | -23 |
|  | $\underset{\alpha}{\leftrightarrows}$ | " | " | " | 14.7 | 5.7 | 70 |  | " | " | 21.3 | 2.0 | 28 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} +6.6 \\ (S) \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} -3.7 \\ (\mathrm{~s}) \end{gathered}$ | -42 |

*     - These changes have been tested for statistical significance.
$(S)$ - The change is statistically significant.


## TABLE II

CITY OF LANSING
SPEED AND DELAY STUDY RESULTS

|  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 . \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | DURING TWO-WAY OPERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  | DURING ONE-WAY OPERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  | CHANGE IN: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ROUTE |  |  |  |  |  |  | ROUTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | E | Via Saginaw St. |  |  |  | 26.0 | 1.9 | 1.5 | Via Saginaw St. |  |  |  | 30.0 | 1.0 | 9 | $\begin{gathered} +4.0 \\ (S) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.9 \\ & (S) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $-6$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | " | " | 18 |  | 25.2 | 2.3 | 18 |  | \% | " |  | 28.3 | 1.3 | 12 | $f(S)$ | $-1.0$ | -6 |
|  | $\pm$ |  | $\because$ | " |  | 23.2 | 3.4 | 22 |  | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{\circ}$ |  | 25.4 | 2.0 | 17 | + 2.2 | -1.4 | -5 |
|  | ¢ | Via Sheridan-Center-Seginam |  |  |  | 26.3 | 1.8 | 10 | Vio Omiland-Logon-Saginam |  |  |  | 28.4 | 1.1 | 8 | $\begin{gathered} +2.1 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.7 \\ & (S) \end{aligned}$ | -2 |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | " | ${ }^{\circ}$ | " | " | 25.9 | 1.8 | 9 |  | " | " | " | 30.7 | 0.2 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & +4.8 \\ & \hline(S) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\left[\begin{array}{l} -1.6 \\ (s) \end{array}\right.$ | - |
|  | $\pm$ | " | 10 | " | ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 25.0 | 2.0 | 12 |  | ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | " | ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 26.0 | 1.5 | 11 | $+1.0$ | -0.5 | - 1 |


(S)-The chante ls gicilifilaty glgnificant.
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TA壇LE
CITY OF PONTIAC
SPEED AND DELAY STUOY RESULTS
FOR PRINCIPAL ROUTES

७

|  |  | DURING TWO－WAY OPERATION |  |  |  |  | DURING ONE－WAY OPERATION |  |  |  |  | CHANGE．IN： |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} c \\ \frac{0}{3} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \therefore \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | ROUTE |  |  |  |  | ROUTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 5 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | E | Vla | Oakland | 22.0 | 1.9 | 18 | Via | Coss | 25.0 | 1.8 | 14 | $1+3.0$ | －0．1 | － 4 |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 1 \\ 0.0 \\ 0 \\ e \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 5 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ＂ | ＂ | 22.3 | 2.2 | 23 | ＂ | ＂ | 25.3 | 1.8 | 19 | $+3.0$ | －0．4 | － 4 |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \overline{3} \\ \dot{B} \\ \dot{心} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\dot{\square}$ | ＂ | ＂ | 21.1 | 2.3 | 22 |  | 10 | 24.8 | 1.9 | 16 | $\begin{gathered} +3.7 \\ (S) \end{gathered}$ | －0．4 | $-6$ |
| － | E | Vio | Oakland | 22.9 | 1.6 | 15 | Vio | Ookland | 22.3 | 1.6 | 31 | －0．6 | 0.0 | $+16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & i \\ & \frac{1}{6} \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 5 \\ 8 \\ 8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ＂ | 8 | 21.0 | 2.5 | 22 | ＂ | 0 | 22.9 | 1.7 | 29 | $\begin{array}{\|c} +1.9 \\ (S) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.8 \\ & (S) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $+7$ |
| 容 | $\frac{\square}{8}$ | ＂ | ＂ | 21.1 | 2.3 | 25 | ＂ | ＂ | 21.2 | 2.0 | 32 | $+0.1$ | －0．3 | $+7$ |

＊－These changes have been tested for statistical significance．
$(S)$－The change is statistically significant．

TABLE TI
CITY OF PORT HURON
SPEED AND DELAY STUDY RESULTS
FOR PRINCIPAL ROUTES

*-These changes have been tested and found to have stotistical significance.

TABLE V
SPEED AND DELAY
AVERAGE CHANGE PERCENTAGES
TWO-WAY AND ONE-WAY OPERATION

| City. | Average Change Percentage In: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Over-all <br> Speed | Stops <br> Per Mile | Stopped <br> Delay <br> Per Mile |
| Kalamazoo | $+28 \%$ | $-70 \%$ | $-56 \%$ |
| Lansing* | $+11 \%$ | $-45 \%$ | $-29 \%$ |
| Pontiac | $+2 \%$ | $+8 \%$ | $+28 \%$ |
| Port Huron | $+19 \%$ | $-46 \%$ | $-18 \%$ |

*Comparis on of Initial One-Way with Two-Way Operation.

## TȦBLE VI

CROSS-STREET. TRAVEL TIME OVER-ALL AVERAGES
(Peak Periods Only)

|  | Two-Way | One-Way | Change |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kalamazoo | 106.5 sec. | 103.6 sec. | -2.9 sec. |
| Lansing | 69.0 | $79.6^{*}$ | +10.6 |
| Port Huron | 58.1 | 76.3 | +18.2 |
| * Initial Phase |  |  |  |

TABLE VII

## total numbers of traffic gaps of various sizes dURING FIVE PEAK HOURS

| LOCATION | GAP SIZES IN SECONDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL GAPS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 61010 seconds |  | 10 1015 seconds |  | 15 to 20 seconds |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Over } 20 \\ & \text { seconds } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Twoway | Oneway | Twoway | One way | Twoway | Oneway | Twoway | Oneway | WAY | ONE WAY |
| KALAMAZOO: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| On Michigan af Church | 161 | 359 | 45 | 148 | 16 | 82 | 8 | 74 | 230 | 663 |
| On Kalamazoo af Church | 346 | 182 | 142 | 194 | 58 | 95 | 38 | 131 | 584 | 602 |
| L. ANSING: K |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| On Saginaw at Seymour | 248 | 203 | 111 | 147 | 42 | 89 | 17 | 100 | 418 | 539 |
| On Saginaw of Chestnut | 220 | 185 | 146 | 160 | 49 | 85 | 16 | 145 | 431 | 575 |
| On Saginaw af Sycamore | 277 | 232 | 113 | 187 | 52 | 76 | 34 | 151 | 476 | 646 |
| PONTIAC: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| On Oakland of Blaine | 205 | 415 | 114 | 199 | 67 | 72 | 172 | 92 | 558 | 778 |
| On Oakland of Cadillac | 277 | 269 | 157 | 190 | 101 | 73 | 99 | 108 | 634 | 640 |
| On Oakland at Florence | 261 | 190 | 136 | 123 | 70 | 67 | 36 | 226 | 503 | 606 |
| On Cass at Florence | 43 | 167 | 43 | 108 | 44 | 95 | 252 | 232 | 382 | 602 |
| PORT HURON: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| On Griswold af 7 fh St. | 314 | 143 | 193 | 114 | 115 | 110 | 203 | 241 | 825 | 608 |
| On Griswold at 16 th St. | 327 | 347 | 206 | 183 | 119 | 140 | 205 | 211 | 857 | 881 |
| On Griswold of 20th St. | 306 | 373 | 218 | 220 | 125 | 121 | 188 | 215 | 837 | 929 |
| On Griswold of 22 nd St. | 389 | 316 | 228 | 176 | 143 | 117 | 176 | 169 | 936 | 778 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\therefore$ |

* = One-way Operation Refers to Initial Phase.
various sizes in the traffic stream on the study streets with two-way and one-way operation. The general trend, with very few exceptions, is that there were more total gaps with one-way traffic. More significantly, the increase in the number of gaps was more pronounced in the larger size gaps. The result is that better conditions have been created for the side street traffic by shortening the time that drivers had to wait at stop-controlled intersections.


## RESULTS OF TRAFFIC VOLUME STUDIES

Traffic volume data in this study were used to evaluate the capacity of a system of streets in an area, rather than of individual streets or intersections. A Burroughs B 5500 computer was used to process the volume data.

By designating those stations which counted traffic near the periphery of the study area, on an inbound or outbound basis, the computer selected the maximum occurring 15 -minute volumes at these stations, and added them together yielding comparative tabulations of entering or leaving traffic totals by 15 -minute periods for the two-way and one-way operation phases.

Information on travel distances controlled by each volume-count station was also introduced into the computer. The computer calculated the maximum values of the 15 -minute vehicle-miles of travel for each station and then added these up for all stations to yield an area-wide comparative table of vehicle-miles by 15 -minute periods.

Similar to the 15 -minute peak values of flow and travel, 24 -hour values were also calculated. The changes in the 15 -minute peak figures after conversion to one-way operation were compared with the changes in the 24 -hour figures. Table VIII shows this information for Lansing and Pontiac. The same analysis was made for Kalamazoo, but the results were irrelevant because the "after" surveys were taken during a different season from the "before" surveys, and traffic characteristics proved to be different. This analysis was not applied to the Port Huron study because the one-
way traffic corridor was not the same as the two-way traffic corridor.

Referring to Table VIII, in Lansing a 16 percent increase with one-way operation is seen in the morning peak traffic entering the area, in comparison to only 8 percent in the 24 -hour traffic entering the area. Similar changes in leaving traffic. are +74 percent during the p.m. peak, in comparison to +17 percent in the 24 -hour period. Theoretically, traffic entering in 24 hours should equal traffic leaving in the same period. The main reason for the discrepancy in this presentation (8 percent change in entering traffic, and 17 percent in leaving) is that count stations were not complete enough to form a tight cordon. This does not, however, detract from the validity of the comparison since the same stations were used each time. Another reason for the discrepancies is the fact that counts were not simultaneous but were taken during a span of two to four weeks.

The one-way system in Pontiac, in the lower half of Table VIII, also displays these higher growth ratios in entering and leaving traffic during peak 15 -minutes as compared with the 24 -hour growth ratios.

The higher increases in peak flows in relation to daily flows are indications of the freedom of movement in the area, and an indirect measure of the improvement in traffic capacity.

## RESULTS OF TURNING-MOVEMENT STUDIES

The numbers of vehicles making turns did not in themselves provide information of any significance other than some auxiliary data which on occasion provided supplement to the volume counts. Surveys of left-lane stoppages which were taken during the turning-movement counts, however, provided insight into vehicle delays. Table IX indicates the cumulative number of minutes when left lanes were blocked by vehicles waiting to make left turns. The extent of time gained in such waiting during one-way operation is evident.

## TABLE VIII <br> PERCENTAGES OF CHANGE IN PEAK-PERIOD AND 24-HOUR TRAFFIC <br> TWO-WAY AND ONE-WAY OPERATION

|  | Traffic <br> Entering Area | Traffic Leaving Area | Vehicle Miles In Area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lansing:* |  |  |  |
| Morning 15-Min. Peak | +16\% | +52\% | +20\% |
| Noon 15-Min. Peak | + 3\% | +85\% | + $2 \%$ |
| Afternoon 15-Min. Peak | $-2 \%$ | +74\% | +13\% |
| 24-Hour Total | + 8\% | +17\% | +23\% |

Pontiac:

| Morning 15-Min. Peak | $+6 \%$ | $+20 \%$ | 0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Noon 15-Min. Peak | $+5 \%$ | $+10 \%$ | $-6 \%$ |
| Afternoon 15-Min. Peak | $+5 \%$ | $+1 \%$ | $+7 \%$ |
| 24 -Hour Total | $+2 \%$ | $+4 \%$ | $+4 \%$ |
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## TABLE IX

## CUMULATIVE DURATION OF LANE STOPPAGES DUE TO LEFT TURNS AT SURVEY STATIONS

## (Extent of Delay: on All Approaches, in Minutes Within 6-Hour Survey)

|  | Two-Way Operation | One-Way Operation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kalamazoo: |  |  |
| Intersection of Kalamazoo \& Rose | 87 | 0 |
| Lansing:* |  |  |
| Intersection of Saginaw \& Verlinden $\quad$ : | 50 | 2 |
| Intersection of Saginaw \& Jenis on | 23 | 14 |
| Pontiac: |  |  |
| Intersection of Oakland, Cass \& Montcalm | 52 | 49 |
| Intersection of Oakland \& Johnson | 31 | 0 |
| Intersection of Oakland \& Baldw in | 2 | 0 |
| Intersection of Cass \& Johnson | 17 | 0 |
| Port Huron: |  |  |
| Intersection of Griswold \& 24th | 56 | 0 |
| Intersection of Griswold \& Military | 32 | 0 |

## RESULTS OF ACCIDENT STUDIES

Accident data compiled in this study failed to indicate, in all cases, similar trends in all cities resulting from change to one-way traffic.

Table $X$ is a summary indicating the percentages of change in accident experience in the individual cities and in all cities lumped together. The four sections of this table facilitate comparison of the different components of the network of streets in the study area in each city with each other, as well as with the whole city.

The figures for Lansing refer to the comparison. of the initial one-way phase with the two-way
phase. A follow up of accident experience during the final one-way phase indicated some improvement over the initial phase.

Some results common to all cities were that on the two-way state trunk lines which were converted to one-way operation the total accidents, injury accidents, rear-end collisions and accidents at signalized intersections decreased; and sideswipes and collisions at non-signalized intersections increased. Considering the three cities of Lansing, Kalamazoo and Pontiac, an appraisal of the two streets forming the one-way pairs before and after conversion fails to indicate a trend toward either a gain or a loss in safety of operation, based on rates per million vehicle miles.

TABLE X

## PERCENTAGES OF CHANGE IN ACCIDENT EXPERIENCE

 TWO-WAY AND ONE-WAY OPERATION1. STREET WHICH CHANGED FROM TWO-WAY TRUNK LINE TO ONE-WAY TRUNK LINE:

|  | Lans |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Number of Accidents . $\ldots .$. | -23\% |
| Total Accident Rate per MVM | + 8\% |
| Number of Injury Accidents | -28\% |
| Injury Accident Rate per MVM | 0 |
| Rear-End Collisions | $-59 \%$ |
| Sideswipes | +173\% |
| Right-Angle Collision | -46\% |
| Accidents at Signalized Intersections | $-33 \%$ |
| Accidents At Non-Signalized Intersect | + $6 \%$ |
| Midblock Accide |  |

2. THE TWO STREETS FORMING THE ONE-WAY PAIR:

| otal Number of Accidents | $+36 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Accident Rate per MVM | 1\% |
| Number of Injury Accidents | +32\% |
| Injury Accident Rate per MVM | - $2 \%$ |
| Intersection Accidents | - $+56 \%$ |
| Midblock Accidents | -15\% |


| Kalamazoo | Pontiac | Port Huron | All Cities |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $-25 \%$ | $-18 \%$ |  | $(1)$ | $-22 \%$ |
| $-9 \%$ | $+28 \%$ | $(1)$ | $+4 \%$ |  |
| $-49 \%$ | $-24 \%$ | $(1)$ | $-35 \%$ |  |
| $-38 \%$ | $+11 \%$ | $(1)$ | $-11 \%$ |  |
| $-39 \%$ | $-32 \%$ | $(1)$ | $-43 \%$ |  |
| $+2 \%$ | $+87 \%$ | $(1)$ | $+60 \%$ |  |
| $+14 \%$ | $-35 \%$ | $(1)$ | $-23 \%$ |  |
| $-15 \%$ | $-25 \%$ | $(1)$ | $-22 \%$ |  |
| $+11 \%$ | $+21 \%$ | $(1)$ | $+12 \%$ |  |
| $-38 \%$ | 0 | $(1)$ | $-39 \%$ |  |


| $-19 \%$ | $+20 \%$ | $(1)$ | $+1 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $-17 \%$ | $+19 \%$ | $(1)$ | $-5 \%$ |
| $-39 \%$ | $+14 \%$ | $(1)$ | $-6 \%$ |
| $-38 \%$ | $+14 \%$ | $(1)$ | $-11 \%$ |
| $-5 \%$ | $+12 \%$ | $(1)$ | $+12 \%$ |
| $-38 \%$ | $+77 \%$ | $(1)$ | $-25 \%$ |

3. ALL STREETS IN STUDY AREA: (2)
Total Number of Accidents . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $+20 \%$
Number of In jury Accidents . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $+500 \%$

| $-6 \%$ | $+18 \%$ | $+30 \%$ | $+7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $-6 \%$ | $+10 \%$ | $+26 \%$ | $+8 \%$ |
| $-4 \%$ | $-43 \%$ | $-25 \%$ | $+10 \%$ |

4. WHOLE CITY:

| Total Number of Accidents $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots+14 \%$ | $-1 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of $\operatorname{In}$ jury Accidents $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots+24 \%$ | $-6 \%$ |
| Pedestrian Accidents $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$ | $+\ldots \ldots \ldots$ |

(1) Port Huron data are not included in this section because the situation is not similar to the other three cities.
(2) In Port Huron: Two corridors along Lapeer, and Oak and Griswold Streets.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary advantage of the one-way systems was their contribution to good signal progression. This resulted in shorter travel time and less and shorter stops with consequent vehicle operating economy and, which is more important in cities, less air pollution because a gas engine's exhaust gases are more objectionable when it accelerates or decelerates than when it runs at constant speed. Reduction in traffic noise is another result of eliminating stop-and-go driving.

Increases of up to 10.6 miles per hour in average over-all speeds during peak periods have been observed. In a typical morning rush-hour trip in Kalamazoo, average number of stops has decreased from 6.3 to 1.0 . Average delay (stopped time) during such trips has been reduced in one case from 71 to 11 seconds per mile.

One-way operation has resulted in more numerous gaps in the traffic stream. Also, the sizes of these gaps have grown larger, making it easier for stop-controlled side-street traffic to enter the trunk line.

Higher peak-traffic demands have been accommodated. Up to 74 percent of rise in the 15 -minute afternoon-peak totals for traffic leaving the study area have been found, compared with only 17 percent of rise in the 24-hour total for leaving traffic.

In a transportation system, the roadway is only one of several factors playing a role in traffic safety. The results of this study indicate that in some cases of one-way operation, adverse changes in the other factors have offset the safety advantage of the unidirectional flow. However, the data reveal that accidents directly related to the stability of the flow, such as rear-end collisions and accidents at signalized intersections, have been alleviated on the trunk lines. On the other hand, in cases where a residential street was converted to a thoroughfare, larger exposure to accidents has created a more hazardous environment. Also, indications are that the safety record of the new one-way systems improves with time.

Careful system design is important if full advantage of a one-way system is expected. Bottlenecks created at the transition points of the system sometimes have materially diminished the advantages of the rest of the system. Elimination of as many signals as possible, especially at the transition points to two-way operation, should be a goal.

If opportunities occur in the future for further evaluation of one-way conversions, measurement of spot speeds and a more detailed survey to determine the total time loss to drivers should be considered.
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## FOREWORD

State highway departments traditionally have been involved in the construction and operation of rural roads. The purpose of the state trunk lines in the past has been to provide transportation between cities. To provide continuity of the network through urban areas, existing city streets have later been designated as urban extensions of the state highway systems. The phenomenal increase in highway traffic during the last fifty years, both within and between urban areas, has necessitated seeking ways and means to provide ample traffic capacity along such urban extensions.

Traffic capacity can be augmented either by building new arteries or by utilizing two streets along a certain corridor to carry the trunk line traffic, usually one street for each direction of travel. Michigan has often established one-way street pairs to carry the state trunk line traffic through urban areas. This can only be accomplished in cooperation and agreement with the local governments concerned. It is essential that the State Highway Commission and the local jurisdictions be aware of the benefits and drawbacks, if any, obtained as a result of converting two-way streets into one-way trunk lines.

Although there seems to exist general knowledge about the benefit of one-way streets, specific cases where these benefits are described in a quantitative way are very scarce. It was believed that much could be learned from a documentation of the quantitative results obtained when actual two-way state trunk lines are converted to a one-way street and a parallel local street is added; or in a few instances when the existing two way state trunk line is abandoned for a new pair of one-way streets. This led to the present study of the Operational Aspects of One-Way and Two-Way Streets.

Four projects involving conversion of operations in four cities, Kalamazoo, Lansing, Pontiac and Port Huron, were selected for the study (See Figure 1)。 An interim report (1)* was earlier published presenting the results of the studies in Kalamazoo and the first phase of the operation in Lansing. Studies of the remaining two projects, in Pontiac and Port Huron, and the final phase in Lansing have now been concluded. This report contains full information for all of the four projects.

The field data obtained were reduced and condensed to make them easier to interpret. Even with such condensation considerable space is devoted to documentation of the study methods by including several maps and charts. Although some of the data may not render themselves to immediate and direct interpretation and clear-cut conclusions, they are included for future reference and because of local and historic interest. The details provided in the report should make it possible for those who are directly concerned with traffic operation in each city to closely study the traffic conditions. On the other hand, it is hoped that these four projects provide a useful set of case studies for others who need not be familiar with these cities.

[^1]
## CONTENTS

Page
FOREWORD ..... 1
LIST OF FIGURES ..... 3
LIST OF TABLES ..... 5
LIST OF APPENDICES ..... 8
ACKNOWLEDGMENT ..... 9
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 11
STUDY PROCEDURES ..... 14
Kalamazoo Study Area ..... 14
Traffic Surveys in Kalamazoo ..... 17
Accident Data for Kalamazoo ..... 19
Lansing Study Area ..... 19
Traffic Surveys in Lansing ..... 34
Accident Data for Lansing ..... 34
Pontiac Study Area ..... 34
Traffic Surveys in Pontiac ..... 34
Accident Data for Pontiac ..... 39
Port Huron Study Area ..... 39
Traffic Surveys in Port Huron ..... 46
Accident Data for Port Huron ..... 50
ANALYSIS OF RESULTS ..... 51
Speed and Delay Study Results ..... 51
Cross-Street Travel-Time Study Results ..... 57
Results of Gap Studies ..... 60
Results of Traffic Volume Studies ..... 70
An Approximate Comparison of Average Travel Distances ..... 101
Results of Turning-Movement Studies ..... 121
Results of Accident Studies ..... 121
SUGGESTED DESIGN CRITERIA ..... 141a
Guidlines for Consideration of One-Way Trunk Line Systems ..... 141a
Suggestions for System Design ..... 141a
BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 142
APPENDICES ..... 143

## LIST OF FIGURES

Page
Fig. 1: Location of Study Cities and One-Way Streets ..... 10
Fig. 2: City of Kalamazoo: Study Area and Survey Routes ..... 15
Fig. 3: City of Kalamazoo: Inventory of Streets and Traffic Control - Two-Way Operation ..... 16
Fig. 4: City of Kalamazoo: Inventory of Streets and Traffic Control - One-Way Operation ..... 18
Fig. 5: City of Kalamazoo: Traffic and Gap Survey Stations ..... 20
Fig. 6: City of Kalamazoo: Routes for the "Speed and Delay" and "Cross-Street Travel Time" Surveys - Two-Way Operation ..... 21
Fig. 7: City of Kalamazoo: Routes for the "Speed and Delay" and "Cross Street Travel Time" Surveys - One-Way Operation ..... 22
Fig. 8: City of Lansing: Study Area and Survey Routes During Two-Way and Initial Phase of One-Way Operation ..... 24
Fig. 9: City of Lansing: Survey Routes During Final Phase of One-Way Operation ..... 26
Fig. 10: City of Lansing: Inventory of Streets and Traffic Control - Two-Way Operation ..... 27
Fig. 11: City of Lansing: Inventory of Streets and Traffic Control - One-Way Operation, Initial Phase ..... 28
Fig. 12: City of Lansing: Inventory of Streets and Traffic Control - One-Way Operation, Final Phase ..... 29
Fig. 13: City of Lansing: Traffic and Gap Survey Stations ..... 30
Eig. 14: City of Lansing: Routes for "Speed and Delay" and "Cross-Street Travel-Time" Surveys - Two-Way Operation ..... 31
Fig. 15: City of Lansing: Routes for "Speed and Delay"' and "Cross-Street Travel-Time" Surveys - One-Way Operation, Initial Phase ..... 32
Fig. 16: City of Lansing: Routes for "Speed and Delay" and "Cross-Street Travel-Time". Surveys - One-Way Operation, Final Phase ..... 33
Fig. 17: City of Pontiac: Study Area and Survey Routes ..... 35
Fig. 18: City of Pontiac: Inventory of Streets and Traffic Control ..... 36
Fig. 19: City of Pontiac: Traffic and Gap Survey Stations ..... 37
Fig. 20: City of Pontiac: Routes for "Speed and Delay" Surveys ..... 38
Fig. 21: City of Port Huron: Study Area and Survey Routes - Two-Way Operation ..... 40
Fig. 22: City of Port Huron: Study Area and Survey Routes - One-Way Operation ..... 42
Fig. 23: City of Port Huron: Inventory of Streets and Traffic Control - Two-Way Operation ..... 44
Fig. 24: City of Port Huron: Inventory of Streets and Traffic Control - One-Way Operation ..... 45
Fig. 25: City of Port Huron: Traffic and Gap Survey Stations ..... 47.
Fig. 26: City of Port Huron: Routes for "Speed and Delay" and
"Cross-Street Travel-Tipne" Surveys - Two-Way Operation ..... 48
Fig. 27: City of Port Huron: Routes for "Speed and Delay"' and "Cross-Street Travel-Time" Surveys - One-Way Operation ..... 49
Fig. 28: City of Lansing: Traffic Gaps on Saginaw Street (East of Logan Street) ..... 67
Fig. 29: City of Lansing: Traffic Gaps on Saginaw Street (West of Logan Street) ..... 69
Fig. 30: City of Kalamazco: Traffic Gaps on Michigan Avenue at Church Street ..... 75
Fig. 31: City of Kalamazoo: Traffic Gaps on Kalamazoo Street at Church Street ..... 76
Fig. 32: City of Pontiac: Traffic Gaps ..... 80
Fig. 33: City of Port Huron: Traffic Gaps ..... 82
Fig. 34a: City of Lansing: Peak Traffic - Initial Phase ..... 91
Fig. 34b: City of Lansing: Peak Traffic - Final Phase ..... 93
Fig. 35a: City of Lansing: Traffic Volume Characteristics -Initial Phase.. ..... 94
Fig. 35b: City of Lansing: Traffic Volume Characteristics -Final Phase ..... 95
Fig. 36: City of Kalamazoo: Peak Traffic ..... 99
Fig. 37: City of Kalamazoo: Traffic Volume Characteristics ..... 100
Fig. 38: City of Pontiac: Peak Traffic ..... 105
Fig. 39: City of Pontiac: Traffic Volume Characteristics ..... 106
Fig. 40: City of Port Huron: Traffic Flow ..... 107
Fig. 41: Trip Patterns in an Area ..... 109

## LIST OF TABLES

Page
Table 1: City of Kalamazoo: Speed and Delay Comparisons ..... 52
Table 2: City of Lansing: Speed and Delay Comparisons ..... 54
Table 3: City of Pontiac: Speed and Delay Comparisons ..... 56
Table 4: City of Port Huron: Speed and Delay Comparisons ..... 58
Table 5: Speed and Delay Summary ..... 59
Table 6: City of Kalamazoo: Cross-Street Travel-Time Comparisons ..... 61
Table 7: City of Lansing: Cross-Street Travel-Time Comparisons - With Initial Phase Operation ..... 62
Table 8: City of Lansing: Cross-Street Travel-Time Comparisons -. With Final Phase Operation ..... 63
Table 9: City of Port Huron: Cross-Street Travel-Time Comparisons ..... 64
Table 10: Cross-Street Travel-Time Over-All Averages ..... 65
Table 11a: City of Lansing: Vehicle Gap Study: East of Logan Street ..... 66
Table 11b: City of Lansing: Vehicle Gap Study: West of Logan Street ..... 68
Table 12: City of Lansing: Possible Utilization of Improved Gap Availability ..... 71
Table 13: City of Kalamazoo: Vehicle Gap Study - Hourly Totals of Various Sizes of Gaps ..... $\cdot 72$
Table 14: City of Kalamazoo: Number of Traffic Gaps of Various Sizes During 15-Minute Periods on Michigan Avenue at Church Street ..... 73
Table 15: City of Kalamazoo: Number of Traffic Gaps of Various Sizes During 15-Minute Periods on Kalamazoo Avenue at Church Street ..... 74
Table 16: City of Kalamazoo: Michigan Avenue at Church Street, 15-Minute Traffic Volumes During Gap Surveys ..... 77
Table 17: City of Kalamazoo: Kalamazoo Avenue at Church Street, 15-Minute Traffic Volumes During Gap Surveys ..... 78
Table 18: City of Pontiac: Vehicle Gap Study - Hourly Totals of Various Sizes of Gaps ..... 79
Table 19: City of Port Huron: Vehicle Gap Study - Hourly Totals of Various Sizes of Gaps ..... 81
Table 20a: City of Lansing: Traffic Volumes Entering Study Area - Initial Phase ..... 84
Table 20b: City of Lansing: Traffic Volumes Entering Study Area - Final Phase ..... 86
Table 21a: City of Lansing: Traffic Volumes Leaving Study Area - Initial Phase ..... 87
Page
Table 21b: City of Lansing: Traffic Volumes Leaving Study Area - Final Phase ..... 88
Table 22a: City of Lansing: Vehicle-Miles of Travel Within Study Area - Initial Phase ..... 89
Table 22b: City of Lansing: Vehicle-Miles of Travel Within Study Area - Final Phase ..... 90
Table 23: City of Kalamazoo: Traffic Volumes Entering Study Area ..... 96
Table 24: City of Kalamazoo: Traffic Volumes Leaving Study Area ..... 97
Table 25: City of Kalamazoo: Vehicle-Miles of Travel Within Study Area ..... 98
Table 26: City of Pontiac: Traffic Volumes Entering Study Area ..... 102
Table 27: City of Pontiac: Traffic Volumes Leaving Study Area ..... 103
Table 28: City of Pontiac: Vehicle-Miles of Travel Within Study Area ..... 104
Table 29: Observed Maximum Hourly Volumes Per Lane ..... 108
Table 30: City of Kalamazoo: Cumulative Duration of Lane Stoppages Due to Left Turns - Intersection of Kalamazoo Street at Rose Street ..... 111
Table 31: City of Lansing: Cumulative Duration of Lane Stoppages Due to Left Tums - Intersection of Saginaw Street and Verlinden Avenue ..... 112
Table 32: City of Lansing: Cumulative Duration of Lane Stoppages Due to Left Turns - Intersection of Saginaw Street and Jenison Avenue ..... 113
Table 33: City of Lansing: Cumulative Duration of Lane Stoppages Due to Left Turns - Intersection of Oakland Avenue and Logan Street ..... 114
Table 34: City of Pontiac: Cumulative Duration of Lane Stoppages Due to Left Turns - Intersection of Oakland Avenue, Cass Avenue and Montcalm Street ..... 115
Table 35: City of Pontiac: Cumulative Duration of Lane Stoppages Due to Left Turns - Intersection of Oakland Avenue and Johnson Street ..... 116
Table 36: City of Pontiac: Cumulative Duration of Lane Stoppages Due to Left Turns - Intersection of Oakland Avenue, Baldwin Avenue and Allison Street ..... 117
Table 37: City of Pontiac: Cumulative Duration of Lane Stoppages Due to Left Turns - Intersection on Cass Avenue and Johnson Street ..... 118
Table 38: City of Port Huron: Cumulative Duration of Lane Stoppages Due to Left Turns - Intersection of Griswold Street and 24th Street ..... 119
Page
Table 39: City of Port Huron: Cumulative Duration of Lane Stoppages Due to Left Turns - Intersection of Griswold Street and Military Street ..... 120
Table 40: City of Lansing: Accident Types on Saginaw Street Between Logan and Grand ..... 123
Table 41: City of Lansing: Accident Types on Saginaw Street Between Belt Line Railroad and Logan ..... 123
Table 42: City of Lansing: Accident Types on Saginaw Street Between Belt Line Railroad and Cedar ..... 124
Table 43: City of Lansing: Accident Types Within Study Area ..... 124
Table 44: City of Lansing: Accidents Within Study Area By Day or Night ..... 125
Table 45: City of Kalamazoo: Accident Types on Michigan Avenue
Between Main and Porter ..... 125
Table 46: City of Kalamazoo: Accident Types on Michigan Avenue Between Lovell and Main ..... 126
Table 47: City of Kalamazoo: Accident Types on Kalamazoo Avenue ..... 126
Table 48: City of Kalamazoo: Accident Types Within Study Area ..... 127
Table 49: City of Kalamazoo: Accidents Within Study Area By Day or Night ..... 127
Table 50: City of Pontiac: Accident Types on Oakland Avenue Between Cass-Montcalm and Wide Track Drive ..... 128
Table 51: City of Pontiac: Accident Types on Oakland Avenue
Between West Boulevard and Cass-Montcalm ..... 128
Table 52: City of Pontiac: Accident Types on Cass Avenue
Between Oakland-Montcalm and Wide Track Drive ..... 129
Table 53: City of Pontiac: Accident Types Within Study Area ..... 129
Table 54: City of Pontiac: Accident Types Within Study Area By Day or Night ..... 130
Table 55: City of Port Huron: Accident Types on Griswold Street ..... 130
Table 56: City of Port Huron: Accident Types on Oak Street ..... 130
Table 57: City of Port Huron: Accident Types on Union and Court Streets ..... 131
Table 58: City of Port Huron: Accident Types Within Griswold-Oak Cortidor ..... 131
Table 59: City of Port Huron: Accident Types Within Lapeer Avenue and Water Street Corridor ..... 132
Table 60: City of Port Huron: Accidents Within Lapeer-Water and Oak-Griswold Corridors By Day or Night ..... 132
Table 61: City of Port Huron: Accidents on Union and Court Streets By Day or Night ..... 132
Table 62: Comparative Accident Summary ..... 135

## LIST OF APPENDICES

Page
Appendix 1: Detailed Description of Traffic Surveys ..... 144
Appendix 2: Approximate Calculation of Number of Vehicles which Can Utilize Various Gap-Size Groups ..... 150
Appendix 3: Computer Processing Flow Chart ..... 151
Appendix 4: Detailed Analysis of Traffic Volume Data ..... 152
Appendix 5: Summary of Vehicle-Miles of Travel ..... 154
Appendix 6: Summary of Traffic Volumes Leaving the Study Area ..... 155
Appendix 7: Hourly Volumes ..... 156
Appendix 8: 24-Hour Summary of Vehicle-Miles of Travel ..... 157
Appendix 9: 24-Hour Summaty of Traffic Volumes Leaving the Study Area ..... 158
Appendix 10: Accident Record Form ..... 159
Appendix 11: Accident Type Codes ..... 160
Appendix 12: Lansing Accident Study ..... 161
Appendix 13: City of Lansing: Intersection Accidents in the Study Area ..... 163
Appendix 14: City of Lansing: Midblock Accidents in the Study Area ..... 165
Appendix 15: Kalamazoo Accident Study ..... 166
Appendix 16: City of Kalamazoo: Intersection Accidents in the Study Area . ..... 168
Appendix 17: City of Kalamazoo: Midblock Accidents in the Study Area ..... 170
Appendix 18: Pontiac Accident Study ..... 171
Appendix 19: City of Pontiac: Intersection Accidents in the Study Area ..... 172
Appendix 20: City of Pontiac: Midblock Accidents in the Study Area ..... 173
Appendix 21: Port Huron Accident Study ..... 174
Appendix 22: City of Port Huron: Accidents Along Lapeer Avenue and Water Street Corridor ..... 176
Appendix 23: City of Port Huron: Accidents on Union and Court Streets ..... 177
Appendix 24: City of Port Huron: Accidents on Oak Street ..... 178
Appendix 25: City of Port Huron: Accidents on Griswold Street ..... 179
Appendix 26: City of Port Huron: Accidents on Streets Crossing Oak-Griswold Corridor ..... 180
Appendix 27: Statistical Analysis ..... 181

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study was accomplished as a result of efforts provided by several people and organizations. All Traffic Surveys were conducted by the Transportation Survey and Analysis Section of the Transportation Planning Division, Michigan Department of State Highways. Traffic volume data were processed by the Computer Services Division of the Department. Accident reports were made available by the City Traffic Engineer's office in Lansing and by the City Police Departments in Kalamazoo, Pontiac and Port Huron. Department of State Highways' District Traffic Engineers at the Jackson, Kalamazoo and Pontiac offices were extremely helpful in compiling the accident data at the cities involved. The Office Services Division is credited for the reproduction of the reports.

The author, on behalf of the Michigan Department of State Highways, extends his deepest appriciation to each individual whose work helped to conduct the study and prepare this report.


## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As the implementation of plans for one-way traffic on some state trunk lines penetrating four selected cities was realized according to schedule, before-and-after surveys were conducted in each city for the purpose of obtaining quantitative information to study the traffic operation on the streets before and after conversion to one-way. These surveys included volume and turning-movement counts, speed-and-delay runs, traffic gap studies and accident analyses. The study evaluated not only the conditions on the one-way trunk lines themselves but also on the rest of the network of city streets in the immediate area which might be affected by the traffic on the trunk lines. The four cities were Kalamazoo, Lansing, Pontiac and Port Huron.

In Lansing a second "after" phase of the operation was also studied. During the first "after", or initial one-way, phase the state trunk line was operating as a one-way pair of streets only to a certain point, on a temporary basis. During the second "after" or final phase, the construction project was completed as far as the west city limits where the one-way system transitioned into a four-lane two-way highway of higher operating speed.

Study results in all cities did not show the same trends in the change in quality of traffic as evaluated by the parameters of time, convenience and safety. Some of the cities indicated greater degrees of improvement than others. In some cases the elapse of considerable time between the before and after phases of the study detracted somewhat from the value of the comparative data.

The most undisputable advantage of the one-way systems was their contribution to good signal progression. This resulted in shorter travel time and less and shorter stops with consequent vehicle-operating economy and, which is more important in cities, less air pollution, because a gas engine's exhaust gasses are more objectionable when it slows down or speeds up than when it runs at constant speed. Reduction in traffic noise is another result of alleviating stop-and-go driving.

In Kalamazoo, the average over-all speed on some of the one-way routes during peak periods increased by up to 10.6 miles per hour, which was 56 percent above the two-way traffic speed of 18.9 miles per hout. On another one-way trunk line route in Kalamazoo, stopped delay was reduced by 60 seconds per mile of travel, or by 75 percent. In Lansing, up to 4.8 miles per hour or 18 percent gain in speed and $8 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{mile}$ or 12 percent reduction in delays were found. In Port Huron, speed increase of up to 11.7 miles per hour or 62 percent, and delay decrease of 24 $\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{mile}$ or 71 percent were observed. Pontiac showed the least gain from one-way operation. In the southeastbound direction, up to 3.7 miles per hour in speed was gained on the Cass Avenue route over Oakland Avenue, but practically no increase was measured on the northwestbound one-way Oakland Avenue except during the noon peak.

Travel time on some major streets crossing the one-way state trunk lines was also examined on a before-and-after basis in the study cities. In most cases, establishment of another street as one of the one-way pair necessitated installation of traffic signals. These signals caused a slight increase in the travel time on the cross-streets. However, these delays were within tolerable limits. In Lansing the largest increase in the average travel time on a cross-street was 37 seconds during the initial one-way phase. During the final one-way phase, which was five years after the "before" phase, and when the traffic had increased by about 50 percent, the largest increase in travel time on any cross-street was one minute and four seconds. In Port Huron the greatest increase was 40 seconds. In Kalamazoo, where no signals were added because of the oneway operation, travel time on some cross-streets showed a decrease, the maximum decrease being one minute and two seconds. Some showed an increase, the maximum being 41 seconds.

Availability of gaps in the trunk line traffic stream at some stop-controlled intersections
along the one-way pair was also studied. In general, these studies indicated an increase in the total number of gaps usable by the traffic approaching from the side streets. Also, duration of gaps in seconds showed an increase. Cities of Pontiac and Port Huron, however, did not show this trend at all of the intersections studied. Existence of extra gaps have added to the traffic capacity of the areas by enabling more vehicles to cross or enter the one-way streets.

Traffic volume studies revealed several interesting results of the one-way trunk line operation. First of all, the capacity of the street network in each study area to move traffic during peak periods, as measured by 15 -minute counts of entering, leaving and circulating traffic, improved. State trunk lines assumed more of the peak-period traffic load by attracting traffic from the city streets, thereby giving relief to city streets. Comparing the total daily travel in the area with the total daily traffic entering and leaving the area, it was possible to calculate the extent of adverse travel caused by one-way routing. The largest increase in such travel was found to be 15 percent for the final phase in Lansing. Pontiac showed only 2 percent, and there was no change in Kalamazoo. The reason for such small indications for adverse travel is believed to be an already existing adverse travel during two-way operation because of left-turn prohibitions and other circuitous routes preferred by drivers to avoid some bottlenecks.

Another advantage of the one-way streets was the elimination of delays due to blocking of left lanes by vehicles waiting to turn left.

Contrary to expectations, these projects have failed to show conclusive evidence supporting the safety aspects of one-way trunk line operation. On the street which earlier served as a two-way state trunk line, there was a reduction in total accidents as a consequence of reduced traffic flow obtained by eliminating one of the flow directions. However, considering the totals of the accidents on both streets forming the oneway pair, the rise in accidents on the new trunk line offset, in most cases, the reduction on the old state trunk line. Especially in the cases of Lansing and Port Huron, where one of the pair
was earlier a very minor residential street with no through-traffic, such additions to the state trunk line system increased the area of exposure to accidents.

Some characteristic results of the accident analysis on the one-way streets in all cities are reduction in: (1) Total and injury accidents, (2) Rear-end collisions, and (3) Accidents at signalized intersections. On the other hand, increase is observed in: (1) Sideswipes and (2) Collisions at non-signalized intersections.

A second "after" study in Lansing indicated that the safety record of the one-way system improved with time, confirming some earlier studies conducted elsewhere.

Careful system design is very important if full advantage of a one-way pair is expected. The Pontiac project is an example of some room for improvement in this respect. The lack of full traffic capacity for northwestbound traffic at the transition point at the Cass-Montcalm intersection has greatly reduced the effectiveness of extra capacity provided by one-way Oakland Avenue further upstream. The addition of another lane is recommended at that location.

Another consideration, especially in the design of the transition points from one way to two-way roadways, is to try to eliminate signals. In most situations one-way streets permit merge type of intersection operation, as was accomplished in Kalamazoo, which has proved safer than signal control.

The present study has been designed as a general overview of several one-way projects. Speeds and delays have been determined by test vehicles, and measurements of delays caused by left-turning vehicles have been on a cumulative basis. If further studies of one-way operation are conducted in the future, it is recommended to study spot speeds and their variation along the arteries in more detail. The contribution of speed characteristics to traffic safety is well known, and such studies may provide some insight into the wide variation found in the accident experiences of the
cities in this study. It may also be feasible to study actual delays incurred by individual vehicles in the traffic stream. This would provide useful data to determine the economy in vehicle operation.

In most instances one-way operation is an inescapable measure in cities. Therefore, the aim of future studies should be not a proof of their
superiority over two-way streets, but rather the determination of design details which can be incorporated into the system to get the most benefit out of it.

Some design recommendations derived from the present study will be found at the end of the report (page 141a).

## STUDY PROCEDURES

## KALAMAZOO STUDY AREA

The study area in the City of Kalamazoo is made up of a network of all of the streets included in Figure 2. The area includes a substantial portion of the central business district. During the twoway phase of the study (upper half of Figure 2), Michigan Route 43 crossed this area following Main Street from the west, then Michigan Avenue for the rest of the way. Two other numbered routes also followed Michigan Avenue, one of them only the western section. Business loop for Interstate Highway 94 and business route for U.S. Highway 131 followed Michigan Avenue from the southwest, then joined M-43 at the Main Street intersection. US-131 BR was then distributed into a north-south one-way pair formed by Westnedge Avenue and Park Street. I-94 BL continued along Michigan all the way to King Highway.

To improve traffic circulation in Kalamazoo, the state trunk line plan was changed to incorporate Kalamazoo Avenue to handle one-way westbound traffic through the city. Main Street from Douglas to Michigan, and Michigan Avenue from Main to Kalamazoo intersection were made into an eastbound one-way thoroughfare. Douglas Avenue,
also functioning as a short one-way southbound street, connected the west end of Kalamazoo Avenue with Main Street. To carry a heavy outbound movement, a new diagonal one-way road, Michikal Street, was built carrying southwestbound traffic from the intersection of Kalamazoo and Westnedge to the intersection of Michigan and Main. A connector was also built across Michikal to handle left-turns from northeastbound Michigan to Elm Street. (Shown in Figure 4.) Kalamazoo Avenue west of Westnedge was improved and resurfaced. Other modifications in the street system, made in preparation for the one-way operation, were the construction of channelizing islands at the intersections of Michigan and Main, Kalamazoo and Douglas, Main and Douglas, Michigan and Portage, and Michigan and Kalamazoo. Necessary revisions were also made in the various traffic control devices. Parking was removed from Kalamazoo Avenue west of Westnedge Avenue, and other minor parking regulation changes were made.

The state trunk line scheme according to the one-way plan is seen in the lower half of Figure 2. The new scheme started operating on October 10, 1965. Figure 3 shows the laneage of the


KALAMAZOO: One-way traffic on Michigan Avenue east of Main Street




KALAMAZOO: One-way Michigan Avenue at Portage Street


KALAMAZOO: Westbound one-way traffic on Kalamazoo Avenue at Park Street
principal streets, and parking and other traffic controls during two-way operation in the study area. Figure 4 is the corresponding map for the one-way operation.

## TRAFFIC SURVEYS IN KALAMAZOO

To obtain data representing the quality of traffic
operation during the "before" phase of the study, surveys were made between October 19 and October 30, 1964. The "after" phase surveys were made between May 2 and 4, 1966. The sample sizes for the various surveys were based on established methods normally used for similar work by Michigan Department of State Highways.
FIGURE 4-CITY OF KALAMAZOO: INVENTORY OF STREETS AND TRAFFIC CONTROL
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Volume counts were taken by pneumatic counters recording by 15 -minute periods.

Time gaps in the traffic stream were measured on Kalamazoo and Michigan Avenues at their intersections with Church Street. Nothing shorter than six seconds was recorded, and the gaps were divided into four size-groups of 6 to 10 seconds, 10 to 15 seconds, 15 to 20 seconds, and over 20 seconds.

Turning-movements were counted for six hours at the intersections of Kalamazoo and Rose, and Michigan and Lovell. Stoppage of left lanes caused by traffic waiting to make left turns at the Kalamazoo and Rose intersection was recorded in seconds.

Figure 5 shows the locations of the survey stations. A full description of all surveys will be found in Appendix 1 。

The speed-and-delay study runs were made by the so-called floating car method. Total travel time and points and durations of all stopped delays were recorded in these runs using automatic recording equipment (See Figures 6 and 7).

Total travel time only was clocked by a survey car on six cross-streets which are situated in a
general north-south direction and which intersect the one-way pair.

## ACCIDENT DATA FOR KALAMAZOO

Accident reports compiled by the City of Kalamazoo Police Department were studied for a one-year-before and one-year-after evaluation. A period of three months after the change of the traffic operation was skipped before starting the "after" period of the accident study. This was done to give ample time for the drivers to get used to the new situation, and for the Department to readjust any traffic devices as might be necessary. A large majority of the streets in the area already described was covered in the canvassing of accident reports. A full list of the streets will be found in Appendix 15.

The details of accident information extracted from the individual police reports can be seen in the recording form in Appendix 10. The classification of the accident types is given in Appendix 11.

## LANSINGSTUDY AREA

The Lansing study area includes the street network shown in Figure 8. The area contains part of the northern fringe of the central business district. During the two-way operation of the state
(Text continued on p.23)


KALAMAZOO: One-way Kalamazoo Avenue west of Park Avenue



trunk line through this area (upper half of Figure 8) Michigan Highway 43 followed Saginaw Street from the west city limits near the Belt Line Railroad east to Center Street. From there east, M-43 was already operating on the Saginaw-Sheridan one-way pair. There were existing one-way streets intersecting the trunk line. These were Pine Street and Capitol Avenue, at that time
running northbound, and Walnut Street and Grand Avenue running southbound.

As an intermediate step in the implementation of the one-way operation of M-43 (lower part of Figure 8), a new bridge was built over the Grand River, and Jefferson and Oakland Streets were widened, reconstructed and joined to form a con-


LANSING: Oakland-Saginaw one-way pair as seen from the Belt Line Railroad structure looking east


LANSING: One-way Saginaw Street west of Verlinden intersection
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FIGURE 8-CITY OF LANSING: STUDY AREA \& SURVEY ROUTES during two-way and initial phase of one-way operation
tinuous westbound trunk line as far as Logan Street. The entire westbound route was then named Oakland Avenue. Median islands on Saginaw Street between Washington Avenue and Center Street were removed and the area converted into a traffic lane. Part-time parking was removed from Saginaw Street, and all other necessary revisions were made in the traffic control devices and parking regulations. In this report, this
period is referred to as the initial phase of the one-way operation, and it began on January 31, 1965. Logan Street operated as a two-way street between Oakland and Saginaw. Saginaw Street west of Logan also operated two-way as before. At the same time, the direction of flow on the north-and-south one-way city streets mentioned earlier was reversed in order to better fit the ultimate city traffic plan to be implemented after
(Text continued on p.34)


LANSING: One-way Oakland Avenue at Center Street


LANSING: One-way Oakland Avenue near Pine Street intersection
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FIGURE 9 -CITY OF LANSING: SURVEY ROUTES dURING FINAL PHASE OF ONE-WAY OPERATION
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FIGURE 13 - CITY OF LANSING: TRAFFIC \& GAP SURVEY STATIONS
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the completion of the east-west freeway through Lansing. Thus, Pine Street and Capitol Avenue became one-way southbound, and Walnut Street and Grand Avenue became one-way northbound.

The Lansing study included an evaluation of the final phase of the one-way operation which went into effect in the fall of 1968. The westbound traffic then continued along reconstructed Oakland Avenue west of Logan Street up to the west city limits. It took several more months, however, until the structure carrying the Belt Line Railroad over the highway was opened to traffic. General cleaning up of the construction area andinstalling pavement markings were completed on May 13, 1969. Figure 9 shows this final phase of the operation.

Figures 10, 11 and 12 show the laneage, parking and other traffic controls in the area during each of the three phases of the study.

## TRAFFIC SURVEYS IN LANSING

Surveys for the sampling of the two-way trunk line operation were taken between July 8 and July 30, 1964. Initial-phase surveys for the oneway operation were taken between June 28 and July 8, 1966; and the final phase surveys were taken between June 30 and August 1, 1969. Figure 13 shows the survey stations. Full descriptions will again be found in Appendix 1.

Traffic gap surveys, similar to those in Kalamazoo, were conducted at the following seven intersections of Saginaw Street: Seymour, Chestnut, Sycamore, Clayton-Carey, Westmoreland, Cawood and Durant.

Six hours of turning-movement counts, similar to those in Kalamazoo, were also recorded at the intersections of Oakland and Logan, Saginaw and Jenison, and Saginaw and Verlinden. Delays caused by traffic waiting to turn left were also recorded.

Speed-and-delay survey runs on the trunk lines, and the cross-street runs for the three phases of the study are shown on Figures 14 through 16.

## ACCIDENT DATA FOR LANSING

Accident reports from Lansing City Police, compiled by the City Traffic Engineer, were studies for the three study phases. As in Kalamazoo, each accident study period covered one full year. All streets in the area which might have been affected by the one-way trunk line were examined. A full description of these streets will be found in Appendix 12. The extent of detail required for each accident was the same as in the Kalamazoo study.

## PONTIAC STUDY AREA

The Pontiac study area is the corridor along US-10 Business Route northwest of the central business district. During the "before" phase of the study, Oakland Avenue was a two-way state trunk line between its intersection with Cass Avenue - Montcalm Street and Wide Track Drive (Figure 17). During the "after" phase, Cass Avenue, two blocks to the southwest, was developed into a southeastbound one-way state trunk line, and Oakland Avenue became one-way northwestbound. Channelizing islands were constructed at each end of Oakland Avenue to accommodate the transitions to two-way operation.

Figure 18 is an inventory map of the study area representing the two phases of the operation. The change to one-way was effected on May 18, 1967. However, interconnection of traffic signals by electrical cables for good progression was delayed until April 5, 1968.

## TRAFFIC SURVEYS IN PONTIAC

Traffic surveys to represent the conditions under the two-way operation were taken during August of 1964. Figure 19 indicates the locations where volume, turning-movement and gap surveys were taken. Figure 20 shows the speed-and-delay study runs.

Corresponding surveys to reflect the one-way operation were first taken during August of 1967. However, as already mentioned in the preceding section, optimum signal progression proved not to have been attained at that time because the signals were not interconnected. This made it
(Text continued on p.39)
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FIGURE 19-CITY OF PONTIAC:
TRAFFIC AND GAP SURVEY STATIONS
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PONTIAC: One-way Oakland Avenue northwest of Clark Street


PONTIAC: Oakland Avenue looking northwest from vicinity of Cadillac Street
necessary to repeat the "after" surveys the following year, and they were taken from August 5 to 15,1968 . Survey details are included in Appendix 1.

## ACCIDENT DATA FOR PONTIAC

Accident data were recorded from the file of
accident reports at the Pontiac Police Department. A list of the streets examined, and the details of the "before" and "after" one-year periods will be found in Appendix 18.

PORT HURON STUDY AREA

The change over to one-way traffic operation in


Port Huron was in essence different from the other three cities examined in this study. As already indicated in describing those three study areas, basically the existing state trunk line in each city was converted to one-way operation, and a paralled street, no more than two to three blocks away was used for the trunk line traffic in the opposing direction. In Port Huron the existing
state trunk line was turned back to the city, and a new corridor approximately $3 / 4$ mile away was selected for the one-way pair.

Figure 21 shows the layout of the state trunk lines and the city streets during two-way operation. Michigan Route 21 followed Lapeer and Water Streets. Port Huron's central business


PONTIAC: Four-lane section of one-way Cass Avenue looking southeast


PONTIAC: Three-lane section of one-way Cass Avenue looking southeast

district starts near the east end of this route and extends to the north. Most of Lapeer Street is in a residential area, with industrial zones near the west city limits. The new trunk line corridor is the Griswold-Oak pair to the south, Griswold Street running westbound, and Oak Street eastbound (Figure 22). The area is mainly residential. These two streets, especially Oak Street, were
widened and reconstructed to serve the state trunk line traffic. Mitchell Street to the east was also rebuilt and connected to Oak. The new oneway pair transitioned to the new limited access highway near the west city limits which joins with the existing two-lane section of M-21 to the northwest, leading to Imlay City.


PORT HURON: One-way Griswold Street west of 10th Street


PORT HURON: One-way Griswold Street looking east at the 10 th Street intersection



Figures 23 and 24 show the street and traffic control inventory in the study area during the two-way and the one-way phases of the project, respectively. The Union and Court Streets corridor is also included here because this was an earlier established one-way pair in this city, and was used as a control in the study.

The Griswold-Oak pair was opened to traffic as a state trunk line on October 19, 1966.

## TRAFFIC SURVEYS IN PORT HURON

Surveys were taken from August 31 to September 11, 1964 for the before phase, and from September
(Text continued on p. 50)


PORT HURON; One-way Oak Street at the 24th Street intersection


PORT HURON: One-way Oak Street looking east at the 16th Street intersection




11 to 21,1967 for the after phase. Volume, turn-ing-movement and gap survey stations are shown on Figure 25, and speed-and-delay and crossstreet travel-time survey routes are shown on Figures 26 and 27. Survey details are included in Appendix 1.

## ACCIDENT DATA FOR PORT HURON

Accidents along three main corridors were studied on a before-and-after basis. These are the La-peer-Water Street corridor, the Union-Court oneway pair corridor, and the Griswold-Oak pair corridor. Accidents on the cross-streets intersecting the first and third of these corridors were also studied for one block north and south from
these intersections. Accidents on the crossstreets intersecting Union and Court Streets were not examined except for the immediate intersection approaches. A full list of the streets for the accident study is given in Appendix 21.

The one-year "before" period in the Port Huron study was terminated 21 months before opening to traffic of the new one-way pair, because of construction activities affecting traffic operation. Thus, although the opening date was October 19, 1966, the accident study period was taken from January 19, 1964 through January 18, 1965. The 'rafter" period started, as in the other cities, three months after the new system was opened to traffic.

## ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

This study was designed to evaluate the operational changes in the traffic of an urban area which is directly affected by the change from two-way to one-way state trunk lines in that immediate area. The changes in the traffic characteristics of the state trunk lines themselves and of the adjacent cross-streets have been examined. The trunk lines have been studied in greater detail.

The quality of a traffic service in general can be measured by the parameters of time, convenience, safety, distance and cost (2). The present study mainly deals with the first three. No data have been compiled to include a study of trip distances as affected by the one-way system, such as ori-gin-destination surveys, driver interviews or questionnaires. An indirect exploration was, however, made to examine whether or not any excessive travel was taking place within the confined areas which are being studied. No cost information is included in this study.

In an over-all evaluation of a street system such as the ones examined in this project, the results are bound to reflect the effects of a whole set of conditions and circumstances in addition to the uni- or bi-directional character of the trunk line traffic. Optimum adjustment of the traffic signals and other traffic control measures, temporal changes in the intensity of land use and in the age and social-group brackets of drivers using the facilities are but a few of these conditions. This should be kept in mind in reviewing the results of the study.

## SPEED AND DELAY STUDY RESULTS

The results of speed and delay studies in Kalamazoo are presented in Table 1. This table lists, on the left, six different traffic survey routes used during two-way operation along the then current state trunk lines and the proposed additions that would form the new east-west one-way pair. The middle portion of the table lists the travel routes that were followed during the oneway operation which most nearly correspond to the earlier routes. Differences in the results
obtained between the "before" and the "after" routes are shown at the right. Statistical significance of the changes in over-all speed and number of stops was examined as explained in in Appendix 27, and indicated in Table 1.

Averages of several runs (described in Appendix 1) for each peak traffic period are given in Table 1. The first four columns after the route descriptions, in both the two-way and one-way sections, are self explanatory. "Average Travel Time" is the average, for each peak period, of the total time spent between the beginning and end of the trip. "Average Over-all Speed" is the average of the over-all speeds of the several trips, which are calculated by dividing trip length by travel time. "Average Number of Stops" is the average of the number of stops for each trip. "Average Delay" is the average, for the several trips, of the total delay or stopped time divided by the trip length. "\%. Delay Time" is calculated by dividing average stopped time by average travel time.

In calculating average results, those survey trips which were delayed at railroad crossings because of the presence of trains were discarded because these trips would unjustly distort the before-andafter comparisons.

No corresponding "after" route is given in Table 1 for Route 1-A since it was no longer possible to repeat that trip eastbound on Kalamazoo Avenue during the one-way operation. The alternate route for the same origin and destination is Route 3-A which is compared with Route 3-B of the one-way operation (Figures 6 and 7).

Route 2-A was a westbound trip mostly on Kalazoo Avenue which was not a state trunk line during the two-way operation. During one-way operation this route (Route 2-B) became westbound M-43. In spite of heavier traffic volumes in the "after" period, it will be noticed that a gain of 8.9 miles per hour in average over-all speed was attained during morning peak traffic. 6.0 and 2.2 miles per hour were gained for the noon and afternoon peaks, respectively. Better signal progression was possible during one-way

TABLE 1
CITY OF KALAMAZOO
SPEED AND DELAY COMPARISONS

| DURING TWO－WAY OPERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DURING ONE－WAY OPERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CHANGE IN： |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route | 京 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dib } \\ & \text { Dī } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Route |  |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 흠 } \\ & \text { 咅 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 言 |
|  | EB | 1.6 | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 10 / 27-29 \\ u \end{array}\right\|$ | Morn． <br> Noon Aft． | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 4^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime} \\ 4^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \\ 5^{\prime} 37^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 20.2 \\ 20.7 \\ \hline 17.4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 4.0 \\ & 5.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26 \\ & 25 \\ & 39 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & 14 \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2－A <br> From Harrison St．to Thompson S．Vio Michigan－Kolamazoo－ Douglas－Main Sts． <br> $\because$ <br> 4 $*$ | $\mid \mathrm{we}$ | 1.6 | 10／27－29 | Morn． <br> Noon Aft． | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 4^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime} \\ 4^{\prime} 46^{\prime \prime} \\ 5^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.6 \\ & 20.2 \\ & 19.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.7 \\ & 2.9 \\ & 2.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27 \\ & 28 \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ | 16 <br> 16 <br> 18 | 2- <br> From Harrison St．to Thompson St．Via Michigan－Kalamazoo－ Douglas－Main Sts． <br> ： | wa | 1.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 5 / 4-6 \\ & 5 / 3-5 \\ & 5 / 3-4 \end{aligned}$ | Morn <br> Noon Aft． | $\begin{aligned} & 3^{\prime} 16^{\prime \prime} \\ & 3^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \\ & 4^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.5 \\ & 26.2 \\ & 21.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 1.0 \\ & 2.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 11 \\ 28 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ 8 \\ 17 \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} --^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime} \\ -1^{\prime \prime} 06^{\prime \prime} \\ -0^{\prime} 29^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{r} +8.9 \\ +(s) \\ +6.0 \\ (s) \\ +2.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} -2.4 \\ -(s)^{4} \\ -(s)^{2} \\ -0.9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -24 \\ & -17 \\ & -6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -13 \\ & -8 \\ & -1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3－A <br> From Thompson St．to Harrison St．Via Main－Michigon Sts． | EB | $1.4$ | 10／27，28 | Morn． <br> Noon Aft． | $\begin{aligned} & 4^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime} \\ & 4^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime} \\ & 5^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | 19.7 18.7 16.6 | 2.0 3.0 3.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \\ & 36 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | 16 <br> 18. <br> 20 | 3－8 <br> From Thempson St．to Harrison St．Via Main－Michigon Sis． <br> 4 |  | $1.4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 / 4-6 \\ & 5 / 3-5 \\ & 5 / 3-4 \end{aligned}$ | Morn． <br> Noon <br> Aft． | $\begin{aligned} & 3^{\prime} 48^{\prime \prime} \\ & 4^{\prime} 04^{\prime \prime} \\ & 4^{\prime} 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22.4 \\ & 20.8 \\ & 20.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 1.6 \\ & 1.8 \end{aligned}$ | 23 25 30 | 14 | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} -0^{\prime} 29^{\prime \prime} \\ -0^{\prime} 28^{\prime \prime} \\ -0^{\prime} 58^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & +2.7 \\ & +2.1 \\ & +2.8 \\ & +3.8 \\ & (1) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.4 \\ -1.4 \\ -(s) \\ -2.0 \\ -(s) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -6 \\ & -11 \\ & -15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -2 \\ & -4 \\ & -3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $4-A$ <br> From Harrison St．to Thompson St．Via Michigan－Main Sts． <br> 11 <br> ${ }^{11}$ | w8 | 1.4 | $10 / 27,28$ $"$ | Morn <br> Noon Aft． | $\begin{aligned} & 4^{\prime} 28^{\prime \prime} \\ & 4^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime} \\ & 5^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | 18.9 17.4 14.7 | 4.0 4.0 5.7 | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \\ & 34 \\ & 70 \end{aligned}$ |  | 2－B <br> From Harrison St．to Thompson St．Via Michigan－Kalamazoo－ Douglas－Main Sis． <br> ＂ |  | 1.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 5 / 4-6 \\ & 5 / 3-5 \\ & 5 / 3-4 \end{aligned}$ | Morn． <br> Noon <br> Aft． | $\begin{aligned} & 3^{\prime} 16^{\prime \prime} \\ & 3^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \\ & 4^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | 29.5 26.2 21.3 | 0.3 1.0 2.0 | 3 11 28 | $17$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{ll} -l^{\prime} 12^{\prime \prime} \\ -l^{\prime} 41^{\prime \prime} \\ -l^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} +10.6 \\ (\mathrm{~s}) \\ +(8.8) \\ (\mathrm{si}) \\ +\left(\begin{array}{c} 6.6 \\ \left.+(S)^{2}\right) \end{array}\right. \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -3.7 \\ \hline(\mathrm{~s}) \\ -3.0 \\ \hline(1) \\ -3.7 \\ \hline(\mathrm{~s}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -25 \\ & -23 \\ & -42 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -12 \\ -8 \\ -11 \end{gathered}$ |
| $5-A$ <br> From Lovell st ．to Harrison St Via Michigan St． <br> 11 <br> II | EB | 1.3 | 10／29 | Morn． <br> Noon <br> Aft． | $\begin{aligned} & 3^{\prime} 58^{\prime \prime} \\ & 3^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \\ & 4^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.8 \\ & 21.4 \\ & 17.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.5 \\ & 1.7 \end{aligned}$ $2.3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & 20 \\ & 38 \end{aligned}$ | 12 18 |  | EB | 1.3 | $\begin{aligned} & 5 / 4-6 \\ & 5 / 3-5 \\ & 5 / 3-4 \end{aligned}$ | Noon <br> Aft． | $\begin{aligned} & 3^{\prime} 03^{\prime \prime} \\ & 3^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \\ & 3^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25.7 \\ & 21.4 \\ & 21.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.8 \\ & 1.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 16 \\ 20 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ 12 | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} -0^{\prime} 55^{\prime \prime} \\ 0 \\ -0^{\prime} 55^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} +5.9) \\ +(S) \\ 0 \\ +4.0 \\ +(5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.2 .2 \\ -(1) \\ -0.9 \\ -1.1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -11 \\ & -4 \\ & -18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -5 \\ & -2 \\ & -6 \end{aligned}$ |
| From Hortison St． to Lovell St． <br> Vio  <br> Michigon St．  | w | 1.3 ＂ | 10／29 | Morn <br> Noon Aft． | $\begin{aligned} & 5^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime} \\ & 5^{\prime \prime} 31^{\prime \prime} \\ & 5^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.7 \\ & 14.2 \\ & 14.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.7 \\ & 6.3 \\ & 5.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73 \\ & 56 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \\ & 29 \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | From Harrison St．to Lovell St． Via Kalamazoo－New Rd．（Mıchikal） II |  | 1.3 | $\begin{aligned} & 5 / 4-6 \\ & 5 / 3-5 \\ & 5 / 3-4 \end{aligned}$ | Morn | $\begin{aligned} & 3^{\prime} 21^{\prime \prime} \\ & 3^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime} \\ & 3^{\prime} 37^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23.5 \\ & 22.8 \\ & 21.9 \end{aligned}$ | 0.7 1.0 1.4 | 11 17 22 | 7 11 13 | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} -1^{\prime} 58^{\prime \prime} \\ -2^{\prime} 04^{\prime \prime} \\ -1^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & +8.8 \\ & (5) \\ & +8.6 \\ & +(5) \\ & +(7.0 \\ & +(5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} -5.0 \\ -(\mathrm{s}) \\ -5 \mathrm{~s}) \\ \hline(\mathrm{s}) \\ -4.3 \\ \hline(\mathrm{~s}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | -60 -56 -34 | $\begin{aligned} & -22 \\ & -18 \\ & -10 \end{aligned}$ |

（S）－The change is statistically significant
operation, resulting in fewer stops which droped from an average of 2.7 for morning peak trips to 0.3. Reductions in number of stops during noon and afternoon peaks were also experienced as will be seen in Table 1. Average delay per mile dropped from 27 seconds to 3 seconds, from 28 to 11 , and from 34 to 28 for the morning, noon and afternoon peaks, respectively. Percent delay time dropped from 16 to 3 , from 16 to 8 , and from 18 to 17 for the various peaks.

In examining the amounts of over-all speed gains realized by the one-way operation, it should be remembered that there is a deliberate limit to travel speed through the business district, and in fact, this is an inherent function of the signal progression system.

Route 3-A was the eastbound route for $\mathrm{M}-43$, and remained the same except that it became one-way (Route 3-B). In this eastbound trip, the greater gains in the speeds and in the delay reductions were experienced in the afternoon peak period where the over-all speed went up from 16.6 miles per hour to 20.4 , number of stops dropped from 3.8 to 1.8 , average delay from 45 seconds per mile to 30 , and percent delay time from 20 to 17 . The figures for the other peak periods can be seen in the table.

Route 4-A, westbound via Michigan Avenue, was the route followed by M-43 during two-way operation. In Table 1 this is compared with Route 2-B which is now westbound M-43. As it will be seen in the comparison columns, up to 10.6 miles per hour of over-all speed gain is accomplished. Even though Route 2 - B was 0.2 mile longer than Route 4-A, average travel times decreased by more than one minute.

Routes 5-A and 5-B, for eastbound I-94 BL, are identical trips via Michigan Avenue except that the later is one-way for most of its length. Fifty-five seconds have been gained in both the morning and afternoon peak trips, and the over-all speed during the morning peak has improved by 5.9 miles per hour.

Route 6-A was the old westbound route for I-94 BL via Michigan Avenue. The new westbound I-94 BL follows Kalamazoo Avenue to its intersection with the newly built Michikal Street, then
follows Michikal and Michigan southwestbound. Both routes are equal in length, but about two minutes of travel time are gained in the morning and noon trips, and almost as much in the afternoon trips. The gain in speed varies from 7.0 to 8.8 miles per hour.

Total travel time and its inverse measure of overall speed serve to indicate the economy in time. Number of stops is important both for economy of vehicle operation and driver convenience and safety. Also, it is known that the automobile engine of today is inefficient in stop-and-go driving, and contributes more to air pollution. A smooth traffic flow is, therefore, very necessary where traffic is heavy. Another important consideration is traffic noise, which is also greatly reduced when traffic flow is uninterrupted. Amount of delay or actual stopped time has a psychological effect on drivers, and remaining stopped while on a trip is suspected to be more disturbing to a driver than moving slowly. The last three columns for trip evaluation in Table 1 are therefore highly significant in quantifying the level of traffic service. One-way trunk line operation in Kalamazoo has resulted in the elimination of up to five stops during peak periods on some of the study routes, and in a reduction in delays (stopped time) of up to one minute per mile of travel. During two-way operation, the ratio of stopped time to travel time (\% delay time) during peak traffic was found to be as high as 29 percent, whereas during one-way operation the highest ratio was found to be 17 percent even though travel time itself was also shorter.

Table 2 contains the results of the speed-and delay surveys in Lansing. The upper portion represents the conditions during the two-way operation and during the initial phase of the oneway operation when Saginaw Street west of Logan Street was still operating two-way. Route 1-A was eastbound M-43 along Saginaw Street during the two-way operation. Route $1-B$ was the same trip after Saginaw became one-way east of Logan, but included the section of Saginaw Street west of Logan which was still a two-way trunk line. A gain in travel time of about 30 seconds has been attained on this trip. Optimum speeds of travel have been reached as indicated by average overall speeds of up to 30 miles per hour, which is

TABLE 2

## CITY OF LANSING <br> SPEED AND DELAY COMPARISONS

| dURING TWO-WAY OPERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | during one-way operation - initial phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | change in: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{y}{\circ} \stackrel{\mathcal{H}}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 믈 } \\ & \text { Be } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Route | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \frac{6}{6} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6} \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B } \\ & \text { : } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 旁容 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 1.9 \\ " \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | 7/14-16 | Morn. <br> Noon Aft, | $\begin{aligned} & 4^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime} \\ & 4^{\prime} 33^{\prime \prime} \\ & 5^{\prime} 00 " \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.0 \\ & 25.2 \\ & 23.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.9 \\ & 2.3 \\ & 3.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & 18 \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 12 \\ & 14 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1.9 \\ & " \\ & " \end{aligned}$ | $6 / 29-30$ $7 / 1$ $"$ $6 / 28$ | Morn. <br> Noon Aft. | $\begin{gathered} 3^{\prime} 53^{\prime \prime} \\ 4^{\prime} 03^{\prime \prime} \\ 4^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.0 \\ & 28.3 \\ & 25.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 1.3 \\ & 2.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 12 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ 9 \\ 12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -34^{\prime \prime} \\ & -30^{\prime \prime} \\ & -24^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} (\mathrm{s}) \\ +4.0 \\ (\mathrm{~s}) \\ +3.1 \\ +2.2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (5) \\ & -0.9 \\ & -1.0 \\ & -1.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -6 \\ & -6 \\ & -5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -2 \\ & -3 \\ & -2 \end{aligned}$ |
| From Cedor $\frac{2-1}{5 t}$ to Beltline RR Vio Sheridan-Center-Saginaw Sts WB |  | $\begin{gathered} 7 / 14-16 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | Morn. <br> Noon <br> Aft. | $\begin{aligned} & 4^{\prime} 48^{\prime \prime} \\ & 4^{\prime} 53^{\prime \prime} \\ & 5^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.3 \\ & 25.9 \\ & 25.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \\ & 1.8 \\ & 2.0 \end{aligned}$ | 9 <br> 12 |  |  |  | 2.1 | $\begin{gathered} 6 / 29-30, \\ 7 / 1 \\ 6 / 29-30 \end{gathered}$ | Morn. <br> Noon <br> Aft. | $\left[\begin{array}{ll} 4^{\prime} 29^{\prime \prime} \\ 4^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime} \\ 4^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.4 \\ & 30.7 \\ & 26.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.1 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | 8 <br> II | $6$ | $\begin{aligned} & -19^{\prime \prime} \\ & -47^{\prime \prime} \\ & -20^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $(s)$ +2.1 <br> (S) +4.8 <br> $+1.0$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.7 \\ (s) \\ -1.6 \\ -0.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -2 \\ & -8 \\ & -1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1 \\ -6 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ |
| - . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DURING ONE - WAY OPERATION - FINAL PHASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\left[\begin{array}{c} 1.90 \\ " \\ " \end{array}\right.$ | $[1969)$ $7 / 23,28$ $7 / 23-25$ $7 / 22,24$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Morn. } \\ \text { Noon } \\ \text { Aft. } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4^{\prime} 13^{\prime \prime} \\ & 4^{\prime} 11^{\prime \prime} \\ & 3^{\prime} 57^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.2 \\ & 27.3 \\ & 29.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \\ & 0.9 \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 10 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | 6 8 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | From Cedar St. to Beltline RR Via Oakiond St. | $\left.\begin{gathered} w_{8} \\ n \\ 4 \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 1.94 \\ " \\ " \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 / 23,28 \\ & 7 / 23-25 \\ & 7 / 22,24 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Morn } \\ \text { Noon } \\ \text { aft. } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 4^{\prime} 03^{\prime \prime} \\ 3^{\prime} 52^{\prime \prime} \\ 4^{\prime} 13^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.1 \\ & 30.4 \\ & 28.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.4 \\ & 0.8 \end{aligned}$ | 7 4 10 | 6 3 8 |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |

the legal speed limit, during the one-way phase. Sizeable reductions in number of stops, duration of stops and ratio of delay time are seen in Table 2.

Route 2-A for Lansing was westbound M-43 via Saginaw. With the initial one-way system, this was replaced by 2-B via Oakland Avenue. From the intersection of Oakland and Logan on trip $2-B$, the rest of the trip was along two-way streets. Even under this partial one-way operation, and considering the devious route necessitated by the use of Logan Street as a detour between Oakland and Saginaw, a comparison of the before and after data reveals substantial improvement. Travel speeds have approached the optimum, and delays have been reduced for all trips. Almost ideal signal progression was present between Cedar and Logan Streets as evidenced from the field data where only one out of the total of 27 westbound runs had any stops on this one-way section.

In the lower portion of Table 2, travel conditions are shown as determined by survey-vehicle runs during the final phase of the one-way operation. No attempt is made in the table to compare these results with the earlier phases because a rather long period of time had elapsed, substantially changing the traffic volumes and patterns. However, average over-all speeds, number of stops and delays are not much different from the initial one-way phase of three years before.

Table 3 portrays the speed-and-delay study in Pontiac. Routes $1-\mathrm{A}$ and $1-\mathrm{B}$ ate the southeastbound state trunk line routes during the two-way and one-way operation, respectively. The latter route, via Cass Avenue, has resulted in gains of 3 miles per hour or better during the peak periods, compared with the two-way Oakland Avenue route. However, no similar improvement was observed in the northwestbound direction (Routes 2-A and 2-B). Average over-all speed has not shown any significant change in this direction except an increase of 1.9 miles per hour during the noon peak when traffic volume is relatively light compared with the morning and afternoon peaks. There is some evidence of reduction in the number of stops, but the seconds of stopped delay have increased. Examination of field data reveals that
stopped-delays occurred only at the Wide Track Drive intersection and at the Cass-Montcalm intersection during the one-way operation, whereas with the two-way operation many intermediate signalized locations were causing delays. Traffic growth on Wide Track Drive in four years, and heavier traffic routed through Cass Avenue necessitated longer green time to be allocated to these streets, causing delay in the northwestbound direction.

The lack of general improvement in the northwestbound traffic flow is also blamed on the constrictive effect of the Oakland-Cass-Montcalm intersection where through-movement is confined to two lanes (Figure 18). A traffic island was added to this intersection in preparation for the one-way operation. This island channelizes two of Oakland Avenue's four lanes into two left-turn lanes onto Cass Avenue, leaving only two lanes for through and right-turn movements. Turning-movement counts taken at this intersection indicate only 385 vehicles turning left in six hours from northwestbound Oakland, with a maximum rate of 112 vehicles per hour. Such a low turning movement would not necessitate two lanes, but no more than two lanes could be allowed for through traffic because only two northwestbound lanes existed northwest of the intersection. Straight-through movement in six hours was counted to be 2936, with a maximum rate of 1152 per hour. On the other hand, the maximum rate of right-turn movement is only 128 per hour. In general, drivers intending to go straight prefer to avoid the right lane which might be impeded by some turning vehicles. This tends to funnel through-traffic into one lane which would be loaded above capacity with the 1152 vehicles per hour.

The constricting effect of funneling the northwestbound traffic down to two, or even one lane, would also cause intemal turbulence in the traffic considerably upstream of the intersection, due to lane changes for getting in the proper lane. This condition may be alleviated to some extent if another lane can be added for Oakland Avenue throughtraffic.

In the southeastbound direction, comparing Route 3-A with 1-B, a slight decrease in the average speeds, and significant increase in the number of

TABLE 3

## CITY OF PONTIAC

SPEED AND DELAY COMPARISONS

| DURING TWO-WAY OPERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DURING ONE-WAY OPERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CHANGE IN: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\square}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\text { जे }}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 믐 } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\square} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ |  |  | $0$ | Route | 毛 |  | $\circ$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{a} \\ & \dot{a} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I-A  <br> From Northview to Saginaw  <br> Via Oakland Ave.  <br> " " <br> " " | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \mathrm{SE} \\ \mathrm{Bd} \\ \mathrm{n} \\ \mathrm{n} \end{array}\right\|$ | $1.3$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 8 / 18-20 \\ 1 \\ 8 / 17-19 \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Morn } \\ \text { Noon } \\ \text { Aft. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3^{\prime} 34^{\prime \prime} \\ & 3^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime} \\ & 3^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | 22.0 <br> 22.3 <br> 21.1 | $\begin{array}{r} 1.9 \\ 2.2 \\ 2.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & 23 \\ & 22 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 14 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 1.3 $"$ $"$ | $8 / 13-15$ | Morn. <br> Noon <br> Aft. | $\text { n } \begin{array}{lll} 3^{\prime} & 09^{\prime \prime} \\ 3^{\prime} & 07 \\ 3^{\prime} & 10^{\prime \prime} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r\|l} 25.0 \\ \hline & 25.3 \\ \hline & 24.8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \\ & 1.8 \\ & 1.9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ 19 \\ 16 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 13 \\ & 11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -25^{\prime \prime} \\ & -25^{\prime \prime} \\ & -33^{\prime \prime} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (\mathrm{S}) \\ +3.0 \\ +3.0 \\ +(\mathrm{S}) \\ +3.7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.1 \\ & -0.4 \\ & -0.4 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -4 -4 -6 | $\left[\begin{array}{r} -1 \\ -1 \\ -2 \\ \hline \end{array}\right.$ |
| $2-A$ <br> From Saginaw to Northview Vio Oaklond Ave. <br> II <br> 11 |  | $1.3$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 8 / 18-20 \\ 1 \\ 8 / 17-19 \end{gathered}\right.$ | Morn. <br> Noon <br> Aft. | $\left\|\begin{array}{ll} 3^{\prime} & 28^{\prime \prime} \\ 3^{\prime} 44^{\prime \prime} \\ 3^{\prime} 4 & 43^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | 22.9 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 2.5 \\ & 2.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 22 \\ 25 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 13 \\ 14 \end{gathered}$ | $2-B$ <br> From Saginaw to Northview Via Oaklond Ave. | $w \left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} N W \\ B d \\ n \\ \\ \hline \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{c\|c} 1.3 \\ " & 8 \\ 1 " & 8 \end{array}$ | 8/13-15 | Morn. <br> Noon <br> Aft. | $\begin{aligned} & 3^{\prime} 34^{\prime \prime} \\ & 3^{\prime \prime} 25^{\prime \prime} \\ & 3^{\prime} 41^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} 22.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 1.7 \\ & 2.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \\ & 29 \\ & 32 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \\ & 19 \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} +6^{\prime \prime} \\ -19^{\prime \prime} \\ -2^{\prime \prime} \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.6 \\ (S) \\ +1.9 \\ +0.1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0 \\ (\mathrm{~S}) \\ -0.8 \\ -0.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} +16 \\ +7 \\ +7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +10 \\ & +6 \\ & +5 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { SE } \\ \mathrm{Bd} \\ " \\ " \\ " \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.3 \\ " \\ " \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 8 / 18-20 \\ " \\ 8 / 17-19 \end{array}\right\|$ | Morn. <br> Noon <br> Aft. | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l\|} 3^{\prime} 02^{\prime \prime} \\ 3^{\prime} 02^{\prime \prime} \\ 3^{\prime} 01^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25.9 \\ & 26.0 \\ & 26.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 1.2 \\ & 0.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 11 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} S E \\ B d \\ " \\ n \end{array}\right\|$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 8 / 13-15 \\ n \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Morn } \\ \text { Noon } \\ \text { Aft. } \end{array}\right\|$ | $n\left\|\begin{array}{ll} 3^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime} \\ 3^{\prime} & 07 \\ 3^{\prime} & 10 \end{array}\right\|$ | " | $\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \\ & 1.8 \\ & 1.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 19 \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & 13 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|} + & 7 \prime \\ + & 5^{\prime \prime} \\ +\quad 9^{\prime \prime} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\left.\begin{aligned} & -0.9 \\ & -0.7 \\ & -1.3 \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{gathered} (\mathrm{S}) \\ +0.8 \\ +0.6 \\ (\mathrm{~S}) \\ +1.1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +3 \\ & +6 \\ & +4 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +2 \\ & +5 \\ & + \end{aligned}$ |
| $4-\mathrm{A}$  <br> Closed loop via Howard-Johnson  <br> Norton-Sanderson-Oaklond B  <br> Baldwin.  <br> B $"$ <br> $"$ $"$ |  | 1.2 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 8 / 18-20 \\ 1 \\ 8 / 17-19 \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Morn. } \\ \text { Noon } \\ \hline \text { Aft. } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 4^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \\ 4^{\prime} 11 \\ 4^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.0 \\ & 17.3 \\ & 16.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.8 \\ & 3.7 \\ & 3.7 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52 \\ & 27 \\ & 38 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 13 \\ & 17 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3-B <br> Closed Loop Via Baldwin- <br> Allison-Coseesanderson- <br> Norton-Johnson a Howard. <br> " <br> " <br> " | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|c} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline 0 \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} 1.2 \\ " \\ " \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 / 13-15 \\ 1 \\ 11 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \text { Morn. } \\ \text { Noon } \\ \text { Aft. } \end{gathered}$ | $\text { n. } \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 4^{\prime} 57^{\prime \prime} \\ 4^{\prime} 45^{\prime \prime} \\ 5^{\prime} 1 & 0^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline 14.6 \\ 15.3 \\ 14.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.4 \\ & 4.0 \\ & 4.6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \\ & 36 \\ & 54 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 15 \\ & 21 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

(s) = Change is Statisticaly signiticant
stops is noticed. Most of this increase in delay is attributed to the intersection with Wide Track Drive which had never caused any stops for the survey vehicle during the before runs on Cass Avenue.

Routes 4-A and 3-B, shown at the bottom of Table 3 , are not on the trunk line corridor, but are two closed loops crossing the one-way pair at two locations. These test runs were made to detect the extent of any delay that the new one-way pair may cause on cross traffic. The direction of travel on the loop originally planned and run during the before period had, however, to be reversed during the after period because in the meantime the City of Pontiac had converted Johnson Avenue into a northeastbound one-way street. This made it impossible to make a direct comparison of the before and after travel conditions on the same streets. In general, a slightly inferior operation in the traffic is indicated on this loop during the after period.

Table 4 is an evaluation of the speed-and-delay study done in Port Huron. It was noted earlier that the one-way project in this city was different in concept from the other three because the city corridor in use as the east-west state trunk line was abandoned and an entirely new corridor several blocks south was selected to carry the oneway pair. The first comparison in Table 4 (Route 1-A vs. 1-B) is that of the eastbound trunk line runs, via Lapeer Street in the two-way phase of the study, and via Oak Street in the one-way phase. All peak-period evaluations of average number of stops indicate statistically significant advantages. The same observation holds true for the comparison of the westbound runs (Route 2-A vs. 2-B). The Griswold route in comparison with the Lapeer route was found to be significantly superior.

The remainder of Table 4 is of minor importance because it involves comparisons of routes where traffic conditions have changed due to changes in functions of the streets. Comparison of the eastbound trip on Griswold (3-A) with the one on Oak (1-B) is really not a fair one because traffic volumes are not alike and the character of Oak Street traffic as a one-way state artery is different from that which existed on Griswold Street when
it was a two-way city street. Higher speeds, however, have resulted. Comparison of the westbound "before" and "after" trips on Griswold (4-A vs. $2-\mathrm{B}$ ) is similarly inadequate.

The last two sets of trip comparisons in Table 4 involve the Lapeer Street corridor alone. The eastbound trips are $1-\mathrm{A}$ and $3-\mathrm{B}$, and the westbound ones are $2-\mathrm{A}$ and $4-\mathrm{B}$. The comparisons show a general deterioration of the quality of traffic flow after Lapeer and Water Streets reverted to city jurisdiction. It is not clear whether this was a reflection of change in traffic enforcement or is it due to insufficient data taken during the after period, because as indicated under Table 4, only one test run for each peak was made.

In order to make a general review of the results of speed-and-delay studies in all cities, an effort has been made in Table 5 to summarize some average values. The figures represent simple averages of the results obtained for the various study trips.

The most significant deduction from Table 5 is that the one-way operation has resulted in the largest speed increases and delay elimination in Kalamazoo. Lansing and Port Huron did not fare as well. Pontiac showed only negligible gain in speed, and a poor record in delays. It can also be said that traffic flow progession initially was better in Lansing and Port Huron than in Kalama$z 00$, and therefore, there was more room for improvement in the last city.

## CROSS-STREET TRAVEL-TIME STUDY RESULTS

In a grid system of streets made up of state trunk lines and local streets, usual efforts to augment traffic capacity and speed along certain arteries result in some sacrifices in the traffic operation on local streets or other state trunk lines crossing the arteries in question. One of the parameters of the quality of traffic on a cross-street is travel time. To detect the possibility of having created any excessive delays on the cross-streets due to the one-way trunk line operation, cross-street travel time studies were made as outlined before.

TABLE 4

## CITY OF PORT HURON

 SPEED AND DELAY COMPARISONS| DURING TWO-WAY OPERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DURING ONE-WAY OPERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CHANGE IN: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\text { F }}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { o } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Route |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 믄 } \\ & \text { مٌ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (20 |
| I~A <br> From 32nd St. to Military Via Lopeef \& Water Sts. <br> ${ }^{4}$ <br> t | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{cc} \mathrm{E} \\ \mathrm{n} \\ \\ \hline \end{array}\right.$ |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 9 / 9-11 \\ " \\ 9 / 8-10 \end{array}\right\|$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 5^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} \\ & 5^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime} \\ & 5^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} 21.3 \\ 19.0 \\ 20.6 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.2 \\ & 3.9 \\ & 3.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 34 \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 18 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | From 32nd St. to Military  <br> Via Oak St.  <br> $"$ $" 1$ <br> $"$ $"$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.0 \\ 1 " \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 / 12 \\ 208 \\ 9 / 21 \\ 9-21 \\ 11 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 4^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime} \\ & 3^{\prime} 57^{\prime \prime} \\ & 4^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.4 \\ & 30.7 \\ & 27.8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 1.2 \\ & 2.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 10 \\ & 21 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 8 \\ 16 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} -0^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \\ -1^{\prime} 50^{\prime \prime} \\ -0^{\prime} 57^{\prime \prime} \end{gathered}++\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} (\mathrm{s}) \\ +6.1 \\ (\mathrm{~s}) \\ +1.7 \\ (\mathrm{~s}) \\ +7.2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (S) \\ & -1.6 \\ & (S) \\ & -2.7 \\ & -(S) \\ & -1.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -2 <br> -24 <br> $-\quad 3$ | +2 <br> -8 <br> +3 |
| From Military to 32nd St. Via Water \& Lapeer Sts. | $\begin{gathered} w \\ \hline " \\ n \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 9 / 9-11 \\ " \\ 9 / 8-10 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Morn. <br> Noon <br> Aft. | $\begin{aligned} & 4^{\prime} 48^{\prime \prime} \\ & 5^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} \\ & 5^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | 22.6 <br> 21.3 <br> 20.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.7 \\ & 3.1 \\ & 3.1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 13 \\ & 13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | From Military to 32nd St. Via Griswold St , | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { ws } \\ n \\ n \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.8 \\ 10 \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 9 / 12, \\ 20 \\ 9 / 19 \\ 9 \\ 11 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Morn } \\ \text { Noon } \\ \text { Aft. } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{ll} 4^{\prime} & 011 \\ 3^{\prime} & 58^{\prime \prime} \\ 4^{\prime} & 1 \end{array} 0^{\prime \prime}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.0 \\ & 27.4 \\ & 26.1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 1.1 \\ & 1.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 12 \\ 14 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} -0^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime} \\ -1^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime} \\ -1^{\prime} 05^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{r} (\mathrm{S}) \\ +\quad 4.4 \\ (\mathrm{~S}) \\ +6.1 \\ (\mathrm{~S}) \\ +5.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} (S) \\ -1.7 \\ (S) \\ -2.0 \\ (S) \\ -1.8 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r}-9 \\ -10 \\ -\quad 9 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} -5 \\ -4 \\ -3 \end{array}\right\|$ |
| 3-A <br> From <br> 32nd <br> Via Griswold St St  <br> " Military  | $\begin{gathered} \text { E B } \\ \text { " } \\ \text { " } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 9 / 9-11 \\ 1 \\ 9 / 8-10 \end{array}\right\|$ | Morn. <br> Noon Aft. | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 4^{\prime} 01^{\prime \prime} \\ 4^{\prime} 29^{\prime \prime} \\ 4^{\prime} 23^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.2 \\ & 24.2 \\ & 25.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.4 \\ & 1.6 \\ & 1.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 13 \\ 13 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 9 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\|$From 32nd St. to Military <br> Via Oak St.  <br> $"$ $"$ <br> " " |  |  | $\left(\left.\begin{array}{c} 9 / 12, \\ 20 \\ 20 \\ 9 / 19 \\ 9 \\ \hline 19 \\ n \end{array} \right\rvert\,\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Morn. } \\ \text { Noon } \\ \text { Aft. } \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 4^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime} \\ 3^{\prime} 57^{\prime \prime} \\ 4^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.4 \\ & 30.7 \\ & 27.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 1.2 \\ & 2.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 10 \\ & 21 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 8 \\ 86 \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & +0^{\prime} 26^{\prime \prime} \\ & -0^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime} \\ & -0^{\prime} 01 " \end{aligned}\right.$ | + +0.2 (S) +6.5 +2.7 | $\begin{array}{r} +0.2 \\ -0.4 \\ +0.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}+13 \\ -\quad 3 \\ +\quad 8 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | +10 <br> -1 <br> +7 |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline w n \\ " 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 9 / 9-11 \\ 1 \\ 9 / 8-10 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Morn. } \\ \text { Noon } \\ \text { Aft. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3' ${ }^{\text {a }} 8^{\prime \prime}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.3 \\ & 25.8 \\ & 24.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \\ & 1.4 \\ & 1.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9 \\ 7 \\ 10 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 5 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $3 \begin{gathered} 1.8 \\ n \\ n \end{gathered}$ | $\left.\begin{gathered} 9 / 12 \\ 20821 \\ 9 / 19-21 \\ n \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Morn. } \\ \text { Noon } \\ \text { Aft. } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4'01" ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.0 \\ & 27.4 \\ & 26.1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 1.1 \\ & 1.3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 12 \\ 14 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 6 9 10 | $\left\|\begin{array}{l}+0^{\prime} 03^{\prime \prime} \\ -0^{\prime} 155^{\prime \prime} \\ -0^{\prime} 111^{\prime \prime}\end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{r}-0.3 \\ +1.6 \\ +\quad 1.2 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | -0.2 <br> -0.3 <br> +0.1 | $\begin{array}{r}-1 \\ +\quad 5 \\ +\quad 4 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | -1 <br> +4 <br> +3 |
| $1-A$ <br> From 32nd St. to Military Via Lapeer \& Water Sts. |  | 1.8 | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 9 / 9-1.1 \\ u \\ 9 / 8-1.0 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Morn. } \\ \text { Noon } \\ \text { Aft. } \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 5^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} \\ 5^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime} \\ 5^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | 21.3 19.0 20.6 | 3.2 3.9 3.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 34 \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & 18 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | $3-8$ <br> From 32nd St. to Military Via Lapeer \& Water Sts. | $\begin{gathered} \text { E B } \\ " \\ n \end{gathered}$ |  | $9 / 19$ $"$ $"$ | (*) Morn ()$^{2}$ Noon ( Aft. aft | $\begin{array}{ll} 5^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime} \\ 5^{\prime} & 40^{\prime \prime} \\ 5^{\prime} 59 \end{array}$ | 18.5 <br> 19.1 <br> 18.1 | 3.0 5.0 4.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 37 \\ & 42 \\ & 48 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \\ & 22 \\ & 24 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & +0^{\prime} 44^{\prime \prime} \\ & -0^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} \\ & +0^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned} .\right.$ | $\begin{array}{r} -2.8 \\ + \\ -0.1 \\ - \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.2 \\ & +1.1 \\ & +1.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | +15 $+\quad 8$ +24 | +6 <br> +4 <br> +11 |
| 2-A <br> From Militory to 32nd St. Via Water \& Lapeer Sts. | $\begin{gathered} \text { W8 } \\ " \\ " \end{gathered}$ | $\left.\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \\ & 1 " \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 9 / 9-1.1 \\ " \\ 9 / 8-10 \end{array}\right\|$ | Morn. <br> Noon <br> Aft. | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 4^{\prime} 48^{\prime \prime} \\ 5^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} \\ 5^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 22.6 \\ 21.3 \\ 20.8 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.7 \\ & 3.1 \\ & 3.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17 \\ & 22 \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 13 \\ & 13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 4-8 From Military to 32 nd St. Via Water \& Lapeer Sts. $"$ $"$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{w} \\ \mathrm{n} \\ \mathrm{n} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 / 19 \\ " \\ " \end{gathered}$ | $(*)$ ( Morn. ( Noon ( (*) Aft. Af | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 4^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime} \\ & 5^{\prime} 58^{\prime \prime} \\ & 5^{\prime} 34^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}\right.$ | 22.9 <br> 18.1 <br> 19.4 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 6.0 \\ & 3.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 41 \\ 20 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 20 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & -0^{\prime} 05^{\prime \prime} \\ & +0^{\prime} 51 \\ & +0^{\prime} 1 \\ & 19 \end{aligned} 9^{\prime \prime}\right.$ | $\left.\begin{array}{r} + \\ + \\ -3.2 \\ -\quad 1.4 \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | $\left[\begin{array}{l} -1.7 \\ +2.9 \\ -0.1 \end{array}\right.$ | 0 +19 $-\quad 3$ | $\begin{array}{r}0 \\ +7 \\ -2 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |

[^2]TABLE 5
SPEED AND DELAY SUMMARY

|  | Kalamazoo |  |  | Lansing |  |  | Pontiac |  |  | Port Huron |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Two-Way | One-Way | Change | Two.Way | One.Way | Change | Two-Way | One-Way | Change | Two-Way | One-Way | Change |
| Average Over-all Speed (Miles per Hour) | 18.1 | 23.1 | +5.0 | 25.3 | $\begin{gathered} 28.2 \\ (28.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +2.9 \\ & (+3.2) \end{aligned}$ | 23.2 | 23.6 | +0.4 | 23.3 | 27.7 | +4.4 |
| ( Average Stops per Mile | 2.7 | 0.8 | -1.9 | 1.1 | $\begin{gathered} 0.6 \\ (0.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.5 \\ (-0.8) \end{gathered}$ | 1.3 | 1.4 | +0.1 | 1.3 | 0.7 | -0.6 |
| Average Delay <br> (Seconds per Mile) | 39 | 17 | -22 | 14 | 10 <br> (8) | $\begin{aligned} & -4 \\ & (-6) \end{aligned}$ | 18 | 23 | +5 | 17 | 14 | -3 |
| Average Delay Ratio | 18\% | 11\% | -7\% | 10\% | $\begin{gathered} 7 \% \\ (6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -3 \% \\ (-4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 11\% | 15\% | +4\% | 10\% | 11\% | +1\% |

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses indicate values for the final phase of one-way operation in Lansing.

Table 6 lists the average results obtained from the cross-street travel-time studies in Kalamazoo. It will be seen by examining the last column that the changes in average travel time vary all the way from a reduction of 62 seconds to an increase of 41 seconds. Results of a statistical analysis for significance of the changes are also indicated. No pattern seems to exist for these variations in the change in travel time. Timing of traffic signals to provide for the needed traffic capacity for conflicting street approaches and to provide for progression is the major factor affecting these travel times. Slight increase in some of the crossstreet travel times is a small sacrifice that can be afforded to compensate for even smaller gains in travel time on the trunk lines, since these gains benefit much larger volumes of traffic. - It can be said, nevertheless, that the introduction of the new one-way trunk line pair has not resulted in delays of any objectionable duration on the cross-streets.

Table 7 compares the average cross-street traveltimes during the two-way operation with those during the initial phase of the one-way operation in Lansing. In this city, as mentioned earlier, changes in the directions of travel of the one-way streets crossing the state trunk lines were made concurrently with the operation of the new oneway state trunk lines. Consequently, in Table 7 some of the before-and-after comparisons relate to conditions of opposite traffic direction, and this makes those comparisons somewhat inconsistent since the peak traffic patterns are not comparable. However, the information as a whole is valuable again in revealing that no excessive delays have been caused by the new scheme. The last column contains a variety of shortening and lengthening of trip times varying from -10 seconds to +37 seconds.

Table 8 is a similar presentation of cross-street travel which includes the results of the second set of "after" surveys during the final phase in Lansing. As might be expected, travel times have lengthened because of heavier traffic volumes in 1969 as compared with 1964 or even 1966 (initialphase of one-way surveys). One minute and four seconds is the largest increase, on Jenison Street, between the two-way and final one-way operation.

Cross-street travels in Port Huron are depicted in Table 9. Surveys were made on five streets in two directions. The largest increases in travel time were found to be 40 seconds during the morning peak, 26 seconds during the noon peak, and 37 seconds during the afternoon peak.

In Pontiac the test runs to compare cross-street travel were not done on a straight course like in the other cities but were made within a loop crossing the one-way system of streets. The results were already presented in Table 3 and discussed in the section titled "Speed-and-Delay Study Results"。

For the sake of an over-all comparison of the results of the before and after surveys in three cities, simple averages of all the peak-period travel times have been shown in Table 10. A gain of 2.9 seconds is seen for Kalamazoo. A similar average for all of the off-peak trips in Kalamazoo (not shown in Table 10) yields 99.6 seconds for the two-way period and 95.1 seconds for the oneway. For Lansing, an over-all time loss of 10.6 seconds is indicated during the initial one-way phase. This is to be expected because another traffic artery, Oakland Avenue, which must be crossed by the traffic, has been added for the one-way operation. At every intersection of this added artery with the cross-streets, traffic signals were added, and these played a role in the resultant slight loss in travel time on the crossstreets. No off-peak trial runs have been made in Lansing or Port Huron. The 18.2 second increase in Port Huron is a natural result of heavier state trunk line traffic on Oak and Griswold Streets and the addition of signals on most of the cross-streets at their intersections with Oak.

## RESULTS OF GAP STUDIES

The gap study is another test of the quality of traffic service on the streets intersecting the one-way trunk lines. This applies to streets controlled by stop signs. Any trunk line traffic improvement project cannot ignore its effect on the ease of access from minor streets. The phenomenon that controls this ease of access is the availability of gaps in the traffic stream on the major street. Earlier traffic engineering research (3) indicates that a gap of smaller size than six
(Text continued on p.65)

(S)-The change is statistically significant.

## TABLE 7

## CITY OF LANSING

CROSS-STREET TRAVEL-TIME COMPARISONS
(WITH INITIAL PHASE OPERATION)

| Run | TWO-WAY OPERATION |  |  | Run | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ONE-WAY OPERATION } \\ & \text { INITIAL PHASE } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CHANGE } \\ & \frac{\text { AVERAGE }}{\text { TRAVEL }} \\ & \frac{T M E}{} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{\text { Date }}{(1964)}$ | Period |  |  | $\frac{\text { Date }}{(1966)}$ | Period |  |  |
| On Washington Ave from Kilborn to Genesee Sts: <br> 11 <br> 41 <br> it | $7 / 14-16$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 31^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | On Washington Ave. from Kilborn to Genesee \$ts. <br> 11 <br> \$1 <br> 11 <br> 46 | $\begin{gathered} 6 / 29-30 \\ 7 / 11 \\ 1 \\ 6 / 28-30 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak Noon " " Afternoon " | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime \prime} 14^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 18^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 21^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +14^{\prime \prime}(5) \\ & +18^{\prime \prime}(5) \\ & -10^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| On Capitol Ave. from Genesee to Kilborn Sts. <br> 11 <br> It <br> 14 <br> $\$$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 / 14-16 \\ 11 \\ 11 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 02^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 12^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | On Capitol Ave. from Kilborn to Genesee Sts. ( $*$ ) <br> 4! <br> 4t <br> 15 <br> tif | $\begin{gathered} 6 / 29-30, \\ 7 / 1 \\ 1 \\ 6 / 28-30 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> Afternoon " | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{1} 35^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 14^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +33^{\prime \prime}(S) \\ & +2^{\prime \prime} \\ & -1^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| On Wolnut St. from Kilborn to Genesee Sts. <br> 11 <br> 16 <br> 11 <br> 15 | $\begin{gathered} 7 / 14-16 \\ 11 \\ 11 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> Afternoon | $\begin{array}{ll} l^{\prime \prime} & 07^{\prime \prime} \\ I^{\prime} & 08^{\prime \prime} \\ I^{\prime} & 12^{\prime \prime} \end{array}$ | On Walnut St. from Genesee to Kilborn Sts. (*) <br> $\$ 1$ <br> 21 <br> 14 <br> 11 | $\left.\begin{gathered} 6 / 29-30 \\ 7 / 1 \\ 7 \\ 6 / 28-30 \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> 月 <br> Afternoon " | $\begin{gathered} I^{\prime \prime} 08^{\prime \prime} \\ 59^{\prime \prime} \\ I^{\prime} 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +1^{\prime \prime} \\ & -\quad 9^{\prime \prime} \\ & -7^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| On Pine St. from Genesee to Kilborn Sts. <br> 11 <br> tl <br> 11 <br> 11 | $\begin{gathered} 7 / 14-16 \\ 1 \\ 11 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon $"$ <br> Afternoon  | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 12^{t 1} \\ & 1^{\prime} 14^{i \prime} \\ & \left.\right\|^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | On Pine St. from Kilborn to  <br> Genesee Sts. $(*)$  <br> $n$  <br> $n$ $n$ | $6 / 29-30$ $7 / 1$ 7 $6 / 28-30$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> Afternoon <br> ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime} \\ & I^{\prime} 29^{\prime \prime} \\ & I^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +37^{\prime \prime}(9) \\ & +10^{\prime \prime} \\ & +66^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| On Logan St. from Myland to Genesee Sts. <br> 71 <br> tl <br> 11 <br> It | $\begin{gathered} 7 / 14-16 \\ 11 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peok <br> Noon H <br> Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 02^{11} \\ & 55^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{1} 03^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | On Logan St. from Hyland to Genesee Sts. <br> 1 1 <br> $\$ 1$ <br> 11 | $\begin{gathered} 6 / 29-30 \\ 7 / 1 \\ 1 \\ 6 / 28-30 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon " <br> Afternoon <br> ${ }^{\prime}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 28^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime} \\ & i^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +26^{\prime \prime}(\$) \\ & +30^{\prime \prime}(3) \\ & +16^{\prime \prime}(\$) \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  | On Logon St. from Genesee to Hyland Sts. <br> 11 <br> 11 <br> 16 <br> ft | $\begin{gathered} 6 / 29-30, \\ 7 / 1 \\ 11 \\ 6 / 28-30 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> 1 <br> Afternoon | $\begin{array}{ll} 1 & 02^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime} \\ I^{\prime} & 11 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | On Washington Ave. from Genesee to Kilborn Sts. <br> 11 <br> 14 <br> 13 <br> 11 | $\begin{gathered} 6 / 29-30 \\ 7 / 1 \\ 1 \\ 6 / 28-30 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon " <br> Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & 116^{11} \\ & 55^{1 \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 08^{11} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| (S)-The chonge is stotistically significant. |  |  |  | (*)Trovel direction was reversed in the "After" phose of the study. |  |  |  |  |

## TABLE <br> 8

## CITY OF LANSING

## CROSS-STREET TRAVEL-TIME COMPARISONS

 (WITH FINAL PHASE OPERATION)| Run | TWO-WAY OPERATION |  |  | Run | $\begin{gathered} \text { ONE-WAY OPERATION } \\ \text { FINAL PHASE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { CHANGE } \\ \text { IN } \\ \text { AVERAGE } \\ \text { TRAVEL } \\ \text { TIME } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dote } \\ (1964) \end{gathered}$ | Period |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Date } \\ (1969) \end{gathered}$ | Period |  |  |
| On Washington Ave from Kilborn to Genesee Sts. <br> 11 <br> 14 <br> 11 <br> 11 | $7 / 14-16$ | Morning Peok <br> Noon $"$ <br> Afternoon $"$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 31^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | On Washington Ave. from Kilborn to Genesee Sts. <br> 11 <br> II | $\begin{gathered} 7 / 29-31 \\ 7 / 28-30 \\ \because \end{gathered}$ | Morning Noon Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 33^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 34^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +33^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{S}) \\ & +34^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{S}) \\ & +5^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| On Capitol Ave. from Genesee to Kilborn Sts. <br> 14 <br> 11 <br> 16 <br> 21 | $\begin{gathered} 7 / \frac{1}{5}=\frac{1}{3} \\ 15 \\ 15 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> Afternoon | $\begin{array}{ll} 1^{\prime} & 02^{\prime \prime} \\ l^{\prime} & 12^{\prime \prime} \\ I^{\prime} & 09^{\prime \prime} \end{array}$ | On Capitol Ave. from Kilborn to Genesee Sts. (*) | $\left\{\begin{array}{c} 7 / 29-31 \\ 7 / 28-30 \\ 11 \end{array}\right.$ | Morning Peak Noon Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & l^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime} \\ & I^{\prime} 58^{\prime \prime} \\ & I^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +49^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +46^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +31^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \end{aligned}$ |
| On Wolnut St. from Kilborn to Genesee Sts. <br> 11 <br> 11 <br> 11 <br> 11 | $7 / 14-16$ <br> $\because$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon " <br> Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 12^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | On Walnut St. from Genesee to Kilborn Sts. (*) <br> 21 <br> 11 <br> 11 | $\begin{aligned} & 7 / 29-31 \\ & 7 / 28-30 \end{aligned}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 53^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \\ & I^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +46^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{S}) \\ & +32^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{S}) \\ & +28^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{S}) \end{aligned}$ |
| On Pine St. from Genesee to Kilborn Sts. <br> 1) <br> 4t <br> H <br> : | $\text { 7/14-16} \begin{gathered} \prime \prime \\ \prime \prime \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon " <br> Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 12^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 14^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | On Pine St. from Kilborn to Genesee Sts. (*) <br> $1 \%$ <br> 14 | $\left\{\begin{array}{c} 7 / 29-31 \\ 7 / 28-30 \\ 11 \end{array}\right.$ | Morning Peak Noon " Afternoon " | $\begin{aligned} & \left.\prime^{\prime} 4\right\|^{\prime \prime} \\ & i^{\prime} 41^{\prime \prime} \\ & \prime^{\prime} 50^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +29^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{S}) \\ & +27^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{S}) \\ & +26^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{S}) \end{aligned}$ |
| On Logan St. from Hyland to Genesee Sts. <br> II <br> 11 <br> 11 <br> 14 | $\text { 7/14-16 } \begin{gathered} " \\ " \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & I^{\prime} 02^{\prime \prime} \\ & 55^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 03^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | On Logan St. from Hyland to Genesee Sts. <br> 14 <br> II <br> It <br> 4 | $\begin{gathered} 7 / 29-31 \\ 7 / 28-30 \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak | $\begin{aligned} & i^{\prime \prime} 26^{\prime \prime} \\ & i^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime} \\ & I^{\prime} 31^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +24^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +20^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +28^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \end{aligned}$ |
| On Jenison St, from Hyland to Genesee Sts. <br> " <br> * <br> $"$ <br> " | $\begin{gathered} 7 / 14-16 \\ " \\ " \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak Noon " Afternoon " | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 12^{\prime \prime} \\ & \text { ' }^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime} \\ & \text { ' }^{\prime} 23^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | On Jenison St. from Hyland to Genesee Sts. <br> 炜 <br> 18 <br> $1 t$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 / 29-31 \\ & 7 / 28-30 \end{aligned}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon " <br> Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime} \\ & 2^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +18^{\prime \prime} \\ & +6^{\prime \prime} \\ & +1^{\prime} 04^{\prime \prime}(5) \end{aligned}$ |
| On Verlinden St. from Osborn to Hyland Sts. <br> " <br> * <br> " <br> ${ }^{\prime}$ | $\text { 7/14-16 } \begin{gathered} 11 \\ 11 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak  <br> Noon $"$ <br> Afternoon $"$ | $\begin{aligned} & l^{\prime \prime} 48^{\prime \prime} \\ & l^{\prime} 18^{\prime \prime} \\ & i^{\prime} 21^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | On Verlinden a cleo Sts. from Osborn to Hyland Sts. <br> fi <br> 11 <br> t <br> 14 | $\begin{gathered} 7 / 29-31 \\ 7 / 28-30 \\ 11 \end{gathered}$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Morning Peak } \\ \text { Noon " } \\ \text { Afternoon " }\end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 34^{\prime \prime} \\ & 2^{\prime} 05^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -10^{\prime \prime} \\ & +16^{\prime \prime} \\ & +44^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \end{aligned}$ |

TABLE 9

## CITY OF PORT HURON

CROSS-STREET TRAVEL-TIME COMPARISONS

| Run | TWO-WAY OPERATION |  |  | Run | ONE-WAY OPERATION |  |  | CHANGE IN AVERAGE TRAVEL TIME |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dote } \\ & (1964) \end{aligned}$ | Period |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Date } \\ (1967) \end{gathered}$ | Period |  |  |
| On Milltary from Minnie to Chestrut. (NB) <br> 11 <br> Is <br> 11 <br> 16 | $9 / 1-3$ 4 4 | Morning Peak <br> Noon $1:$ <br> Afternoan $\prime \prime$ | $\begin{gathered} 50^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} 01^{\prime \prime} \\ 49^{\prime \prime} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | On Military from Minnie to Chestnut. (NB) $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 / 12,13, \\ 148 / 18 \\ 9 / 12-14 \\ 9 / 13,14,18 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak Noon <br> Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 04^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +17^{\prime \prime} \\ & +03^{\prime \prime} \\ & +20^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \end{aligned}$ |
| On Military from Chestnut to Minnie. (SB) | $9 / 1-3$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon $"$ <br> Afternoon $"$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43^{\prime \prime} \\ & 48^{\prime \prime} \\ & 55^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | On Military from Chestnut to Minnie. (SB) <br> $\$ 1$ <br> 11 <br> 11 <br> It | $\begin{gathered} 9 / 12,13 \\ 148,18 \\ 9 / 12-14 \\ 9 / 13,14,18 \end{gathered}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> Afternoon | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\prime} 14^{\prime \prime} \\ 54^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +31^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +04^{\prime \prime} \\ & +05^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| On 7th St. from Minnie Chestnut. (NB) <br> 11 <br> 11 <br> 11 <br> II | $9 / 1-3$ | Morning Peak  <br> Noon $"$ <br> Afternoon $1 "$ | $\begin{gathered} 53^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \\ 54^{\prime \prime} \end{gathered}$ | On 7th St. from Minnie to Chestmut. (NB) <br> 41 <br> il <br> II | * <br> * <br> * | Morning Peak <br> Noon " <br> Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 33^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 21^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +40^{\prime \prime}(s) \\ & +22^{\prime \prime}(s) \\ & +27^{\prime \prime}(s) \end{aligned}$ |
| On 7th St. from Chestnut Minnie. (SB) | $\begin{array}{r} 9 / 1 \\ 14 \\ \\ 1! \end{array}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> Afternoon | $\begin{array}{cc} 54^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} & 02^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} & 02^{\prime \prime} \end{array}$ | On 7th St, from Chestnut to Minnie. (S日) <br> 14 <br> II <br> II | * <br> * <br> * | Morning Peak  <br> Noon $n$ <br> Afternoon  | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 20^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 20^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +26^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +18^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +15^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \end{aligned}$ |
| On loth St. from Minnie to Chestnut. (NB) <br> 11 <br> $\ddagger$ <br> 11 | $9 / 1-3$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> Afternoon | $\begin{array}{cc} 1^{\prime} 02^{\prime \prime} \\ & 59^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} & 1^{\prime \prime} \end{array}$ | On IOth St. from Minnie to Chestrut. (NB) <br> si it <br> 11 <br> 4 | * <br> * <br> * | Morning Peok <br> Noon " <br> Afternoon " | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +15^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +20^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +14^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| On IOth St. from Chestn Minnie. (SE) <br> 14 <br> 11 <br> 11 | $9 / 1-3$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon $"$ <br> Afternoon "  | $\begin{array}{cc} 1^{\prime} & 08^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} & 10^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} & 09^{\prime \prime} \end{array}$ | On loth St. from Chestnut to Minnie. (SB) <br> 4 <br> 11 <br> EI |  | Morning Peak  <br> Noon $"$ <br> Afternoon "  | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 14^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 16^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 31^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +06^{\prime \prime} \\ & +06^{\prime \prime} \\ & +22^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| On 13 th St from Minnie to Chestnut. (NB) <br> It II <br> 11 <br> 11 | $9 / 1-3$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon $"$ <br> Afternoon $"$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58^{\prime \prime} \\ & 55^{\prime \prime} \\ & 51^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | On 13 th St. from Minnie to Chestnut. (NB) <br> \$1 $\$$ | * <br> * <br> * | Morning Peak <br> Noon " <br> Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 28^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 21^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 28^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +30^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +26^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +37^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \end{aligned}$ |
| On 13th St. from Chestnut to Minnie. (SB) <br> 11 <br> 14 <br> : <br> 3 | $9 / 1-3$ | Morning Peak  <br> Noon $"$ <br> Afternoon  | $\begin{gathered} 57^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} 05^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} 12^{\prime \prime} \end{gathered}$ | On 13th St. from Chestnut to Minnie. (SB) <br> 1 <br> 11 <br> it | * <br> * <br> * | $\|$Morning Peak <br> Noon " <br> Afternoon" | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime} 31^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 26^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +34^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +21^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +18^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \end{aligned}$ |
| On 24th St, from Minnie to Chestnut. (NB) <br> 11 <br> 11 | $9 / 1-3$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon " <br> Afternoon | $\begin{gathered} 51^{\prime \prime} \\ 52^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} 14^{\prime \prime} \end{gathered}$ | On 24th St.from Minnie to Chestnut. (NB) <br> II <br> tit | * <br> * | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> Afternoon | $\begin{gathered} 53^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime} \\ 1^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +02^{\prime \prime} \\ & +17^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{s}) \\ & +05^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| On 24th St. from Chestnut to Minnie. (SB) | $9 / 1-3$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{lc}\text { Morning } & \text { Peak } \\ \text { Noon } & \text { A } \\ \text { Afternoon } & "\end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} 38^{\prime \prime} \\ 56^{\prime \prime} \\ f^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} \end{gathered}$ | On 24th St. from Chestnut to Minnie. (SB) <br> $\$ 1$ <br> 14 | $\begin{aligned} & * \\ & * \\ & * \end{aligned}$ | Morning Peak <br> Noon <br> Afternoon | $\begin{aligned} & 1^{\prime \prime} 06^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime} \\ & 1^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +28^{\prime \prime}(S) \\ & +14^{\prime \prime} \\ & +02^{\prime \prime} \end{aligned}$ |

[^3] $(S)=$ The change is statistically significant.

|  | (P TREET TR | 10 <br> E OVER-AL <br> s Only) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Two-Way | One-Way | Change |
| Kalamazoo | 106.5 sec . | 103.6 sec. | - 2.9 sec. |
| Lansing |  |  |  |
| Five Streets | 69.0 | 79.6* | +10.6 |
| Seven Streets | 73.3 | 101.5** | +28.2 |
| Port Huron | 58.1 | 76.3 | +18.2 |
| * Initial Phase |  |  |  |
| **Final Phase |  |  |  |

seconds is not utilized by the majority of drivers desiring to cross or to make a turn onto a street from a stopped position. Consequently, no gaps smaller than six seconds have been recorded or analyzed in this study.

Table 11-a shows the numbers and sizes of gaps as surveyed at three intersections east of Logan Street in Lansing. The "before" figures relate to the two-way, and the "after" figures relate to the initial and final phases of one-way operation on Saginaw Street. Hourly totals during the morning and afternoon peak periods, and 5 -hour totals are given. Figure 28 is a graphical representation of the same information. Table 11-b shows the results of the gap studies on Saginaw Street west of Logan. The "Initial" columns of the after period are left blank in this table because oneway operation was not yet implemented west of Logan during the initial phase. Figure 29 is the graphical form of the same data.

These charts reveal two significant facts. The first is that more total gaps were available during a majority of the survey hours for either phase of the one-way operation. The second and more important fact is that there were more of the larger gaps during the one-way operation. It is apparent, therefore, that the one-way project has resulted in considerably better conditions for the side street
traffic by shortening the time that drivers had to wait at stop-controlled intersections.

Another quantitative evaluation of this improvement can be made by calculating the extra traffic capacity that can be utilized by vehicles entering from the side streets. An approximate method of determining the number of vehicles that could utilize the various sizes of gaps is presented in Appendix 2. No distinction has been made, in this calculation, between vehicles desiring to go straight through or to make a turn. Also, it is assumed that no gap shorter than six seconds will be utilized, and that each car starting from a stopped position will use four seconds of headway. According to this analysis, the number of vehicles that can utilize the various gap-size groups is as follows:

| Gap Size | Vehicles |
| :---: | :---: |
| $6-10$ seconds | 1 |
| $10-15$ seconds | 2 |
| $15-20$ seconds | 3 |
| $>20$ seconds | 5 |

The above figures are for cars entering from one leg of the side street. For a full intersection these can be doubled to account for traffic from the opposite leg also.
(Text continued on p. 70)
(East of Logan Street.)

Hourly Totals of Various Sizes of Gaps

ON SAGINAW ST. AT SEYMOUR ST:

| Gap Sizes <br> (Seconds) | 7-8 A.M. |  |  | 8-9 A. M. |  |  | 3-4 P. M. |  |  | 4-5 P. M. |  |  | 5-6 P. M. |  |  | Total for (5) Hours |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  |
|  |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |
| 6.10 | 40 | 40 | 45 | 62 | 39 | 61 | 58 | 37 | 50 | 49 | 43 | 63 | 39 | 44 | 48 | 248 | 203 | 267 |
| 10-15 | 18 | 29 | 27 | 31 | 22 | 24 | 22 | 34 | 25 | 13 | 30 | 20 | 27 | 32 | 23 | 111 | 147 | 119 |
| 15-20 | 13 | 19 | 16 | 10 | 18 | 10 | 5 | 18 | 21 | 5 | 21 | 7 | 9 | 13 | 14 | 42 | 89 | 68 |
| Over 20 | 5 | 23 | 17 | 3 | 27 | 23 | 2 | 21 | 14 | 0 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 4 | 17 | 100 | 67 |
| Total | 76 | 111 | 105 | 106 | 106 | 118 | 87 | 110 | 110 | 67 | 107 | 99 | 82 | 105 | 89 | 418 | 539 | 521 |

ON SAGINAW ST. AT CHESTNUT ST:

| Gap Sizes <br> (Seconds) | 7-8 A. M. |  |  | 8-9 A.M. |  |  | 3-4 P. M. |  |  | 4-5 P.M. |  |  | 5-6 P. M. |  |  | Total for (5) Hours |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  |
|  |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initiol | Final |  | Initial | Final |
| 6-10 | 49 | 35 | 42 | 70 | 34 | 31 | 39 | 41 | 40 | 27 | 41 | 58 | 35 | 34 | 46 | 220 | 185 | 217 |
| 10-15 | 45 | 33 | 24 | 49 | 32 | 30 | 17 | 37 | 19 | 15 | 26 | 24 | 20 | 32 | 26 | 146 | 160 | 123 |
| 15-20 | 14 | 18 | 12 | 18 | 23 | 17 | 4 | 14 | 14 | 4 | 11 | 16 | 9 | 19 | 15 | 49 | 85 | 74 |
| Over 20 | 6 | 24 | 29 | 7 | 30 | 24 | 0 | 27 | 30 | 0 | 32 | 20 | 3 | 32 | 24 | 16 | 145 | 127 |
| Total | 114 | 110 | 107 | 144 | 119 | 102 | 60 | 119 | 103 | 46 | 110 | 118 | 67 | 117 | 111 | 431 | 575 | 541 |

ON SAGINAW ST. AT SYCAMORE ST:

| Gap Sizes <br> (Seconds) | 7-8 A.M. |  |  | 8-9 A.M. |  |  | 3-4 P. M. |  |  | 4-5 P. M. |  |  | 5-6 P.M. |  |  | Total for (5) Hours |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  |
|  |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initiol | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initiol | Final |
| 6-10 | 56 | 42 | 33 | 57 | 51 | 23 | 50 | 40 | 41 | 56 | 47 | 44 | 58 | 52 | 48 | 277 | 232 | 189 |
| 10-15 | 21 | 36 | 22 | 27 | 27 | 23 | 23 | 40 | 27 | 20 | 34 | 23 | 22 | 50 | 51 | 113 | 187 | 146 |
| 15-20 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 25 | 14 | 17 | 7 | 12 | 17 | 5 | 18 | 20 | 3 | 19 | 22 | 52 | 76 | 87 |
| Over 20 | 18 | 29 | 27 | 12 | 47 | 34 | 1 | 26 | 31 | 1 | 25 | 28 | 2 | 24 | 23 | 34 | 151 | 143 |
| Total | 107 | 120 | 93 | 121 | 139 | 97 | 81 | 118 | 116 | 82 | 124 | 115 | 85 | 145 | 144 | 476 | 646 | 565 |



# TABLE Ilb <br> <br> CITY OF LANSING 

 <br> <br> CITY OF LANSING}

## VEHICLE GAP STUDY

(West of Logan Street.)

## Hourly Totals of Various Sizes of Gaps

ON SAGINAW ST. AT CAREY \& CLAYTON STS:

| Gap Sizes (Seconds) | 7-8 A.M. |  |  | 8-9 A. M. |  |  | 3-4 P. M. |  |  | 4-5 P. M. |  |  | 5-6 P. M. |  |  | Total for (5) Hours |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  |
|  | Before | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |
| 6-10 | 72 |  | 63 | 75 |  | 47 | 53 |  | 57 | 52 |  | 38 | 61 |  | 39 | 313 |  | 244 |
| 10-15 | 29 |  | 26 | 44 |  | 19 | 12 |  | 19 | 18 |  | 27 | 25 |  | 21 | 128 |  | 112 |
| 15-20 | 11 |  | 14 | 17 |  | 16 | 9 |  | 17 | 8 |  | 15 | 11 |  | 10 | 56 |  | 72 |
| Over 20 | 6 |  | 15 | 13 |  | 19 | 2 |  | 14 | 2 |  | 27 | 7 |  | 28 | 30 |  | 103 |
| Total | 118 |  | 118 | 149 |  | 101 | 76 |  | 107 | 80 |  | 107 | 104 |  | 98 | 527 |  | 531 |

ON SAGINAW ST. AT WESTMORELAND ST:

| Gap Sizes (Seconds) | 7-8 A.M. |  |  | 8-9 A. M. |  |  | 3-4P.M. |  |  | 4-5P.M. |  |  | 5-6 P. M. |  |  | Total for <br> (5) Hours |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  |
|  |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |
| 6-10 | 53 |  | 49 | 53 |  | 43 | 53 |  | 39 | 47 |  | 40 | 35 |  | 50 | 241 |  | 221 |
| 10-15 | 25 |  | 47 | 23 |  | 38 | 29 |  | 31 | 22 |  | 28 | 27 |  | 27 | 126 |  | 171 |
| 15-20 | 20 |  | 13 | 12 |  | 22 | 7 |  | 27 | 9 |  | 24 | 12 |  | 15 | 60 |  | 101 |
| Over 20 | 13 |  | 28 | 29 |  | 32 | 7 |  | 22 | 13 |  | 28 | 17 |  | 40 | 79 |  | 150 |
| Total | 111 |  | 137 | 117 |  | 135 | 96 |  | 119 | 91 |  | 120 | 91 |  | 132 | 506 |  | 643 |

ON SAGINAW ST. AT CAWOOD ST:

| Gap Sizes (Seconds) | 7-8 A.M. |  |  | 8-9 A. M. |  |  | 3-4P.M. |  |  | 4-5 P. M. |  |  | 5-6 P. M. |  |  | Total for (5) Hours |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  |
|  | Before | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |
| 6-10 | 68 |  | 36 | 68 |  | 40 | 74 |  | 47 | 58 |  | 62 | 53 |  | 69 | 321 |  | 254 |
| 10-15 | 45 |  | 24 | 32 |  | 42 | 26 |  | 31 | 22 |  | 52 | 33 |  | 52 | 158 |  | 201 |
| 15-20 | 13 |  | 18 | 21 |  | 21 | 6 |  | 13 | 2 |  | 27 | 18 |  | 37 | 60 |  | 116 |
| Over 20 | 8 |  | 25 | 16 |  | 33 | 1 |  | 18 | 3 |  | 36 | 2 |  | 24 | 30 |  | 136 |
| Total | 134 |  | 103 | 137 |  | 136 | 107 |  | 109 | 85 |  | 177 | 106 |  | 182 | 569 |  | 707 |

ON SAGINAW ST. AT DURANT ST:

| Gap Sizes (Seconds) | 7-8 A.M. |  |  | 8-9 A. M. |  |  | 3-4 P.M. |  |  | 4-5P. M. |  |  | 5-6 P.M. |  |  | Total for (5) Hours |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | Affer |  | Before | After |  |
|  |  | Initiol | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Final |  | Initial | Finol |  | Initial | Final |
| 6-10 | 68 |  | 52 | 78 |  | 73 | 64 |  | 62 | 65 |  | 69 | 69 |  | 79 | 344 |  | 335 |
| 10-15 | 28 |  | 28 | 47 |  | 49 | 21 |  | 25 | 15 |  | 42 | 21 |  | 39 | 132 |  | 183 |
| 15-20 | 11 |  | 17 | 13 |  | 9 | 5 |  | 12 | 5 |  | 9 | 8 |  | 16 | 42 |  | 63 |
| Over 20 | 7 |  | 10 | 17 |  | 7 | 3 |  | 3 | 1 |  | 13 | 2 |  | 12 | 30 |  | 45 |
| Total | 114 |  | 107 | 155 |  | 138 | 93 |  | 102 | 86 |  | 133 | 100 |  | 146 | 548 |  | 626 |



Applying the above information to the initialphase gap study results in Table 11-a, capacities added to the three intersections in Lansing during five hour peak traffic are shown in Table 12. This amounts to a total improvement in the capacity of the three streets of 4178 vehicles in five hours.

Table 13 gives the hourly and 5-hour totals for the number of various sizes of gaps at two intersections in Kalamazoo during the morning and afternoon peak traffic. A further breakdown of this data by 15 -minute periods will be found in Tables 14 and 15 . Figures 30 and 31 are graphical representations of the 15 -minute gap information. They also include, at the upper part, traffic volumes that were counted during the gap surveys.

Figure 30 shows the gaps on Michigan Avenue at Church Street. When Michigan Avenue was a twoway trunk line, it carried more traffic than later when it became a one-way trunk line. The 15 minute volume vatiation graph in Figure 30 indicates, however, a larger peak in the morning during the one-way period. One would normally expect less and shorter traffic gaps as the volume increases, and yet, it is observed that even with higher volumes, the number and especially the sizes of gaps are larger with one-way traffic. This results from the fact that gaps depend on the directional split of the traffic flow as well as total volume, and when volumes are equal, a oneway street will allow more and larger gaps. Table 16 contains traffic volume data for this intersection.

Figure 31 is the gap and volume chart for Kalamazoo Avenue at Church Street. Volumes were in general lighter even with the two-way traffic during the "before" phase of the study. In spite of the heavier volumes, the one-way operation made available more and larger gaps as summarized in Table 13. Volume figures for this intersection are given in Table 17.

Table 18 shows the results of gap surveys in Pontiac. Figure 32 is the corresponding graphical presentation. Gaps on Cass Avenue at the Florence Avenue intersection, the bottom chart in Figure 32, indicate improvement in the total number of gaps and in all gap sizes except those of more than 20 seconds. This last size shows a slight decrease.

Total gaps on Oakland Avenue, the top three charts in Figure 32, do not show the general trend of increase as on Cass Avenue. The morning peak periods show definite improvement, and so does the 3:00-4:00 pom. peak. The 4:00-5:00 pom. peak manifests results varying with the particular location, and the 5:00-6:00 pom. peak shows improvement in the most upstream location, Florence Avenue, and deterioration in the two downstream locations, at Blaine Avenue and at Cadillac Street. This may be due to the restrictive flow condition explained earlier under "Speed-and-Delay Study Results".

Table 19 and Figure 33 contain the gap study results in Port Huron. The data pertain to Griswold Street only. Although total traffic load on this street became lighter with one-way operation, traffic gaps during the one-way phase do not, in general, show improvement over the two-way phase. It is not known whether or not any changes in the turning-movement patterns at the gap-study intersections contributed to this lack of improvement, because no turning-movement counts were taken at these intersections.

## RESULTS OF TRAFFIC VOLUME STUDIES

Volume count data in this study have been used to evaluate the capacity of a system of streets in an area, rather than of single streets or intersections, to move traffic in a unit of time. The areas in question in Lansing, Kalamazoo and Pontiac were the traffic corridors served by the state trunk lines already described. The same method of evaluation was not applicable to Port Huron because the traffic corridors under study were different.

A Burroughs B5500 computer was used to process the volume data. The raw data were received from the field in the form of paper tapes on which 15 -minute volumes were printed by the traffic counters. Two different kinds of traffic counters were used during the several years' time involved in this study. In the earlier surveys the records were cumulative volumes by 15 -minute increments up to a full hour and reset to zero on the hour. Later, all 15 -minute counters in the Department of State Highways were converted so that they accumulated continually without resetting on the
(Text continued on p. 83)

TABLE 12

## CITY OF LANSING

## POSSIBLE UTILIZATION OF IMPROVED GAP AVAILABILITY

(During 5 Hours of Peak Traffic)

| Gap Size <br> (Seconds) | Number of Gaps |  | $=$ | Increase in No. of Gaps | $x$ | Vehicles <br> Per Gap ** | $=$ | Additional Vehicles Which Can Be <br> Accommodated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AFTER* | - BEFORE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| On Saginaw St. at Seymour St.: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6-10 | 203 | 248 |  | - 45 |  | 2 |  | -90 |
| 10-15 | 147 | 111 |  | 36 |  | 4 |  | 144 |
| 15-20 | 89 | 42 |  | 47 |  | 6 |  | 282 |
| $>20$. | 100 | 17. |  | 83 |  | 10 |  | 830 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1166 |
| On Saginaw St. at Chestnut St. : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $6-10$ | 185 | 220 |  | - 35 |  | 2 |  | -70 |
| $10-15$ | 160 | 146 |  | 14 |  | 4 |  | 56 |
| 15-20 | 85 | 49 |  | 36 |  | 6 |  | 216 |
| $>20$ | 145 | 16 |  | 129 |  | 10 |  | 1290 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1492 |
| On Saginaw St. at Sycamore St.: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6-10 | 232 | 277 |  | - 45 |  | 2 |  | -90 |
| 10-15 | 187 | 113 |  | 74 |  | 4 |  | 296 |
| 15-20 | 76 | 52 |  | 24 |  | 6 |  | 144 |
| $>20$ | 151 | 34 |  | 117 |  | 10 |  | 1170 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1520 |
|  |  |  |  | otal on thre | tree |  |  | 4178 |

[^4]
## CITY OF KALAMAZOO

VEHICLE GAP STUDY
Hourly Totals of Various Sizes of Gaps.
ON MICHIGAN AVE. AT CHURCH ST.

| Gop Sizes <br> (Seconds) | 7-8 A.M. |  | 8-9 A.M. |  | 3-4 P.M. |  | 4-5 P.M. |  | 5-6 P.M. |  | Total for <br> (5) Hours |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 6-10 | 72 | 61 | 24 | 81 | 27 | 79 | 14 | 63 | 24 | 75 | 161 | 359 |
| 10-15 | 23 | 26 | 9 | 43 | 7 | 30 | 3 | 19 | 3 | 30 | 45 | 148 |
| 15-20 | 4 | 25 | 5 | 14 | 4 | 13 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 21 | 16 | 82 |
| Over 20 | 5 | 19 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 18 | 8 | 74 |
| Total | 104 | 131 | 39 | 156 | 39 | 134 | 20 | 98 | 28 | 144 | 230 | 663 |

ON KALAMAZOO ST. AT CHURCH ST.

| Gap Sizes <br> (Seconds) | 7-8 A.M. |  | 8-9 A.M. |  | 3-4 P.M. |  | 4-5 P.M. |  | 5-6 P.M. |  | Total for <br> (5) Hours |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After. | Before | After |
| 6-10 | 70 | 39 | 74 | 27 | 77 | 47 | 71 | 34 | 54 | 35 | 346 | 182 |
| 10-15 | 43 | 18 | 15 | 30 | 23 | 51 | 31 | 51 | 30 | 44 | 142 | 194 |
| 15-20 | 19 | 23 | 6 | 13 | 2 | 30 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 13 | 58 | 95 |
| Over 20 | 14 | 49 | 12 | 48 | 5 | 12 | 5 | 16 | 2 | 6 | 38 | 131 |
| Total | 146 | 129 | 107 | 118 | 107 | 140 | 123 | 117 | 101 | 98 | 584 | 602 |

CITY OF KALAMAZOO
Number of Traffic Gaps of Various Sizes During 15-Minute Periods On MICHIGAN AVENUE at CHURCH STREET.

| PERIOD | GAP SIZES IN SECONDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL GAPS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6 to 10 seconds |  | 101015 seconds |  | 15 to 20 seconds |  | Over 20 seconds |  | Twoway | Oneway |
|  | Two-way | One-way | Two-way | One-way | Two-way | One-way | Two-way | One-way |  |  |
| 7:00-7:15 A.M. | 35 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 48 | 42 |
| 7:1 5-7:30 A.M. | 22 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 34 | 27 |
| 7:30-7:45 A.M. | 13 | 21 | 6 | 9 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 41 |
| 7:45-8:00 A.M. | 2 | 15 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 21 |
| 8:00-8:15 A.M. | 3 | 27 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 45 |
| 8:15-8:30 A.M. | 1 | 18 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 36 |
| 8:30-8:45 A.M. | 12 | 14 | 2 | 15 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 39 |
| 8:45-9:00 A.M. | 8 | 22 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 36 |
| 3:00-3:15 P.M. | 15 | 26 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 18 | 36 |
| 3:15-3:30P.M. | 7 | 15 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 25 |
| 3:30-3:45 P.M. | 4 | 23 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 40 |
| 3:45-4:00 P.M. | 1 | 15 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 33 |
| 4:00-4:I5P.M. | 3 | 17 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 25 |
| 4:15-4:30P.M. | 7 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 18 |
| 4:30-4:45 P.M. | 1 | 18 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 29 |
| 4:45-5:00P.M. | 3 | 17 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 26 |
| 5:00-5:15 P.M. | 2 | 17 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 28 |
| 5.15-5:30P.M. | 4 | 21 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 1. | 3 | 6 | 36 |
| 5:30-5:45 P.M. | 4 | 18 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 37 |
| 5:45-6:00 P.M. | 14 | 19 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 43 |
| (5) Hour Total | 161 | 359 | 45 | 148 | 16 | 82 | 8 | 74 | 230 | 663 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## CITY OF KALAMAZOO

Number of Traffic Gaps of Various Sizes During 15 -Minute Periods On KALAMAZOO AVENUE af CHURCH STREET.

| PERIOD | GAP SIZES IN SECONDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL GAPS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 61010 seconds |  | 10 to 15 seconds |  | 15 to 20 seconds |  | Over 20seconds |  | Twoway | Oneway |
|  | Two-way | One-way | Two-way | One-way | Two-way | One-way | Two-way | One-way |  |  |
| 7:00-7:15 A.M. | 8 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 15 | 32 | 33 |
| 7:15-7:30A.M. | 13 | 6 | 25 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 15 | 49 | 30 |
| 7:30-7:45 A.M. | 29 | 19 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 37 | 40 |
| 7:45-8:00 A.M. | 20 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 10 | 28 | 26 |
| 8:00-8:15 A.M. | 19 | 6 | 8 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 35 | 33 |
| 8:15-8:30 A.M. | 17 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 10 | 21 | 26 |
| 8:30-8:45 A.M. | 19 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 14 | 26 | 33 |
| 8:45-9:00 A.M. | 19 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 25 | 26 |
| 3:00-3:15 P.M. | 29 | 10 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 41 | 37 |
| 3:15-3:30 P:M. | 11 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 26 |
| 3:30-3:45 P.M. | 19 | 7 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 24 | 34 |
| 3:45-4:00 P.M. | 18 | 24 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 43 |
| 4:00-4:15 P.M. | 24 | 15 | 14 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 40 | 29 |
| 4:15-4:30 P.M. | 21 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 37 | 32 |
| 4:30-4:45 P.M. | 14 | 8 | 3 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 23 | 29 |
| 4:45-5:00 P.M. | 12 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 27 |
| 5:00-5:15 P.M. | 15 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 20 |
| 5:15-5:30 P.M. | 13 | 10 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 26 |
| 5:30-5:45 P.M. | 15 | 14 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 28 |
| 5:45-6:00 P.M. | 11 | 8 | 14 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 31 | 24 |
| (5) Hour Total | 346 | 182 | 142 | 194 | 58 | 95 | 38 | 131 | 584 | 602 |





FIGURE 31 - CITY OF KALAMAZOO
TRAFFIC GAPS ON KALAMAZOO ST. AT CHURCH ST.

TABLE 16

## CITY OF KALAMAZOO

## Michigan Avenue at Church Street

15minute Traffic Volumes During Gap Surveys

Period
Volumes With One-Way Operation (5-5.66)

145
169
400
576
444
310
305
263
318
292
273
316
367
293
293
252
321
231
262
243

TABLE 17

## CITY OF KALAMAZOO

## Kalamazoo Avenue at Church Street

15-Minute Traffic Volumes During Gap Surveys

Period

|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7:00-7:15A | 85 | 73 | 158 | 137 |
| 7:15-7:30 | 136 | 57 | 193 | 137 |
| 7:30-7:45 | 87 | 63 | 150 | 222 |
| 7:45-8:00 | 46 | 66 | 112 | 265 |
| 8:00-8:15 | 99 | 87 | 186 | 205 |
| 8:15-8:30 | 203 | 79 | 282 | 183 |
| 8:30-8:45 | 203 | 77 | 280 | 155 |
| 8:45-9:00 | 95 | 58 | 153 | 235 |
| 3:00-3:15P | 91 | 109 | 200 | 256 |
| 3:15-3:30 | 97 | 116 | 213 | 265 |
| 3:30-3:45 | 107 | 122 | 229 | 316 |
| 3:45-4:00 | 91 | 186 | 277 | 359 |
| 4:00-4:15 | 95 | 129 | 224 | 329 |
| 4:15-4:30 | 114 | 141 | 255 | 303 |
| 4:30-4:45 | 102 | 144 | 246 | 383 |
| 4:45-5:00 | 92 | 185 | 277 | 413 |
| 5:00-5:15 | 108 | 157 | 265 | 437 |
| 5:15-5:30 | 127 | 228 | 355 | 479 |
| 5:30-5:45 | 88 | 159 | 247 | 378 |
| 5:45-6:00 | 115 | 150 | 265 | 276 |

137
222
265
205
183
155
235
256
265
316
359
329
303
383
413
437
479
378
276

Volumes With One-Way Operation (5-3.66)

CITY OF PONTIAC

## VEHICLE GAP STUDY

Hourly Tofals of Various Sizes of Gaps.

ON OAKLAND AVE. AT BLAINE AVE:

| Gap Sizes (Seconds) | 7-8 A. M. |  | 8-9 A. M. |  | 3-4 P. M. |  | 4-5 P. M. |  | 5-6 P. M. |  | Topal for (5) Hours |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 6-10 sec. | 39 | 71 | 49 | 100 | 31 | 88 | 45 | 97 | 41 | 59 | 205 | 415 |
| 10-15 sec. | 20 | 57 | 22 | 44 | 29 | 42 | 19 | 28 | 24 | 28 | 114 | 199 |
| 15-20 Sec. | 12 | 26 | 12 | 25 | 14 | 14 | 10 | 5 | 19 | 2 | 67 | 72 |
| Over 20 Sec . | 46 | 38 | 37 | 41 | 26 | 5 | 35 | 7 | 28 | 1 | 172 | 92 |
| Total | 117 | 192 | 120 | 210 | 100 | 149 | 109 | 137 | 112 | 90 | 558 | 778 |

ON OAKLAND AVE. AT CADILLAC ST.

| Gop Sizes (Seconds) | 7-8 A. M. |  | 8-9 A. M. |  | 3-4P. M. |  | 4-5P.M. |  | 5-6 P. M. |  | Tofal for <br> (5) Hours |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 6-10 Sec. | 60 | 46 | 56 | 58 | 51 | 87 | 51 | 41 | 59 | 37 | 277 | 269 |
| 10-15 Sec. | 31 | 44 | 32 | 40 | 31 | 64 | 28 | 25 | 35 | 17 | 157 | 190 |
| 15-20 Sec. | 26 | 26 | 22 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 20 | 8 | 16 | 8 | 101 | 73 |
| Over 20 Sec . | 38 | 42 | 31 | 44 | 13 | 15 | 10 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 99 | 108 |
| Total | 155 | 158 | 141 | 159 | 112 | 180 | 109 | 76 | 117 | 67 | 634 | 640 |

ON OAKLAND AVE. AT FLORENCE AVE.

| Gap Sizes <br> (Seconds) | 7-8A. M. |  | 8-9 A. M. |  | 3-4P.M. |  | 4-5 P. M. |  | 5-6 P. M. |  | Total for <br> (5) Hours |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 6-10 sec. | 47 | 30 | 42 | 31 | 64 | 46 | 54 | 57 | 54 | 26 | 261 | 190 |
| 10-15 Sec. | 33 | 19 | 25 | 27 | 26 | 31 | 25 | 27 | 27 | 19 | 136 | 123 |
| 15-20 Sec. | 19 | 18 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 9 | 70 | 67 |
| Over 20 sec . | 22 | 59 | 6 | 50 | 1 | 43 | 3 | 34 | 4 | 40 | 36 | 226 |
| Total | 121 | 126 | 85 | 120 | 103 | 135 | 94 | 131 | 100 | 94 | 503 | 606 |

ON CASS AVE. AT FLORENCE AVE.

| Gap Sizes <br> (Seconds) | 7-8 A. M. |  | 8-9 A. M. |  | 3-4 P. M. |  | 4-5 P. M. |  | 5-6 P. M. |  | Total for (5) Hours |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 6-10 Sec. | 8 | 26 | 9 | 30 | 14 | 34 | 8 | 62 | 4 | 15 | 43 | 167 |
| 10-15 Sec. | 6 | 20 | 4 | 16 | 9 | 16 | 10 | 34 | 14 | 22 | 43 | 108 |
| 15-20 Sec. | 5 | 25 | 8 | 19 | 7 | 13 | 13 | 17 | 11 | 21 | 44 | 95 |
| Over 20 Sec . | 51 | 46 | 48 | 48 | 50 | 48 | 56 | 44 | 47 | 46 | 252 | 232 |
| Tolal | 70 | 117 | 69 | 113 | 80 | 111 | 87 | 157 | 76 | 104 | 382 | 602 |



## CITY OF PORT HURON

## VEHICLE GAP STUDY

Hourly Totals of Various Sizes of Gaps.

ON GRISWOLD ST. AT 7th ST.

| Gap Sizes (Seconds) | 7-8 A. M. |  | 8-9 A.M. |  | 3-4 P. M. |  | 4-5 P. M. |  | 5-6 P. M. |  | Total for (5) Hours |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 6-10 Sec. | 45 | 10 | 44 | 14 | 76 | 31 | 78 | 52 | 71 | 36 | 314 | 143 |
| 10-15 sec. | 23 | 10 | 26 | 17 | 54 | 31 | 54 | 33 | 36 | 23 | 193 | 114 |
| 15-20 Sec. | 15 | 14 | 24 | 10 | 23 | 24 | 19 | 35 | 34 | 27 | 115 | 110 |
| Over 20 Sec . | 34 | 47 | 60 | 50 | 34 | 55 | 37 | 49 | 38 | 40 | 203 | 241 |
| Total | 117 | 81 | 154 | 91 | 187 | 141 | 188 | 169 | 179 | 126 | 825 | 608 |

ON GRISWOLD ST. AT 16th ST.

| Gap Sizes (Seconds) | 7-8 A. M. |  | 8-9 A. M. |  | 3-4 P. M. |  | 4-5 P. M. |  | 5-6 P. M. |  | Total for (5) Hours |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| $6-10 \mathrm{Sec}$. | 42 | 42 | 56 | 50 | 78 | 92 | 85 | 91 | 66 | 72 | 327 | 347 |
| $10-15 \mathrm{sec}$. | 44 | 25 | 43 | 28 | 51 | 52 | 45 | 45 | 23 | 33 | 206 | 183 |
| 15-20 sec. | 22 | 30 | 24 | 17 | 25 | 29 | 25 | 37 | 23 | 27 | 119 | 140 |
| Over 20 sec . | 44 | 59 | 49 | 50 | 32 | 37 | 33 | 34 | 47 | 31 | 205 | 211 |
| Total | 152 | 156 | 172 | 145 | 186 | 210 | 188 | 207 | 159 | 163 | 857 | 881 |

ON GRISWOLD ST. AT 20th ST.

| Gap Sizes (Seconds) | 7-8 A. M. |  | 8-9 A. M. |  | 3-4 P. M. |  | 4-5 P. M. |  | 5-6 P. M. |  | Total for (5) Hours |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 6-10 sec. | 41 | 57 | 46 | 36 | 83 | 94 | 76 | 93 | 60 | 93 | 306 | 373 |
| 10-15 Sec. | 36 | 38 | 42 | 32 | 57 | 55 | 45 | 53 | 38 | 42 | 218 | 220 |
| 15-20 sec. | 28 | 19 | 26 | 16 | 22 | 27 | 29 | 22 | 20 | 37 | 125 | 121 |
| Over 20 Sec . | 45 | 49 | 57 | 55 | 32 | 34 | 14 | 37 | 40 | 40 | 188 | 215 |
| Total | 150 | 163 | 171 | 139 | 194 | 210 | 164 | 205 | 158 | 212 | 837 | 929 |

ON GRISWOLD ST. AT 22 nd ST.

| Gap Sizes (Seconds) | 7-8 A. M. |  | 8-9 A. M. |  | 3-4 P. M. |  | 4-5 P. M. |  | 5-6 P. M. |  | Total for (5) Hours |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | Affer |
| 6-10 Sec. | 59 | 47 | 49 | 20 | 123 | 78 | 97 | 77 | 61 | 94 | 389 | 316 |
| 10-15 sec. | 50 | 39 | 40 | 25 | 35 | 29 | 56 | 35 | 47 | 48 | 228 | 176 |
| 15-20 sec. | 34 | 28 | 32 | 7 | 20 | 26 | 23 | 28 | 34 | 28 | 143 | 117 |
| Over 20 Sec . | 42 | 49 | 52 | 49 | 25 | 12 | 22 | 25 | 35 | 34 | 176 | 169 |
| Total | 185 | 163 | 173 | 101 | 203 | 145 | 198 | 165 | 177 | 204 | 936 | 778 |

*. - Guard on Griswold St. stopping traffic for school children 3:00 P.M. - 4:00 P. M.

Griswold at 7th St.


Griswold at 20 th Si .


Griswold at 16 th St.


Griswold at 22nd St.


LEGEND


TRAFFIC GAPS
hour. In the office, each count station was identified by key-punching a header card for each tape to show the identification number, station location, direction of flow, starting time, and other pertinent information. The volume records were punched consecutively on data cards following the header card in the deck and carrying the same identification number as the header card. Each data card contained 14 volume records.

The first part of the computer program developed for this study converted the cumulative count records of both the "before" and the "after" surveys to 15 -minute volumes. Information on travel distances and the numbers of traffic lanes controlled by each count station during the before and the after phases were introduced into the computer by means of two sets of control cards. A flow chart showing the processing of the data is presented in Appendix 3.

Several tabulation printouts for the analyses of the 15 -minute volumes and vehicle-miles of travel were obtained. Appendix 4 shows a sample page of a printout which contains all the basic information for the eight peak-traffic hours for the duration of the counts.

By using the basic information mentioned above, the computer was programmed to search the maximum values of the 15 -minute vehicle-miles of travel for each station and then to add these up for all stations to yield an area-wide comparative table of vehicle-miles by 15 -minute periods for the two-way and one-way operation phases. A sample of this information can be seen in Appen$\operatorname{dix} 5$.

By selecting those stations which counted traffic near the periphery of the study area, on an inbound and outbound basis, choosing the maximum occurring 15 -minute volumes at those stations, and adding together yielded comparative tabulations of entering or leaving traffic totals by 15 -minute periods (Appendix 6).

Additional programs processed the volume data to print out hourly volume information on a continuous 24-hour day basis. Also, vehicle-miles of travel, and entering and leaving traffic during a composite 24 -hour day were obtained. Samples
of the printouts pertaining to these tabulations can be seen in Appendices 7 to 9.

The purpose in processing the traffic volume data in the manner described above was to examine and compare the traffic flow and capacity characteristics of the study areas during the two-way and one-way phases. Three parameters were used to weigh these characteristics. The first parameter was the ability of the streets in the study area to receive traffic from adjacent areas during a short period of time. The second was the street system's capacity to move traffic within itself in a time period, and the third was the ability to discharge traffic to the adjacent area. The most accurate instantaneous measure of any fluctuating flow is a rate during infinitesimal time. The traffic counters recorded volumes by 15 -minute periods, and this was used as the shortest interval of time in examining the volume fluctuations.

In Table $20-\mathrm{a}$, the summation of inbound traffic counted at the volume stations in Lansing during the two-way and the initial one-way phase is presented for each of the morning, noon and afternoon 15 -minute traffic peaks; for a composite total of the maximum 15 -minute volumes counted during eight hours of peak traffic; and for 24 hours of an average week day. The totals are broken down by state trunk lines and city streets. Under the category of trunk lines, both in the before and in the after periods, are included those streets which were not state trunk lines under the two-way operation but became trunk lines under the one-way operation.

Considering first the total newtork made up of state trunk lines and city streets, it is seen in Table 20-a that during an average day 66,920 vehicles entered the area in the before period. During the after period, this daily total of entering traffic was counted to be 72,585 . This is a growth of 8.5 percent, as shown in the last column of Table $20-$ a, which took place during the intervening two years. Examination of the 15 -minute morning peaks, however, discloses that maximum flow into the area changed from 1581 to 1835 vehicles, which is a rise of 16.1 percent.

Another way of examining these peak volumes would be to express them as ratios of the daily

## Table 20-a <br> CITY OF LANSING <br> Traffic volumes entering study area *

(Initial Phase)


* The study area used for this table does not include the area west of Logan Street.
** The 15 -minute peak times are different in the "before" and "after" periods.
*** Initial phase of one-way operation.
volumes. During the before phase, the ratio of the morning 15 -minute peak of entering traffic to the daily total was $1581 / 66,920=0.0236$. During the after phase, it became $1835 / 72,585=0.0253$. Normally, it is to be expected that as the populations of cities grow, the peaks in the traffic volumes become less accentuated (4). If no changes had been made in traffic facilities, it would be expected that, due to the growth of the greater Lansing area, the ratio of the peak flow would be smaller two years later; and yet, the opposite result is observed for the morning peak. This can be attributed to the over-all improvement in the capacity of the street system to receive a larger rate of flow of traffic.

Table 20-b is a similar comparison of the entering traffic during the two-way and the final phase of the one-way operation. Elapse of five years between these two periods, however, has somewhat reduced the impact of the comparison of the increase in peak traffic with the daily traffic: a growth of 26.3 percent in the morning peak, compared to 24.5 percent in the daily flow. It should be noted also that the study areas used in Table $20-\mathrm{a}$ and $\mathrm{Table} 20-\mathrm{b}$ are different.

Table 21-a, which is similar to Table 20-a, shows the total of vehicles counted as they leave the study area in Lansing, and indicates the initial comparison. It should be remembered during these discussions that the count stations in any of the cities, whether counting inbound or outbound traffic, were never complete enough to form a closed cordon around the area. This is the main reason why the daily totals for entering traffic (Table $20-\mathrm{a}$ or $20-\mathrm{b}$ ) do not agree, for the same survey periods, with leaving traffic (Table 21-a or $21-\mathrm{b}$ ). This situation does not, however, detract from the value of the comparison of the before and after periods since the same stations were used each time although they did not provide 100 percent coverage. Another minor reason for disagreement between entering and leaving totals is, naturally, the fact that in most cases counts were not simultaneous but were taken during a span of two to four weeks.

Referring again to Table 21-a, the change in the 24-hour totals of traffic leaving the area was from 62,749 to 73,679 , or a growth of 17.4 percent.

The growth in each of the 15 -minute peaks, however, was much higher, as will be seen in the last column, varying between 51.8 and 85.4 percent. This unusually high increase in the peak flows is an indication of the freedom of movement that the traffic experienced in traveling out of the area in shorter time as a direct result of better traffic service provided by the one-way trunk line operation.

Table 21-b is a similar comparison of leavingtraffic between the two-way and the final one-way phases. Here, although the noon and afternoon peaks do not show as much growth as the daily totals, increase in the morning peak ( 60.5 percent) still is larger than in the daily total ( 44.5 percent).

Table 22-a is a tabulation of the peak and daily travel totals within the Lansing study area, for the initial comparison, measured in vehicle-miles. Again, as in the case of inbound and outbound counts, these stations were not all-encompassing, but covered all the important streets quite extensively. The moming and afternoon peaks indicate, respectively, 19.5 and 13.4 percent of increase, The 24 -hour increase is 22.9 percent which is comparable with the increases for the peak 15 minutes. In this table, even though the peak travel totals do not indicate a relatively sharper rise in comparison to the 24 -hour travel totals, as was the case in "entering" and "leaving" traffic, there is no question but that the street network was able to move the peak loads which had increased substantially between the before and after phases of the study. Table 22-b is the later comparison of travel in Lansing and indicates increases of about 50 percent in the 15 -minute peaks, the composite 8 -hour totals and the daily totals. In the next section of this report, discussing average travel distances, a further thought will be presented for the evaluation of data relating to vehicle-miles of travel.

Figure 34-a shows three graphs depicting the 15 -minute peak values, during eight highest hours, of total traffic entering the study area, leaving the area, and traveling within the area in Lansing. The "before" graphs are for the two-way phase (1964), and the "after" graphs are for the initial one-way phase (1966), all for the smaller study area. Almost all except some of the noon-period

Table 20-h

## CITY OF LANSING

TRAFFIC VOLUMES ENTERING STUDY AREA *

## (Final Phase)

| TIME | "BEFORE" PERIOD (July 1964) |  |  |  |  | "'AFTER" PERIOD *** (July 1969) |  |  |  |  | \% Change |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Trunk | nes | City | Streets | System Total | Trunk | lines | City S | treets | System <br> Total | T.L. | City | System <br> Total |
| 15- Minute Peaks | Volume | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { System } \end{gathered}$ | Volume | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { of } \\ & \text { System } \end{aligned}$ |  | Volume | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { System } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Volume | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { System } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 7:30-7:45 A.M. | 603 | (32.9) | 1,228 | (67.1) | 1,831 | 1,000 | (43.2) | 1,313 | (56.8) | 2,313 | +65.8 | +6.9 | +26.3 |
| Noon Peak ** | 370 | (22.9) | 1,249 | (77.1) | 1,619 | 607 | (34.1) | 1,173 | (65.9) | 1,780 | +64.1 | -6.1 | + 9.9 |
| 5:00-5:15 P.M. | 393 | (16.1) | 2,046 | (83.9) | 2,439 | 734 | (26.9) | 1,994 | (73.1) | 2,728 | +86.8 | -2.5 | +11.8 |
| $\frac{\text { Composite 8-hr. }}{\text { Total }}$ | 11,847 | (26.0) | 33,714 | (74.0) | 45,561 | 21,621 | (39.9) | 32,618 | (60.1) | 54,239 | +82.5 | -3.3 | +19.0 |
| Average 24 Hours | 20,615 | (26.4) | 57,381 | (73.6) | 77,996 | 36,366 | (37.4) | 60,749 | (62.6) | 97,115 | +76.4 | +5.9 | +24.5 |

* The study area used for this table includes the entire area east and west of Logan Street.
*     * The 15 -minute peak times are different in the "before" and "after" periods.
*** Final phase of one-way operation.

Table 21-a

## CITY OF LANSING

TRAFFIC VOLUMES LEAVING STUDY AREA *
(Initial Phase)


* The study area used for this table does not include the area west of Logan Street.
** The 15-minute peak times are different in the "before" and "after" periods.
*** Initial phase of one-way operation.

Table 21-b

## CITY OF LANSING

## TRAFFIC VOLUMES LEAVING STUDY AREA*

(Final Phase)

| TIME | "BEFORE" PERIOD(July 1964) |  |  |  |  | "AFTER" PERIOD*** (July 1969) |  |  |  |  | \% CHANGE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Trunkli | nes | City | Streets | System <br> Total | Trunk | ines | City S | Streets | System <br> Total | T.L. | City | System Total |
| 15-Minute Peaks | Volume | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { System } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Volume | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { System } \end{gathered}$ |  | Volume | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { System } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Volume | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { System } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 7:30-7:45 A.M. | 547 | (32:1) | 1,158 | (67.9) | 1,705 | 841 | (30.7) | 1,895 | (69.3) | 2,736 | +53.7 | +63.6 | +60.5 |
| Noon Peak ** | 609 | (40.7) | 888 | (59.3) | 1,497 | 901 | (43.8) | 1,155 | (56.2) | 2,056 | +47.9 | +30.1 | +37.3 |
| 5:00-5:15 P.M. | 912 | (39.1) | 1,419 | (60.9) | 2,331 | 1,531 | (49.9) | 1,540 | (50.1) | 3,071 | +67.9 | + 8.5 | +31.7 |
| $\frac{\text { Composite 8-hr. }}{\text { Total }}$ | 14,931 | (35.4) | 27,279 | (64.6) | 42,210 | 26,211 | (41.6) | 36,796 | (58.4) | 63,007 | +75.5 | +34.9 | +49.3 |
| Average 24 Hours | 25,917 | (34.9) | 48,346 | (65.1) | 74,263 | 43,278 | (40.3) | : 64,050 | (59.7) | 107,328 | $+67.0$ | +32.5 | +44.5 |

[^5]Table 22-a

## CITY OF LANSING

## VEHICLE-MILES OF TRAVEL WITHIN STUDY AREA *

(Initial Phase)


* The study area used for this table does not include the area west of Logan Street.
** The 15 -minute peak times are different in the "before" and "after" periods.
*** Initial phase of one-way operation

Table 22-b
CITY OF LANSING
VEhicLe-miles of travel within study area *

## (Final Phase)

| TIME | "BEFORE" PERIOD (July 1964) |  |  |  |  | "AFTER" PERIOD*** (July 1969) |  |  |  |  | \% CHANGE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Trunkl | ines | City St | reets | System Total | Trunkl | ines | City St | treets | System <br> Totel | T.L. | City | System Total |
| 15- Minute Peaks | Trave | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { System } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Travel | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { System } \end{gathered}$ |  | Travel | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { Sy stem } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Travel | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { System } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Morning Peak ** | 1,101 | (63.6) | 629 | (36.4) | 1,730 | 1.779 | (66.7) | 888 | (33.3) | 2,667 | +61.6 | +41.2 | +54.2. |
| Noon Peak * | 841 | (60.6) |  | (39.4) | 1,387 | 1,405 | (68.3) | 651 | (31.7) | 2,056 | +67.1 | +19.2 | +48.2 |
| 5:00-5:15 P.M. | 1,214 | (55.9) |  | (44.1) | 2,172 | 1,935 | (65.9) | 1,001 | (34.1) | 2,936 | +59.4 | + 4.5 | +35.2 |
| $\frac{\text { Composite } 8 \text {-hr. }}{\text { Total }}$ | 24,972 | (60.8) | 16,100 | (39.2) | 41,072 | 43,666 | (69.6) | 19,063 | (30.4) | 62,729 | +74.9 | +18.4 | +52.7 |
| Average 24 Hours | 44,553 | (60.6) | 28,914 | (39.4) | 73,467 | 79,653 | ${ }^{(71.4)}$ | 31,896 | (28.6) | 111,549 | +78.8 | +10.3 | +51.8 |

* The study area used for this table include the entire area, east and west of Logan Street.
*     * The 15-minute peak times are different in the "before" and "after" periods.
*** Final phase of one-way operation.

peaks are found to be higher for the after period. The most significant differences between the before and after peaks are seen in the graph for leaving traffic.

Figure $34-b$ is a similar set of peak-traffic graphs, for the larger study area in Lansing, comparing the two-way (1964) with the final one-way (1969) operation. This comparison is only of casual interest because of too long a time lapse between the two periods.

Figure 35-a compares the share which state trunk lines and city streets took in Lansing in carrying the traffic, as counted while entering and leaving the area and while circulating within the street network. The comparison is between the two-way and initial one-way periods. In all but a few minor cases, these sets of bar charts reveal that the percent of the traffic load carried by the state trunk line has increased. The most pronounced changes in this percentage are seen in the 15minute peaks of traffic leaving the study area. For example, during the morning peak in the before period, the state trunk lines carried 36.7 percent of all traffic leaving the area, whereas in the after period they carried 61.9 percent of this load. This is a relief for the city streets since their burden is lightened by attracting the traffic to the state trunk lines during the rush hours. The same general trend for larger share of the load for state trunk lines is also observed in the final comparison shown in Figure 35-b.

Surveys to reflect the "before" phase of the study in Kalamazoo were taken during October, 1964. The change over to one-way operation had to be delayed until October 10, 1965, since it depended on the completion of construction work. Even at that date, construction on some streets and intersections was incomplete. Considering this and the fact that more time would be needed for local drivers to become accustomed to the new conditions and for making further adjustments to the signals to obtain maximum operation, it was necessary to postpone the "after" surveys until the following year. On the other hand, with the intent of not delaying the after surveys any more than necessary, and relying on some past experience concerning seasonal variations of traffic volumes in Michigan cities, it was decided to
conduct these surveys in May, 1966, this month having indicated volumes similar to the month of October. This decision was found to be invalid, however, in the light of subsequent detailed volume data. In other words, dissimilarities in the daily totals and especially in the peaking characteristics of traffic were found between the Fall and the Spring months. This has made impossible a full comparative evaluation of the volume data.

Tables 23-25 shows the analysis of peak traffic volumes entering, leaving and circulating within the Kalamazoo study area. Trunk line and city portions of these volumes are also indicated. As seen in Table 23, the "after" surveys show drops in all the peaks of total entering traffic. Nevertheless, the trunk line portion of the entering traffic does show gains in all peak periods, as in the case of Lansing. Unlike the total entering traffic, the 15 -minute peaks of total leaving volumes in Table 24 are found to indicate increases in the after period. Table 25 represents the peakperiod and 24 -hour comparisons of travel in the area.

Figure 36 is a graphical representation of the observed maximum 15 -minute values for the entering, leaving and circulating traffic totals for eight hours. The effect of the seasonal differences in the peaking characteristics is reflected in these graphs such that some peak volumes were considerably lower in the after period and some were higher. The decreases in the 15 -minute volumes are certainly not caused by any deficiency in the traffic capacity of the system of streets but rather they are the result of lower traffic demand during the after surveys. This can be substantiated by the observation that such decreases have been experienced also during noon peaks, which are considerably lower than morning and afternoon peaks, and therefore, restraint due to lack of capacity should not be the reason for the lower flows.

Figure 37, which is a graphical representation of Tables $23-25$, is interesting in showing once again that traffic entering or leaving the study area during peak periods has shifted to the use of state trunk lines from city streets, as witnessed by percentage figures depicting the shares of the two classes of streets.



FIGURE $35 a-$ CITY OF LANSING
TRAFFIC VOLUME CHARACTERISTICS (INITIAL PHASE)


Table 23

## CITY OF KALAMAZOO

Traffic volumes entering study area

| TIME | "BEFORE" PERIOD (Oct. 1964) |  |  |  |  | "AFTER" PERIOD (May 1966) |  |  |  |  | \% CHANGE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-Minute Peaks | Trunklines |  | City Streets |  | System <br> Total | Trunklines |  | City Streets |  | System <br> Total | T.L. | City | System <br> Total |
|  | Volume | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { System } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Volume | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { System } \end{gathered}$ |  | Volume | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { System } \end{gathered}$ | Volume | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { System } \end{gathered}$ |  | . |  |  |
| 7:45-8:00 A.M. | 1340 | (43.2) | 1764 | (56.8) | 3104 | 1380 | (49.3) | 1419 | (50.7) | 2799 | +3.0 | - 19.6 | - 9.8 |
| Noon Peak * | 678 | (31.9) | 1447 | (68.1) | 2125 | 1135 | (54.3) | 957 | (45.7) | 2092 | +67.4 | -33.9 | - 1.6 |
| 5:00-5:15 P.M. |  | (34.7) | 1743 | (65.3) | 2669 | 1044 | (42.0) | 1439 | (58.0) | 2483 | + 12.7 | - 17.4 | - 7.0 |
| Composite 8-hr. Total | 24,901 | (39.4) | 38,242 | (60.6) | 63,143 | 27,496 | (46.9) | 31,086 | (53.1) | 58,582 | + 10.4 | - 18.7 | - 7.2 |
| Average 24 Hours | 38,967 | (40.9) | 56,380 | (59.1) | 95,347 | 44,999 | (46.1) | 52,664 | (53.9) | 97,663 | + 15.5 | - 6.6 | + 2.4 |

[^6]Table 24

## CITY OF KALAMAZOO

traffic volumes leaving study area


Table 25
CITY OF KALAMAZOO
VEHICLE-MILES OF TRAVEL WITHIN STUDY AREA


* The 15-minute peak times are different in the "before" and the "after" periods.

OBSERVED MAXIMUM I5-MINUTE TRAFFIC VOLUMES
ENTERING STUDY AREA


OBSERVED MAXIMUM I5-MINUTE TRAFFIC VOLUMES
LEAVING STUDY AREA


OBSERVED MAXIMUM I5-MINUTE TOTALS OF VEHICLE-MILES OF TRAVEL IN STUDY AREA




Tables 26 through 28 and Figures 38 and 39 are the results of traffic volume analyses for Pontiac, done in the same manner as the previous two cities. As explained earlier in this report, a considerable time period of four years elapsed between the "before" and the final "after" surveys in this city. However, very little increase is indicated in the traffic load of the study area during this period.

In Tables 26 and 27, for the entering and leaving vehicles, respectively, higher percentages of rise for all except one 15 -minute peak are observed than the percentages of rise for average 24 hours. This is similar to the findings in Lansing, except that traffic growth in Pontiac was lighter.

Travel within the Pontiac study area, as depicted in Table 28, shows a rise of 6.9 percent in the afternoon peak in comparison with 4.3 percent for the 24 -hour total. The morning and noon peaks show a decrease in total travel.

Figure 39 again shows the characteristic trend for the state trunk line generally to carry a heavier portion of the traffic load during the one-way operation. This holds true for all 15 -minute peaks and 8 -hour totals, and all 24 -hour totals except that for vehicle-miles of travel.

It was earlier mentioned that the method of analyzing traffic volumes in the typical city in this project was not applied to Port Huron. An attempt to examine the redistribution of traffic among the affected streets is shown in Figure 40. The state trunk line corridor was shifted from Lapeer Street to the new one-way pair made up of Griswold and Oak Streets. Union and Court Streets, located between these two traffic corridors, are two local streets which were already operating as a one-way pair when the change in the state trunk line was made. Volume counts were taken on this pair as a possible control section, and are included in Figure 40.

Abandonment of Lapeer Street as a state trunk line did not materially affect traffic volumes on this street. It lost roughly 3,000 vehicles per day, and the same amount was gained by the Griswold-Oak pair. Within the pair, Griswold, which was a two-way street before, lost about 2,000 vehicles per day to Oak.

Figure 40 also shows the ratios of maximum 15minute volumes to daily flow in one direction. No significant change in these ratios occurred on Lapeer Street. Same is true for Court-Union pair except on that section of Union between 6th and 10th Streets where the peak traffic ratio doubled from 0.026 to 0.053 . On Griswold Street considerable reduction in the ratios is observed between 10 th and 16 th Streets, from 0.049 to 0.030 west of 10 th Street and to 0.026 east of 16 th Street. Other sections of this street did not change materially. Volume counts on Oak Street were taken bi-directionally during the two-way phase so that no data exist on directional peaks for comparison with the one-way phase.

Traffic volume counts for this study were made by machines with pneumatic hoses extending across several lanes. No record of actual lane volumes could therefore be made. The rates of flow per lane were, however, computed by dividing the flow in any direction by the number of lanes used by the traffic. Table 29 gives the highest observed hourly flows per lane. An inspection of this Table reveals that higher maximum flows per lane existed in Port Huron than in the other cities, both under two-way and one-way operation. In Kalamazoo and Pontiac the maximum hourly flow per lane within the study area has increased, and in Lansing and Port Huron it has decreased.

## AN APPROXIMATE COMPARISON OF AVERAGE TRAVEL DISTANCES

The average layman's first reaction to a change to one-way traffic usually is his dislike of the necessity to double back in the opposite direction for some of his usual trips in the city. Although no specific surveys were planned in this study to obtain data on this adverse travel distance, an indirect investigation using the traffic volume data has been made.

To explain the method used in this investigation, reference will be made to Figure 41. It is supposed that the rectangular area represents a study area in a city. There are four basic categories of trips that affect this area. These are (A) through trips, (B) trips into the area by commuters who
(Text continued on p. 110)

Tamle 26

## CITY OF PONTIAC

TRAFFIC VOLUMES ENTERING STUDY AREA


* The 15-minute peak times are different in the "before" and "affer" periods.

Table 27

## CITY OF PONTIAC

TRAFFIC VOLUMES LEAVING STUDY AREA


## Table 28

## CITY OF PONITAC

VEHICLE-MILES OF TRAVEL WITHIN STUDY AREA


* The 15-minute peak times are different in the "before" and "after" periods.


## OBSERVED MAXIMUM $15-$ MINUTE TRAFFIC VOLUMES



OBSERVED MAXIMUM IS-MINUTE TRAFFIC VOLUMES



FIGURE 38-CITY OF PONTIAC: PEAK TRAFFIC



## OBSERVED MAXIMUM HOURLY VOLUMES PER LANE

(Three Highest Values)

| CITY | "BEFORE ${ }^{\text {B }}$ PERIOD |  |  | "AFTER" PERIOD |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Flow | Count Station | Time | Flow | Count Station | Time |
| KALAMAZOO | 781 <br> 739 <br> 735 | NWB Portage Ave. SE of Michigan Ave. <br> WB Kolamazoo Ave. W of Wesinedge Ave. <br> $E B$ Michigan Ave. W of Harrison St . | 5 P. M. <br> I2Noor <br> 6 P.M. | $\begin{aligned} & 806 \\ & 770 \\ & 734 \end{aligned}$ | EB Michigon Ave. $W$ of Harrison St. <br> E8 Michigan Ave. W of Harrison St. <br> EB Michigan Ave. W of Horrison St. | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \mathrm{P} . \mathrm{M} . \\ & 5 \mathrm{P} . \mathrm{M} . \\ & 6 \mathrm{P} . \mathrm{M} . \end{aligned}$ |
| LANSING* | $\begin{aligned} & 691 \\ & 666 \\ & 656 \end{aligned}$ | EB Saginaw Si. W of Grand Ave. <br> NB Capitol Ave. $S$ of Saginaw St. <br> EB Saginaw St. W of Washington Ave. | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 6 P . M \\ 6 P . M . \\ \text { BA.M. } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & 639 \\ & 620 \\ & 587 \end{aligned}$ | NB Washingion Ave. N of Jefferson St. <br> NB Washington Ave. $N$ of Jefferson St. <br> EB Soginaw St. W of Logan St. | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \mathrm{P} . \mathrm{M} . \\ & 5 \mathrm{P} . \mathrm{M} . \\ & 5 \mathrm{P} . \mathrm{M} . \end{aligned}$ |
| PONTIAC | 534 <br> 508 $493$ | NWB Oakland Ave. NW of Montcalm <br> NWB Oakland Ave. NW of Montcalm <br> NWB Oakland Ave. NW of Wide Track Drive | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 6 \mathrm{P} . \mathrm{M} . \\ 6 \mathrm{P} . \mathrm{M} . \\ 5 \mathrm{P} . \mathrm{M} . \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & 629 \\ & 625 \\ & 600 \end{aligned}$ | NWB Oakland Ave. NW of Monicalm <br> NWB Oakland Ave. NW of Montcalm <br> NWB Oakland Ave. NW of Montcalm | 6 P.M. <br> 6P.M: <br> 6 P. M. |
| PORT HURON | $\begin{aligned} & 929 \\ & 879 \\ & 850 \end{aligned}$ | SB 24th St. N of Gilswold St. <br> WB Lapeer St. E of 24th St. <br> NB 24th St. N of Griswold St. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 4 \text { P. M. } \\ 5 \text { P. M. } \\ 5 \text { P. M. } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 830 \\ & 810 \\ & 777 \end{aligned}$ | NB $24 t h \mathrm{St} . \mathrm{N}$ of Griswold St . <br> SB 24th St. S of Oak St. <br> SB 24th St. S of Oak St. | $5 \mathrm{P} . \mathrm{M} .$ <br> 8A. M. $4 \text { P. M. }$ |
| fter" period for | ing | fers to the initial One-Way p | se. |  |  |  |

Figure 41

## TRIP PATTERNS IN AN AREA


live outside the area and work within the area, (C) trips by commuters who live within the area and work outside, and (D) intemal trips. To simplify the analysis, it will be assumed that there is one vehicle representing each of these trip categories, and that each vehicle makes two daily trips. Each trip is represented by a line, the full line representing the initial trip and the dashed line the return trip of each vehicle. Dots represent the origins and the arrowheads represent the destinations of these trips. The top sketch shows each of these eight trips and their assumed lengths within the study area.

In the bottom sketch it will be assumed that some new one-way streets were introduced and, hypothetically, this caused lengthening of some of the trips by the original four vehicles. These trip distances are shown in parentheses.

Remembering that each trip is caused by one vehicle only, a summation of daily vehicle-miles of travel within the area before the one-way operation would be as follows:

| Trip | Vehicle-Miles of <br> Travel in Area |
| :---: | :---: |
| ${ } }$ | 3.0 |
| A-2 | 3.0 |
| B-1 | 2.0 |
| B-2 | 2.0 |
| C-1 | 1.0 |
| C-2 | 1.0 |
| D-1 | 1.0 |
| D-2 | 1.0 |
|  | Total Travel |
|  | 14.0 |

In a real situation in a small area, trip category D will be very small in relation to total travel mileage, especially where major trunk line traffic traverses the area. In this study no surveys were conducted to count the number of internal trips (category D) although their flow was counted at internal volume-count stations together with the rest of the trips. Entering and leaving traffic was counted at the boundaries of the area and this was made up of category- $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$ and C trips. Ignoring the negligible category-D trips in our fictitious area, it can be stated that 14.0 vehiclemiles of travel was the result of four entering and
four leaving vehicles, or a total of eight daily vehicles. Average travel length generated by one vehicle counted at the area boundary would then be $14 \div 8=1.75$ miles.

In the after situation, the summation of the ve-hicle-miles of travel would be as follows:

| Trip | Vehicle-Miles of <br> Travel in Area |
| :---: | :---: |
| A-1 | 3.2 |
| A-2 | 3.0 |
| B-1 | 2.0 |
| B-2 | 2.3 |
| C-1 | 1.2 |
| C-2 | 1.0 |
| D-1 | 1.0 |
| D-2 | 1.1 |
|  | Total Travel |
|  | 14.8 |

Average travel length generated by each vehicle counted at the area boundary would now be 14.8 $\div 8=1.85$ miles. In this hypothetical case, then, there was 0.10 miles of "adverse" travel distance per vehicle in the after period as compared with the before period.

Applying this analysis now to the actual situation in Lansing, use will be made of the 24 -hour totals of traffic in Tables 20 -a, 21-a and 22-a which represent the changes during the initial study phase. In the before period, rounding the figures to the nearest thousand (since this approximation is within the degree of accuracy which is dependent on the coverage of the volume stations as earlier discussed), the total of entering and leaving traffic, from Tables $20-\mathrm{a}$ and $21-\mathrm{a}$, was $67,000+63,000=130,000$ vehicles. Total travel, from Table $22-\mathrm{a}$, was 48,000 vehicle-miles. Consequently, the average travel length generated by each vehicle counted at the area boundary was $48,000 \div 130,000=0.37$ mile. Using the figures, from the same three tables, corresponding to the after period, the total of entering and leaving traffic was $73,000+74,000=147,000$, and total travel was 59,000 . The new average travel length per vehicle was $59,000 \div 147,000=0.40 \mathrm{mile}$ or 0.03 mile more than the before figure. This is a difference of about 8 percent which is not excessive.

TABLE 30

## CITY OF KALAMAZOO

CUMULATIVE DURATION OF LANE STOPPAGES DUE TO LEFT TURNS
Two-Way Operation Intersection of Kalamazoo St. and Rose Sí.
(Extent of Delay in Seconds)


## TABLE 31

## CITY OF LANSING

## CUMULATIVE DURATION OF LANE STOPPAGES DUE TO LEFT TURNS <br> Intersection of Saginaw St．and Verlinden Ave．

（Extent of Delay in Seconds）

| 15 Min． Period | From N．on Verlinden |  | From E．on Saginaw |  | From S．on Verlinden |  | From W．on Saginaw |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 6－6：15A | 0 | 0 | 16 |  | 3 |  | 8 | 0 |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 36 |  | 35 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | 0 | 0 | 12 |  | 37 |  | 13 | 0 |
| 7A | 0 | 5 | 5 |  | 9 |  | 8 | 0 |
| 7－7：15A | 0 | 0 | 26 | ¢ | 0 |  | 6 | 0 |
| 30 | 5 | 7 | 69 | 古 | 10 | ${ }_{0}^{\circ}$ | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | 20 | 36 | 115 | ¢ | 25 | 古 | 14 | 0 |
| 8A | 13 | 24 | 102 | ठ | 21 | － | 20 | 0 |
| 8－8：15A | 12 | 15 | 10 | － | 2 | त | 12 | 0 |
| 30 | 3 | 0 | 22 | \％ | 0 | $\stackrel{\otimes}{\circ}$ | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | 0 | 10 | 6 | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | 0 | 。 | 14 | 0 |
| 9 A | 2 | 0 | 26 | 䂞 | 0 | $\stackrel{+}{\text { ¢ }}$ | 0 | 0 |
| 3－3：15P | 2 | 0 | 25 | O | 9 | O | 63 | 0 |
| 30 | 3 | 0 | 57 | $\bigcirc$ | 4 | $\bigcirc$ | 36 | 0 |
| 45 | 47 | 0 | 70 | 山 | 73 | 5 | 193 | 0 |
| 4 P | 20 | 0 | 91 | E | 79 | 단 | 124 | 0 |
| 4－4：15P | 24 | 0 | 97 | 空 | 189 | ＋ | 171 | 0 |
| 30 | 59 | 0 | 88 | 문 | 32 | \％ | 22 | 0 |
| 45 | 7 | 0 | 19 | 앙 | 31 |  | 34 | 0 |
| 5P | 132 | 0 | 30 |  | 27 |  | 55 | 0 |
| 5－5：15P | 14 | 0 | 7 |  | 21 |  | 141 | 0 |
| 30 | 8 | 0 | 9 |  | 25 |  | 26 | 0 |
| 45 | 6 | 0 | 5 |  | 2 |  | 58 | 0 |
| 6 P | 0 | 0 | 15 |  | 5 |  | 4 | 0 |
| 6 Hr. Total | 377 | 97 | 958 |  | 639 |  | 1022 | 0 |

TABLE 32

## CITY OF LANSING

 CUMULATIVE DURATION OF LANE STOPPAGES DUE TO LEFT TURNSIntersection of Saginaw St. and Jenison Ave.
(Extent of Delay in Seconds)

| 15 Min. Period | From N. on Jenison |  | From E. on Saginaw |  | From S. on Jenison |  | From W. on Saginaw |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 6-6:15A | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | 0 | 9 | 5 |  | 11 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | 0 | 0 | 7 |  | 24 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 7A | 2 | 19 | 3 |  | 2 |  | 10 | 0 |
| 7-7:15A | 4 | 14 | 0 | $\dot{\text { ¢ }}$ | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | 5 | 30 | 0 | \% | 2 |  | 7 | 0 |
| 45 | 11 | 66 | 0 | \% | 36 | . | 0 | 0 |
| 8 A | 12 | 44 | 65 | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | 18 | 흉 | 54 | 0 |
| 8-8:15A | 0 | 2 | 0 | 影 | 0 | $\stackrel{\square}{\bigcirc}$ | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | 7 | 13 | 13 | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | 4 | 15 | 8 | \% | 16 | $\stackrel{\circ}{5}$ | 3 | 0 |
| 9A | 0 | 17 | 4 | 䂞 | 3 | \% | 0 | 0 |
| 3-3:15P | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 7 | $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | 8 | 20 | 0 | ${ }_{5}$ | 23 | ¢ | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | 9 | 69 | 54 | แ | 13 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 4P | 15 | 36 | 92 | E | 31 | E | 4 | 0 |
| 4-4:15P | 18 | 59 | 71 | $\stackrel{\square}{\sim}$ | 24 | $\pm$ | 31 | 0 |
| 30 | 6 | 43 | 50 | \% | 28 | $\bigcirc$ | 20 | 0 |
| 45 | 21 | 80 | 28 | $\stackrel{ }{\circ}$ | 24 | \% | 5 | 0 |
| 5 P | 8. | 80 | 39 | z | 7 |  | 8 | 0 |
| 5-5:15P | 27 | 108 | 50 |  | 39 |  | 21 | 0 |
| 30 | 22 | 46 | 16 |  | 40 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | 14 | 44 | 55 |  | 28 |  | 19 | 0 |
| 6 P | 10 | 30 | 7 |  | 11 |  | 4 | 0 |
| 6-Hr. Total | 203 | 827 | 569 |  | 395 |  | 186 | 0 |

TABLE 33

## CITY OF LANSING

## CUMULATIVE DURATION OF LANE STOPPAGES DUE TO LEFT TURNS

Intersection of Oakland Ave. and Logan St.
(Extent of Delay in Seconds)

| 15 Min . <br> Period | From N on Logan |  | From S on Logan |  | From W on Oakland |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After* | Before | After |
| 6-6:15A | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 30 | 0 |  | 3 | 6 | 0 |  |
| 45 | 0 |  | 15 | 41 | 0 |  |
| 7A | 0 |  | 12 | 53 | 0 |  |
| 7-7:15A | 0 |  | 7 | 27 | 0 |  |
| 30 | 0 |  | 0 | 10 | 0 | ¢ |
| 45 | 0 |  | 30 | 70 | 0 | ¢ |
| 8A | 0 | $\stackrel{\text { 듬 }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | 17 | 65 | 0 | 흥 |
| 8-8:15A | 0 | ¢ | 21 | 67 | 0 | त |
| 30 | 0 | $\stackrel{\circ}{\lambda}$ | 8 | 30 | 0 | ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 45 | 2 | $\stackrel{\square}{3}$ | 6 | 56 | 0 | 5 |
| 9 A | 0 | 宮 | 4 | 34 | 0 | + |
| 3-3:15P | 0 | $\stackrel{+}{\circ}$ | 0 | 45 | 0 | O |
| 30 | 0 | $\stackrel{+}{5}$ | 13 | 79 | 0 | - |
| 45 | 0 | O | 20 | 117 | 0 | ¢ |
| 4 P | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{8} \\ & \Sigma \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | 15 | 92 | 0 | $\underset{\text { E }}{ }$ |
| 4-4:15P | 0 | E | 49 | 75 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |
| 30 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 96 | 0 | 它 |
| 45 | 0 | ¢ | 15 | 65 | 0 | 온 |
| 5P | 0 | \% | 19 | 110 | 0 | \% |
| 5-5:15P | 0 |  | 80 | 160 | 0 |  |
| 30 | 0 |  | 51 | 41 | 0 |  |
| 45 | 0 |  | 47 | 73 | 0 |  |
| 6 P | 0 |  | 9 | 35 | 0 |  |
| 6-Hr. Total | 12 |  | 446 | 1447 | 0 |  |

NOTE: Oakland east of the intersection was closed to traffic during the "before" survey, and it was operating one-way during the "after" period.

[^7]TABLE 34

## CITY OF PONTIAC

CUMULATIVE DURATION OF LANE STOPPAGES DUE TO LEFT TURNS
Intersection of Oakland Ave．，Cass Ave．，and Montcalm St．
（Extent of Delay in Seconds）

| 15 Min． <br> Period | From NW on Oakland |  | From SE on Oakland |  | From SW on Cass |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 6－6：15A | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 30 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 45 | 50 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7 A | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |  |
| 7－7：15A | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |  |
| 30 | 48 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | ． |
| 45 | 40 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 茄 |
| 8A | 47 | 90 | 12 | 0 | 11 | 응 |
| 8－8：15A | 28 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 12 | o |
| 30 | 10 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 10 | $\stackrel{\text { d }}{\circ}$ |
| 45 | 24 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | \％ |
| 9A | 30 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 28 | $\stackrel{+}{+}$ |
| 3－3：15P | 126 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 64 | O |
| 30 | 85 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 31 | － |
| 45 | 124 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 98 | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ |
| 4P | 95 | 420 | 50 | 0 | 82 | 家 |
| 4－4：15P | 140 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 28 | E |
| 30 | 51 | 480 | 10 | 0 | 74 | 安 |
| 45 | 58 | 540 | 0 | 0 | 151 | ＋ |
| 5P | 143 | 360 | 10 | 0 | 101 | \％ |
| 5－5：15P | 293 | 330 | 7 | 0 | 118 |  |
| 30 | 32 | 240 | 17 | 0 | 59 |  |
| 45 | 123 | 270 | 0 | 0 | 109 |  |
| 6 P | 106 | 60 | 17 | 0 | 57 |  |
| 6－Hr．Total | 1747 | 2940 | 298 | 0 | 1083 |  |

NOTE：No left turns were allowed from NE on Montcalm during the＂before＂period ad well as during the＂after＂period．

TABLE 35
CITY OF PONTIAC
CUMULATIVE DURATION OF LANE STOPPAGES DUE TO LEFT TURNS
Intersection of Oakland Ave．and Johnson St．
（Ex．tent of Delay in Seconds）

| 15 Min ． Period | From SW on Johnson |  | From NW on Oakland |  | From NE on Johnson |  | From SE on Oakland |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 6－6：15A | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 30 | 4 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 45 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 7A | 7 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 29 |  |
| 7－7：15A | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & \Sigma_{0} \\ & \text { n } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  | 0 |  | 11 |  |
| 30 | 0 | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 5 |
| 45 | 6 | 5 | 64 | ． | 4 | ．응 | 40 | $\stackrel{n}{5}$ |
| 8A | 0 | $\stackrel{5}{6}$ | 44 | 喜 | 0 | 항 | 58 | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }$ |
| 8－8：15A | 5 | － | 12 | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ | 0 |  | 16 | 5 |
| 30 | 0 | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | $\bigcirc$ |
| 45 | 0 | 合 | 16 | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ | 8 | $\stackrel{\circ}{5}$ | 12 | $\bigcirc$ |
| 9 A | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & \stackrel{y}{\circ} \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ | 0 | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ | 87 | 응 |
| 3－3：15P | 18 | ¢ | 5 | H | 4 | ${ }_{0}$ | 34 | 3 |
| 30 | 10 | $\stackrel{+}{5}$ | 12 | － | 0 | U | 87 | $\stackrel{5}{5}$ |
| 45 | 20 | \％ | 65 | 5 | 16 | $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | 45 | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ |
| 4 P | 31 | $\bigcirc$ | 30 | 5 | 7 | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | 17 | t |
|  |  | 5 |  | 家 |  | z |  | \％ |
| 4－4：15P | 52 | 츰 | 25 | E | 8 | 등 | 26 | ¢ |
| 30 | 29 | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ | 54 | $\stackrel{\square}{2}$ | 0 | $\stackrel{+}{4}$ | 21 | 5 |
| 45 | 40 | c | 39 | $\underset{\sim}{4}$ | 0 | 安 | 27 | E |
| 5P | 35 | 5 | 44 | 훈 | 6 | \％ | 41 | 5 |
| 5－5：15P | 103 | － |  | \％ |  | Z |  | － |
| 30 | 35 | 之 | 52 |  | 6 |  | 51 | \％ |
| 45 | 19 |  | 54 |  | 0 |  | 43 |  |
| 6 P | 15 |  | 28 |  | 5 |  | 17 |  |
| 6－Hr．Total | 429 |  | 614 |  | 64 |  | 742 |  |

TABLE 36

CITY OF PONTIAC
CUMULATIVE DURATION OF LANE STOPPAGES DUE TO LEFT TURNS
Intersection of Oakland Ave., Baldwin Ave., and Allison Str.
(Extent of Delay in Seconds)

| 15 Min. Period | From SE on Oakland |  | From SW on Allison |  | From $N$ on Baldwin |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 6-6:15A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7-7:15A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 45 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8 A | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\stackrel{5}{0}$ |
| 8-8:15A | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | त |
| 3.3:15P | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\stackrel{1}{0}$ |
| 30 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |
| 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\stackrel{+}{0}$ |
| 4 P | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 . | 3 |
| 4.4:15P | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 들 |
| 30 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 灾 |
| 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |
| . 5 P | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Z |
| 5-5:15P | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |  |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 45 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6 P | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| $51 / 2-\mathrm{Hr}$. Total | 72 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 |  |

NOTE: No left furns from NW on Oakland onto Baldwin were allowed during the "before" period.

TABLE 37

## CITY OF PONTIAC

CUMULATIVE DURATION OF LANE STOPPAGES DUE TO LEFT TURNS Intersection of Cass Ave．and Johnson St．
（Extent of Delay in Seconds）

| 15 Min． Period | From SW on Johnson |  | From NW on Cass |  | From NE on Johnson |  | From SE on Cass |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 6－6：15A | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 든 | 0 |  |
| 30 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | O | 0 |  |
| 45 | 12 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\stackrel{\square}{6}$ | 0 |  |
| 7A | 39 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | E | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{0}{+}$ |  |  |
| 7－7：15A | 28 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\stackrel{+}{+}$ | 0 | ． |
| 30 | 32 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | ＋ | 0 | 豆 |
| 45 | 47 | ¢ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{Z}$ | 0 | ¢ |
| 8A | 27 | ＋ | 0 | 0 | 0 | ¢ | 0 | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ |
| 8－8：15A | 22 | $\stackrel{\text { 응 }}{ }$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\xrightarrow{-1}$ | 0 | ¢ |
| 30 | 10 | \％ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | 0 | ¢ |
| 45 | 3 | $\stackrel{ \pm}{\circ}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ |
| 9A | 27 | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 古 | 0 | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ |
| 3－3：15P | 6 | $\stackrel{+}{5}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 응 | 0 | U |
| 30 | 26 | O | 0 | 0 | 10 | 合 | 65 | ${ }_{0}$ |
| 45 | 52 | － | 0 | 0 | 14 | $\stackrel{\text { d }}{ }$ | 12 | 山 |
| 4 P | 44 | ¢ | 2 | 0 | 10 | ¢ | 6 | \％ |
| 4－4：15P | ＊ | $\pm$ | 0 ． | 0 | 4 | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ | 4 | － |
| 30 | 47 | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 山 | 6 | \％ |
| 45 | 72 | \％ | 0 | 0 | 0 | z | 0 | $\pm$ |
| 5P | 50 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | E | 12 | z |
| 5－5：15P | 90 |  | 0 | 0 | 7 | 苞 | 10 |  |
| 30 | 71 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | ＋ | 15 |  |
| 45 | 58 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | \％ | 3 |  |
| 6 P | 42 |  | 0 | 0 | 15 |  | 0 |  |
| $6-\mathrm{Hr}$ ．Total | 805 |  | 2 | 0 | 60 |  | 133 |  |

[^8]TABLE 38
CITY OF PORT HURON CUMULATIVE DURATION OF LANE STOPPAGES DUE TO LEFT TURNS

Two-Way Operation
Intersection of Griswold St. and 24th St.
(Extent of Delay in Seconds)

| 15 Min. Period | On 24th St. |  | On Griswold St. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FromN | Froms | FromE | From W |
| 6-6:15A | 0 | 15 | 8 | 0 |
| 30 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 45 | 26 | 15 | 37 | 0 |
| 7A | 0 | 21 | 98 | 14 |
| 7-7:15A | 0 | 29 | 21 | 0 |
| 30 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 45 | 35 | 27 | 80 | 16 |
| 8A | 37 | 61 | 152 | 0 |
| 8-8:15A | 18 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| 30 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| 45 | 26 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 9 A | 12 | 9 | 15 | 10 |
| 11-11:15A | 48 | 10 | 27 | 20 |
| 30 | 33 | 26 | 15 | 0 |
| 45 | 67 | 32 | 38 | 8 |
| 12 N | 57 | 12 | 28 | 30 |
| 12-12:15P | 124 | 48 | 15 | 25 |
| 30 | 62 | 10 | 53 | 28 |
| 45 | 19 | 9 | 85 | 0 |
| 1 P | 23 | 28 | 7 | 8 |
| 3-3:15P | 28 | 15 | 52 | 15 |
| 30 | 37 | 51 | 58 | 33 |
| 45 | 34 | 13 | 33 | 54 |
| 4 P | 23 | 6 | 39 | 34 |
| 4-4:15P | 28 | 11 | 126 | 78 |
| 30 | 65 | 42 | 30 | 16 |
| 45 | 112 | 38 | 19 | 34 |
| 5P | 24 | 0 | 32 | 6 |
| 5-5:15P | 88 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 30 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 45 | 46 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 P | 52 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| $8-\mathrm{Hr}$. Total | 1170 | 562 | 1138 | 464 |

TABLE 39

## CITY OF PORT HURON

## CUMULATIVE DURATION OF LANE STOPPAGES DUE TO LEFT TURNS <br> Two-Way Operation <br> Intersection of Griswold St. and Military St. <br> (Extent of Delay in Seconds)

| 15 Min. Period | On Military St. |  | On Griswold St. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | From S | From N | From E | From W |
| 6-6:15A | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | 22. | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 45 | 18 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7A | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7-7:15A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 8A | 0 | 25 | 4 | 0 |
| 8-8:15A | 15 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 30 | 4 | 21 | 9 | 0 |
| 45 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 A | 0 | 44 | 5 | 0 |
| 11-11:15A | 31 | 8 | 14 | 19 |
| 30 | 25 | 81 | 29 | 14 |
| 45 | 50 | 0 | 23 | 0 |
| 12N | 75 | 16 | 0 | 10 |
|  |  | . |  |  |
| 12-12:15P | 12 | 11 | 5 | 11 |
| 30 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 45 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 1 P | 47 | 11 | 8 | 0 |
| 3-3:15P | 48 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 30 | 43 | 33 | 7 | 9 |
| 45 | 58 | 14 | 0 | 9 |
| 4 P | 83 | 19 | 11 | 0 |
| 4-4:15P | 41 | 5 | 5 | 12 |
| 30 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | 98 | 41 | 0 | 28 |
| 5P | 81 | 12 | 13 | 0 |
| 5-5:15P | 125 | 13 | 8 | 22 |
| 30 | 71 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| 45 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 6 P | 63 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| $8-\mathrm{Hr} . \mathrm{Total}$ | 1173 | 372 | 194 | 171 |

Using the information from Tables 20-b, 21-b and 22-b for Lansing final phase, the "before" and "after" figures for average travel length per vehicle are 0.48 and 0.55 mile , respectively, or a change of 15 percent.

Similar calculations for Kalamasoo, using the information from Tables 23-25, result in average travel length per vehicle crossing the boundary of the study area of 0.38 mile during the "before", and 0.37 mile during the "after" period. This is a decrease rather than an increase; however, considering the limited accuracy of this calculation method, it would be safer to state that there was no difference, even if an apparent reduction may be disregarded.

In the case of Pontiac the average travel length was calculated to have changed from 0.44 to 0.45 mile.

It is conjectured that shortening of some trips in the after period due to removal of left-turn prohibitions, and choice of new and shorter routes, made possible in some cases with the elimination of congestion at bottlenecks, has offset some of the adverse distances caused by the one-way movements, with the result that trip lengths are kept shorter than might be expected.

## RESULTS OF TURNING-MOVEMENT STUDIES

In all of the four study cities, turning-movement counts were taken at a few intersections as earlier described. The numbers of vehicles making turns did not, in themselves, provide information of any significance other than some auxiliary data which on occasion provided supplement to the volume counts. Survey of left-lane stoppages which were taken during the turning-movement counts, however, provided insight into vehicle delays. Tables 30 through 39 contain this information at the various intersections of the study cities.

Table 30 is for the intersection of Kalamazoo Street and Rose Street in the City of Kalamazoo, and shows the delays due to left turns in conflict during each 15 -minute period of the two-way operation. :These figures represent the total number of seconds during each 15 -minute period
when the left lane contained stopped vehicles unable to move because of vehicles waiting to turn left. They do not reflect the total time loss by all vehicles, since this would require more extensive data showing how long each vehicle waited. No delays were encountered during the one-way operation.

Table 31 for the intersection of Saginaw Street and Verlinden Avenue in Lansing indicates considerable reduction in delays during the one-way phase. Table 32 for the Saginaw and Jenison intersection in the same city shows an increase in the delays in Jenison traffic from the north. There are no delays on any of the other three approaches, of course, due to one-way operation. Table 33 for the Oakland and Logan intersection shows substantial increase in the delays from the south, which is only natural because during the "before" phase there was no northbound traffic at this intersection with destination on the westbound state trunk line.

In Table 34 for the Oakland, Cass and Montcalm intersection in Pontiac, delays have lengthened mainly during the afternoon peaks on the approach from northwest. This is due to the general, increase in the traffic volumes during the intervening period. Delays on the other approaches have been entirely eliminated due to one-way operation. Left turns were not allowed from Montcalm Street even during the two-way phase, so that this approach is not shown in the table. All left-turn delays are eliminated at the Oakland and Johnson intersection as seen in Table 35. The same is true for the Oakland, Baldwin and Allison intersection as shown in Table 36. Again no left-turns were allowed from southeastbound Oakland during the before phase. The Cass and Johnson intersection delays were also entirely eliminated as indicated in Table 37.

Tables 38 and 39 for two intersections of Griswold Street in Port Huron show the left-turn delays during the two-way phase. These were all eliminated during the one-way phase.

## RESULTS OF ACCIDENT STUDIES

Extensive tabulations of accident analysis for the four cities are presented in the following pages,
as well as supplementary lists, in the Appendices, for accident experience at specific locations. However, the data do not indicate, in all cases, similar trends in all cities as to improvement or worsening of traffic safety after conversion to one-way operation.

Degree of traffic safety is a parameter which does not always reflect accurately the change in any one aspect of highway transportation. Recent research into accident causes has drawn attention to the fact that every traffic accident is usually the result of a series of failures in a system comprising several interdependent elements such as the driver, the vehicle, physical conditions of the roadway, type of land use, quality of traffic flow, traffic control devices, natural and environmental conditions like weather and lighting, traffic law enforcement, general economic conditions, etc. Therefore, it is difficult to evaluate effectively the result of only the change in traffic operation from two-way to one-way. It appears that, at least in certain cases, some of the other elements or their combinations have had stronger adverse effect on safety than the favorable effect of oneway operation per se.

Table 40 compares the accident types on the eastern section of Saginaw Street in Lansing before and after this section was changed to one-way operation. It is at once apparent that substantial reduction has been achieved in rearend and right-angle collisions. On the other hand, sideswipes have risen very sharply. Overall performance of the one-way trunk line, expressed in accidents per million vehicle-miles, has worsened.

Table 41 is a similar comparison of the western section of Saginaw Street where traffic continued to run in both directions during the interim period. A genergl upward trend is noted in the number and rate of accidents in this section also.

Table 42 compares accidents on Saginaw Street during the two-way and the final one-way operation. This result is the reverse of that in Table 40 , and a significant reduction is indicated in the rate of accidents. Table 43 shows the accident experience of the total area studied in Lansing during the three phases. The accident total
worsened between the two-way and the initial one-way phase but improved during the final one-way phase. Considering the increase in traffic volume of about 50 percent during the five and a half years, this improvement is noteworthy. This is also true for the injury accidents although the absolute number does not show a decrease between the initial and final one-way phases. Table 44 is a breakdown of the totals shown in Table 43 by day and night.

One last remark concerning the accident experience in Lansing will be about the change in the safety record of the Saginaw-Grand intersection. During the two-way operation, despite heavy leftturns from westbound Saginaw onto Grand in the presence of opposing traffic, and with considerably higher total traffic volumes on Saginaw Street, there were only three property-damage accidents in one year (See Appendix 13). During the one-way operation, with the completion of the north leg of Grand Avenue, a four-leg intersection of two one-way streets was formed, and stop-andgo signals were installed. Also, as mentioned earlier, the flow direction on Grand was reversed from southbound to northbound. During the oneyear period, 12 property-damage and 5 injuryaccidents were reported. This experience of rise in accidents upon signal installations is typical of numerous other intersections throughout the state.

Table 45 shows the accident experience on the section of Michigan Avenue in Kalamazoo where traffic was changed to one-way. Appreciable reduction is observed, especially in rear-end collisions and parking accidents. However, a control section of Michigan Avenue where operation remained two-way is shown in Table 46, and a similar reduction in the accident rate per million vehicle-miles has occurred which nullifies the apparent improvement due to one-way operation. Table 47 contains accidents on Kalamazoo Avenue which was a local two-way street during the before period. Accident rate has decreased on this street also. Tables 48 and 49 reflect the experience of the total study area. A reduction in total accidents from 1380 to 1291 is experienced, a decrease of 6 percent. Again, as a control figure, this should be compared with a reduction of 1 percent in the number of accidents
(Text continued on p. 133)

TABLE 40
CITY OF LANSING
Accident Types on Saginaw Street
Beiween Logan (Excluded) and Grand (Included)
(One-Y ear Periods)

| Type of Accident | Two-Way Phase (Jan. 31, 1964 .Jan. 30, 1965) | One-Way Initial Phase (Apr. 30, 1965 -Apr. 29, 1966) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear-end, straight | 73 | 26 |
| Rear-end involving left furn | 5 ¢ 83 | -- 34 |
| Rear-end involving right furn | 5 | $8)$ |
| Head-on, straight | - | - |
| Head-on involving left turn | 9 | 1 |
| Sideswipe, same direction | 19\} 22 | $58) 60$ |
| Sideswipe, opposite direction | 3) 22 | 2. 60 |
| Right angle | 41 | 22 |
| Involving parking of parked vehicle | 5 | 1 |
| Hitting fixed object | 2 | 6 |
| Backing vehicle | 9 | 7 |
| Hitting pedestrian | 1 | 2 |
| Unknown | 1 | - |
| Total | 173 | 133 |
| Rate of total accidents per million vehicle | miles 24.7 | 26.8 |

TABLE 41

## CITY OF LANSING

Accident Types on Saginaw Street
Between Belt Line RR and Logan (Inclusive)
(Two-Way Operation During Both Study Periods)

| Type of Accident | One-Year Before (Jan. 31, '1964 Jan. 30, 1965) | One-Year After (Apr. 30, 1965 -Apr. 29, 1966) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear-end, straight | 45 ) | 58 ) |
| Rear-end involving left turn | 7 - 57 | 3 3 68 |
| Rear-end involving right turn | $5)$ | 7 ) |
| Head-on, straight | 1 | - |
| Head-on involving left turn | 6 | 10 |
| Sideswipe, same direction | 14 16 16 | 19 19 21 |
| Sideswipe, opposite direction | $2)$ |  |
| Right angle | 25 | 24 |
| Involving parking or parked vehicle | 1 | 2 |
| Hitting fixed object | 5 | 3 |
| Backing vehicle | 7 | 4 |
| Hitting pedestrian | 1 | 2 |
| Unknown | 2 | - |
| Total | 121 | 134 |
| Rate of total accidents per million vehicle | miles 19.6 | 21.5 |

TABLE 42
CITY OF LANSING
Accident Types on Saginaw Street
Between Belt Line RR and Cedar (Inclusive)
(One-Year Periods)

| Type of Accident | Two-Way Phase $\begin{aligned} & \text { (Jan. 31, 1964- } \\ & \text { Jan. 30, 1965) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | One-Way Final Phase (Aug. 14, 1969. Aug. 13, 1970) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear-end, straight | 131 ) | 81 |
| Rear-end involving left turn | 12 153 | $9\} 103$ |
| Rear-end involving right turn | 10 | 13 |
| Head-on, straight | 1 | - |
| Head-on involving left furn | 15 | 4 |
| Sideswipe, same direction | 55 , 60 | 79 ) 81 |
| Sideswipe, opposite direction | $5) 60$ | 2 \% 81 |
| Right angle | 82 | 65 |
| Involving parking or parked vehicle | 6 | -. |
| Hitting fixed object | 11 | 21 |
| Backing vehicle | 16 | 9 |
| Hitting pedestrian | 2 | 2 |
| Other | - | 1 |
| Unknown | 3 | -. |
| Total | 349 | 286 |
| Rate of total accidents per million vehicle | iles 23.3 | 18.8 |

TABLE 43
CITY OF LANSING Accident Types Within Study Area
(One-Year Periods)


TABILE 44
CITY OF LANSING
Accidents Within Study Area by Day or Night
(One-Year Periods)

|  |  | Two Way Phase (Jan. 31, 1964Jan. 30, 1965) | One-Way Initial Phase (Ap. 30, 1965. Ap. 29, 1966) | One.Way <br> Final Phase (Aug. 14, 1969Aug. 13, 1970) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Day Time |  | 365 | 463 | 403 |
| Night time |  | 123 | 140 | 148 |
| Twilight |  | 32 | 21 | - |
|  | Total | 520 | 624 | 551 |

TABLE 45
CITY OF KALAMAZOO
Accident Types on Michigan Avenue Between Main (Excluded) and Porter (Included)

| Type of Accident | One-Year Before |  | One-Year After |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear-end, straight | 158 |  | $83)$ |  |
| Rear-end involving left turn | 9 9 | 176 | 19 \} | 107 |
| Rear-end involving right turn | $9)$ |  | $5)$ |  |
| Head-on, straight | 1 |  | - |  |
| Head-on involving left turn | 7 |  | 2 |  |
| Sideswipe, same direction | 57 \} | 57 | 54 \} | 58 |
| Sideswipe, opposite direction | - | 5 | $4)$ | 5 |
| Right angle | 35 |  | 40 |  |
| Involving parking or parked vehicle | 56 |  | 38 |  |
| Hitting fixed object | 9 |  | 4 |  |
| Backing vehicle | 10 |  | 11 |  |
| Hitting pedestrian | 5 |  | 7 |  |
| Unknown | 1 |  | - |  |
| Total | 357 |  | 267 |  |
| Rate of total accidents per million vehicle-miles | 57.5 |  | 52.3 |  |

TABLE 46
CITY OF KALAMAZOO Accident Types on Michigan Avenue Between Lovell and Main (Inclusive)

| Type of Accident | One-Year Before |  | One-Year After |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear-end, straight | 40 |  | 40 ) |
| Rear-end involving left turn | $1\}$ | 42 | 5 |
| Rear-end involving right turn | $1)$ |  | $3)$ |
| Head-on, straight | - |  | 3 |
| Head-on involving left turn | 1 |  | 1 |
| Sideswipe, same direction | $15\}$ | 16 | 13 |
| Sideswipe, opposite direction | 1 ) | 16 | 1 , |
| Right angle | 13 |  | 3 |
| Involving parking or parked vehicle | 2 |  | 1 |
| Hitting fixed object | 7 |  | 9 |
| Backing vehicle | - |  | 1 |
| Hitting pedestrian | 1 |  | - |
| Total | 82 |  | 80 |
| Rate of total accidents per million vehicle-miles | 59.5 |  | 55.6 |

TABLE 47
CITY OF KALAMAZOO
Accident Types on Kalamazoo Avenue

| Type of Accident | One-Year Before |  | One-Year After |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear-end, straight | 36 |  | 40 ) |  |
| Rear-end involving left turn | 2 \} | 40 | $11\}$ | 51 |
| Rear-end involving right turn | $2)$ |  | - |  |
| Head-on, straight | - |  | 2 |  |
| Head-on involving left turn | 5 |  | 1 |  |
| Sideswipe, same direction | 26 \} | 30 | 35 | 37 |
| Sideswipe, opposite direction | 4 | 30 | 2 ) | 37 |
| Right angle | 34 |  | 30 |  |
| Involving parking or parked vehicle | 11 |  | 7 |  |
| Hitting fixed object | 8 |  | 4 |  |
| Backing vehicle | 5 |  | 5 |  |
| Hitting pedestrian | 2 |  | 4 |  |
| Total | 135 |  | 141 |  |

Rate of total accidents per million vehicle-miles 33.5
29.4

TABLE 48

## CITY OF KALAMAZOO

Accident Types Within Study Area

| Type of Accident | One-Year Before |  | One-Year After |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear-end, straight | 422 ) |  | 336 |  |
| Rear-end involving left turn | 33 \} | 484 | 58 \} | 419 |
| Rear-end involving right furn | 29 |  | 25 |  |
| Head-on, straight | 11 |  | 11 |  |
| Head-on involving left turn | 33 |  | 26 |  |
| Sideswipe, same direction | 263 ) | 290 | 269 \} | 292 |
| Sideswipe, opposite direction | 27 |  | 23 |  |
| Right angle | 205 |  | 237 |  |
| Involving parking or parked vehicle | 182 |  | 144 |  |
| Hitting fixed object | 75 |  | 70 |  |
| Backing vehicle | 73 |  | 67 |  |
| Hitting pedestrian | 23 |  | 22 |  |
| Unknown | 4 |  | 3 |  |
| Total | 1380 |  | 1291 |  |

TABLE 49
CITY OF KAL AMAZOO
Accidents Within Study Area by Day or Night

|  | One-Year <br> Before | One-Year <br> After |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Day time | 950 | 909 |
| Night time | 375 | 321 |
| Twilight | 52 | 55 |
| Unknown | 3 | $\frac{6}{1291}$ |

TABLE 50
CITY OF PONTIAC
Aecident Types on Oakland Avenue Between Cass-Montcalm (Included) and Wide Track Drive (Included)

| Type of Accident | One-Yea Before |  | One-Ye <br> After |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear-end, straight | $33)$ |  | 27 |  |
| Rear-end involving left turn | 8 \} | 47 | 1 | 32 |
| Rear-end involving right turn | $6)$ |  | 4 |  |
| Head-on, straight | - |  | - |  |
| Head-on involving left turn | 18 |  | 7 |  |
| Sideswipe, same direction | 27 | 31 | 57 | 58 |
| Sideswipe, opposite direction | 4 \} | 31 | …1 | 58 |
| Right angle | 31 |  | $\therefore 20$ |  |
| Involving parking or parked vehicle | 5 |  | - 2 |  |
| Hitting fixed object | 11 |  | 9 |  |
| Backing vehicle | 4 |  | $\because 1$ |  |
| Hitting pedestrian | 3 |  | 2 |  |
| Unknown | 1 |  |  |  |
| Other | - |  | 2 |  |
| Total | 151 |  | \% 133 |  |

Rate of total accidents per million vehicle-miles 24.9
31.9

TABLE 51
CITY OF PONTIAC
Accident Types on Oakland Avenue Between West Boulevard (Included) and Cass-Montcalm (Excluded)


TABLE 52
CITY OF PONTIAC
Accident Types on Cass Avenue Between Oakland-Montcalm (Excluded) and Wide Track Drive (Included)

| Type of Accident | One-Year Before | One-Year After |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear-end, straight | 10 | 21 |
| Rear-end involving left turn | - $\} 10$ | -\} 22 |
| Rear-end involving right furn | - | 1) |
| Head-on, straight | - | - |
| Head-on involving left turn | 1 | 1 |
| Sideswipes, same direction | 3 3 4 | 14 14 |
| Sideswipes, opposite direction | 1 ? 4 | -) |
| Right angle | 13 | 35 |
| Involving parking or parked vehicle | 1 | 1 |
| Hitting fixed object | 3 | 10 |
| Backing vehicle | 1 | 4 |
| Hitting pedestrian | - | - |
| Other | - | 1 |
| Total | 33 | 88 |
| Rate of total accidents per million vehicle-miles | 12.9 | 19.4 |

TABLE 53
CITY OF PONTIAC Accident Types Within Study Area

| Type of Accident | One-Year Before |  | One-Year After |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear-end, straight | 57 | 80 | $61)$ |
| Rear-end involving left turn | $15\}$ |  | 9 , |
| Rear-end involving right turn | $8)$ |  | $5)$ |
| Head-on, straight | - |  | - |
| Head-on involving left turn | 28 |  | 14 |
| Sideswipe, same direction Sideswipe, opposite direction | $\left.\begin{array}{r}39 \\ 9\end{array}\right\}$ | 48 | $\left.\begin{array}{r}89 \\ 2\end{array}\right\}$ |
| Right angle | 63 |  | 82 |
| Involving parking or parked vehicle | 20 |  | 17 |
| Hitting fixed object | 21 |  | 31 |
| Backing vehicle | 6 |  | 5 |
| Hitting pedestrian | 7 |  | 4 |
| Unknown | 1 |  | - |
| Other | - |  | 4 |
| Total | 274 |  | 323 |

TABLE 54
CITY. OF PONTIAC
Accidents Within Study Area by Day or Night

|  | One-Year <br> Before | One-Year <br> Affer |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Day time | 187 | 225 |
| Tight time | $\frac{87}{274}$ | $\frac{98}{323}$ |

TABLE 55
CITY OF PORT HURON
Accident Types on Griswold Street


TABLE 56 CITY OF PORT HURON Accident Types on Oak Street

| Type of Accident | One-Year Before | One-Year After |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear-end, straight | 1 | 9 |
| Rear-end involving left turn | - | 1 |
| Rear-end involving right turn | - | 2 |
| Head-on, straight | - | 2 |
| Head-on involving left turn | - | 1 |
| Sideswipe, same direction | 1 | 24 |
| Sideswipe, opposite direction | - | 3 |
| Right angle | 6 | 33 |
| Involving parking or parked vehicle | 2 | - |
| Hitting fixed object | - | 3 |
| Backing vehicle | 1 | 2 |
| Hitting pedestrian | - | 1 |
| Total | 11 | 81 |
| Rate of total accidents per million vehicle-miles | 38.6 | 25.1 |

TABLE 57
CITY OF PORT HURON
Accident Types on Union \& Court Streets


TABLE 59
CITY OF PORT HURON
Accident Types within Lapeer Avenue \& Water Street Corridor

| Type of Accident | One-Year Before | One-Year After |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear-end, straight | 107 | 77 |
| Rear-end involving left turn | 3 | 2 |
| Rear-end involving right turn | 12 | 7 |
| Head-on, straight | - | 6 |
| Head-on involving left turn | 6 | 18 |
| Sideswipe, same direction | 25 | 28 |
| Sideswipe, opposite direction | 7 | 8 |
| Right angle | 42 | 41 |
| Involving parking or parked vehicle | 3 | . 4 |
| Hitting fixed object | 10 | 9 |
| Backing vehicle | 9 | 22 |
| Hitting pedestrian | 4 | 3 |
| Overturned motorcycle | - | 1 |
| Total | 228 | 226 |

TABLE 60
CITY OF PORT HURON
Accidents within Lapeer-Water \& Oak-Griswold Corridors by Day or Night

|  | One-Year <br> Before | One-Year <br> Affer |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 197 | 290 |
| Day time | 112 | 139 |
| Night time | 17 | 14 |
| Twilight | 19 | 7 |
| Unknown | 345 | 450 |

TABLE 61
CITY OF PORT HURON
Accidents on Union \& Court Streets by Day or Night

|  | One-Year <br> Before | One-Year <br> After |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 50 | 59 |
| Day time | 21 | 30 |
| Night time | 6 | 2 |
| Twilight | 2 | - |
| Unknown | 79 | 91 |

in the whole City of Kalamazoo (Table 62 - Sheet 6). Attention is called to the intersection of Michigan and Kalamazoo and the intersection of Main and Douglas in the City of Kalamazoo (See Appendix 16). These two intersections were signal-controlled during the two-way operation, and the signals were removed by virtue of the one-way operation, with the result that accidents dropped from 22 to 8 at the former intersection, and from 15 to 4 at the latter ${ }_{\text {o }}$ : This is a reverse of the situation at the Saginaw-Grand intersection in Lansing which experienced a rise in accidents after the installation of signals.

It is not possible to detect safety improvement in Pontiac due to the one-way project under study, except a relief in the total number of accidents on Oakland Avenue (Table 50). Accident rate, however, has increased on this street. The control section of Oakland where operation remained two-way, on the contrary, shows decrease in accident rates (Table 51). These rates, however, are very low in comparison with the one-way section because there are no signals in the control section, and the character of the traffic flow is not comparable. Cass Avenue accidents have also increased (Table 52). The study area experience is shown in Tables 53 and 54, and accidents have risen from 274 to 323 . This is a rise of 18 percent which is higher than the 5 percent rise in accidents in all of the city.

As already explained, the one-way project in Port Huron, the last of the cities under study, was basically different. Accident totals and rates both increased on Griswold, one of the new oneway pair (Table 55). On Oak, the other street in this pair, accident totals increased but the rate decreased (Table 56). On Union and Court Streets, which form another one-way pair in this city and were examined for control purposes, accident totals and rates also rose (Table 57). Table 58 shows the accidents on the Oak-Griswold corridor, including a three-block portion of all cross-streets. The result is almost a doubling in the number of accidents. An unproportionate rise is seen in same-direction side-swipes and right-angle collisions. On the other hand, no relief can be observed as a trade-off on the Lapeer Avenue and Water Street corridor which is no longer on a State Trunk Line (Table 59). Ta1
ble 60 is a summation of the two corridors mentioned above. A rise in accident experience from 345 to 450 is shown, which is 30 percent. Table 61 is a similar summation for the control pair of Union and Court. The rise here is from 79 to 91 , or 15 percent. As a final comparison (from Table 62 - Sheet 6), city-wide rise was 38 percent.

A few casual references were made earlier to Table 62. This Comparative Accident Summary Table will now be reviewed in some detail. It is divided into six sections. Section I compares the streets in each city which changed from a two-way state trunk line to one-way trunk line operation. Section II refers to a control section of the same state trunk line as in Section I but where operation remained two-way. Section III indicates the street which changed from two-way into a one-way state trunk line operation. Section IV is an evaluation of the pair of streets, considered together, before and after they were made part of the oneway system. Section $V$ reviews the accidents in all the streets considered in each study area. Finally, Section VI is the total experience in the whole city, and provides a general basis for comparison.: In this last section the one-year periods do not coincide with the exact one-year periods of the before and after phases of the study, but they are calendar years nearest to these phases.

Table 62 will provide a multitude of information as to accident rates and types, and influence of signals, peak periods, etc. It will also make it possible to compare all the cities studied.

The last column in this table provides a total evaluation of the performance of all cities lumped together as one project. The "'after" information in Lansing refers to the first "after", or the initial phase of the one-way operation. Some salient points in Table 62 are as follows:

In Section I, total accident rates (I-A.6) worsened in two cities and improved in one city. Comparing with the control streets in Section II (II-A.6), the rise in the accident rate of the one-way portion in Lansing ( +8 percent) is not very much different from the two-way portion ( +10 percent). A similar
observation is true for Kalamazoo, except that in this case the rates have both decreased ( -9 percent vs. -7 percent). In Pontiac, however, the one-way section shows considerable deterioration ( +28 percent) in comparison with the two-way section ( -23 percent). This was discussed earlier. Injury accident rates (I-B.6) in Lansing showed no change in the one-way section but improved in the two-way (II-B.6) section ( -12 percent). In Kalamazoo they showed improvement in the one-way portion ( -38 percent) in comparison to a sharp deterioration in the two-way portion ( +103 percent). Injury accident rates in Pontiac showed the same poor record as the total accident rates ( +11 percent in Section I versus -36 percent in Section II). Rearend collisions dropped on the one-way sections (I-D.3) in Lansing and Kalamazoo, whereas such collisions increased on the two-way sections (II-D.3). In Pontiac both the one-way and the two-way sections improved ( -32 percent and -20 percent). Sideswipes worsened on the one-way sections (I-E.3) in all cities. A lesser degree of worsening was also experienced in the twoway sections (II-E.3) in Lansing and Pontiac, but a 12 percent improvement was observed in Kalamazoo. Because of the character of the traffic in the particular trunk lines under study; there were very few pedestrian accidents in all cities, and such small numbers are insufficient to indicate significant trends (I-G and II-G). Accidents during peak periods were reduced on the one-way section (I-L.3) in Lansing by 29 percent but increased on the control section (II-L.3) by 12 percent. Kalamazoo and Pontiac showed similar reduction trends on both sections. Accidents at signalized intersections dropped on the one-way sections of all cities (I-N.3) in contrast to some rise on the two-way portions (II-N.3). In all cities, accidents at nonsignalized intersections increased on the one-way routes (I-P.3), while on the two-way routes (II-P.3) they increased only in Lansing and decreased in Pontiac. Accidents on the two-way section in Kalamazoo were too few to indicate a trend. Midblock accidents on the one-way streets (I-Q.3) showed considerable improvement in Lansing and Kalamazoo
as compared with the two-way portion (II-Q.3)。 In Pontiac no change occurred on the oneway street but a 40 percent rise in midblock accidents took place on the two-way section.

The safety record of the streets which were not state trunk lines before and were converted into one of the one-way trunk line pair was aggravated in all cities except Kalamazoo where a slight improvement was observed (III-A.3). In most cases this aggravation was the direct result of much heavier traffic volumes on these streets during the after phase. An extreme example of such a situation occurred in Lansing. Former Oakland and Jefferson Streets were purely residential access streets with no through-traffic whatever. In fact, this route was discontinuous at two locations, and physically no throughmovement was possible. Therefore, traffic volumes and speeds were in no way comparable with the "after" phase when actually a new state trunk line was built, where these streets existed before, to carry heavy traffic, and the accident experience became proportionately severe.

Section IV is a summation of Sections I and III, and serves as a balance sheet of gains and losses in accidents on the state trunk line route through the study area. This overall evaluation indicated improvement in the rate of total accidents (IV-A.6) for Kalamazoo and deterioration in Pontiac. No significant change occurred in Lansing. The rate of injury accidents (IV-B.6) decreased in Kalamazoo, increased in Pontiac and did not materially change in Lansing. Intersection accidents (IV-O.3) increased in Lansing and Pontiac, and decreased slightly in Kalamazoo. Midblock accidents (IV-Q.3) improved in Lansing and Kalamazoo but worsened in Pontiac.

From Section V it may be deduced that total accidents in the study area (V-A.3) increased in Lansing, Pontiac and Port Huron, and decreased in Kalamazoo. Similar results were seen for injury accidents (V-B.3). Pedestrian accidents remained practically the same in Kalamazoo, decreased in Pontiac and Port Huron, but increased in Lansing.
(Text continued on p. 141)

TABLE 62

## COMPARATIVE ACCIDENT SUMMARY

Two-Way Vs. One-Way Trunk Line Operation<br>(One-Year Periods)


(1) In Lansing: Saginaw St. between Logan and Grand. In Kalamazoo: Michigan Ave. between Ma in and Porter. In Pontiac: Oakland Ave. between Montcalm-Cass and Wide Track Dr. None in Port Huron.

* No street in Port Huron was changed from two-way trunk line to one-way trunk line.
** Average
(F) Includes one fatal accident.

TABLE 62 - Sheet 2
I-G Pedestrian Accidents:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

I-H Day Accidents:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

I-J Night Accidents:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

| City of <br> Lansing | City of <br> Kalamazoo | City of <br> Pontiac | City of <br> Port Huron | All Cities <br> 2 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

1-K Twilight Accidents:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

1-L Peak-traffic Accidents

1. Before
2. After

| 94 | 172 | 72 | $*$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 67 | 140 | 53 |  | $\star$ |
| $-29 \%$ | $-19 \%$ | $-26 \%$ |  | $*$ |

338
3. Percent change

I-M Off-Peak Traffic Accidents:

1. Before

| 78 | 181 | 79 | $*$ | 338 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 66 | 123 | 80 | $*$ | 269 |
| $-15 \%$ | $-32 \%$ | $+1 \%$ | $*$ | $-20 \%$ |

I-N Accidents at Signalized Intersections; (2)

| 1. Before | 69 | 147 | 99 | $*$ | 315 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. After | 46 | 125 | 74 | $*$ | 245 |
| 3. Percent change | $-33 \%$ | $-15 \%$ | $-25 \%$ | $*$ | $-22 \%$ |

I-P Accidents at Non-Signalized Intersections: (2)

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

| 36 | 19 | 34 | $*$ |  | 89 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 38 | 21 | 41 | $*$ |  | 100 |
| $+6 \%$ | $+11 \%$ | $+21 \%$ | $*$ |  | $+12 \%$ |

1-Q Midblock

1. Before

| 65 | 180 | 18 | $*$ | 263 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 | 111 | 18 | $*$ | 161 |
| $-51 \%$ | $-38 \%$ | 0 | $*$ | $-39 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $-29 \%$ | $-12 \%$ | $-31 \%$ | $*$ | $-23 \%$ |

* No street in Port Huron was changed from two-way trunk line to one-way trunk line.
(NL) Not listed.
(2) Not including accidents at those intersections where signals were either installed or removed during the one-way operation.

| II. A SEC SECT REMA | CTION OF SAME TRUNK LINE AS IN TION I BUT WHERE OPERATION AINED TWO-WAY: (3) | City of hansing | City of Kalamazoo | City of Pontiac | City of Port Huron | All Cities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II-A | Total Accidents |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Before: Number | 121 | 82 | 41 | * | 244 |
|  | 2. After: Number | 134 | 80 | 35 | * | 249 |
|  | 3. Percent change in number | +11\% | -2\% | -15\% | * | +2\% |
|  | 4. Before: Rate per million vehicle-miles | 19.6 | 59.5 | 5.6 | * | 28.2 ${ }^{\text {** }}$ |
|  | 5. After: Rate per million vehicle-miles | 21.5 | 55.6 | 4.3 | * | 27.1** |
|  | 6. Percent change in rate | $+10 \%$ | -7\% | -23\% | * | -4\% |
| H-B | Injury Accidents: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Before: Number | 30 | 9 | 18 | * | 57 |
|  | 2. After: Number | 26 | 19 | 13 (F) | * | 58 (F) |
|  | 3. Percent change in number | -13\% | +111\% | -28\% | * | +2\% |
|  | 4. Before: Rate per million vehicle-miles | 4.8 | 6.5 | 2.5 | * | 4.6** |
|  | 5. After: Rate per million vehicle-miles | 4.2 | 13.2 | 1.6 | * | 6.3 ** |
|  | 6. Percent change in rate | -12\% | +103\% | -36\% | * | +37\% |
| H-C | Property damage Accidents: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Before: Number | 91 | 73 | 23 | * | 187 |
|  | 2. After: Number | 108 | 61 | 22 | * | 191 |
|  | 3. Percent change in number | +19\% | -16\% | -4\% | * | +2\% |
|  | 4. Before: Rate per million vehicle-miles | 14.7 | 53.0 | 3.2 | * | 23.6** |
|  | 5. After: Rate per million vehicle-miles | 17.3 | 42.4 | 2.7 | * | 20.8** |
|  | 6. Percent change in rate | +18\% | -20\% | -16\% | * | -12\% |
| II-D | Rear-end Collisions: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Before |  |  |  | * | 114 |
|  | 2. After | 68 | 48 | 12 | * | 128 |
|  | 3. Percent change | +19\% | +14\% | -20\% | *. | +11\% |
| II-E | Sideswipes: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Before | 20 | 16 | 5 | * | 41 |
|  | 2. After | 29 | 14 | 6 | * | 49 |
|  | 3. Percent change | +45\% | -12\% | +20\% | * | +20\% |
| II-F | Right-angle Collisions: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Before | 25 | 13 | 8 | * | 46 |
|  | 2. Affer | 24 | 3 | 5 | * | 32 |
|  | 3. Percent change | -4\% | -77\% | -38\% | * | -30\% |
| II-G | Pedestrian Accidents: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Before | 1 | 1 | 1 | * | 3 |
|  | 2. Affer | 2 | 0 | 0 | * | 2 |
|  | 3. Percent change | +100\% | -100\% | -100\% | * | -33\% |

(3) In Lansing: Saginaw St. between Beltline Railroad and Logan St. In Kalamazoo: Michigan Ave. between Lovell and Main. In Pontiac: Oakland Ave, between West Blvd. and Montcalm-Cass intersection.

* No street in Port Huron was changed from two-way trunk line to one-way trunk line.
** Average
(F) Includes one fatal accident.

TABLE 62 - Sheet 4
II-H Day Accidents:
1.. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

II-J Night Accidents:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

II-K Twilight Accidents:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

II-L Peak-Traffic Accidents:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

II-M Off-peak Traffic Accidents:

1. Before
2. Affer
3. Percent change

II-N Accidents at Signalized Intersections:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

II-P Accidents at Non-Signalized Intersections:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

II-Q Midblock Accidents:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

II-R Percent change in vehicle-miles of travel

| City of Lansing | City of Kalamazoo | City of Pontiac | City of Port Huron | All Cities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 94 | 52 | 26 | * | 172 |
| 97 | 52 | 23 | * | 172 |
| +3\% | , | -12\% | * | 0 |


| 22 | 26 | 15 | $*$ | 63 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 | 24 | 12 | $*$ | 67 |
| $+41 \%$ | $-8 \%$ | $-20 \%$ | $*$ | $+6 \%$ |


| 5 | 4 | $(\mathrm{NL})$ | $*$ | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 4 | $(\mathrm{NL})$ | $*$ | 10 |
| $+20 \%$ | 0 | $(\mathrm{NL})$ | $*$ | $+11 \%$ |


| 73 | 44 | 25 | $*$ | 142 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 82 | 38 | 17 | $*$ | 137 |
| $+12 \%$ | $-14 \%$ | $-32 \%$ | $*$ | $-4 \%$ |


| 48 | 38 | 16 | $*$ | 102 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 52 | 41 | 18 | $*$ | 111 |
| $+8 \%$ | $+8 \%$ | $+12 \%$ | $*$ | $+9 \%$ |


| 55 | 56 | (NS) | $*$ | 111 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 61 | 58 | (NS) | $*$ | 119 |
| $+11 \%$ | $+4 \%$ | (NS) | $*$ | $+7 \%$ |

III. STREET WHICH CHANGED FROM TWO-WAY NON-TRUNK LINE TO ONE-WAY TRUNK LINE: (4)

III-A Total Accidents:

| 1. Before | 9 | 157 | 33 | 95 | 294 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. After | 115 | 149 | 88 | 174 | 526 |
| 3. Percent change | $+1180 \%$ | $-5 \%$ | $+175 \%$ | $+83 \%$ | $+79 \%$ |

* No street in Port Huron was changed from two-way trunk line to one-way trunk line.
(NL) Not listed.
(NS) No Signals
(F) Includes one fatal accident.
(4) In Lansing: Oakland and Jefferson Sts. between Logan and Grand. In Kalamazoo: Kalamazoo St, between Douglas and Michigan. In Pontiac: Cass Ave. between Oakland and Wide Track. In Port Huron: Oak St. between 27th and Military, and Griswold between 32 nd and 4th.

TABLE 62 - Sheet 5
III-B Injury Accidents:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

III-C Property-damage Accidents:

| 1. Before | 7 | 131 | 23 | 70 | 231 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. After | 89 | 128 | 59 | 128 | 404 |
| 3. Percent change | $+1170 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $+157 \%$ | $+83 \%$ | $+75 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accidents at Signalized Intersections: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Before |  |  | 94 | 21 | 37 |

III-P Accidents at NonSignalized Intersections:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

III-Q Midblock Accidents:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

III-S Number of Signalized Intersections:

1. Before
2. After
26

| 48 | 88 |
| :---: | ---: |
| 53 | 148 |
| $+10 \%$ | $+68 \%$ |

$-4 \%+388 \%+10 \% \quad+68 \%$
6
31
$+417 \%$
26
25
$-4 \%$
8
39
$+388 \%$

148 $+68 \%$

| 3 | 37 | 4 | 10 | 54 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 | 23 | 21 | 19 | 89 |
| $+767 \%$ | $-38 \%$ | $+425 \%$ | $+90 \%$ | $+65 \%$ |


| 0 | 7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 6 |

2

| 3 | 12 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 20 |

IV. THE TWO STREETS FORMING THE ONE-WAY PAIR: (5)

IV-A Total Accidents:

| 1. Before: Number | 182 | 514 | 184 | $\mathrm{NI}:$ | 880 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. After: Number | 248 | 416 | 221 | NI | 885 |
| 3. Percent change in number | $+36 \%$ | $-19 \%$ | $+20 \%$ | NI | $+1 \%$ |
| 4. Before: Rate per million vehicle-miles | 23.1 | 50.6 | 21.4 | NI | $31.7^{* *}$ |
| 5. After: Rate per million vehicle-miles | 23.3 | 42.0 | 25.4 | NI | $30.2^{* *}$ |
| 6. Percent change in rate | $+1 \%$ | $-17 \%$ | $+19 \%$ | NI | $-5 \%$ |

IV-B Injury Accidents:

1. Before: Number

| 41 | 79 | 56 | NI | 176 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 54 | 48 | 64 | NI | 166 |
| $+32 \%$ | $-39 \%$ | $+14 \%$ | NI | $-6 \%$ |
| 5.2 | 7.8 | 6.5 | NI | $6.5^{* *}$ |
| 5.1 | 4.8 | 7.4 | NI | $5.8^{* *}$ |
| .$-2 \%$ | $-38 \%$ | $+14 \%$ | Nl | $-11 \%$ |

(F) Includes one fatal accident.
*** There were no signalized intersections during the "before" period, and 6 intersections were signalized during the "after" period. (See III-S.)
(5) Total of I and III. (Port Huron data are not included in this section because the situation is not similar to the other three cities.)
NI Not included. (See above note.)
** Average

TABLE 62 - Sheet 6
IV-C Property-damage Accidents:

1. Before: Number
2. After: Number
3. Percent change in number
4. Before: Rate per million vehicle-miles .
5. After: Rate per million vehicle-miles
6. Percent change in rate

IV-O Intersection Accidents:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change
111
173
286
272
162
+56\%
$-5 \%$
182 NI
$+12 \% \quad \mathrm{NI}$
559
627
$+12 \%$
IV-Q Midblock Accidents:
4. Before
5. After
6. Percent change

IV-R Percent change in vehicle-miles of travel

## V. ALL STREETS IN STUDY AREA: (6)

V-A Total Accidents:

1. Before: Number

| 520 | 1380 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 624 | 1291 |


| 274 | 345 | 2519 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 323 | 450 | 2688 |
| $+18 \%$ | $+30 \%$ | $+7 \%$ |

V-B Injury Accidents:

| 1. Before | 114 | 188 | 87 | 76 | 465 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. After | 133 | 176 | $96(\mathrm{~F})$ | 96 | $501(\mathrm{~F})$ |
| 3. Percent change | $+17 \%$ | $-6 \%$ | $+10 \%$ | $+26 \%$ | $+8 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  | - |  |
| Pedestrian Accidents: | 2 | 23 | 7 | 8 | 40 |
| 1. Before | 12 | 22 | 4 | 6 | 44 |
| 2. After | $+500 \%$ | $-4 \%$ | $-43 \%$ | $-25 \%$ | $+10 \%$ |

## VI. WHOLE CITY:

VI-A Total Accidents:
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 1. Before } & 7000 & 5153 & 4661 & 1392 & 18206\end{array}$
2. After
3. Percent

VI-B Injury Accidents:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change

VI-G Pedestrian Accidents:

| 1. Before | 7000 | 5153 | 4661 | 1392 | 18206 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. After | 7980 | 5077 | 4872 | 1914 | 19843 |
| 3. Percent | $+14 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $+5 \%$ | $+38 \%$ | $+9 \%$ |
| VI-B Injury Accidents: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Before | 1500 | 1084 | 1414 | 316 | 4314 |
| 2. After | 1862 | 1020 | 1477 | 391 | 4750 |
| 3. Percent change | $+24 \%$ | $-6 \%$ | $+4 \%$ | $+24 \%$ | $+10 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VI-G Pedestrian Accidents: | 149 | 80 | 108 | 23 | 360 |
| 1. Before | 141 | 97 | 101 | 37 | 376 |
| 2. Affer | $-5 \%$ | $+21 \%$ | $-6 \%$ | $+61 \%$ | $+4 \%$ |


| City of Lansing | City of Kalamazoo | City of Pontiac | City of Port Huron | All Cities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 141 | 435 | 128 | NI | 704 |
| 194 | 368 | 157 | N | 719 |
| +38\% | -15\% | +23\% | NI | +2\% |
| 17.9 | 42.8 | 14.9 | NI | 25.2** |
| 18.2 | 37.2 | 18.0 | NI | 24.5** |
| +2\% | -13\% | +21\% | NI | -3\% |


| 68 | 217 | 22 | NI | 307 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 58 | 134 | 39 | NI | 231 |
| $-15 \%$ | $-38 \%$ | $+77 \%$ | NI | $-25 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $+35 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | $+1 \%$ | NI | $+10 \%$ |

2. After: Number
3. Percent change in number
$+20 \%$
$-6 \%$
$+18 \%$
$+30 \%$

V-G Pedestrian Accidents:

1. Before
2. After
3. Percent change
+500\%
$-4 \%$
6
44
$+10 \%$
$\underset{* *}{\text { NI }} \underset{\text { Average }}{\text { Not included }}$
(6) In Port Huron: two corridors along Lapeer-Water, Oak and Griswold Sts.
(F) Includes one fatal accident

Most of the foregoing analysis fails to indicate similarities in the safety trends which were looked for in the four study cities. Some results common to all cities were that on the two-way state trunk lines which were converted to oneway operation the total accidents, injury accidents, rear-end collisions and accidents at signalized intersections decreased; and sideswipes and collisions at non-signalized intersections increased. Considering the three cities of Lansing, Kalamazoo and Pontiac, an appraisal of the oneway pairs before and after the conversion fails to indicate a trend toward either a gain or a loss in safety of operation, based on rates per million vehicle-miles.

As was pointed out at the start of this discussion on the results of accident studies, there exist wide differences in the accident experiences of the study cities. To make a comparison of accident experiences possible, the only tool known
to date is to express them in rates based on vehicle-miles of travel. However, recent studies $(5,6)$ suggest that accident rate is not a linear function of traffic volume but varies on a parabolic curve, decreasing as hourly volume increases and then rising again as volume further increases.

Other studies (7) find that the roadway is responsible for about 4.5 percent of the variation in the accident rate and that the remaining 55 percent of the variability is accountable to such factors as the driver and the vehicle. This makes it difficult to use accidents as a sensitive criterion in evaluating improvements in the highway system.

A final reminder is that some of the variation in results may also be due to the difference in the degree of traffic enforcement and the procedures used for accident reporting in different cities.

## SUGGESTED DESIGN CRITERIA

This study is by no means an exhaustive examination of all types of one-way street systems. It is merely a case study of a traffic corridor in each of the four cities where the State Trunk Line was changed from two-way to one-way operation. It should also be remembered that the study was an evaluation coincidental with normal highway projects. No attempts were made to interject deliberate parameters into the individual projects for purposes of controlled research. The design criteria suggested below are somewhat limited in scope to the experience gained from these four projects.

## GUIDELINES FOR CONSIDERATION OF ONE-WAY TRUNK LINE SYSTEMS

Conversion to a one-way system should be considered when the following conditions exist after optimization of signal timing has been effected and additional laneage possibilities have been ruled out:

1. Average overall travel speed during peak periods falls below $20 \mathrm{~m} \cdot \mathrm{poh}$. under normal daily operation.
2. Average stopped delays are in the vicinity of 30 seconds or greater per mile of trunk line.
3. Accident rates continue to be above average for comparable streets particularly after unsuccessful attempts to correct specific accident patterns.
4. Considerable desire to turn left from the trunk line is present but cannot be accommodated by special signal-phasing which requires loss of needed through-capacity.
5. Impending need for new traffic signals at some of the stop-controlled intersections, which can continue to be stop-controlled
under one-way operation by virtue of creating more usable gaps in the trunk line traffic stream.
6. Traffic congestion on streets within the trunk line corridor becomes intolerable and the efficiency of a well planned one-way system is viewed as an aid to organizing traffic flow.

Each of the above items may not by itself be viewed as adequate justification for initiating a one-way street system. As more of the above guidelines are evidenced, the case for such a system becomes stronger. No specific volume warrants appear to be appropriate; rather, the ability to provide a desired level of service should be the consideration.

Implied in the consideration of a one-way street system is the existence of a suitable corridor for constructing or reconstructing the street to be paired with the trunk line.

## SUGGESTIONS FOR SYSTEM DESIGN

1. Free-flow channelization should be used if feasible. This will minimize the number of stop-and-go signals which reduce capacity and may increase accidents. Such operation can be made possible by constructing channelizing islands. There are two areas of application where such channelization can be used. The first is at transitions between one-way and two-way sections. The second is at cross-streets where turning movements are accommodated. Merge and diverge operations on the trunk line will require extra pavement width near such cross-streets to allow construction of the channelizing islands and free-flow operation. This can sometimes be accomplished by eliminating parking, standing or stopping at least in the vicinity of cross streets. Decisions for free-flow channelization should be tempered by considering any factors which may introduce operation haz-
ards. The presence of driveways, alleys and streets which intersect the auxiliary lanes are such hazard factors.
2. The one-way pair of streets should normally operate to the right of the intervening block or blocks, as in the case of a divided highway with a median. This will permit normal counter-clockwise circulation around the blocks and also permit simple transition geometrics at the two extremities.
3. Wherever feasible, implementation of one-way flow on the cross-streets will further improve over-all operations.
4. Weaving conditions should be kept to a minimum to reduce sideswipe accidents which are typical of multilane one-way traffic.
5. Lane concentration in traffic flow is an important factor in ensuring full capacity of the system. It is sometimes possible to improve lane concentration by means of advance overhead signing so that unbalanced concentration of traffic on certain lanes may be avoided. Such measures will also be helpful in reducing weaving. Provision for more than one turning lane for each movement at necessary loca-
tions will also help in a better distribution of flow among the available lanes.
6. Conversion to one-way operation can be accomplished effectively by phasing it into successive sections along the traffic corridor. Ample transitions should be designed, however, into the interim schemes so as not to create bottlenecks at the temporary terminals. Furthermore, the design of roadways and signing should obviate any driver confusion which may cause wrong-way travel.
7. Elimination of parking on the streets should be considered when feasible.
8. Signals should be interconnected to synchronize them for optimum speed.
9. Signal-progression speed should approximate the legal speed limit which should be posted frequently on the streets.
10. New traffic signs needed for one-way operation can be given added emphasis by adding flashing lights for the first few months after conversion to one-way operation, until all drivers familiar with the old scheme are acclimated to the new system.
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## APPENDIX 1

## DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF TRAFFIC SURVEYS

## CITY OF KALAMAZOO

The "before" phase of the traffic surveys was conducted between October 19 and October 30, 1964. Volume counts by pneumatic counters were taken at 66 locations which are shown in Figure 5. At five of these locations, the counts were continuous for at least seven days and as long as other traffic surveys were in progress. At the remainder of the locations, 48 -hour counts were taken. Actually, the total number of volume counts were much more than 66 since separate counts were taken for each direction of traffic at most locations. Thus, for the "before" surveys, 105 volume counts were taken. The taking of the 48 -hour counts was spread over a period of 12 days due to their large number, which, of necessity, made such counts non-simultaneous. The machines recorded the volumes by 15 -minute periods.

Time gaps in the traffic stream were measured on Kalamazoo and Michigan Avenues at their intersections with Church Street. These were taken one day only from 7 to $9 \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{m}$. and from 3 to $6 \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{o}}$, and were totaled by 15 -minute intervals. Nothing shorter than 6 seconds was recorded, and the gaps were divided into four size-groups of 6 to 10 seconds, 10 to 15 seconds, 15 to 20 seconds and over 20 seconds.

Turning-movements were counted for six hours, from 6 to 9 a.m. and from 3 to 6 p.mo, at the intersections of Kalamazoo and Rose, and Michigan and Lovell. : Stoppage of left lanes caused by traffic waiting to make left turns at the Kalamazoo and Rose intersection was recorded in seconds by 15 -minute intervals.

Speed-and-delay study runs listed below were made by the floating car method during the "before" period, where total travel time, and points and duration of all delays were recorded in these cars using automatic recording equipment (See Figure 6):

1-A. From the intersection of Thompson Street and Main Street, eastbound via Main-Doug-
las-Kalamazoo-Michigan, to the intersection of Harrison Street and Michigan Avenue. Three runs were made during each of the three peak periods, morning, noon and afternoon, for three consecutive days.

2-A. From the intersection of Harrison and Michigan, westbound via Michigan-Kalamazoo-Douglas-Main, to the intersection of Thompson and Main. Same number of runs were made as in the eastbound iuns mentioned above.

3-A. From the intersection of Thompson and Main, eastbound via Main-Michigan, to the intersection of Harrison and Michigan. Three tuns were made during each of the three peak periods for two days.

4-A. From the intersection of Harison and Michigan, westbound via Michigan-Main, to the intersection of Thompson and Main. Same number of runs were made as in the eastbound runs mentioned for route $3-\mathrm{A}$, above.

5-A. From the intersection of Lovell and Michigan, eastbound via Michigan, to the intersection of Harrison and Michigan. Three runs were made during each peak period of one day only.

6-A. From the intersection of Harrison and Michigan, westbound via Michigan, to the intersection of Lovell and Michigan. Same number of runs were made as in the eastbound runs mentioned for route $5-\mathrm{A}$, above.

Total travel time only was clocked by a survey car on the six cross-streets which are situated in a general north-south direction and which intersect the one-way pair. These streets and the directions of survey runs were as follows: (See Figure 6).

1. Westnedge (southbound)
2. Park (northbound)
3. Church (southbound)
4. Rose (northbound and southbound)
5. Edwards (northbound)
6. Pitcher (southbound)

The beginning and the end of all but one of these runs were Ransom Street, which is two blocks north of Kalamazoo Avenue, and South Street, which is two blocks south of Michigan Avenue. The run on Church Street was ended at Academy Street which terminates Church Street on the south.

During the "before" surveys, on each of the streets and directions indicated above, three runs were made during morning peak periods (two of these on the same day and the third on the next day), two runs during morning off-peak periods (both on the same day), three runs during noon peak (all on the same day), one run during afternoon off-peak, and three runs during afternoon peak (two of them on the same day and the third on another day).

Traffic surveys reflecting the "after" or one way traffic conditions were taken in Kalamazoo between May 2, 1966 and May 14; 1966. Basically the same count stations and speed-and-delay routes were used during these "after" surveys, except that some modifications were made for new streets and travel routes as necessitated by the one-way operation.

Volume counts numbered 89 during the "after" surveys. The taking of the 48 -hour counts were distributed within a period of 10 days.

Traffic gaps and turning movements were counted at the same stations and in the exact manner as the "before" surveys.

Four speed-and-delay study runs as listed below were made during the "after" period. (see Figure 7.)

2-B. From the intersection of Harrison and Michigan, westbound via Michigan-Kalamazoo-Douglas-Main, to the intersection of Thompson and Main.

3-B. From the intersection of Thompson and Main, eastbound via Main-Michigan, to the intersection of Harrison and Michigan.

5-B. From the intersection of Lovell and Michigan, eastbound via Michigan, to the intersection of Harrison and Michigan.

7-B. From the intersection of Harrison and Michigan, westbound, via Michigan-Kalamazoo-Michikal-Michigan, to the intersection of Lovell and Michigan.

Six runs were made on each of the above routes for each of the peak periods. The morning peaks were covered in three consecutive days, two runs being made the first day, three runs on the next and one on the third day. Noon peaks were also covered in three consecutive days, one run being made the first day, three on the second and two runs on the third day. Afternoon peaks were done in two days, three runs being completed on each day.

Travel-time surveys on the six cross-streets were repeated for the "after" phase of the study. On each of the routes; three trips were made during the morning peak period, all on the same day. One trip was made during the morning off-peak period. Three trips were made during the noon peak period, one trip being on one day and two trips on another day. Two trips were made during the afternoon off-peak on two consecutive days. Three trips were made during the afternoon peak period, one trip being on one day and two trips on another.

## CITY OF LANSING

The "before" surveys were taken befween July 8 and July 30,1964 . Volume counts by 15 -minute totals were planned for a total of 110 stations (Figure 13). However, some stations were omitted due to construction work or narrow street widths. In the latter case instead of two stations counting directional volumes at one location, one station was used counting total traffic. The actual number of stations thus reduced to 87 . At six of these stations, volume counts were continued for at least seven days and as long as other traffic surveys were in progress. At the remaining 81 stations, counts were recorded for 48 hours. The 48 -hour counts took place within a total time span of 23 days.

Traffic gap surveys, similar to those in Kalamazoo, were conducted at the following seven intersections of Saginaw Street: Seymour, Chestnut, Sycamore, Clayton-Carey, Westmoreland, Cawood and Durant.

Six hours of turning-movement counts, similar to those in Kalamazoo, were also recorded at the intersections of Oakland and Logan, Saginaw and Jenison, and Saginaw and Verlinden. Delays caused by traffic waiting to turn left were also recorded.

The following speed-and-delay survey runs were made during the "before" phase of the study: (See Figure 14.)

1-A. From Beltline Railroad, eastbound via Saginaw Street, to the intersection of Cedar and Saginaw。

2-A. From Cedar and Sheridan intersection, westbound via Saginaw, to Beltline Railroad.

These runs were made during three consecutive days and within the moming, noon and afternoon peak periods of each day. For the morning peak data, five runs were made in both directions during the first day, and four runs each during the next two days. For the afternoon peak, four runs were made during each of the three days.

Cross-street travel time surveys were taken on seven streets. These runs started or terminated on Kilborn and Hyland Streets on the north, and at Genesee and Osborn Streets on the south. (See Figure 14)。. The names of the cross-streets and the direction of the trips were:

1. Washington (southbound)
2. Capitol (northbound)
3. Walnut (southbound)
4. Pine (northbound)
5. Logan (southbound)
6. Jenison (southbound)
7. Verlinden (northbound)

All of the above trips were made during three consecutive days, and two runs were made during each of the three daily peak periods.

Traffic surveys to reflect the initial phase of the one-way operation (for the area east of Logan Street) were taken between June 28 and July 8, 1966. Basically the same count stations and travel routes were used for this phase of surveys, with the exceptions that counts were not taken
for the area west of Logan Street, that modifications were made as necessitated by the one-way system, and that the speed studies were run on the newly established streets and travel directions. Thirty-two volume counts were taken for this phase. The 48 -hour counts were all taken at the same time, using as many machines.

Traffic gap studies were repeated at the three intersections that fell within the initial one-way phase study area. Tuming-movement counts were repeated at the Oakland and Logan intersection.

Speed-and-delay survey routes for this phase of the study were as follows: (See Figure 15.)'

1-B. From Beltline Railroad, eastbound via Saginaw Street, to the intersection of Cedar and Saginaw.

2-B. From the intersection of Cedar and Sheridan, westbound via Oakland-Logan-Saginaw, to Beltline Railroad.

On each of the above described routes, runs were made during four consecutive days. On the first day, three runs were made during the afternoon peak periods only; on each of the second and third days, three runs were made during each of the morning, noon and afternoon peaks; and on the fourth day, three runs were made during morning and noon peaks.

Cross-street travel-time runs were repeated on the first five of the seven streets listed for the before phase. However, due to the change in direction of traffic on four of the city's local streets, which went into effect on the same date as the one-way state trunk lines, the travel directions of some of the test trips were different from the "before" runs, and they were as follows: (See Figure 15.

1. Washington (northbound and southbound)
2. Capitol (southbound)
3. Walnut (north bound)

4: Pine (southbound)
5. Logan (northbound and southbound)

The above trips were repeated twice for each of the three peak periods for three days as before,
except that they were spread to four days, afternoon peak runs only being done in the first day, and morning and noon peaks only being surveyed on the fourth day.

Traffic surveys to reflect the finial phase of the one-way operation (with the area west of Logan Street also included) were taken between June 30 and August 1, 1969. These were basically a repetition of the "before" study with the adjustments necessitated by the conversion of the state trunk lines to one-way operation, and the changes in the directions of flow of some of the cross-streets as earlier mentioned. Seventy-two volume counts were taken for the final phase. The 48 -hour counts were taken during a total time span of 26 days from June 30 to July $25,1969$.

Gap and turning-movement studies were repeated at the same stations as the before phase.

Speed-and-delay survey routes for the final phase were (Figure 16):

1-B. From Beltline Railroad underpass, eastbound via Saginaw Street, to the intersection of Cedar and Saginaw.

2-B. From the intersection of Cedar and Oakland, westbound via Oakland Avenue to Beltline Railroad underpass."

On each of the above routes, runs were made during three consecuṭive days. On the first day three runs were made during the afternoon peak only, on the second day three runs for each of the peaks were made, and on the third day three runs were made for the morning peak only.

The same seven cross-streets were driven as in the before surveys, the only difference being in the direction of travel as follows (Figure 16):

1. Washington (southbound)
2. Capitol (southbound)
3. Walnut (northbound)
4. : Pine (southbound)
5. Logan (southbound)
6. Jenison (southbound)
7. Verlinden-Cleo (northbound)

All cross-street runs were completed in four consecutive days. For each of the seven routes two noon-peak runs and two afternoon-peak runs were made on the first day, two runs for each of the three peaks were made both on the second and the third day; and only two morning-peak runs were made on the fourth day.

## CITY OF PONTIAC

Survey procedures were similar to Kalamazoo and Lansing, except that no cross-street travel-time runs were made. : Instead, an additional speed-and-delay route making a closed loop was made through some of the cross and parallel streets near the east end of the study area.

The "'before" surveys were taken between August 3 and 21, 1964: Traffic volumes were recorded at 59 stations (Figure 19). At seven of these, counts were continuous for the total duration of other traffic surveys. The remaining stations were in operation for 48 hours spread over the 18 -day survey period.

Gap surveys were conducted on Oakland Avenue at its intersections with Blaine, Cadillac and Florence Streets, and on Cass Avenue at Florence intersection.

Turning-movements were recorded at the intersections of Oakland Avenue with Cass-Montcalm, Johnson; and Allison-Baldwin Streets; and at the intersection of Cass Avenue and Johnson Street. Stoppage of left lanes due to left turns were recorded as in the other cities.

Speed and delay routes for the "before" study were the following (Figure 20):

1-A. From the intersection of Oakland Avenue and Northview Street, southeastbound via Oakland, to the intersection of Oakland and Saginaw.

2-A. From the intersection of Oakland and Saginaw, northwestbound via Oakland, to the intersection of Oakland and Northview.

3-A. From the intersection of Oakland and Northview, southeastbound via Oakland-Cass, to the intersection of Cass and Wide Track Drive.

4-A. Counter-clockwise, closed loop starting and ending at the intersection of East Howard and Baldwin Streets, via Howard-Johnson-Norton-Sanderson-Oakland-Baldwin.

On each of the above routes, runs were made during four consecutive days. On the first day three runs were made during the afternoon peak only; on each of the second and third days three runs were made during the morning peak, two during the noon peak, and three during the afternoon peak; and on the fourth day three morningand two afternoon-peak runs were made.

The first "after" surveys taken in 1967 were not analyzed, as explained in the report, and will not be discussed here.

The second "after" surveys were taken between August 5 and 15,1968 . Only 52 of the initial 59 volume stations were used due to one-way traffic. At six of these, counts were continuous for the whole survey period. The remaining were 48 -hour stations which were in operation between August 5 and 8 .

Gap surveys were repeated at the earlier four intersections, and turning-movement counts were also repeated at the other earlier group from forr intersections.

Speed and delay routes for the "after"' survey were the following (Figure 20):

1-B. From the intersection of Oakland and Northview, southeastbound via Oakland-Cass, to the intersection of Cass and Wide Track.

2-B. From the intersection of Oakland and Saginaw, northwestbound via Oakland, to the intersection of Oakland and Northview.

3-B. Clockwise, closed loop starting and ending at the intersection of East Howard and Baldwin, via Baldwin-Allison-Close-Sander-son-Norton-Johnson-Howard.

On each of the above routes, runs were made during three consecutive days, and on each day three runs were made for each of the morning, noon and afternoon peaks.

## CITY OF PORT HURON

Survey procedures were similar to the other three cities. The "before" surveys were taken from August 31 to September 11, 1964: - Volumes were recorded at 78 stations withir three separate traffic corridors. Eight of these were key stations for continuous counts for the duration of the whole survey, the rest being 48 -hour stations which recorded sometime between August 31 and September 11.

Gap surveys were conducted only on Griswold Street at its intersections with $7 \mathrm{ch}, 16 \mathrm{th}, 20$ th and 22 nd Streets. Turning-movement counts were taken at the intersections of Griswold Street with Military and 24th Streets, and included records of left-lane stoppage.

Speed and delay routes during the "before"' surveys were (Figure 26):

1-A. From the intersection of Lapeer and 32nd Streets, eastbound via Lapeer and Water Streets, to the intersection of Water and Military Streets.

2-A. From the intersection of Water and Military; westbound via Water and Lapeer, to the intersection of Lapeer and 32nd.

3-A. From the intersection of Griswold and 32nd Streets, eastbound via Griswold, to the intersection of Griswold and Military.

4-A. From the intersection of Griswold and Military, westbound via Griswold, to the intersection of Griswold and 32nd.

The above routes were driven during four consecutive days. On the first day only three after-noon-peak runs were made for each of the routes. During the second and third days three runs were made for each of the three peak-periods on each route, and on the fourth day, morning and noon runs were completed by three runs for each peak.

Cross-street travel-time surveys were only done for the Griswold-Oak corridor. Vehicle runs, northbound and southbound, were made between

Chestnut and Minnie Streets on the following streets:

1. Military Street
2. 7 th Street
3. 10th Street
4. 13th Street
5. 24 th Street

These runs were completed during three consecutive days. During the first day two runs were accomplished in both directions on each street during each of the three peak periods. During each of the next two days, only one run in each direction on each street was completed for each peak.

The "after" surveys were completed from September 11 to 21,1967 . Volume stations were reduced to 72 in number, the key stations remaining eight as before. Gap studies were repeated at the four intersections.

Oak Street in the eastbound direction was added to the speed-and-delay survey routes (Figure 27), and conversely no eastbound runs were made on

Griswold Street. Since the Lapeer-Water Streets route was abandoned as a state route, and no change in the directional operation was involved, only one survey run in each direction on this route was made for each peak period. On Griswold and Oak Streets test runs were made during three consecutive days, and each day three runs were made during each of the peak periods.

Cross-street travel-time surveys were repeated, for the "'after" study, on the five routes earlier established. On Military. Street these surveys were completed during a total of four days. During the first day, one morning run and two noon runs were logged in each direction. The following two days two runs were made each day for each direction during each peak. The last day's runs were made four days later, and one morning run and two afternoon runs were logged.

Travel-time runs on 7 th, 10 th, 13 th and 24 th Streets were accomplished with a similar schedule and took four days to complete, but faulty recording made the exact survey dates unavailable. Six runs were made in each direction for each peak period.

## APPENDIX 2 <br> Approximate Calculation of <br> NUMBER OF VEHICLES WHICH CAN UTILIZE VARIOUS GAP-SIZE GROUPS

Basic Assumptions: 1. No gap shorter than 6 seconds is acceptable.
2. Headway used by each car statting from stopped position is 4 seconds.

Gap-size Group I: $\quad 6$ to 10 seconds
Assumed average gap size $=8$ 'seconds
Headway used by 1 cat $=\frac{4}{4}$ seconds (deduct)
Gap Group II: 10 to 15 seconds
Assumed average size $\quad=12$ seconds
Headway used by 2 cars $=2 \times 4=\frac{8}{4}$ seconds (deduct)

Group III: 15 to 20 seconds
Assumed average size $=17$ seconds

Headway used by 3 cars $=3 \times 4=12$ seconds (deduct) 5 seconds not usable

Group IV: More than 20 seconds
Minimum size $\quad=21$ seconds
Headway used by 5 cars $=5 \times 4=20$ seconds (deduct) 1 second not usable

## COMPUTER PROCESSING FLOW CHART
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## APPENDIX 4 - - SHEET 2

## TITLES OF COLUMNS IN TABLE I

"Before" Period:

1. Count Station
2. Time
3. Travel Distance (Miles)
4. Moving Lanes
5. Date
6. 15-Minute Volume
7. Hourly Volume
8. Hourly Volume Per Lane
9. 15-Minute Vehicle-Miles
10. Hourly Vehicle-Miles
"After" Period:
11. Travel Distance (Miles)
12. Moving Lanes
13. Date
14. 15-Minute Volume
15. Hourly Volume
16. Hourly Volume Per Lane
17. 15-Minute Vehicle-Miles
18. Hourly Vehicle-Miles

Changes:
19. 15-Minute Volume
20. Hourly Volume
21. Hourly Volume Per Lane

1. Count Station

## OPERATIOMAL ASPECTS OF OME-WAY AND THO-WAY STREETS

fable it - summary of vemiclempiles of travel
GROUP 2

TIME
15-MIMUTE VEHICEEMILES
AEFURE PERIUD AFTEK PERIOD
Change

| 06.00 | -06.15 | Am |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 06.15 | - 06.30 A | AM |
| 06.30 | - 06.45 | AN |
| 06.45 | - 67.00 | A A |
| 07.00 | - 47.15 | Am |
| 07.15 | - c.7.30 | A ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 07.30 | - 47.6) | $A^{\text {m }}$ |
| 07.45 | - 68.00 | AM |
| 08.00 | - 0t. ${ }^{\text {ds }}$ | $A{ }^{\text {A }}$ |
| 08.15 | - 68.36 | Am |
| 48. 30 | - 08.4s | $A^{\text {m }}$ |
| 04.45 | - 0\%.30 | AM |
| 11.00 | - 11.15 | AM |
| 11.15 | - 11.30 | ${ }^{\text {Am }}$ |
| 11.30 | - 11.45 | $A{ }^{\text {A }}$ |
| 11.45 | - 12.00 | PM |
| 12.00 | - 12.13 | PM |
| 12.15 | - 12.30 | H9 |
| 12.30 | - 12.45 | PH |
| 12.43 | - נ1.0n | ${ }^{\text {p }}$ |
| 63.00 | - U3.15 | $\mathrm{P}^{\text {ma }}$ |
| U3.15 | -03.30 | $\mathrm{P}^{(1)}$ |
| 03.30 | - 03.43 | P ${ }^{\text {m }}$ |
| U3.45 | - 14.00 | Pm |
| 04.00 | - 44.15 | Pm |
| 04.15 | - 04.30 | Pm |
| 44.30 | - 4.4 .45 | PM |
| 44.45 | - (i5.03) | PM |
| Ub.us | - 45.15 | PM |
| (3).15 | - 13.36. | pm |
| Cb.3C | - (3.4) | $+\infty$ |
| (b)43 | - 06.06 | PM |


| 83.0602 | 100.5817 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 145.6342 | 182.9280 |
| $\overline{278.9123}$ | 284.8384 |
| 324.8732 | 272.7741 |
| 246.9527 | 233.9110 |
| 268.3260 | 324.230\% |
| 493.2373 | 512.4063 |
| 661.0223 | 599.4144 |
| 510.2288 | 464.5305 |
| 466.5250 | 403.4416 |
| 461.9214 | 385.6293 |
| 4548.8626 | 352.1806 |
| 511.4322 | 357.8741 |
| \$11.8417 | 364.9342 |
| 580.1077 | 402.7542 |
| 561.3297 | 550.7291 |
| 541.5834 | 506.1947 |
| 484.4245 | 384.7488 |
| 440.1481 | 424.6352 |
| 470.6310 | 442.2656 |
| 489.3273 | 516.1893 |
| 533.0450 | 509.5518 |
| 042.0040 | 566.6234 |
| 635.2881 | 530.3440 |
| 6 ¢0.6892 | 535.8008 |
| 573.1616 | 582.7337 |
| 640.5422 | 599.0と10 |
| 636.1143 | 611.2223 |
| 710.0013 | 662.1968 |
| 618.7114 | 534.5443 |
| 4.34 .3514 | 471.2143 |
| 428.1646 | 363.1782 |
| 15584.6547 | 14007.7919 |



OPERATIONAE ASPEGTS DF GMEDAMY AMD TMOMAY STREETS TARLE III - SUMmARY GF TRAFFEC VILUMES EEAVImG THE STUDY AREA

GROUP 28
fime
before period
15-mimult volumes
AFIER PERIOD
cammes

| 227 | 276 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 369 | \$72 |
| 698 | 761 |
| 786 | 734 |
| 629 | \$99 |
| 721 | 756 |
| 1203 | 1328 |
| 1553 | 1591 |
| 1156 | 1173 |
| \$1 | 963 |
| 763 | 990 |
| 271 | 881 |
| 856 | 898 |
| 943 | 920 |
| 1134 | 962 |
| 1124 | 1090 |
| 1205 | 1279 |
| 1129 | 1039 |
| 1122 | 1061 |
| 1236 | 1195 |
| 1148 | 1382 |
| 1263 | 1212 |
| 1422 | 1448 |
| 1384 | 1390 |
| 1325 | 1331 |
| 1268 | 1293 |
| 1426 | 1451 |
| 1529 | 1461 |
| 1664 | 1812 |
| 1593 | 1399 |
| 1154 | 1245 |
| 961 | 872 |
| 34713 | 3526\% |

$22907-06060$

TOP解
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fperapional. aspecis of onf-gay ano twomay strefts
table $V$ - zambiUur summary of vfhicleomiles of fravfl - kalamazoo

## GROUP 2

TIME
$12=01 \mathrm{AM}$
$01=02 \mathrm{AM}$
$02=03 \mathrm{AM}$
$03=04 \mathrm{AM}$
$04=05 \mathrm{AM}$
$05=06 \mathrm{AM}$
$06=07 \mathrm{AM}$
$07=08 \mathrm{AM}$
$08=09 \mathrm{AM}$
$09=10$
$10=11 \mathrm{AM}$
$11=12 \mathrm{PM}$
$12=01 \mathrm{PM}$
$01=02 \mathrm{PM}$
$02=03 \mathrm{PM}$
$03=00 \mathrm{PM}$
$04=05 \mathrm{PM}$
$05=06 \mathrm{PM}$
$06=07 \mathrm{PM}$
$07=08 \mathrm{PM}$
$08=09 \mathrm{PM}$
$09=10$
hefore pfrioo
983.5770
399.3350
274.0447
123.9435
92.8916
151.0948
770.3092
1552.7424
1673.0802
1570.0721
1717.9734
2004.0629
1939.1642
1681.1243
1640.1855
2237.1746
2378.0430
2144.7125
1574.2430
1450.7132
1157.8755
1004.2835
687.0970
838.2067
29233.3003
223.4759
150.月96
102.556 A
59.9038
59.903 C
67.4355
152.4527
$152.4 \times 27$
812.1930
1587.6881
1587.6481
1507.1051
1284.4770
1310.0388
1510.7553
1510.7553
1670.1718
1670.1718
1555.2982
1588.3726
1588.372
2051.4373
2051.4373
2258.0750

225 B .0750
1981.7770
1981.7779
1200.1797
1362.9790
1083.2 ABA
852.3630
584.5454
584.5454
917.3377
25434.5717

Change
-240.1015 $-198.4398$ $-121.5079$
$-64.0397$
$-25.4581$ +7683
+.7681
-35.A 438
+35.6838
+34.9257
$-165.9751$
$-285.5851$
$-407.9348$
.493 .3076
-2080.0924
-268.9924
-125.8268
-125.8268
-51.0629
-51.8629
-185.7373
-185.7373
-120.6180
-120.6180
-162.9746
-167.9746
-314.1133
-314.1133
-87.7842
$-74 . A 089$
-151.8805
$-102.5316$
-220.A690
$-3798.7286$
nferatidnal aspects of onf-may and thomay strefts table vi - 24 ohtur summary of praffic volumes leaviag the stuny area o kalamazot

GROUP 29

PIIME

compusite 24 ha tital

GEFORE PERIDO
20-hoIn VILHMEs

## 1071 077 <br> 077 089 <br> 489 <br> 344 249 <br> 249 434 <br> 634 1908 3791 <br> 3791 3491 <br> 3491 3153 <br> 3153 3567 <br> 1567 10 <br> 450 ? <br> 40nt <br> 3日Ra <br> $50 A B$ <br> $5<70$ 8980 <br> 9940 1807 <br> 1807 3630 <br> 3630 380 <br> $\rightarrow 870$ <br> 13 AO <br> 13 AO 1058 <br> BROAT

AFtER PERIDD
CHANGE

| 530 | -532 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 310 | -367 |
| 25a | -233 |
| 147 | -204 |
| 193 | -58 |
| 4.40 | + ${ }_{\text {a }}$ |
| 2170 | $+202$ |
| 4070 | - 28 A |
| 375a | - 205 |
| 3300 | -197 |
| 3490 | -73 |
| 3774 | -14? |
| 4404 | -19A |
| 4044 | -17 |
| 4150 | -275 |
| S26? | $+194$ |
| 5304 | +3A |
| 5200 | - 7 A9 |
| 3045 | -762 |
| 350 A | -124 |
| 279A | - 7 R |
| 213 A | \$59 |
| 1041 | -125 |
| 100\%. | -301 |

A485)

$-1215$

## APPENDIX 10: ACCIDENT RECORD FORM

## Study on Operational Aspects of One-Way and Two-Way Streets ONE-YEAR ACCIDENT RECORD <br> $\frac{\text { Two }}{\text { One }}$ Way Operation Phase

Period $\qquad$ Thru $\qquad$ Street: $\qquad$ City:

| Accident Report No. | Severity | ```Intersection or Midblock``` | Type <br> (*) | Date | Day of Week | Time | Weather | Pav't. <br> Cond. | Daylight or Dark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\cdot$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(*) See coding sheet

## APPENDIX 11

Study on Operational Aspects of One-Way and Two-Way Streets

ACCIDENT-TYPE CODES
1-Rear-end, straight
2 - Rear-end involving left-turn
3 - Rear-end involving right-turn
4-Head-on, straight
5 - Head-on involving left-turn
6 - Sideswipe, sare ditection
7 -Sideswipe, opposite direction
8- Right angle
9 - Involving parking or parked vehicle
$10 \rightarrow$ Hitting fixed object
11 - Backing vehicle
12 - Hitting pedestrian

Time period before conversion to one-way operation: January 31, 1964 thru January 30, 1965
Time period after conversion to one-way operation (excluding a period of three months for driver acclimatization and readjustment of traffic devices): April 30, 1965 thru April 29, 1966
"Before" period accidents were studied on following streets:

| Street | From (Inclusive) |  | To (Inclusive) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Oakland | Stanley Intersection |  | Wisconsin Intersection |  |
| 2. Jefferson | Pine |  | Grand | " |
| 3. Sheridan | Center St. |  | Cedar | " |
| 4. Saginaw | Belt Line |  | Cedar | " |
| 5. Stanley | Genesee I | ersection | Hyland | " |
| 6. Durant | Genesee | " | Hyland | $"$ |
| 7. Verlinden | Genesee | " | Hyland | " |
| 8. Cleo | Verlinden | " | Hyland | $\cdots$ |
| 9. Cawood | Genesee | " | Hyland | ", |
| 10. Comfort | Saginaw | " | Hyland | " |
| 11. Drexel | Genesee | " | Jenison | " |
| 12. Jenison | Genesee | " | Hyland | " |
| 13. Westmoreland | Genesee | " | Hyland | " |
| 14. Carey | Genesee | ',' | Saginaw | " |
| 15. Clayton | Saginaw | " | Hyland | " |
| 16. Bartlet | Genesee | , | Saginaw | " |
| 17. Holten | Oakland | " | Hyland | " |
| 18. Clyde | Oakland | " | Hyland | " |
| 19. Logan | Lapeer | ', | Daleford | " |
| 20. Princeton | Saginaw | ", | Daleford | " |
| 21. Summerville | Oakland | ". | Daleford | " |
| 22. Butler | Lapeer | , | Saginaw | " |
| 23. Chicago | Saginaw | " | Daleford | ", |
| 24. Edgewood | Oakland | " | Daleford | " |
| 25. Wisconsin | Saginaw | , | Daleford | " |
| 26. Sycamore | Lapeer | ", | Bluff | " |
| 27. Leonard | Madison | " | Jefferson | " |
| 28. Pine | Lapeer | ', | Bluff | " |
| 29. Chestnut | Lapeer | "' | Lawler | " |
| 30. Walnut | Lapeer | " | Kilborn | " |
| 31. Seymour | Lapeer | " | Kilborn | " |
| 32. Capitol | Lapeer | " | Kilborn | " |
| 33. Washington | Lapeer | " | Kilborn | " |
| 34. Grand | Lapeer | " | Saginaw | " |
| 35. Center | Saginaw | " | Sheridan | " |
| 36. Cedar | Saginaw | " | Sheridan | ", |

"After" period accidents were studied on following streets:

| Street | From (Inclusive) |  | To (Inclusive) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Oakland | Stanley Intersection |  | Cedar Intersection |  |
| 2. Saginaw | Belt Line R.R. |  | Cedar | "' |
| 3. Stanley | Genesee Intersection |  | Hyland | " |
| 4. Durant | Genesee | , | Hyland | ', |
| 5. Verlinden | Genesee | , | Hyland | " |
| 6. Cleo | Verlinden | " | Hyland | " |
| 7. Cawood | Genesee | " | Hyland | ', |
| 8. Comfort | Genesee | " | Hyland | " |
| 9. Drexel | Genesee | " | Jenison | " |
| 10. Jenison | Genesee | " | Hyland | " |
| 11. Westmoreland | Genesee | , | Hyland | " |
| 12. Carey | Genesee | " | Saginaw | " |
| 13. Clayton | Saginaw | " | Hyland | " |
| 14. Bartlet | Genesee | , | Saginaw | ", |
| 15. Holten | Oakland | ,". | Hyland | " |
| 16. Clyde | Oothand | " | Hyland | " |
| 17. Logan | Lapeer | ", | Daleford | " |
| 18. Princeton | Saginaw | ", | Daleford | " |
| 19. Summerville | Oakland | , | Daleford | ,' |
| 20. Butler | Lapeer | , | Saginaw | " |
| 21. Chicago | Saginaw | " | Daleford | ", |
| 22. Edgewood | Oakland | " | Daleford | " |
| 23. Wisconsin | Saginaw | ,' | Daleford | " |
| 24. Sycamore | Lapeer | , | Bluff | " |
| 25. Leonard | Madison | " | Oakland | " |
| 26. Pine | Lapeer | " | Bluff | " |
| 27. Chestnut | Lapeer | , | Kilborn | " |
| 28. Walnut | Lapeer | " | Kilborn | ." |
| 29. Seymour | Lapeer | " | Kilborn | " |
| 30. Capitol | Lapeer | , | Kilborn | " |
| 31. Washington | Lapeer | " | Kilborn | " |
| 32. Grand | Lapeer | " | Dead end | N . of |
| 33. Center Street | Saginaw | " | Oakland | ters |
| 34. Cedar | Saginaw | , | Oakland | " |

## APPENDIX 13

## CITY OIF LANSING

Intersection Accidents in the Study Area
(One-Year Periods)

| Intersection |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Two-Way } \\ \text { Phase } \\ \text { (Jan. 31, 1964 - } \\ \text { Jan. 30, 1965) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | One-Way Initial Phase (Ap. 30, 1965 Ap. 29, 1966) |  | One.Way <br> Final Phase <br> (Aug. 14, 1969- <br> Aug. 13, 1970) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Property Damage Accidents | Injury <br> Accidents | Property Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents | Property Damage Accidents | Injury <br> Accidents |
| Saginaw | @ Belt Line RR | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | - | - |
| " | "Stanley | 4 | - | 2 | 5 | 9 | 2 |
| " | " Durant | 4 | 1 | 5 | - | 3 | 1 |
| " | "Verlinden (S) | 11 | 2 | 20 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| " | 'Cawood | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - |
| " | "Comfort | 4 | - | - | - | 2 | 2 |
| " | "Jenison (S) | 12 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 6 | 2 |
| " | "Westmoreland | 1 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 1 |
| " | "Clayton | - | 2 | 3 | - | 3 | 1 |
| " | "Carey | - | - | 2 | - | - | - |
| " | "Bartlett | - | - | 2 | - | - | - |
| " | "Logan (S) | 18 | 5 | 18 | 3 | 17 | 7 |
| " | "Princeton | 5 | 1 | 14 | 3 | 7 | 1 |
| $\cdots$ | "Butler-Chicago (S) | 11 | 2 | 7 | - | 3 | 1 |
| " | "Wisconsin | 1 | - | 3 | - | - | - |
| " | "'Sycamore | 3 | 2 | 4 | - | $\overline{7}$ | - |
| " | $\cdots$ Pine (S) | 7 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 7 |  |
| " | "Chestnut | 3 | 1 | 2 | - | 3 | 2 |
|  | "Walnut (S) | 6 | 3 | 11 | 2 | 7 | - |
| " | "Seymour | 14 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 9 | - |
| " | "Capitol (S) | 13 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 9 | - |
| " | "Washington (S) | 14 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 1 |
| " | "Grand (S-A) | 3 | - | 12 | 5 | 21 | 9 |
| " | " Spur RR | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| " | "Center | 3 | - | 6 | - | - | - |
| " | "Cedar (S) | 34 | 9 | 23 | 10 | 42 | 10 |
| Oakland | @ Stanley | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| " | "Cleo | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| " | " Cawood | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | - |
| " | " Comfort | 1 | - | - | 1 | 2 | - |
| " | "Jenison | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| " | "Westmoreland | 3 | 2 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 |
| " | "Clayton | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| " | "Logan (S-A) | - | 1 | 14 | 3 | 20 | 8 |
| " | "Princeton | 1 | - | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| " | "Summerville | - | - | 2 | - | - | - |
|  | "Chicago | 1 | - | 5 | - | 3 | - |
| "' | "Edgewood | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| " | "Wisconsin | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| " | "Leonard | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| " | " Pine (S-A) | - . | - - | 5 | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| " | " Chestnut | - | - | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| " | " Walnut (S-A) | - | _ | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| " | "Seymour | - | - | 6 | 6 | 5 | 8 |
| " | "Capitol (S-A) | - | - | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| " | "Washington (S-A) | 2 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 7 | 4 |
| " | " Grand (S-A) | - | - | 5 | 1 | 5 | - |


| APPENDIX 13 - Sheet 2 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Tw } \\ \mathrm{Ph} \\ \text { (Jan. } 31 \\ \text { Jan. } 3 \end{array}$ | Way <br> se <br> 1964 - <br> 1965) |  | Way Phase 1965 1966) | Fina <br> (Aug. <br> Aug. | Way <br> Phase <br> 1969 - <br> 1970) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Property <br> Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents | Property <br> Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents | Property <br> Damage Accidents | Injury <br> Accidents |
| " "Center | 5 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 6 |
| " "Cedar (S) | 20 | 2 | 27 | 6 | 15 | 2 |
| Durant @ Genesee | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Cleo @ Hyland | 1 | _ | - | - | - | - |
| Cawood @ Hyland | 1. | . - | - | - | - | - |
| Bartlett@ Genesee | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Church Court @ Logan | - | - | 2 | - | - | - |
| Logan @ Rose Ct. \& Englewood | 4 | - | 12 | 3 | - | 1 |
| Logan @ Kirby | - | - | - | - | 1 | - |
| Englewood @ Princeton | - | - | 2 | - | - | - |
| Englewood @ Chicago | - | - | - | - | 1 | - |
| Butler @ Lapeer | 1 | - | 2 | - | - | - |
| Chestnut @ Lapeer | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Capitol @ Kilborn | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Capitol @ Madison | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - |
| Capitol @ Lapeer | - | - | 4 | 1 | - | - |
| Genesee @ Verlinden | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Genesee@ Westmoreland | . | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Hyland @ Jenison | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - |
| Hyland @ Westmoreland | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Genesee @ Jenison | 2 | - | 6 | 3 | - | - |
| Drexel @ Genesee | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Drexel @ Jenison | 2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lapeer@ Logan | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | - |
| Lapeer @ Seymour | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - |
| Lapeer @ Pine | - | - | - | 1 | -- | - |
| Lapeer @ Sycamore | 2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lapeer @ Walnut | 3 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lapeer @ Washington | 7 | 1 | 10 | 1 | - | - |
| Chicago @ Daleford | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Daleford @ Logan | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | - | - |
| Daleford@ Princeton | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Kilborn@ Walnut | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Kilborn @ Seymour | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | -. |
| Kilbom@ Washington | 4 | - | 3 | - | - | - |
| Madison@ Washington | 2 | 1 | - | - | 2 | - |
| Walnut @ Madison | - | 1 | - | - | - - | - |
| Madison @ Seymour | - | - | 2 | - | 2 | - |
| Pine @ Madison | 2 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Grand @ Lapeer | 1 | - | 2 | - | - | . - |
| Grand @ Madison | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Center @ Monroe | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cedar @ Monroe | 1 | 1 | - | - | 5 | - |
| Total intersection accidents | 258 | 81 | 341 | 105 | 259 | 92 |

(S) Signal-controlled intersection
(S-A) Intersection was signal-controlled during the one-way phases only.


## KALAMAZOO ACCIDENT STUDY

Time period before conversion to one-way operation:
October 10, 1964 thru October 9, 1965

Time period after conversion to one-way operation (considering a period of three months for driver acclimatization and readjustment of traffic devices): January 10, 1966 thru Januray 9, 1967
"Before" period accidents were studied on the following streets:

| Street | From (Inclusive) |  | To(Inclusive) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. North St. | Summer Intersection |  | Gull Rd. Intersection |  |
| 2. Kalamazoo | Douglas | " | Michigan | " |
| 3. Water | Westnedge | " | Kalamazoo | " |
| 4. Main | Thompson | " | Michigan | " |
| 5. Michigan | Lovell | " | King Hwy | " |
| 6. South St. | Michigan | " | Pitcher | " |
| 7. Lovell | Michigan | , | Pitcher | " |
| 8. Douglas | Main | " | North | " |
| 9. Carmel | Academy | , | Main | " |
| 10. Stuart | Main | , | North | " |
| 11. Catherine | icademy | " | Main | " |
| 12. Main Ct . | South end | , | Main | " |
| 13. Woodward | Main Inters | ction | North | , |
| 14. Elm | Main | " | North | " |
| 15. Elm Pl. | Elm | " | Eleanor | " |
| 16. Allen | Michigan | " | Eleanor | " |
| 17. Old Orchard Pl. | South end |  | Eleanor | " |
| 18. Arcadia Ct . | North end |  | Westnedge | " |
| 19. Eleanor | Eleanor St. | " | Kalamazoo | " |
| 20. Westnedge | Lovell |  | North St. | " |
| 21. Cooley | Water | " | Willard | " |
| 22. Park | Lovell | " | North St. | " |
| 23. Church | Academy | " | North St. | " |
| 24. Rose | Lovell | " | North St. | , |
| 25. Burdick | Water | , | North St. | ' |
| 26. Portage | Michigan | " | Lovell | " |
| 27. Edwards | North St. | " | South St. | " |
| 28. Pitcher | North St. | " | Lovell | " |
| 29. Porter | North St. | , | Michigan | " |
| 30. Walbridge | North St. | " | Michigan | " |
| 31. Hatrison | Kalamazoo | , | North St. | " |
| 32. Mitchell | Kalamazoo | " | Willard | " |
| 33. Greenwich | Kalamazoo | " | Willard | " |
| 34. Eleanor | Elm | " | Burdick | " |

"After" period accidents were studied on the following streets:

Items 1 thru 14 same as for the "before" period.

Items 17 and 18 same as for the "before" period.

Items 20 thru 33 same as for the "before" period.

Street
15. Elm Pl.
16. Allen
19. Eleanor P1.
34. Eleanor
35. Eleanor
36. Michikal
37. New Connector

From (Inclusive)
Elm Intersection
Michigan ",
South End
Elm Intersection
West End East of Michikal
Main and Michigan Intersection

Elm Intersection

To (Inclusive)
East End
North End
Kalamazoo Intersection
East End West of Michikal
Burdick Intersection
Kalamazoo and Westnedge
Intersection
Michigan Intersection

North End
Kalamazoo Intersection
East End West of Michikal
Burdick Intersection
Kalamazoo and Westnedge Intersection
Michigan Intersection

APPENDIX 16
CITY OF KALAMAZOO
Intersection Accidents in the Study Area

| Intersection |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Michigan | @ Lovell | (S) |
| " | " South | (S) |
| " | " Main | (S) |
| " | ''Allen |  |
| " | "Westnedge | (S) |
| " | " Park | (S) |
| " | "' Church |  |
| " | " Rose | (S) |
| "' | "Burdick | (S) |
| " | " Portage | (S-B) |
| " | "'Edwards | (S) |
| " | "Pitcher | (S) |
| " | "Porter |  |
| " | "'Walbridge |  |
| " | "Kalamazoo | (S-B) |
| " | " Harrison |  |
| " | "King | (S) |


| One.Y ear ''Befor | Period | One-Y ear "After" | Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Properfy Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents | Property Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents |
| 34 | 4 | 24 | 7 |
| 2 | - | - | - |
| 15 | 3 | 21 | 6 |

Kalamazoo@ Douglas

| "Stuart |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| ", Woodward |  |
| " Elm |  |
| " Westnedge | (S) |
| " Park | (S) |
| "' Church |  |
| "Rose | (S) |
| " Burdick | (S) |
| "Edwards | (S) |
| "Pitcher | (S) |
| "Porter \& Water |  |
| " Walbridge |  |

"' "Stuart
" '"Woodward
"' "Elm
" "Westnedge
(S)
", ", Edwards
" "Pitcher
" "Porter
" "Harrison
" "Gull
" '"Summer
Eleanor@Elm
Eleanor @ Church
Eleanor @ Cooley
Water@ Church
South @ Burdick
South @ Henriett
Lovell@ Burdick
(S)

Lovell @ John

| APPENDIX 16 - Sheet 2 |  | One-Year "Before" Period |  | One.Year "After" Period |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection |  | Property Damage Accidents | Injury <br> Accidents | Property Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents |
| Lovell @ Henriett |  | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Lovell @ Jasper |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Main @ Douglas | (S-B) | 15 | - | 4 | - |
| Main @ Stuart |  | 3 | - | 6 | - |
| Main @ Catherine |  | 2 | - | 2 | - |
| Main @ Woodward |  | 4 | - | 6 | - |
| Main @ Elm |  | 5 | , | 7 | - |
| Douglas @ Forbes |  | - | 1 | 1 | - |
| Douglas @ Jefferson |  | 2 | - | - | 1 |
| Catherine @ Academy |  | - | 1 | - - | - |
| Westnedge @ Lovell | (S) | 7 | 1 | 9 | 1 |
| " " South | (S) | 5 | 1 | 21 | 1 |
| " "A Academy |  | 7 | - | 9 | - |
| " "Water |  | 5 | 1 | 6 | - |
| ", "Willard |  | 2 | 1 | - | - |
| "' "Ransom |  | 5 | - | - | 2 |
| Park @ Lovell | (S) | 15 | 2 | 14 | 2 |
| " " South | (S) | 12 | 1 | 8 | 2 |
| " "Academy |  | 11 | - | 4 | 1 |
| " " Water |  | 8 | - | 19 | 1 |
| " "'Eleanor |  | 5 | - | 3 | 4 |
| " "Willard |  | 3 | - | 1 | - |
| " "Ransom |  | 3 | 2 | 3 | - |
| Rose @ Lovell | (S) | 11 | 3 | 13 | , |
| " " South | (S) | 10 | 3 | 14 | 1 |
| " "Water | (S) | 10 | 1 | 8 | 1 |
| "' "Eleanor |  | 6 | - | 5 | 1 |
| " "'Ransom |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | - |
| Burdick@ Water | (S) | 5 | 1 | 2 | - |
| " ''Ransom |  | 3 | - | 3 | - |
| " "'Eleanor |  | - | - | 3 | - |
| Edwards@ South |  | 4 | - | 4 | 2 |
| " "Water | (S) | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| " '"Ransom |  | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Pitcher © Lovell |  | 1 | 1 |  | - |
| "' ' Spring |  | 4 | - | 1 | - |
| ", ''South |  | 8 | 1 | 2 | - |
| " '" Water | (S) | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| " "Ransom |  | 1 | - | 6 | 2 |
| Porter @ Ransom |  | - | - | 3 | 1 |
| Walbridge @ Ransom |  | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| Church @ Ransom |  | - | - | - | 3 |
| Harrison @ Ransom |  | 1 | - |  | - |
| " " Gull |  | 4 | - | 3 | , |
| Portage@ Lovell | (S) | 6 | - | 9 | 1 |
| " " Spring |  | 1 | - | 2 | 1 |
| " " South | (S) | 13 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| Total intersection accidents |  | 604 | 112 | 605 | 111 |

(S) Signal-controlled intersection
(S-B) Intersection was signal-controlled during the "before" period only.


## APPENDIX 18

## PONTIAC ACCIDENT STUDY

Time periad before conversion to one-way operation:
May 18, 1966 thru May 17, 1967

Time period after conversion to one-way operation (considering a period of three months for driver acclimatization and readjustment of traffic devices): July 5, 1968 thru July 4, 1.969
"Before" and "After" period accidents were studied on following streets:

| Street | From (Inclusive) |  | To (Inclusive) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Oakland | Northwest City Limits |  | Wide Track Blvd. Intersection |  |
| 2. Cass | Oakland-Montcalm Intersection |  | Wide Track Blvd. Intersection |  |
| 3. Montcalm | Oakland-Cass Intersection |  | Corwin Intersection |  |
| 4. Gerdon | Oakland Intersection |  | Corwin " |  |
| 5. Blaine | Oakland | " | Jefferson | " |
| 6. Euclid | Oakland | " | Jefferson | ,' |
| 7. Summit | Oakland | , | Jefferson | , |
| 8. Cadillac | Oakland | " | Putnam | " |
| 9. Adelaide | Oakland | " | Howard | " |
| 10. Wisner | Cass | " | Oakland | " |
| 11. Johnson | Norton | ", | Howard | , |
| 12. Florence | Norton | " | Qakland | " |
| 13. Baldwin | Howard | , | Oakland | " |
| 14. Allison | Close | " | Oakland | " |
| 15. Sanderson | Norton | " | Oakland | , |
| 16. Clark | Oakland | " | Stockwell | " |
| 17. Wide Track | Oakland | " | Cass | " |
| 18. Lafayette | Cass | " | Jacokes | " |


| Intersection |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Oakland @ West Blvd. |  |
|  | " Pershing |
| "' | " Sarasota |
| "' | " Inglewood |
| " | ' Orlando |
| " | "' Pensecola |
| " | '" Monticello |
| "' | " Ojista |
|  | " Kinney |
| '' | " Northview |
|  | " Lounsbury |
|  | " Cass-Montcalm (S) |
| " | " Gerdon |
| " | ' Blaine |
| " | "' Euclid |
| " | " Summit (S) |
| " | " Cadillac |
|  | " Adelaide |
|  | "W is ner |
|  | " Johrison (S) |
| " | " Florence |
|  | "Allison-Baldwin (S) |
| " | " Sanderson |
|  | "RR Grade Crossing |
|  | " Clark |
|  | "Wide Track Drive (S) |

Cass@ Wisner
" "Johnson (S)
"' '"Florence
" "S Sanderson
" " Wide Track Drive (S)
Montcalm@ Corwin
Blaine @ Jefferson
Euclid @ Jefferson
Summit @ Jefferson
Cadillac @ Putnam
Cadillac@ Pingree
Johnson @ Norton
Johnson @ Howard
Johnson @ Pine Grove
Florence @ Norton
Florence @ Pine Grove
Allison-Baldwin@ Howard
Allison-Baldwin @ Close
Sanderson @ Norton
Sanderson @ Close
Clark @ Stockwell
Wide Track Dr. @ Lafayette
Total intersection accidents

Intersection Accidents in the Study Area

| One-Year "Before" | Period | One-Year "After" | " Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents | Property Damage Accidents | Injury <br> Accidents |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | - |
| - | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| - | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 2 | - | 1 |
| 5 | - | 3 | - |
| - | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| - | - | 1 | - |
| - | 1 | - | - |
| 4 | 1 | - | - |
| 24 | 10 | 19 | 4 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | - |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | - |
| - | 1 | - | - |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | - |
| 2 | - | 3 | - |
| 1 | - | - | 1 |
| - | - | 4 | - |
| 7 | 8 | 4 | 2 |
| 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 12 | 2 | 13 | 6 |
| 6 | 3 | 12 | 7 |
| 2 | - | 3 | 3 |
| 6 | 2 | 1 | - |
| 25 | 6 | 19 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | - |
| 15 | 4 | 10 | 5 |
| 1 | - | 3 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 22 | 10 |
| 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 |
| 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | - | - | - |
| - | 1 | - | 1 |
| 1 | - | 1 | - |
| 1 | - | - | - |
| 1 | - | - | - |
| 3 | - | 7 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | - |
| - | - | 1 | 1 |
| - | - | 2 | 1 |
| - | - | 1 | - |
| 5 | 5 | 8 | 1 |
| - | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | - | 1 |
| - | - | 2 | - |
| 1 | - | - | - |
| - | - | 5 | 3 |
| 151 | 75 | 172 | 75 |

(S) Signal-controlled intersection.
$\quad$ Street
Oakland NW of Cass-Montcalm
Oakland SE of Cass-Montcalm
Cass
Montcalm
Gerdon
Jefferson
Euclid
Summit
Cadillac
Wisner
Johnson
Florence
Allison-Baldwin
Sanderson
Clark
Wide Track Drive
Total Midblock Accidents

* Includes one fatality


## APPENDIX 20 CITY OF PONTIAC

Midblock Accidents in the Study Area

| One-Year "Befo | 'Period | One-Year "After | ' Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property Damage Acciden ts | Injury <br> Accidents | Property Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents |
| 5 | 4 | 11 | 4* |
| 13 | 5 | 13 | 5 |
| 3 | 1 | 15 | 6 |
| 1 | - | 2 | - |
| - | - | 1 | - |
| - | - | - | 1 |
| 1 | - | 2 | - |
| 3 | - | 3 | 1 |
| 1 | - | - | - |
| 1 | - | 1 | - |
| 3 | _ | 2 | - |
| 2 | - | 2 | - |
| - | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| - | - | - | 1 |
| 2 | - | 2 | - |
| 1 | 1 | - | 1 |
| 36 | 12 | 56 | $20^{*}$ |

* Includes one fatality


## APPENDIX 21

## PORT HURON ACCIDENT STUDY

Time period before conversion to one-way operation (before start of construction period):
January 19, 1964 thru January 18, 1965

Time period after conversion to one-way operation (considering a period of three months for driver acclimatization and readjustment of traffic devices):

January 19, 1967 thru January 18, 1968
"Before" and "after" period accidents were studied on following streets:

| Street | From (Inclusive) |  | To (Inclusive) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Lapeer | 32nd Street Intersection |  | Water Street Intersection |  |
| 2. Water | -Lapeer Street | " | 4th Street | " |
| 3. Botsford | Lapeer Street | " | John L. Street | " |
| 4. 24 th | Farrand Street | " | Lapeer Street | " |
| 5. Rural | Lapeer Street | " | G.T.W. RR crossing |  |
| 6. 20th | Martin Street | " | Lapeer Street | " |
| 7. 18th | Martin Street | " | Lapeer Street | " |
| 8. 17 th |  | " | Miller Street | ", |
| 9. 16 th | Jenks Street | " | Miller Street | " |
| 10. 15th | Jenks Street | " | Miller Street | ', |
| 11. 14 th | Jenks Street | " | Miller Street | " |
| 12. 13 th | Jenks Street | , | Pearl Street | " |
| 13. 12th | Jenks Street | " | Pearl Street | " |
| 14. 11 th | Gillett Street | , | Pearl Street | , |
| 15. 10th | Gillett Street | " | Pearl Street | " |
| 16. Lapeer Ct . | Lapeer Street | " | Ernst Street | " |
| 17. 9th | Howard Street | , | Lapeer Street | " |
| 18. 8th | Howard Street | " | Lapeer Street | " |
| 19. 7 th | Howard Street | " | Quay Street | " |
| 20. 6 th | Pine Street | " | Water Street | " |
| 21. Military | Pine Street | " | Quar Street | " |
| 22. Mitchell | 7th Street | , | 6th (Before-Period) |  |
| 23. Mitchell | 8 th Street | " | Military (After-period) |  |
| 24. Court | 20th Street | " | 4th Street Intersection |  |
| 25. Union | 24 th Street | " | Military Street | " |
| 26. Griswold | 32nd Street | " | 4th Street | " |
| 27. Oak | 27th Street | " | 8th Street | " |
| 28. 27 th | Oak Street | " | Griswold Street | " |
| 29. 26 th | Oak Street | " | Griswold Street | " |

Street
30. 25 th
31. 24 th
32. 23 rd
33. 22 nd
34. 21 st
35. 20 th
36. 19 th
37. 18 th
38. 17 th
39. 16 th
40. 15 th
41. 14 th
42. 13 th
43. 12 th
44. 11 th
45. 10 th
46. 9 th
47. 8 th
48. 7 th
49. Jay
50. 6 th
51. Military

| From (Inclusive) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Oak Street Intersection |  |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | ' |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | , |
| Division Street | ", |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | ", |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | '" |
| Division Street | " |
| Division Street | " |


| To (Inclusive) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Griswold Street | Intersection |
| White Street | ', |
| White Street | " |
| White Street | ,' |
| White Street | ,' |
| White Street | "' |
| White Street | " |
| White Street | " |
| White Street | " |
| White Street | " |
| White St reet | " |
| White Street | " |
| White Street | ', |
| White Street | " |
| White Street | , |
| White Street | " |
| White Street | " |
| White Street | " |
| White Street | " |
| Griswold Street | , |
| White Street | " |
| White Street | " |

Accidents Along Lapeer Avenue \& Water Street Corridor

| INTERSECTION ACCIDENTS: | One-Year "'Bef | " Period | One-Year '"After | 'Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Property Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents | Property Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents |
| Lapeer @ 32nd | 5 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| " "By Pass (S) | 10 | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| " ''Botsford | 3 | 1 | - | 1 |
| " " 24th (S) | 14 | 4 | 11. | - |
| "' "Rural | 5 | 1 | 8 | - |
| " '" 20th (S) | 3 | 3 | 6 | - |
| " '"18th | 2 | - | 3 | 1 |
| '" " 17th | 1 | - | 2 | - |
| " " 16th | 3 | - | 1 | - |
| " " 15th | 4 | - | 1 | - |
| " " 14th | 2 | 1 | - | 2 |
| " " 13th (S) | 11 | 2 | 9 | - |
| " " 12th | - | 2 | 1 | - |
| " '" 11th | - | 3 | 1 | - |
| " ' ' 10th (S) | 16 | 4 | 14 | 7 |
| " " "9th | 4 | 1* | 1 | - |
| " "8th | 5 | - | 1 | - |
| " " Water \& 7th (S) | 11 | - | 10 | - |
| Water @ 6th | 2 | - | 5 | - |
| " "'Military (S) | 10 | 3 | 18 | 5 |
| " " 4th | - | 1 | 1 | - |
| 24th @ Farrand | 4 | 1 | 6 | - |
| 22nd @ Farrand | - | - | 2 | - |
| 20th @ Farrand | - | _ | 1 | - |
| 18th @ Martin | - | - | 1 | - |
| 17th @ Miller | - | 1 | - | - |
| 14th @ Jenks | 1 | - | - | - |
| 13th @ Pearl | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| 10th @ Gillett | - | - | - | 1 |
| 10th @ Pearl | - | - | 1 | - |
| 8th @ Howard | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| 7th @ Howard | 1 | - | - | - |
| 7th @ Quay | - . | - | 1 | - |
| Military@ Pine | 24 | 1 | 20 | 4 |
| Military @ Quay | - | - | - | 1 |
| Total Intersection Accidents | 143 | 41 | 132 | 36 |
| Street |  |  |  |  |
| Lapeer | 17 | 6 | 20 | 2 |
| Water | 3 | 1 | 11 | 2 |
| 24th | 3 | - | - | - |
| 20th | - | - | 1 | - |
| 10th | - | - | 1 | - |
| 8th | - | - | 1 | - |
| 7th | 4 | - | 1 | - |
| 6th | - | - | 3 | - |
| Military | 9 | 1 | 14 | 2 |
| Total Midblock Accidents | 36 | 8 | 52 | 6 |

(S) Signal-controlled intersection

* Fatal

APPENDIX 23

## CITY OF PORT HURON

Accidents on Union \& Court Streets

INTERSECTION ACCIDENTS:

Court @ 20th
" " 19 th
" " 18th
" " 16th
", " 15th
" " 13th
" "11th
", " 10th (S)
" " 9 th
" "8h
" '"7th (S)
" " 6th
" "Military
" " 4 th
Total Intersection Accidents
MIDBLOCK ACCIDENTS:

## Street

Union
Court
Total Midblock Accidents


1

$\begin{array}{r}1 \\ 1 \\ \hline 2\end{array}$
(S) Signal-controlled intersection

APPENDIX 24
CITY OF PORT HURON
Accidents on Oak Street

| INTERSECTION ACCIDENTS: | One-Year ' 'Befor | e" Period | One-Year "Afte | $\mathrm{r}^{\prime}$ Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Property Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents | Property Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents |
| Oak@ 27th | - | - | 1 | - |
| " " 26th | - | - | 2 | - |
| " " 25th | 1 | - | - | - |
| " " 24th (SA) | - | - | 19 | 11 |
| " ' ${ }^{\text {2 } 23}$ rd | - | - | 3 | 2 |
| " " 22nd | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| " " 20th | - | 1 | 2 | - |
| " " 19th | - | - | 1 | - |
| " " 15th | 2 | - | - | - |
| " "13th | 2 | - | 3 | - |
| " " 12th | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| " " 10th (SA) | 1 | - | 14 | 5 |
| " "' 8th | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| " '" Jay | - | - | 1 | - |
| " " 7th | - | - | 1 | - |
| " "6th | 1 | - | - | - |
| " "Military (SA) | - | - | 7 | 3 |
| Total Intersection Accidents | 10 | 1 | 57 | 21 |
| MIDBLOCK ACCIDENTS | - | - | 2 | 1 |

(SA) Intersection was signal-controlled during the "after" period only.

|  | APPENDIX 25 <br> CITY OF PORT HURON <br> Accidents on Griswold Street |  | One-Year "After' |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECTION ACCIDENTS: |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | Property Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents | Property Damage Accidents | Injury Accidents |
| Griswold @ 32nd | 1 | 2 | - | - |
| " "Eastbound M-21 | - | - | 1 | - |
| " " 28th | 1 | - | - | - |
| " " 26th | 3 | - | - | - |
| " " 24 th (S) | 15 | 5 | 10 | 7 |
| " " 23 rd | - | - | 4 | 1 |
| " " 22nd | 1 | - | - | - |
| " " 21 st | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| " " 20th | 2 | - | 4 | 1 |
| " " 19th | - | 1 | - | - |
| " " 17th | - | - | 2 | - |
| " " 16th | - | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| ", "15th | 1 | - | - | - |
| " " 13th | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| " " 12 h | - | - | 2 | - |
| " " 11th | 5 | 1 | 4 | - |
| " " 10th (S) | 5 | 3 | 11 | 7 |
| " "9th | 2 | - | 3 | 1 |
| " " 8th | 2 | 2* | - | - |
| " " 7th | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| " " 6th | - | - | - | 1 |
| " " Military (S) | 7 | 2 | 8 | - |
| " "4th | 2 | - | - | - |
| Total Intersection Accidents | 52 | 22 | 54 | 23 |
| MIDBLOCK ACCIDENTS: | 8 | 2* | 15 | 1 |
| * Includes one fatal accident <br> (S) Signal-controlled intersectio |  |  |  |  |


|  | APPENDIX |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CITY OF PORT | JRON |  |  |
|  | Streets Crossing | k-Griswold | Corridor |  |
| INTERSECTION ACCIDENTS: | One-Year "Bef | '' Period | One-Y ear 'After' | 'Period |
|  | Property Damage | Injury | Property Damage | Injury |
| Intersection | Accidents | Accidents | Accidents | Accidents |
| 24th @ Division | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 24th @ White | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| 23rd@ White | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| 22nd@ White | 1 | - | - | - |
| 20th @ Division | - | - | 1 | - |
| 18th @ White... | - | - | 2 | - |
| 17th @ White | 2 | 1 | - | - |
| 16th @ Division | $\cdots$ - | - | 1 | - |
| 15th @ Division | - | - | - : | 1 |
| 13th @ White | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| 12th @ Division | - | - | 1 | - |
| 11th @ Division | 1 | - | - | - |
| 11th@White | 1 | - | 3 | 1 |
| 10th @ White | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| 9th @ Division | - | - | 1 | - |
| 8th @ Division | - | - | 2 | - |
| 8th@ White | 1 | - | - | - |
| 7th @ Division | - | _ | 1 | - |
| 6th @ White | 1 | - | - | - |
| Military@ Division | - | - | 1 | - |
| Military @ White | 4 | - | 1 | 1* |
| Total Intersection Accidents | 13 | 4 | 19 | 7 |

MIDBLOCK ACCIDENTS:

## Streets

| 24th | 2 | - | 4 | 1 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22nd | - | - | 1 | - |
| 16th | - | - | 1 | - |
| 14th | - | - | 1 | - |
| 13 th | - | - | 2 | - |
| 11th | - | 1 | 6 | - |
| 10 th | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| 9th | - | - | 1 | - |
| 8th | - | - | 2 | - |
| Military | 1 | 4 | 1 | 22 |

[^9]
## STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

(by Arthur Yang)

The results of speed-and-delay studies on the trunk line routes and of travel-time surveys on cross-streets were analyzed statistically to determine the significance of the changes between the conditions during the two-way and the one-way operations.

## ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

This method was used for analyzing the changes in the average overall speeds during each peak period. The results are indicated on the individual tabulations for the study cities. The letter (S) is used to indicate that the change was significant.

The following is a brief explanation of the method:
It is desired to test the hypothesis that the means of k normal populations are equal, given independent samples of $\operatorname{size} N_{i}(i=1,2, \ldots . k)$ from the $k$ populations and assuming that the populations have equal variances.

Hypotheses are defined

$$
\text { Null Hypothesis: } \mu_{1}=\mu_{2}=\ldots=\mu_{k}
$$

Alternative Hypothesis: at least two of the means are unequal.
With mathematical model

$$
x_{i j}=u_{i}+\varepsilon_{i j} \text { where }
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
i & =1,2, \ldots k \\
j & =1,2, \ldots N_{i}
\end{aligned}
$$

$\varepsilon_{i j}$ are independent chance components with identical normal distribution $N(O, \sigma)$
F - statistics is used to test the hypothesis.

## T-TEST

This method was used for analyzing the average number of stops during each peak period of the speed-and-delay runs, and the average travel time during each period of the cross-street travel-time runs. Statistical significance in the changes is again indicated by an ( S ) with the individually tabulated results.

The method is as follows:

It is desired to test the hypothesis that the means of two normal populations are equal, given independent samples from the two populations and assuming that the population variances are equal.

Hypotheses are defined
(1) One-tail test:

Null Hypothesis: $\mu_{1}=\mu_{2}$
or
Alternative Hypothesis: $\mu_{1}>\mu_{2}$
Null Hypothes is: $\mu_{1}=\mu_{2}$
Alternative Hypothesis: $\mu_{1}<\mu_{2}$
(2) Two-tail test:

Null Hypothes is: $\mu_{1}=\mu_{2}$
ilteinative Hypothesis: $]_{1} \neq \mu_{2}$
with mathematival model

$$
X_{i, j}=\mu_{i}+\varepsilon_{i j} \quad \text { where } i=1,2, \quad j=1,2, \ldots N_{i}
$$

$\varepsilon_{i j}$ are independent change components with identical normal distribution $\mathrm{N}(0, \sigma)$
t-statistics is used to test the hypothes is.


[^0]:    * Comparison of Initial One-Way with Two-Way Operation.

[^1]:    * The numbers refer to publications listed in the BIBLIOGRAPHY at the end of the report.

[^2]:    (S)= Change is Statistically Significont. $\quad(*)=$ Only one run was made

[^3]:    * $=$ Some field notes did not contain dotes on them, but the surveys are known to hove been taken between September 12 and 21 .

[^4]:    * Initial Phase of One-way Operation
    **F or two approaches of the minor road

[^5]:    * The study area used for this table includes the entire area, east and west of Logan Street
    *     * The 15-minute peak times are different in the "before" and "after" periods.
    *** Final phase of one-way operation.

[^6]:    * The 15-minute peak times are different in the "before" and the "after" periods.

[^7]:    * Final Phase

[^8]:    ＊ 127 seconds of delay due to railroad train did not allow timing of delay due to left turns．

[^9]:    * Fatal

