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ABSTRACT

A before-and-after study was undertaken by the Michigan Department of Transportation to assess accident experience and changes in travel time, stopped delay, fuel consumption, and vehicle emissions after changing from two-phase, fixed-time control to 8~phase, fully-actuated control at nine Michigan intersections.

The intersections selected for 8 -phase control were unique in that they were generally located at or near large regional shopping centers in a suburban setting. Variable and high left-turning volumes were present resulting in significant delays and a pattern of head-on, left-turn accidents for leftturning motorists.

Total, property damage, and injury accidents and injuries decreased. Property damage accidents were reduced at six intersections, combined injury/fatal accidents were reduced at seven, and combined injuries/fatalities were reduced at eight. Left-turn, angle, and head-on accidents were decreased and rear-end accidents were increased. Property damage accident rates decreased at five intersections and combined injury/fatal accident rates decreased at eight. Tests of statistical significance are discussed in the text.

NETSIM modelling of three intersections at a non-peak hour showed increases in travel time, stopped delay, fuel consumption, and vehicle emissions.
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SUMMARY
A before-and-after study was undertaken by the Michigan Department of Trans= portation to assess accident experience and changes in travel time, stopped delay, fuel consumption, and vehicle emissions after changing from two phase, fixed-time control to 8-phase, fullymactuated control at nine Michigan intersections.

The intersections selected for 8 -phase control were unique in that they were located at or near large regional shopping centers generally in a suburban setting, Variable and high left-turning volumes were present resulting in significant delays and a pattern of head-on, left-turn accidents for leftturning motorists.

Volume changes at all intersections ranged from a 7 percent decrease to a 24 percent increase. Left-turn volumes at the three intersections selected for NETSIM modelling increased by 50 percent.

The total number of accidents at the nine intersections decreased by 10 percent. Property damage accidents decreased by 6 percent, injury accidents decreased by 20 percent, and injuries by 28 percent. The small number of fatal accidents and fatalities make it impossible to draw legitimate conclusions concerning them.

Six of the nine intersections experienced fewer property damage accidents than had been anticipated. Seven of nine showed fewer combined injury and fatal accidents and eight of nine showed fewer combined injuries and fatalities. The overall reductions in accidents for the three categories were statistically significant at the 99 percent confidence level.

Left-turn, angle, and head-on accidents decreased by 91 percent, 67 percent, and 33 percent, respectively. Rear-end accidents increased by 66 percent.

Property damage accident rates decreased at five intersections and increased at four intersections. The combined injury and fatal accident rates decreased at eight intersections and increased at one intersection. The difference in property damage accident rates was not statistically significant. The difference in combined injury and fatal accident rates was significant at the 99 percent confidence level.

NETSIM modelling of three intersections at non-peak hour (11 a.m. to noon) volumes showed average increases of 65 percent in travel time, 656 percent in stopped delay, 51 percent in fuel consumption, 37 percent in hydrocarbon emissions, 55 percent in carbon monoxide emissions, and 7 percent in emissions of oxides of nitrogen.

## Introduction

Michigan's first 8-phase traffic-actuated signal was installed in May, 1970, at the junction of Jackson (BL-94) and Maple Roads in Ann Arbor. Eleven additional 8 -phase signals were installed between 1970 and 1977 . These signals were generally located at or near large regional shopping centers in suburban settings. Variable and high leftmturn volumes were present resulting in significant delays and a pattern of head-on, left-turn accidents for left-turning motorists. The signals were installed to reduce left-turn delay by freeing left-turning movements of opposite-direction, through-traffic conflicts.

Nine intersections controlled by 8 -phase traffic-actuated signals were evaluated to determine the effects of this control compared to the two-phase signal controls they replaced. Three intersections were deleted from consideration due to extensive changes in the roadway between the before and after periods. The factors evaluated were accident experience, travel time, stopped delay, fuel consumption, and vehicle emissions. These factors were evaluated using a NETSIM analysis of several of these intersections.

The nine intersections, their Locations (see Location Map, page 2), dates of $8-$ phase signal installation, and speed limits are:

1. Jackson (BL-94) at Maple, Ann Arbor, 5-4-70

Posted Speed: 35 mph (both roads)
2. Saginaw ( $\mathrm{M}-43$ ) at Waverly, Lansing, $2-22-70$ to $10-21-71$

Posted Speed: Saginaw ( 40 mph ), Waverly ( 45 mph )
(This signal operated under 4 -phase, fixed-time control for brief periods during the installation period due to malfunctions of the $8 \times \mathrm{phase}$, fully actuated signal).
3. Logan $(M-99)$ at Holmes, Lansing, $1-10-72$

Posted Speed: Logan ( 40 mph ), Holmes (WB-30 mph, EB-35 mph)
4. Cedar (BL-96) at Jolly, Lansing, 12-23-74

Posted Speed: Cedar (NB-35 mph, SB-45 mph), Jolly ( 35 mph )
5. Grand River (M-43) at: Hagadorn, East Lansing, 7-28-76

Posted Speed: Grand River (WB-35 mph, EB-40 mph), Hagadorn ( 35 mph )
6. Washtenaw (M-17) at Carpenter, Ann Arbor, 10-28-76

Posted Speed: Washtenaw ( 45 mph ), Carpenter ( 35 mph )
7. Logan (M-99) at. Jolly, Lansing, 5-25-77

Posted Speed: Logan ( 40 mph ), Jolly ( 35 mph )
8. Fair $(M-139)$ at Napier, Benton Haxbor, $8-12-77$

Posted Speed: Fair ( 45 mph ), Napier ( 35 mph )
9. 28th Street (M-11) at East Beltline (M-37), Grand Rapids, 10-27-77

Posted Speed: 28th Street (WB-45 mph, EB-50 mph), East Beltine ( 50 mph )


## Conclusions

The purpose of installation of 8 -phase, fully-actuated traffic control was to effectively accommodate large, variable, left-turning movements.

These signals reduced injuries and injury accidents by 20 and 28 percent, respectively. Seven of the nine intersections showed fewer combined injury and fatal accidents than expected and eight of the nine showed fewer combined injuries and fatalities than expected. The combined injury and fatal accident rates decreased at eight intersections and increased at one. The overall decrease was statistically significant. Although total accidents decreased by 10 percent and property damage accidents decreased by 6 percent, these decreases were not uniform. Five of the nine intersections showed decreased property damage rates, but the overall change in rates was not statistically significant.

The 8 -phase signals produced the expected changes in accident types - i.e. decreasing left-turn, angle, and head-on accidents and increasing rear-end accidents. The overall effect of the installation of the 8 -phase signals on accident types was to reduce accident types that occurred at the actual intersection (i.e. between crosswalks) and increase accident types that occurred on the approaches (i.e. parking, rear-end, and "other" accidents). This shift in accident types was presumably due to the longer back-ups created at these signals and the increased conflicts at driveways in the vicinity of these intersections as a result of these back-ups.

It was not possible to classify injuries by severity in this study. An additional study, using a smaller sample size and actual accident reports indicating injury severity, would aid in evaluating changes in average severity.

The results of NETSIM modelling indicated increased travel time, stopped delay, fuel consumption, and vehicle emissions. These changes ranged from a 7 percent increase in oxides of nitrogen emissions to a 656 percent increase in stopped delay during a non peak hour. Part of these increases may be attributed to the volume increases at two of the three intersections and the increase in left-turning volumes of 50 percent, and part to the increased delay due to the installation of 8 -phase control. Back-up delay studies conducted for two of the intersections indicated peak hour delays may be up to twice the non-peak hour delays. Field observations and the results of the NETSIM modelling indicate that adequate storage must be provided to accommodate these large back-ups without impacting an excessive number of intersections and driveways in the vicinity.

A study utilizing the NETSIM program currently being developed to better simulate fully-actuated signals would be useful to confirm the results of this study and simulate the peak hour.

Clearly, the installation of an 8-phase, fully-actuated signal is a drastic measure, to be used when significant left-turn volumes cause the left-turn delay and head-on, left-turn accidents to become excessive. Fixed-time signals with left-turn phases may provide similar operational characteristics and cost less to install and maintain. A comparative study would prove beneficial to traffic engineers seeking to more effectively accommodate left-turning vehicles.

## Volumes

Daily approach volumes were obtaned from machine counts performed before and after installation of the 8 -phase signals. For thee intersections only one count was available (i.e. either the before on after count was not taken), and the same volumes were used for the before and after periods. These volumes are shown in Table 1 .

Table 1
Daily Approach Volumes

|  |  | Percentage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Before | After | Change |
| 1. Jackson (BL-94) at Maple |  | 39018 | --~* |
| 2. Saginaw (M-43) at Waverly | 59537 | 56618 | - 5 |
| 3. Logan ( $M-99$ ) at Holmes | 40798 | 46699 | +14 |
| 4. Cedar (BL-96) at Jolly | 42017 | 47469 | +13 |
| 5. Grand River (M-43) at Hagadorn | 50888 | 51982 | + 2 |
| 6. Washtenaw ( $\mathrm{M}-17$ ) at Carpenter | 43354 | 53841 | $+24$ |
| 7. Logan (M-99) at Jolly | 35147 |  | --** |
| 8. Fair ( $\mathrm{M}-139$ ) at Napier | 33666 |  | --** |
| 9. 28th Street ( $M-11$ ) at East Beltline ( $M-37$ ) | 57291 | 53056 | - 7 |

"Same count used for "before" and "after" daily approach volume.

Table 2 shows the total hourly approach volumes and hourly left-turn volumes of all approaches at the non-peak hour (11 a.m. to noon) for the three intersections selected for NETSIM modelling. Table 3 shows the same information for the peak hour.

Table 2
Non-Peak Hour Volumes (11 a.m. to Noon)
Left-Turn Volume
All Approaches
Total Approach Volume

| Location | Before | After | Percentage Change | Before | After | Percentage $\qquad$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saginaw (M-43) at Waverly | 436 | 681 | +56 | 3,706 | 3,379 | - 9 |
| Cedar (BL-96) at Jolly | 346 | 519 | $+50$ | 2,087 | 2,628 | +26 |
| Grand River ( $\mathrm{M}-43$ ) at Hagadorn | 32.5 | 499 | $+54$ | 1,843 | 2,818 | +53 |

Table 3
Peak-Hour Volumes

Left-Turn Volume All Approaches

| Location | Before | After | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percentage } \\ \text { Change } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Before | After | Percentage Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saginaw (M-43) at Waverly | 451 | 808 | +79 | 4,800 | 4,521 | - 6 |
| Cedar (BL-96) at Jolly | 405 | 715 | +77 | 3,058 | 3,879 | $+27$ |
| Grand River (M-43) at Hagadorn | 449 | 752 | +67 | 3,424 | 4,323 | +26 |

## Accident Frequency

Three years of "before" accident data were evaluated" for all intersections. Three years of "after" accident data were evaluated for all intersections except Logan (M-99) at Jolly, Fair (M-139) at Napier, and 28th Street (M-11) at East Beltline (M-37): Only two years and seven months of data were available for these because of their more recent installation of 8 phase signals. The data for these intersections were extrapolated by straight-line method to reflect 3 -year periods. The complete accident data for all nine intersections are shown in Appendix A. Accidents were obtained for distances of 500 feet on either side of the intersections to include any inorease in driveway accidents due to traffic backed up at the signals. All intersections were controlled by two-phase, fixed-time signals in the "before" period and 8 -phase; fully-actuated signals in the "after" period"

The numbers of accidents for all nine intersections for three years are shown below:

|  | Before | After | Percentage Change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Accidents |  |  |  |
| Property Damage Accidents | 1,556 | 113 | 1,402 |
| Injury Accidents | 442 | 1,049 | -10 |
| Injuries | 706 | 350 | 6 |
| Fatal Accidents | 1 | 511 | -21 |
| Fatalities | 1 | 3 | -28 |
|  |  | 4 | +200 |
|  |  |  |  |

Despite volume changes ranging from a percent decrease to a 24 percent increase, the total number of accidents at these intersections decreased by 10 percent. Property damage accidents decreased by 6 percent, injury accidents decreased by 21 percent, and injuries decreased by 28 percent. The small number of latal aceitents and fatalities make it imposibible lo draw legitimate conclusions.

The numbers of property damage accidents, injury and fatal accidents, and injuries and fatalities expected to occur in the "after" period were projected using the corresponding numbers in the "before" period and the rate of change of these factors for the entire state (Table 4). Injury accidents and fatal accidents, and injuries and fatalities were combined due to the low number of fatal accidents and fatalities: Chi-square tests were used to determine the statistical significance of the reductions (Appendix B). The overall reductions in property damage accidents, injury and fatal accidents, and injuries and fatalities for all nine intersections were statistically significant at the 99 percent confidence level: However, two intersections (Grand River at Hagadorn and Fair at Napier) were the major contributors to the property damage accident Chi-square value. Two intersections: (Grand River at Hagadorn and 28th Street at East Belthine) were the major contributors to the injury and fatal accident Chi-square value: Three intersections (Grand River at Hagadorn, Fair at Napier, and 28th Street at East Belthine) were the major contributors to the injuries and fatalities Chi-square value.

Six of the nine intersections showed fewer "after observed" than "after expected" property damage accidents. Seven showed fewer injury and fatal accidents and eight showed fewer injuries and fatalikies.

Table 4
Expected and Observed Accidents (3-Year Total)

|  | Property | Damage | Accidents | Injury | and Fatal | Accidents | Injurie | s and Fa | alities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Before | After Expected | After Observed | Before | After Expected | After Observed | Before | After Expected | After Observed |
| ```Jackson (BL-94) at Maple``` | 21 | 25 | 35 | 18 | 16 | 12 | 25 | 28 | 16 |
| Saginaw ( $\mathrm{M}-43$ ) at Waverly | 159 | 187 | 160 | 57 | 51 | 55 | 101 | 107 | 79 |
| Logan (M-99) at Holmes | 128 | 139 | 137 | 57 | 53 | 51 | 77 | 67 | 74 |
| ```Cedar (BL-96) at Jolly``` | 127 | 134 | 141 | 39 | 37 | 39 (1) | 74 | 67 | $51(2)$ |
| Grand River (M-43) at Hagadorn | ) $140$ | 169 | 112 | 72 | 85 | 58(2) | 105 | 126 | $99(2)$ |
| Washtenaw (M-17) at Carpenter | 157 | 190 | 152 | 56 | 66 | 33 | 94 | 113 | 51 |
| Logan (M-99) at Jolly | 60 | 66 | 70* | 26 | 29 | $23^{*}$ | 34 | 38 | 34* |
| Fair (M-139) at Napier | 188 | 206 | 105* | 50 | 55 | 38* | 83 | 92 | 52* |
| $\begin{aligned} & 28 \text { th Street (M-11 } \\ & \text { at East Beltline } \\ & (\mathrm{M}-37) \end{aligned}$ | 1) $133$ | 146 | 137\% | 68 (1) | 75 | 44* | 114(1) | 126 | 59* |

*Two years, seven months of data extrapolated to three years.
( ) denotes number of fatal accidents and fatalities.

There were three "after" period fatal accidents. In 1979, a motorist passing through the intersection of Grand River and Hagadorn on the amber signal struck a pedestrian resulting in a fatality. The other fatal accident at Grand River and Hagadorn occurred in 1977 and involved a rear-end collision. The remaining fatal accident occurred in 1975, at the intersection of Cedar and Jolly and was a fixed object collision that resulted in two fatalities.

Table 5 shows the total number of accidents, by type, for all nine intersections. As expected, angle, left-turn, and right-turn accidents decreased and rear-end accidents increased. Chi-square tests were used to evaluate the significance of the changes (Appendix B). The accident types were divided into two categories,
those that increased and those that decreased, and separate Chi-square tests were performed on each. Both categories experienced statistically significant changes at the 99 percent confidence level. The major contributors to the Chi-square value for those intersections which had increases were parking and "other" accidents. Rear-end accidents contributed a minor amount to the overall Chi-square value. The major contributors for those intersections which had decreases were head-on, angle, and left-turn accidents. The large increase in "other" accidents was attributed to an increase in driveway and entrance-exit accidents near these intersections caused by longer traffic queues.

The overall effect on accident types of the installation of the 8 -phase signals was to reduce the types of accidents which occur at the actual intersection (i.e. between crosswalks - angle, left-turn accidents) and increase the types that occur on the approaches (i.e. rearmends, parking, and "other" accidents).

Table 5
Number of Accidents By Type (3-Year Totals)

|  | Before | After | Percentage Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Head-On | 15 | 10 | $-33$ |
| SS | 61 | 64 | + 5 |
| Angle | 313 | 103 | - 67 |
| Left-Turn | 407 | 38 | - 91 |
| Right-Turn | 34 | 14 | - 59 |
| Rear-End | 469 | 779 | +66 |
| Backing | 16 | 22 | + 38 |
| Parking | 149 | 173 | + 16 |
| Other | 38 | 145 | $+282$ |
| Other - Misc. ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 54 | 54 | 0 |
| Total | 1,556 | 1,402 | - 10 |

*Tnvolving other than two motor vehicles.

The signals at four of these intersections (Saginaw at Waverly, Cedar at Jolly, Grand River at Hagadorn, and 28th at Last Beltline) were interconnected with other signals in the before period, while operating under two phase control. However, the distance between the interconnected signals was so great that traffic progxession generally was not very good. Therefore, no attempt was made to assess the effects of the installation of the 8 phase signals on traffic progression.

## Accident Rates

Table 6 shows the yearly accident rates per million vehicles for all nine intersections. The volumes used to calculate these rates are those shown in Table 1. Property damage accident rates decreased at five intersections and increased at four intersections. Injury and fatal accident rates decreased at: eight intersections and increased at one intersection.

Table 6
Accident Rates (Accidents/MV)
Property Damage Accidents Injury and Fatal Accidents

| Location | Before | After | Percentage Change $\qquad$ | Before | After | Percentage $\qquad$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jackson (BL-94) at Maple | 0.49 | 0.82 | $+67$ | 0.42 | 0.28 | -33 |
| Saginaw (M-43) at Waverly | 2.44 | 2.58 | $+6$ | 0.87 | 0.89 | + 2 |
| Logan (M-99) at Holmes | 2.87 | 2.68 | $-7$ | 1.28 | 1.00 | -22 |
| ```Cedar (BL=96) at Jolly``` | 2.76 | 2.71 | - 2 | 0.85 | 0.75 | -12 |
| Gxand River ( $\mathrm{M}-43$ ) at Hagadorn | 2.51 | 1.97 | -22 | 1.29 | 1.02 | -21 |
| Washtenaw (M-17) at Carpenter | 3.31 | 2.58 | -22 | 1.18 | 0.56 | -53 |
| Logan (M-99) at Jolly | 1.56 | 1.82 | $+17$ | 0.68 | 0.60 | -12 |
| Fair (M-139) at Napier. | 5.10 | 2.85 | -44 | 1.36 | 1.03 | -24 |
| 28 th Street (M-11) at East Beltline (M-37) | 2.12 | 2.36 | +11 | 1.08 | 0.76 | $-30$ |

The significance of the changes in accident rates was evaluated using paired T-tests (Appendix B). There was no significant difference in the before and after property damage accident rates. The difference in before and after injury and fatal accident rates was statistically significant at the 99 percent confidence level.

## NETSTM Traffic Model

Three intersections weme modelled using the NESM computer program. These were the intensections of Saginaw at Waverly, Cedar at Jolly, and Grand River at Hagadom. Those intersections were simulated as operating under two-phase, fixed-time control in the before period and 8 phase, fully-actuated control in the "after" period. The geometrics of the intersections we simulated as they existed in the befone and after periods (Appendix C). The volumes used for these simulations were machine counts taken in the years shown. Tarning movement counts, taken in conjunction with the machine counts, were also ased. The actual before and after volumes wewe used, ther than identical volumes, to best simulate the actual operating conditions. Only a non-peak hour (la a.m. to noon) was simulated. A sumary of the simulation is shown in table 7 and the complete output statistics are shown in Appendix $C$.

An attempt was made to simulate the peak hour for the three intersections, however, the results seemed unrealistic. Apparently, the volumes experienced by these intersections during the peak hour are beyond the ability of the trafic-actuated portion of the NETSMM model to hande adequately.

Table 7
Results of NETSIM Modelling (Non-Peak Hour - 11 a.m. - 12 Noon)

|  | Saginaw @ Waverly |  |  | Cedar @ Jolly |  |  | Grand River @ Hagadorn |  |  | Average \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After | \% <br> Change | Before | After | \% <br> Change | Before | After | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Year of Count | 1969 | 1980 |  | 1972 | 1979 |  | 1969 | 1978 |  |  |
| Hourly Volume | 3,706 | 3,379 | -9 | 2,087 | 2,628 | +26 | 1,843 | 2,818 | +53 | $+23$ |
| Stopped Delay/Vehicle (Min.) | 0.15 | 1.70 | +1033 | 0.14 | 1.16 | +729 | 0.14 | 0.43 | +207 | +656 |
| Travel Time/Veh. - Mile (Min./V-Mile) ${ }^{1 /}$ | 2.04 | 4.21 | $+106$ | 2.13 | 3.58 | +68 | 2.16 | 2.63 | +22 | + 65 |
| Fuel Consumption (Gallons/Year) | 701,100 | 888,900 | +27 | 372,500 | 599,400 | $+61$ | 325,500 | 541,600 | +66 | + 51 |
| MPG | 12.78 | 9.08 | -29 | 13.46 | 10.40 | -23 | 13.74 | 12.45 | -9 | - 20 |
| Vehicle Emissions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hydrocarbons (grams/mile) | 2.60 | 4.01 | +54 | 2.39 | 3.38 | +41 | 2.33 | 2.71 | +16 | + 37 |
| Carbon Monoxide (grams/mile) | 38.79 | 69.34 | +79 | 34.40 | 55.67 | +62 | 32.85 | 40.50 | +23 | + 55 |
| Oxides of Nitrogen (grams/mileo | 6.39 | 6.97 | +9 | 5.60 | 6.08 | $+9$ | 5.38 | 5.60 | +4 | + 7 |

$1 /$ Travel time is computed over a distance beginning 2,000 feet upstream and ending 2,000 feet downstream of the intersection.

Averaging the results for the non-peak hour simulation for the three intersections gave a 65 percent increase in travel time, a 656 percent increase in stopped delay, a 51 percent increase in Euel consumption, and increases in vehicle emissions of 37 percent for hydrocarbons, 55 percent for carbon monoxide, and 7 percent for oxides of nitwogen.

Back up delay studies conducted at Gnand River at Hagadorn and Saginaw at Waverly in the after period indicated delays of 0.8 minutes and 1.2 minutes, respectively. These agree fairly well with the NETSIM figures for stopped delay of 0.4 and 1.7 minutes for the two intersections. These back-up delay studies also indicated delays of 1.8 minutes and 1.1 minutes for these inter sections during the peak hour. This increase in delay is partly dae to the installation of the 8 mphase signals, but part must also be attributed to the increase in left-turning volumes and the increase in total approach volumes at two of the three intersections, as shown in Tables 2 and 3.

APPENDIX A

## Accident Tabulation


$\therefore$ Accidents involving other than two motor vehicles.

Logan (M-99) at Jolly Before Afte After Eair (M-139) at Napiex
Before fter ir (M-139) 1979 1980* TOTAL

| P.D. Accidents | 15 | 28 | 17 | 60 | 28 | 23 | 9 | 60 | 67 | 62 | 59 | 188 | 38 | 35 | 17 | 90 | 40 | 40 | 53 | 133 | 52 | 50 | 16 | 118 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inj. Accidents | 10 | 8 | 8 | 26 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 20 | 19 | 17 | 14 | 50 | 19 | 11 | 3 | 33 | 15 | 21 | 31 | 67 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 38 |
| Injuries | (16) | (9) | (11) | (34) | (12) | (13) | (4) | (29) | (36) | (27) | (20) | (83) | (25) | (17) | (3) | (45) | (25) | (30) | (58) | (113) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (51) |
| Tatal Accidents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fatalities | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (1) | (1) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| Total Accidents | 25 | 36 | 25 | 86 | 36 | 31 | 13 | 80 | 86 | 79 | 73 | 238 | 57 | 46 | 20 | 123 | 55 | 61 | 85 | 201 | 65 | 64 | 27 | 156 |
| Head-On | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| SS-SM \& SS-OP | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| Angle | 5 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 11 | 13 | 22 | 12 | 47 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 24 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 15 |
| L-Turn | 7 | 8 | 12 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 16 | 5 | 41 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 23 | 25 | 40 | 88 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| R-Tarn | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Rear-End | 10 | 9 | 6 | 25 | 20 | 14 | 10 | 44 | 16 | 10 | 27 | 53 | 24 | 21 | 11 | 56 | 9 | 17 | 23 | 49 | 34 | 40 | 15 | 89 |
| Backing | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Parking | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 18 | 19 | 65 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1. | 5 | 8 | 2 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 14 | 6 | 41 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 11 | 0 | 25 |
| Other-Misc. ${ }^{*}$ | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Total | 25 | 36 | 25 | 86 | 36 | 31 | 13 | 80 | 86 | 79 | 73 | 238 | 57 | 46 | 20 | 123 | 55 | 61 | 85 | 201 | 65 | 64 | 27 | 156 |

$\pm$ January through July
Accidents involving other than two motor vehicles

| Location | Logan (M-99) at Holmes Before <br> After |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cedar (BL-96) at Jolly } \\ \text { Before } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Washtenaw ( $\mathrm{M}-17$ ) at Carpenter Before <br> After |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | TOTAL | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | TOTAL | 1971. | 1972 | 1973 | TOTAL | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | TOTAL | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | TOTAL | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | total |
| P.D. Accidents | 48 | 47 | 33 | 128 | 50 | 42 | 45 | 137 | 39 | 47 | 41 | 127 | 46 | 52 | 43 | 141 | 56 | 56 | 45 | 157 | 49 | 52 | 51 | 152 |
| Inj. Accidents | 20 | 23 | 14 | 57 | 19 | 16 | 16 | 51 | 9 | 15 | 15 | 39 | 13 | 10 | 15 | 38 | 20 | 15 | 21 | 56 | 14 | 9 | 10 | 33 |
| Injuries | (29) | (29) | (19) | (77) | (28) | (19) | (27) | (74) | (19) | (31) | (24) | (74) | (17) | (15) | (17) | (49) | (36) | (22) | (36) | (94) | (23) | (16) | (12) | (51) |
| Fatal Accidents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fatalities | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (2) | (0) | (0) | (2) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) |
| Total Accidents | 68 | 70 | 47 | 185 | 69 | 58 | 61 | 188 | 48 | 62 | 56 | 166 | 60 | 62 | 58 | 180 | 76 | 71 | 66 | 213 | 63 | 61 | 61 | 185 |
| Head-On | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| SS-SM \& SS-OP | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 13 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| Angle | 31 | 15 | 5 | 51 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 20 | 12 | 17 | 49 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 28 |
| L-Turn | 12 | 12 | 8 | 32 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 17 | 16 | 42 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 20 | 23 | 20 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| R-Turn | 2 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Rear-End | 15 | 31 | 1.4 | 60 | 32 | 23 | 25 | 80 | 19 | 2.4 | 21 | 64 | 42 | 39 | 41 | 122 | 22 | 21 | 17 | 60 | 42 | 39 | 33 | 114 |
| m Backing | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | , | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| $G$ Parking | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 23 | 17 | 22 | 62 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 15 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 22 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Other | 4 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 9 | 19 |
| Other-Misc. $* *$ | 1 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| Total | 68 | 70 | 47 | 185 | 69 | 58 | 61 | 188 | 48 | 62 | 56 | 166 | 60 | 62 | 58 | 180 | 76 | 71 | 66 | 213 | 63 | 61 | 61 | 185 |

*Accidents involving more than two motor vehicles.

APPENDIX B
Statistical Analysis

| Location | Percentage Changes* |  |  |  |  | Property Damage Accidents |  | Injury and Fatal Accidents |  | Injuries and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Middle <br> Year |  | Property | Injury | Injuries |  |  | Fatalities |
|  | $\underset{\text { Befor }}{\mathrm{Y}}$ | /After | Damage <br> Accidents | and Fatal <br> Accidents | $\begin{gathered} \text { And } \\ \text { Fatalities } \end{gathered}$ | Before | After Expected |  |  | Before | After Expected | Before | After Expected |
| 1 Jackson (BL-94) at | 1968 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maple |  | 1972 | +. 201 | -. 131 | +. 113 | 21 | 25 | 18 | 16 | 25 | 28 |
| 2 Saginaw (M-43) at | 1968 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Waverly |  | 1973 | +. 174 | -. 098 | +. 055 | 159 | 187 | 57 | 51 | 101 | 107 |
| 3 Logan (M-99) at | 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Holmes |  | 1974 | +. 085 | -. 065 | -. 127 | 128 | 139 | 57 | 53 | 77 | 67 |
| 4 Cedar (BL-96) at | 1972 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jolly |  | 1976 | +. 052 | -. 059 | -. 090 | 127 | 134 | 39 | 37 | 74 | 67 |
| 5 Grand River (M-43) | 1974 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| at Hagadorn |  | 1978 | +. 208 | +. 176 | +. 198 | 140 | 169 | 72 | 85 | 105 | 126 |
| 6 Washtenaw (M-17) | 1974 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| at Carpenter |  | 1978 | +. 208 | +. 176 | +. 198 | 157 | 190 | 56 | 66 | 94 | 113 |
| - 7 Logan ( 4 -99) at | 1975 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| or Jolly |  | 1979 | +. 096 | +. 104 | +. 103 | 60 | 66 | 26 | 29 | 34 | 38 |
| 8 Fair (M-139) at | 1975 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Napier |  | 1979 | +. 096 | +. 104 | +. 103 | 188 | 206 | 50 | 55 | 83 | 92 |
| 9 28th Street (M-11) | 1975 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| at Beltline ( $\mathrm{M}-37$ ) |  | 1979 | +. 096 | +. 104 | +. 103 | 133 | 146 | 68 | 75 | 114 | 126 |

*Calculated using data from Michigan Traffic Accident Facts prepared by Michigan Department of State Police.

Property Damage Accidents ( 3 Years)

| Location | Before | After <br> Expected | After Observed | $A_{\text {EXP }}{ }^{-A_{\text {ODS }}}$ | $\left(A_{E X P}{ }^{-A_{O B S}}\right)^{2}$ | $\frac{\left(\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{EXP}}-\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{OBS}}\right)^{2}}{\mathrm{EXP}^{2}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 21 | 25 | 35 | 10 | 100 | 4.0 |
| 2 | 159 | 187 | 160 | 27 | 729 | 3.9 |
| 3 | 128 | 139 | 137 | 2 | 4 | 0.0 |
| 4 | 127 | 134 | 141 | 7 | 49 | 0.4 |
| 5 | 140 | 169 | 112 | 57 | 3249 | 19.2 |
| 6 | 157 | 190 | 152 | 38 | 1444 | 7.6 |
| 7 | 60 | 66 | 70\% | 4 | 16 | 0.2 |
| 8 | 188 | 206 | 105* | 101 | 10201 | 49.5 |
| 9 | 133 | 146 | 137* | 9 | 81 | 0.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{x}^{2}=85.4$ |
| ${ }^{2} 2$ years, 7 months of data adjusted to 3 years <br> P $<0.001$ :There is a significant difference between the after expected and aftec observed |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Injury \& Fatal Accidents (3 Years)

| Location | Before | After Expected | After <br> Observed | $\mathrm{A}_{\operatorname{EXP}}{ }^{-} \mathrm{A}_{\text {OBS }}$ | $\left(A_{E_{X P}}-A_{O B S}\right)^{2}$ | $\frac{\left(A_{E^{-A}}{ }^{-A}{ }_{O B S}\right)^{2}}{E X P}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 18 | 16 | 12 | 4 | 16 | 1.0 |
| 2 | 57 | 51 | 55 | 4 | 16 | 0.3 |
| 3 | 57 | 53 | 51 | 2 | 4 | 0.1 |
| 4 | 39 | 37 | 39 | 2 | 4 | 0.1 |
| 5 | 72 | 85 | 58 | 27 | 729 | 8.6 |
| 6 | 56 | 66 | 33 | 33 | 1089 | 16.5 |
| 7 | 26 | 29 | 23* | 6 | 36 | 1.2 |
| 8 | 50 | 55 | 38* | 17 | 289 | 5.3 |
| 9 | 68 | 75 | 44* | 31 | 961 | 12.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{df}=$ $\mathrm{P}$ | $\begin{aligned} & x^{2}=45.9 \\ & (2-1)=8 \end{aligned}$ $001$ |
| $\cdots 2$ years | months | data adju | d to 3 ye |  | : .Ther <br> diff <br> afte <br> afte | a significant nce between the xpected and bserved. |

Injuries \& Fatalities (3 Years)

*2 years, 7 months of data adjusted to 3 years
:.There is a significant difference between after expected and after observed.

## Chi-Square Test of Accidents by Type

## Expected Values



# Chi-Squane Test of Accidents by Type 

Accident Types That Increased


|  |  | Before | After | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Head-On |  | 15 | 10 | 25 |
| Angle |  | 313 | 103 | 416 |
| L-Turn |  | 407 | 38 | 445 |
| R-Turn |  | 34 | 14 | 48 |
| Total |  | 769 | 165 | 934 |
| Head-On |  | $\frac{25}{934} \times 769=21$ | $\frac{25}{934} \times 165=4$ |  |
| Angle |  | $\frac{416}{934} \times 769=343$ | $\frac{416}{934} \times 165=73$ |  |
| L-Turn |  | $\frac{445}{934} \times 769=366$ | $\frac{445}{934} \times 165=79$ |  |
| R-Turn |  | $\frac{48}{934} \times 769=40$ | $\frac{48}{934} \times 165=8$ |  |
| OBS | EXP | OBS-EXP | $(\text { OBS -EXP })^{2}$ | $\frac{(0-E)^{2}}{E X P}$ |
| 15 | 21 | 6 | 36 | 1.71 |
| 10 | 4 | 6 | 36 | 9.00 |
| 313 | 343 | 30 | 900 | 2.62 |
| 103 | 73 | 30 | 900 | 12.33 |
| 407 | 366 | 41 | 1681 | 4.59 |
| 38 | 79 | 41 | 1681 | 21.28 |
| 34 | 40 | 6 | 36 | 0.90 |
| 14 | 8 | 6 | 36 | 4.50 |
| 934 | 934 |  |  | $\mathrm{x}^{2}=56.93$ |
|  |  | $(4-1)(2-1)=3$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & P<0.001 \\ & \text { Critical Value }=16.266 \\ & : \text { Significant difference in } \\ & \quad \text { before and after } \end{aligned}$ |

## Paired T Test - Property Damage Accident Rates

| Location | Before $\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{B}}\right)$ | After $\left(X_{A}\right)$ | $\mathrm{d}=\mathrm{X}_{A}-\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{B}}$ | $\mathrm{d}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.49 | 0.82 | +0.33 | 0.1089 |
| 2 | 2.44 | 2.58 | $+0.14$ | 0.0196 |
| 3 | 2.87 | 2.68 | -0.19 | 0.0361 |
| 4 | 2.76 | 2.71 | -0.05 | 0.0025 |
| 5 | 2.51 | 1.97 | -0.54 | 0.2916 |
| 6 | 3.31 | 2.58 | -0.73 | 0.5329 |
| 7 | 1.56 | 1.82 | +0.26 | 0.0676 |
| 8 | 5.10 | 2.85 | -2, 25 | 5.0625 |
| 9 | 2. 12 | 2.36 | $+0.24$ | 0.0576 |
|  |  |  | $-2.79$ | 6.1793 |

$H_{0}: U_{A}=U_{B} \quad d=X_{A}-X_{B}=0$
$N=9 \quad \sum d=-2.79 \quad \sum d^{2}=6.1793$
$\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{d}}=\sum \mathrm{d} / \mathrm{N}=-2.79 / 9=-0.31$
$S=\sqrt{\frac{\sum d^{2}-\left(\sum d\right)^{2} / N}{N-1}}=\sqrt{\frac{6.1793-(-2.79)^{2} / 9}{9-1}}=0.82$
$t=\frac{\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}}-0}{\mathrm{~S} / \sqrt{\mathrm{N}}} \frac{-0.31-0}{0.82 / \sqrt{9}}=-1.13 \quad / \mathrm{t} /=1.13$
$0.50>p>0.20$
:. There is no significant difference in before and after

## Paired t Test - Injury and Fatal Accident Rates

| Location | $\begin{gathered} \text { Before } \\ X_{B} \end{gathered}$ | After $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{A}}$ | $\mathrm{d}=\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{A}}-\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{B}}$ | $d^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.42 | 0.28 | -0.14 | 0.0196 |
| 2 | 0.87 | 0.89 | +0.02 | 0.0004 |
| 3 | 1.28 | 1.00 | -0.28 | 0.0784 |
| 4 | 0.85 | 0.75 | -0.10 | 0.01 |
| 5 | 1.29 | 1.02 | -0.27 | 0.0729 |
| 6 | 1.18 | 0.56 | -0.62 | 0.3844 |
| 7 | 0.68 | 0.60 | -0.08 | 0.0064 |
| 8 | 1.36 | 1.03 | -0.33 | 0.1089 |
| 9 | 1.08 | 0.76 | -0.32 | 0.1024 |
|  |  |  | -2.12 | 0.7834 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H_{0}=U_{A}=U_{B} \quad d=X_{A}-X_{B}=0 \\
& N=9 \quad \Sigma d=-2.12 \quad \Sigma d^{2}=0.7834 \\
& \overline{\mathrm{~d}}=\Sigma \mathrm{d} / \mathrm{N}=-2.12 / 9=-0.24 \\
& S=\sqrt{\frac{\sum d^{2}-(\Sigma d)^{2} / N}{N-1}}=\sqrt{\frac{0.7834-(-2.12)^{2} / 9}{8}}=0.19 \\
& t=\frac{\mathrm{d}-0}{\mathrm{~S} / \sqrt{\mathrm{N}}}=\frac{-0.24-0}{0.19 / \sqrt{9}}=-3.79 \quad / \mathrm{t} /=3.79 \\
& \mathrm{df}=8 \quad \mathrm{p}<0.005 \\
& \text { : . There is a significant change } \\
& \text { in before and after }
\end{aligned}
$$

APPENDIX C
NETSIM SIMULATION SUMMARY

BRIGLIAFXTIME/4PHASE, LANSING , MI $002 / 23 / 81$
SEEO FOR RANDOM NUMBER GENERATOR IS 7581


| (800, | 1) | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | ENTRY | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 5) | 2 | 2000 | 12 | 0 | 45 | 21 | 6 | 66. | 28 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| (802. | 3) | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | ENTRY | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3. | 5) | 2 | 2000 | 10 | 0 | 45 | 21 | 23 | 62 | 15 | 0 | 4 |  | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| (803. | 4) | 4 | 1000 | 0 | O | ENTRY | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 3 | 00 | 3 | O | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 4. | 5) | 4 | 2000 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 40 | 21 | 11 | 73 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 4 | 00 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| (801. | 2) | 4 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | ENTRY | 21 | $\bigcirc$ | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 3 | 00 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| 2. | 5) | 4 | 2000 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 21 | 8 | 89 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 37 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| 5. | 1) | 2 | 2000 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 800 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 5. | 2) | 2 | 2000 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 801 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| 5. | 3) | 2 | 2000 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 45 | 21 | $\bigcirc$ | 100 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 802 | 0 | 0 | 37. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| 5. | 4) | 3 | 2000 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 803 | 0 | 0 | 37 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 00 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 |

N


BRIGLIASIGSTUOY/SAGQWAV (AFTER-BO
BRIGLIA/8PHASE , LANSING , MI O 05/01/81
SEED FOR RANDOM NUMBER GENERATOR IS 7581


| (800. | 1) | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | ENTRY | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | o | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( 1 , | 5) | 2 | 1999 | 40 | 0 | 45 | 21 | 13 | 52 | 35 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc 0$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| (801. | 2) | 2 | 1000 | $\bigcirc$ | O | ENTRY | 21 | $\bigcirc$ | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 37 |  | 0 | 0. | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| ( 2 , | 5) | 3 | 1999 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 21 | 11 | 86 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 37 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| (802. | 3) | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | ENTBY | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 37 |  | $\bigcirc$ | 00 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 13. | 5) | 2 | 1999 | 40 | 0 | 45 | 21 | 42 | 45 | 13 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc 0$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| (803, | 4) | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | ENTRY | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | $\bigcirc$ | 00 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| (4, | 5) | 2 | 1999 | 40 | 9 | 40 | 21 | 21 | 64 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 00 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| ( 5 . | 1) | 2 | 1999 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 800 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 37. | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | O O | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 2 | 9. |
| ( 5, | 2) | 2 | 1999 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 21 | $\bigcirc$ | 100 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 801 | 0 | 0 | 37 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | O. 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| ( 5, | 3) | 2 | 1999 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 802 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| ( 5 . | 4) | 2 | 1999 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 40 | 21 | $\bigcirc$ | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 803 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0. 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 2 | 12 |



## SIMULATION OF PRAFFIC

THE UTCSOI MODEL

```
BRIGLIASIGSTUDY/GRISDRIV/HAG (BEFORE- 1969)
BRIGLIAFXTIME/MPHASE, LAHSJNG:0 05/02/81
```

SEED FOR RANDOH HUHEER GENERATOR IS 7581


POCK MEAN
TURNIHG MOVEMENTS
DESTINATION NODES
PED LANE CHAN $\qquad$ ANE SPAN UTF II LEFT THRU RT DIAG LEFT THRU RI DIAG LOST DEN I 23 \& 5 TYPE G L IDENTIFICATIUN

| 8800. | 1) | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | Entry | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( do | 5) | 2 | 2000 | 14 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 35 | 9! | 24 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| (802. | 3) | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | EMTRY | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 57 |  | 0 | - | - |  | - | 8 | 2 | 3 |
| ( ${ }^{\circ}$ | 5) | 2 | 2000 | 6. | 0 | 35 | 21 | 32 | 38 | 30 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | , | - |  | - | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| (801\% | 2) | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | Enthy | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 0 | - | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| $\bigcirc 20$ | 58 | 3 | 2000 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 21 | 8 | 82 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | d | 1 |  | - | 8 | 2 | 6 |
| ¢003. | 41 | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | ENTRY | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| $\bigcirc 40$ | 5 ) | 3 | 2000 | 0 | 0 | 35 | E1 | 16 | 77 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |  | - |  | 2 | 8 |
| - 50 | 11 | 2 | 2000 | 0 | 0 | 35 | E11 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 800 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | - |
| -5. | 2) | 2 | 2000 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 21 | 0 | 100 | $\theta$ | 1 | 0 | 808 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | - | ) |  | - | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| 85. | $3)$ | 2 | 2000 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 802 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | $\checkmark$ | - | 0 |  | - | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| (5. | 4) | 2 | 2000 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 303 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 12 |



## STMULATION OF TRAFFIC <br> THE UTCS-I MODEL

BRIGGIASIGSTUDYIGRNDRVAHAG (AFIER-1978)
BRIGLA/BPHASE HARSING OMI 05/01781
SEED FOR RANDOH NUMBER GENERATOR IS 7581
ETHK LANE SPAN LR UOF H TURNING MOVEMEMTS DESTINATION NODES

PED LANE CHAN LEFT THRU RT DIAG LOST DEN 12345 TYPE G $C$ IDENTIFICATIOA

| 1800. | 1) | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | EHTRY | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) 1 | 53 | 2 | 1999 | 40 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 37 | 42 | 21 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | . | ) |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| (801) | 2) | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | EnTRY | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2. | $5)$ | 2 | 1999 | 40 | 9 | 40 | 21 | 11 | 79 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| 1802 | 3) | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | EHIRY | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 43. | 5) | 2 | 1999 | 40 | 9 | 35 | 21 | 27 | 37 | 36 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| (803) | 4) | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | ENTRY | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ | 5) | 2 | 1999 | 40 | 9 | 35 | 21 | 7 | 83 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| ( 5\% | 1) | 2 | 1999 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 800 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\square$ | 2 | 9 |
| 5 | 2) | 2 | 1999 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 801 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| ( 5. | 3) | 2 | 1999 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0. | 802 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 11 |
| 5. | 4) | 2 | 1999 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 805 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 |



## SIHULATION OF TRAFFIC

## THE UTGSO\& MODEG




## PHE UYGSN I MODEL



| 1800\% | $1)$ | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | Eitray | 28 | 0. | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 57 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . |  | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 88 | $5 \%$ | 2 | 1990 | 40 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 14 | 77 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | ${ }^{3}$ | 2 |
| (80) | 2) | 2 | 8600 | 0 | 0 | Elfiny | 21 | 0 | 800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| $\bigcirc 2$ | 5 | 2 | 1990 | 10 | 0 | 35 | 28 | 25 | 56 | 19 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 4 |
| $880 \%$ | 3) | 2 | 1600 | 0 | 0 | ENTKY | 21 | 0 | 100 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 5 |
| $(30$ | $5)$ | z | 8990 | 40 | 0 | 45 | 28 | 59 | 73 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| 8803. | 45 | 2 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | EHTRY | 21 | \% | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 0 | $\theta$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| 848 | $5)$ | 2 | 1999 | 11 | 0 | 35 | 28 | 27 | 47 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| $\bigcirc 58$ | 18 | 己 | 1990 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 800 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | E | 9 |
| ( 5. | a) | 2 | 1999 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 808 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 10 |
| ( 5\% | 3) | 2 | 8909 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 28 | 0 | 100 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 802 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 11 |
| 15 | 48 | 2 | 1994 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 21 | 0 | 800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 803 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 12 |
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## OFE-PEAK HOUR

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SAGINAW } \\ & \text { AT } \\ & \text { WAVERLY } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\%}{\%} \underset{\text { CHANGE }}{ }$ | CEDAR <br> AT <br> JOLEY |  | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { CHANGE } \end{gathered}$ | GRAND RIVER <br> AT <br> HAGADORN |  | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { CHANGE } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  | Before | After |  |
| Vehicle-Miles | 2818.92 | 2477.20 | -12 | 1577.83 | 1929.23 | +22 | 1401.33 | 2114.19 | +51 |
| Vehicle-Minutes | 5759.9 | 10427.2 | +81 | 3361.5 | 6900.6 | +105 | 3024.5 | 5550.6 | +84 |
| Vehicle-Trips | 3724 | 3322 | -11 | 2087 | 2593 | +24 | 1848 | 2796 | +51 |
| Stops/Vehicle | 0.66 | 1.02 | +55 | 0.63 | 0.98 | +56 | 0.61 | 0.88 | +44 |
| Moving/Total Trip Time | 0.716 | 0.350 | -51 | 0.769 | 0.456 | -41 | 0.777 | 0.635 | -18 |
| Ave. Speed (MPH) | 29.36 | 14.25 | -51 | 28.16 | 16.77 | -40 | 27.80 | 22.85 | -18 |
| Mean Occupancy (Veh.) | 95.6 | 173.4 | +81 | 55.8 | 114.7 | +106 | 50.2 | 92.2 | +84 |
| Ave. Delay/Vehicle (Sec.) | 26.33 | 122.37 | +365 | 22.32 | 86.80 | +289 | 21.94 | 43.48 | +98 |
| Total Delay (Min.) | 1634.4 | 6775.1 | +315 | 776.4 | 3751.3 | +383 | 675.7 | 2025.9 | +200 |
| Delay/Veh.-Mile (Min/V-Mile) | 0.58 | 2.74 | +372 | 0.49 | 1.94 | +296 | 0.48 | 0.96 | +100 |
| Travel Time/Veh.-Mile <br> (Min/V-Mile) | 2.04 | 4.21 | +106 | 2.13 | 3.58 | +68 | 2.16 | 2.63 | +22 |
| Stopped Delay as a Percentage of Total Delay | 34.8 | 83.5 | +140 | 37.1 | 80.5 | +117 | 39.6 | 58.8 | +48 |
| Fuel Consumption (Gallons) | 192.08 | 243.54 | +27 | 102.06 | 164.22 | +61 | 89.17 | 148.38 | +66 |
| M.P.G. | 12.78 | 9.08 | -29 | 13.46 | 10.46 | -23 | 13.74 | 12.45 | -9 |
| HC (Grams/Mile) | 2.60 | 4.01 | +54 | 2.39 | 3.38 | +41 | 2.33 | 2.71 | +16 |
| C0 (Grams/Mile) | 38.79 | 69.34 | +79 | 34.40 | 55.67 | +62 | . 32.85 | 40.50 | +23 |
| $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{y}}$ (Grams/Mile) | 6.39 | 6.97 | +9 | 5.60 | 6.08 | $+9$ | 5.38 | 5.60 | +4 |
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