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MEMORANDUM TO: J. R. Harbison  
State Highway Engineer  
Chairman, Research Committee

SUBJECT: Research Report (Interim); "Operational Characteristics of Lane Drops;" KYHPR-70-63; HPR-1 (7), Part II.

The route junctions of I 75 and I 64, northeast of Lexington, and of I 75 and I 71 in northern Kentucky presented geometric design problems which demanded decisions based on insights and foresights beyond established design criteria. If the number of outgoing lanes equals or exceeds the number of incoming lanes at a hub, there are no attendant lane drops. This is a mere mathematical assertion. A split or bifurcation of lanes becomes a lane-drop situation only by paradoxical definition -- that is to say, the sum of outgoing lanes from a cross-type intersection can never be twice the number of incoming lanes without confounding and compounding the multiplicity of lanes at a successive interchange or intersection. This simply means that if a duplicity of lanes is carried through the junction the extra lanes must ramp off at the next interchange or else be carried forward.

Inasmuch as no specific theory or guiding criterion has been advanced heretofore regarding route junctions and lane splits, I submit the following hypotheses:

1. So-called "driving" and "passing" lanes in a rural area simply became destination lanes when approaching Y- or T-type junctions. Lane-assignment signing should begin far enough in advance to permit traffic to weave into the proper lanes. The distance allowed may be proportional to traffic volume and the possibility of needed storage. Extra destination lanes provided in the inbound leg or branch cause no difficulties -- the difficulties arise in the outbound branch -- but then only if a lane is dropped.

2. A lane drop in an outbound direction may indicate that more lanes were carried through the intersection than were needed. Either a single-lane, "off-to-on" ramp would suffice or else all needed ramp lanes should be carried forward to a succeeding destination split preceded by lane-assignment signing.

3. A lane drop, per se, is an entrapment -- justified only by planned, future construction to extend the dropped lane. Signing to indicate which lane ends and which gives information about merging into another lane only alerts the driver to a bad situation ahead.

4. If for some other reason not yet apparent a lane must be terminated, it seems psychologically more tolerable to accomplish it in conjunction with re-confirmation or re-allocation of lane assignment and destination signing.

Indeed, the foregoing statements attempt to disclaim the existence of lane drops as an admissible recourse for design. It is significant to note that the Highway Capacity Manual makes no mention of lane drops, per se. It mentions ramp terminals, acceleration lanes, auxiliary lanes, climbing lanes, and passing bays, etc., but not lane drops. The only reference or allusion thereto concerns a hypothetical case where a two-lane ramp merges with two through lanes; there it is casually mentioned that perhaps a lane might
be dropped; but, even so, an attendant note cautions that the situation described has not been researched sufficiently (the AASHO, A Policy on Geometric Design for Rural Highways, 1965, p. 380, portrays this situation as an admissible design).

The hypothetical case is practically identical to the situation at the juncture of I 71 and I 75 in northern Kentucky. There, a two-lane, northbound ramp was built; only one of the lanes was carried ahead. Indeed, complications were foreseen; but the ramp was marked for two lanes; and, in a manner of speaking, no lane assignments were made on inbound I 71.

Privileged overviews and afterthoughts, such as offered here, are not intended in any way to demean Mr. Cornette's report. Whereas a "lane termination" (a true lane drop) may have been considered a necessary design recourse, I merely advance the question now: Is it really necessary? Finally, I am inclined to believe that the future direction of the study should be more toward signing for lane assignment, destination, and lane re-allocations -- if necessary.

We have another current study, (KYHPR-70-61) signing for lane closures, etc. during maintenance operations on high-speeds roads. A similarity between a lane closure and a lane termination seems unavoidable.

Respectfully submitted,

Jas. H. Havens
Director of Research
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INTRODUCTION

A lane drop is defined as a location on a highway where the number of lanes provided for through traffic decreases. For purposes of this study, the broad category of lane drops has been further subdivided into three specific classes: lane exits, lane splits, and lane terminations. These subdivisions are illustrated schematically in Figure 1. A lane exit refers to a location where the number of through lanes decreases at an interchange on a multilane roadway. A designation of lane split denotes a major fork of a multilane highway where the level of traffic service provided at the terminus of either prong is approximately equal. Thus, the lane split does not have the same exit connotation which is associated with a lane exit. The third category is the lane termination which occurs when a lane is simply terminated. A lane termination leaves a driver with no choice, he must merge into the other available lane(s). A lane termination also has no connection with an exiting situation.

Associated with the first two categories, lane exits and lane splits, is the concept of driver decision. The driver who is confident of his destination and the proper path thereto generally presents no conflict with the flow of traffic. The problem arises largely from those drivers who are inattentive, intoxicated, uncertain of how to reach their destination, and/or have improper driving habits. It is these individuals, as shown in Figure 2, who conflict with the traffic stream. Therefore, it is imperative that the driver be made aware of the necessity for an early decision regarding his course of travel. The driver who makes an errant decision and abides by it is not as dangerous as the one who makes a delayed decision and attempts, often too late, to correct it. Thus, the driver who perchance takes the wrong branch is likely to resort to desperation tactics and back up or undertake some other maneuver that is illegal or contrary to safety.

The purpose of the study reported herein was to evaluate the operational characteristics of lane-drop situations as they are influenced by various fore-warning, decision-demanding messages. More specifically, the immediate purpose was to discover types of signs, pavement markings, and lane delineations which minimize or reduce erratic movements at existing lane drops. It was also hoped that an optimum design criteria for lane-drop situations might be determined.

Several standard and untried traffic control devices were selected for experimentation. A pilot study at a geographically advantageous location containing three lane splits was conducted. The results of this pilot study are the subject of this report.

HISTORY

The AASHO Special Traffic Safety Committee best described the undesirability of lane drops (1) when it said "lane drops should normally be avoided altogether by original design or later rebuilding, but where this is not practicable, fully adequate advance warning of lane drop situations must always be provided to give drivers sufficient time to maneuver safely into the proper lanes." Others (2, 3, 4, 5, 6) are also critical of the potential hazards (vehicle entrapment, driver indecision, etc.) inherent in most lane-drop situations.

Although recognized by many as an undesirable highway feature, the topic of lane drops is a substantially unresearched area. One lane-drop study is currently being undertaken by the System Development Corporation of California (7). It is essentially a study of traffic operations at several sites utilizing sequential aerial photographs to compute vehicle trajectories. At the present time, insufficient data have been accumulated to reach conclusions. Another lane-drop study by the California Division of Highways (8) used accumulations of accident data to evaluate lane-drop situations. Four conclusions of this study were: 1) Accident experience was alike for all three-to-two (three lanes transitioning to two lanes) lane termination types, 2) 'Single lane exit without taper' had the lowest overall accident rate of any category, 3) For all two-to-one lane termination types, the situation wherein the shoulder (right hand) lane continued through the lane drop had an accident rate only half as great as those having the higher speed median lane continued through, 4) Traffic volume analysis indicated only a slight trend toward an accident rate that increased as the volume of traffic increased.

No completely satisfactory manner of signing lane-drop situations has yet emerged (1). In an attempt to determine improved methods of signing and pavement delineation at lane-drop locations, and thereby improve traffic flow and lessen driver confusion, a thorough study of the technical literature was made. Two studies concluded, insofar as nighttime conditions are concerned, that a carefully planned and executed delineator treatment is highly accepted by drivers, easily followed, and generally helpful (9, 10). The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (11) also attests to the merits of a proper reflective treatment.

One study of lane-termination signing done in California tested drivers' reactions to various signs shown on film or slides. The study indicated that a rectangular four-foot by eight-foot sign bearing the message LANE ENDS - MERGE LEFT was significantly better understood than four other signs or sign combinations.
used in the study (12). Another study done in Michigan indicated some reduction in driver confusion with a "color coding" system, consisting of edgemarking, delineation and signing (13). A study conducted by the Michigan Department of State Highways (14) disclosed that certain significant reductions in lane changes and erratic movements (70 and 78 percent decreases, respectively) can be attributed to the use of a black-on-yellow EXIT ONLY panel and that the continued use of this panel for lane-drop situations is advisable.

From two studies (15, 16) of the effectiveness of pavement edge markings, it was concluded that edge markings reduced both the number of fatalities and the number of accidents at intersections during both daytime and nighttime conditions. To explain these findings, it was suggested that edge markings encourage drivers to look farther ahead and thus become more aware of vehicle movements ahead. Other studies describe the beneficial psychological effects on driver confidence provided by edge marking (17, 18). Another study (19) related the usefulness of pavement markings in reducing hazardous lane changes where roadways diverge.

Two recent studies (20, 21) indicate that it is possible to objectively measure the accident potential of a given area using the traffic conflict criterion, i.e., to evaluate the area dynamically, not waiting for an accident history to evolve. These studies also indicated that the traffic conflict technique provides a relatively quick test, in the form of "before and after" conflict counts, for determining the effectiveness of traffic engineering changes. Furthermore, the traffic conflict technique, according to these same studies, resulted in accurate measures of accident potentials, provided an understanding of the basic causes of accidents and should ultimately lead to a reduction of traffic accidents.

**PROCEDURE**

A pilot study was conducted at the I 64 - I 75 interchange in Fayette County. This interchange, shown in Figure 3, is a standard three-leg interchange of directional design with a three-level structure (3). At the time this interchange was designed, projected traffic volumes and existing safety design standards did not indicate an immediate need for constructing two-lane ramps on the legs. Therefore, this interchange provided three lane splits (Figures 4 through 6) which could be investigated as a pilot effort. The single-lane aspects of the legs provided an excellent example of the necessary decisions drivers must make.

Conflict studies, spot-speed studies, and volume counts were conducted at each of the three approaches. Conflict studies were originally of 12-hour duration: nine hours of daytime conditions and three hours of nighttime conditions. The day and the hours were selected to provide a wide range of traffic volume and lighting conditions. Thus, at the I 75 northbound gore area, a study was conducted from noon to midnight on Sunday, the highest traffic-volume day in this direction. At the I 75 southbound gore area, the study was made from noon to midnight on Friday. The I 64 westbound lane-split study was conducted on Tuesday because no exceptionally heavy traffic-volume day existed there. Furthermore, the extremely light volume of traffic at
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FINDINGS OF THE PILOT STUDIES

Although it has been argued that driving performance is largely dependent on inherent personal characteristics (22), the dominance of geometries over operational characteristics is undeniable. Exit ramps should provide good sight relationships so that there is a clear indication to the driver that he is approaching a point of departure from the through lanes (23, 24). Basically, the approaches to the three lane splits provided adequate sight distances. Relatively speaking, however, it can be seen from Figure 3 that the I 75 southbound approach, with a downhill grade of 3.00 percent, offered a better sight relationship than either the I 75 northbound approach (grade of +1.90 percent) or the I 64 westbound approach (grade of +1.20 percent). Furthermore, the I 75 northbound lane split was located near the crest of a vertical curve and the I 64 westbound lane split was partially obscured by an overpass structure located approximately 400 feet from the gore. Another positive characteristic of the I 75 southbound lane-split approach was its location on a tangent, whereas the I 75 northbound and I 64 westbound approaches both have a small amount, 3°00' and 1°00' respectively, of horizontal curvature. The geometries of the lane-split ramps, the one-lane sections of roadway in this instance, also affected the operational characteristics of these locations. Although it has been stated that a high-speed exit is best provided by a flat angle of 4° or 5° (23), none of the lane-split ramps of the tri-level interchange conforms. The ramps of the I 75 southbound lane split were both downgrade, with the shoulder (right hand) lane continuing through the bifurcation on tangent and the median (left hand) lane becoming a ramp with 8°00' horizontal curvature and a radius of only 716 feet. The ramps of the I 75 northbound lane split were both upgrade, with the median-lane ramp on tangent and the shoulder-lane ramp having 6°30' horizontal curvature and an 881-foot radius. The ramps of the I 64 westbound lane split were also both upgrade, with the median-lane ramp of 6°00' horizontal curve and a 955-foot radius and the shoulder-lane ramp a 3°00' horizontal curve with a 1910-foot radius.

Operational characteristics of the lane splits at the I 64 - I 75 interchange may also be negatively affected by its non-conformance to certain rules of operational flexibility and expressway connection-system design. According to principles of operational flexibility, any change in the basic (minimum) number of lanes, in this case four, should occur at an intersection with another freeway; and then only if the exit volume is sufficiently
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large to change the basic number of lanes beyond this point on the freeway route as a whole (25). Two deficiencies of the I 64 - I 75 interchange may be enumerated: 1) "T" intersections between expressways should be avoided, particularly when the top of the "T" faces toward a region of higher average traffic density. 2) Two facilities should not reduce to one in areas of increasing traffic density; instead, they should branch as traffic loads become higher (26).

From the preceding discussion, one might conclude that there would be a high rate of erratic movements at the I 64 - I 75 interchange. Such a conclusion would be correct. Tables 1 and 2 indicate that, as anticipated from the roadway geometrics, the I 75 southbound erratic movement rates were lower, in all cases, than those of either of the other two lane splits. The highest rates were found at the I 75 northbound lane split. This was also anticipated due to roadway geometrics and to the fact the through traffic on I 75 must go through the interchange in the left-hand lane, as the heavily traveled right lane of I 75 splits off to become the lesser traveled I 64 eastbound. (Average hourly volumes for each erratic movement count are given in Tables 1 and 2. Annual average daily traffic volumes for 1971 are shown in Figure 11.) This excessive lane-change movement is seen most easily in the high "cut across the gore" rate. It was felt by study observers that the absence of a Bluegrass Parkway directional sign at the I 64 westbound lane split was the chief source for the unusually high "stopped" rate at this location. Overall, it may be stated that these erratic movements substantiate the hypothesis that lane splits are confusing to a significant number of drivers.

An accident analysis by Maffei (27) of the 7.9-mile combined route of I 64 and I 75 in Fayette County has shown that there were 313 accidents reported for the period from August 15, 1967, through December 31, 1970. The accident rate for the entire section was 143 accidents per hundred million vehicle miles of travel. The injury rate was 103 injuries per hundred million vehicle miles of travel. The accident rate for the tri-level interchange was 192 accidents per hundred million vehicle miles of travel, while the injury rate was 101 injuries per hundred million vehicle miles of travel. Fifty-six percent of the accidents on the entire combined route occurred in the southbound lanes, whereas 57 percent of the accidents in the tri-level interchange area occurred either on northbound I 75 or on the westbound ramp from I 64 to northbound I 75. The author concurs with Maffei's findings that the roadway geometrics, particularly sight distances, account for this high number of northbound accidents at the tri-level interchange. A collision diagram of the tri-level interchange is shown in Figure 12. Additional accident information is tabulated in APPENDIX B.

A statistical analysis of all erratic-movement and brakelight-rate deviations was made using the Smith-Satterthwaite test (28). Significant erratic movement and brakelight rate deviations are given in Tables 3 through 7. A summary of statistical theory and tests utilized in the analysis of data is presented in APPENDIX C. A study of these deviations indicates that no type of traffic control device was significantly effective in reducing erratic movement and brakelight rates at all three lane-split locations. Rather, it appears that different devices are most effective at each of the locations, i.e., amber delineators at the I 75 southbound lane split during both day and night conditions, EXIT ONLY signs at the I 64 westbound lane split during day conditions, and yellow striping at the I 75 northbound lane split during day conditions. No device was particularly effective at the I 75 northbound lane split during night conditions.

Spot speeds were analyzed to determine significant mean speed differences before and after each different traffic control device installation. The statistical method used may be found in APPENDIX C (29). Mean speeds for each of the three study locations are given in Figures 13 through 15. Although these speeds appear low upon initial inspection, it should be recognized that horizontal alignment is the principal roadway feature related to spot-speed characteristics (30). Thus, from the geometric data given in Figure 3, subnormal speeds would be expected at each of the four ramps possessing relatively high (by interstate standards) degrees of horizontal curvature. Furthermore, it has been stated that, on the average, operating speeds through weaving sections for a given level of service will fall from 5 to 10 miles per hour below those for the same level on adjacent roadway sections (31).

At the beginning of this study, it was hypothesized that an effective traffic control device at a lane-split location would result in higher spot speeds in the immediate vicinity of the gore and in slightly lower or unchanged spot speeds at a distance of approximately 500 feet back from the gore. It was felt that a driver recognizing the lane-split situation ahead would either slow down slightly or keep a constant speed during the final few seconds of approach. This final decision making was estimated to occur at a distance of 500 feet from the lane split. At the gore, the driver becomes more certain of his path of travel and recovers speed. Basically, this trend was observed for all auxiliary traffic control devices installed during the pilot study. Particular adherence to this trend was associated with the amber delineators at the I 75 southbound lane split...
# Table 1

## Erratic Movement and Brakelight Rates*
### Daytime Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Study Number</th>
<th>Traffic Control Device(s) Employed</th>
<th>Erratic Movement Rates</th>
<th>Brakelight Rates</th>
<th>Average Hourly Traffic Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>164 WB</td>
<td>1 ORIGINAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 &quot;ONLY&quot; SIGNS YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 &quot;ONLY&quot; SIGNS YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 SB</td>
<td>1 ORIGINAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 &quot;ONLY&quot; SIGNS YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 &quot;ONLY&quot; SIGNS YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 AMBER DELINEATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rates were obtained by dividing the number of erratic movements or brakelight applications by the applicable traffic volumes and expressing this quotient as a percentage.*
### TABLE 2

**ERRATIC MOVEMENT AND BRAKELIGHT RATES**

**NIGHTTIME CONDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>STUDY NUMBER</th>
<th>TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE(S) EMPLOYED</th>
<th>ERRATIC MOVEMENT RATES</th>
<th>BRAKELIGHT RATES</th>
<th>AVERAGE HOURLY TRAFFIC VOLUMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CUT ACROSS GORE</td>
<td>CROUCHED WAVE</td>
<td>STOPPED</td>
<td>SHOVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 NB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ORIGINAL</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot; ONLY&quot; SIGNS YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot; ONLY&quot; SIGNS YELLOW STRIPING AMBER DELINEATORS</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 175 SB   | 1            | ORIGINAL          | .97          | .18   | .31   | .56   | .09         | .26  | 2.33 | 78.12       | 18.27   | 36.10 | 126       | 263  | 389         |
|          | 2            | YELLOW STRIPING   | 1.12         | .23   | .32   | .06   | .00         | .64  | 2.50 | 75.48       | 12.17   | 31.07 | 297       | 719  | 1016        |
|          | 3            | YELLOW STRIPING   | .36          | .00   | .00   | .13   | .00         | .64  | 2.50 | 74.88       | 2.60    | 30.77 | 93        | 163  | 260         |
|          | 4            | " ONLY" SIGNS YELLOW STRIPING AMBER DELINEATORS | .47 | .15 | .18 | .09 | .00 | .00 | 1.21 | 68.77 | 3.90 | 27.10 | 172 | 300 | 472 |
|          | 5            | " ONLY" SIGNS YELLOW STRIPING | .41 | .22 | .21 | .26 | .15 | .41 | 1.81 | 77.20 | 3.22 | 29.31 | 90   | 160 | 250 |

* RATES WERE OBTAINED BY DIVIDING THE NUMBER OF ERRATIC MOVEMENTS OR BRAKELIGHT APPLICATIONS BY THE APPLICABLE TRAFFIC VOLUMES AND EXPRESSING THIS QUOTIENT AS A PERCENTAGE.
FIGURE 11. 1971 ADJUSTED AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUMES FOR THE I 64 - I 75 TRI-LEVEL INTERCHANGE
FIGURE 12. COLLISION DIAGRAM OF THE I-64 I-75 TRI-LEVEL INTERCHANGE
TABLE 3

I 75 SB - I 64 EB LANE SPLIT (DAYTIME)
SIGNIFICANT ERRATIC MOVEMENT AND BRAKELIGHT RATE DEVIATIONS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY NUMBER</th>
<th>TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE(S) EMPLOYED</th>
<th>COMPARISON</th>
<th>TYPE OF ERRATIC MOVEMENT RATE</th>
<th>TYPE OF BRAKELIGHT RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STUDY</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>CUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ORIGINAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>YELLOW STRIPING &amp; AMBER DELINEATORS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ONLY SIGNS, YELLOW STRIPING, &amp; AMBER DELINEATORS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ONLY SIGNS &amp; YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The words "INCREASE" & "DECREASE" refer to certain erratic movement or brakelight rate deviations that were found to be statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.
TABLE 4

I 75 NB - I 64 EB LANE SPLIT - DAYTIME
SIGNIFICANT ERRATIC MOVEMENT & BRAKELIGHT RATE DEVIATIONS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY NUMBER</th>
<th>TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE(S) EMPLOYED</th>
<th>COMPARISON</th>
<th>TYPE OF ERRATIC MOVEMENT RATE</th>
<th>TYPE OF BRAKELIGHT RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ORIGINAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;ONLY&quot; SIGNS &amp; YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;ONLY&quot; SIGNS, YELLOW STRIPING,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMBER DELINEATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY #</th>
<th>FROM TO</th>
<th>CUT ACROSS GORE</th>
<th>CROWDED CLOSER</th>
<th>STOPPED</th>
<th>SWERVED</th>
<th>BACKED AT GORE</th>
<th>MULTIPLE ERRORS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The words "INCREASE" & "DECREASE" refer to certain erratic movement or brakelight rate deviations that were found to be statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY NUMBER</th>
<th>TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE (S) EMPLOYED</th>
<th>COMPARISON</th>
<th>TYPE OF ERRATIC MOVEMENT RATE</th>
<th>TYPE OF BRAKELIGHT RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FROM STUDY #</td>
<td>TO STUDY #</td>
<td>CUT ACROSS GORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ORIGINAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;ONLY&quot; SIGNS &amp; YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;ONLY&quot; SIGNS, YELLOW STRIPING, &amp; AMBER DELINEATIONS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The words "INCREASE" & "DECREASE" refer to certain erratic movement or brakelight rate deviations that were found to be statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.
**TABLE 6**

**I 75 SB - I 64 EB LANE SPLIT (NIGHTTIME)**

SIGNIFICANT ERRATIC MOVEMENT AND BRAKELIGHT RATE DEVIATIONS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY NUMBER</th>
<th>TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE(S) EMPLOYED</th>
<th>COMPARISON</th>
<th>FROM STUDY</th>
<th>TO STUDY</th>
<th>TYPE OF ERRATIC MOVEMENT RATE</th>
<th>TYPE OF BRAKELIGHT RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CUT ACROSS GORE</td>
<td>CROWDED WEAVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ORIGINAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>YELLOW STRIPING &amp; AMBER DELINEATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;ONLY&quot; SIGNS, YELLOW STRIPING, &amp; AMBER DELINEATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;ONLY&quot; SIGNS &amp; YELLOW STRIPING</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The words "INCREASE" & "DECREASE" refer to certain erratic movement or brakelight rate deviations that were found to be statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.
TABLE 7

I 75 NB - I 64 EB LANE SPLIT (NIGHTTIME)
SIGNIFICANT ERRATIC MOVEMENT AND BRAKELIGHT RATE DEVIATIONS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY NUMBER</th>
<th>TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE(S) EMPLOYED</th>
<th>COMPARISON</th>
<th>TYPE OF ERRATIC MOVEMENT RATE</th>
<th>TYPE OF BRAKELIGHT RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FROM STUDY # TO STUDY #</td>
<td>CUT ACROSS GORE</td>
<td>CROWDED</td>
<td>STOPPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The words "INCREASE" & "DECREASE" refer to certain erratic movement or brakelight rate deviations that were found to be statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.
I75 SOUTHBOUND - I64 EASTBOUND LANE SPLIT
MEAN SPEEDS

TO I64
EASTBOUND

AUTOS

Initial
Stripes
Stripes & Signs
S, S, & Delineators

54
54
56
54

INITIAL

58
57
62
60

AUTOS

Initial
Stripes
Stripes & Signs
S, S, & Delineators

54
54
56
54

58
57
62
60

TRUCKS

Initial
Stripes
Stripes & Signs
S, S, & Delineators

53
50
53
52

INITIAL

56
56
54
52

TRUCKS

Initial
Stripes
Stripes & Signs
S, S, & Delineators

53
50
53
52

56
56
54
52

MEDIAN

23

SHOULDER

500'

NOTE: BRACKETS DENOTE STATISTIALLY SIGNIFICANT MEAN SPEED DEVIATIONS

FIGURE 13. MEAN SPEEDS AT THE I 75
SOUTHBOUND - I 64 EASTBOUND
LANE SPLIT
FIGURE 14. MEAN SPEEDS AT THE I-75 NORTHBOUND - I-64 EASTBOUND LANE SPLIT
I64 LANE SPLIT AT FAYETTE CO. TRI-LEVEL INTERCHANGE
MEAN SPEEDS

TO I75
SOUTHBOUND

TO I75
NORTHBOUND

AUTOS
Initial 41
Stripes & Signs 56.3
S. S. & Delineators 52

TRUCKS
Initial 43
Stripes & Signs 50
S. S. & Delineators 52

AUTOS
Initial 48
Stripes & Signs 57
S. S. & Delineators 58

TRUCKS
Initial 47
Stripes & Signs 52
S. S. & Delineators 54

NOTE: BRACKETS DENOTE STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT MEAN SPEED DEVIATIONS

FIGURE 15. MEAN SPEEDS AT THE I64 WESTBOUND LANE SPLIT
and by the EXIT ONLY signs at the I 64 westbound lane split. However, the application of yellow striping at the I 75 northbound lane split unexpectedly showed a reverse trend, i.e., vehicles increased speed slightly 500 feet back from the gore but slowed down at the gore. The steepness of the vertical curve, the poor sight relationships, and the necessary lane change by through vehicles are believed to have some connection with this irregularity.

FURTHER STUDIES

Four lane-drop situations, shown in Figures 16 through 19, will be observed using refined data collection techniques. An attempt will be made to use motion picture photography in collecting some of the data.

FIGURE 16. SINGLE-LANE EXIT WITH TAPER (I 75 SOUTHBOUND - I 71 SOUTHBOUND)

FIGURE 17. SINGLE-LANE EXIT WITHOUT TAPER (I 75 NORTHBOUND AT THE 5TH STREET EXIT IN COVINGTON)
FIGURE 18. SINGLE LANE SPLIT (WESTERN TERMINUS OF THE BLUEGRASS PARKWAY)

FIGURE 19. LANE END (US 27-68 (PARIS PIKE) NORTHBOUND, JUST NORTH OF NEW CIRCLE ROAD, FAYETTE COUNTY)
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APPENDIX A

ERRATIC MOVEMENT DEFINITIONS
ERRATIC MOVEMENT DEFINITIONS

CUT ACROSS GORE AREA - Vehicle crosses over the pavement markings used to delineate the gore area.

CROWDED WEAVE - Vehicle changes lanes directly in front of a following vehicle, causing the following vehicle to apply its brakes. This type of erratic movement always directly involves at least two vehicles.

STOPPED or SLOWED DRASTICALLY - Vehicle either comes to a complete stop or undergoes a very rapid deceleration, causing "dipping" of the front end or tire squealing.

SWERVE - Vehicle abruptly veers from its straight ahead course. A swerve may or may not consist of a change of lanes for the erratic vehicle. This type of erratic movement always involves only one vehicle.

BACKED AT GORE - Vehicle backs up either in a traffic lane, on the shoulder, or in the gore area.

MULTIPLE ERROR - Occurs when a vehicle commits a combination of two or more of the above errors.
APPENDIX B

ACCIDENT ANALYSIS

I 64 - I 75 TRI-LEVEL INTERCHANGE
# Accident Analysis

## I 64 - I 75 Tri-Level Interchange

### Study Period
August 15, 1967, through December 31, 1970

### Accident Rate
192 accidents per hundred million vehicle miles

### Injury Rate
101 accidents per hundred million vehicle miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Accidents</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Vehicle Accidents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sideswipe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear-End</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single Vehicle Accidents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Failure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Control*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accidents Involving Injury</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number Injured</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fatalities</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Light Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavement Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Loss of control includes falling asleep, adverse roadway conditions (wet, ice, snow, etc.), inattention, drinking, object in roadway, etc.
STATISTICAL THEORY

INFERENCES CONCERNING MEANS

The following Smith Satterthwaite test can be used to test for equality of means when concerned with two independent random samples with normal populations whose variances are not necessarily equal:

\[ H_0 : x = y \quad \quad H_1 : x \neq y \]

\[ t = \frac{(x - y)}{\left( \frac{s_x^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_y^2}{n_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \]

\[ v = \left[ \frac{s_x^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_y^2}{n_2} \right]^2 / \left[ \frac{(s_x^2 / n_1)^2}{n_1 - 1} + \frac{(s_y^2 / n_2)^2}{n_2 - 1} \right] \]

“BEFORE AND AFTER” SPOT SPEED STUDIES

In order to determine significant differences between the mean speeds of "before and after" studies, it is necessary to estimate the standard deviation of the difference in means by use of the equation:

\[ \hat{s} = \sqrt{s_{xb}^2 + s_{xa}^2} \]

where \( \hat{s} \) = standard deviation of the difference in means

\[ s_{xb}^2 = \frac{\Sigma f_{b_i} (x_{b_i})^2 - \frac{1}{n_b} (\Sigma f_{b_i} x_{b_i})^2}{n_b (n_b - 1)} \]

= mean variance of "before" study,

\[ s_{xa}^2 = \frac{\Sigma f_{a_i} (x_{a_i})^2 - \frac{1}{n_a} (\Sigma f_{a_i} x_{a_i})^2}{n_a (n_a - 1)} \]

= mean variance of "after" study.

If the difference in mean speeds is greater than twice the standard deviation of the difference in means, i.e.

\[ \bar{x}_b - \bar{x}_a > 2\hat{s} \]

it can be said with 95 percent confidence that the observed difference in mean speeds is significant (the change in conditions has significantly affected the mean speed).