



### FLASHING RED ARROW: LEFT-TURN INDICATION AND INTERSECTION SAFETY

**Piotr Rachtan** 



Yang (Carl) Lu



## PRESENTATION OUTLINE

- 1. Background
- 2. Locations
- 3. Before-After Study
- 4. Conclusion

### BACKGROUND

- Only Maryland and Delaware use flashing red arrow (FRA) display; most states utilize flashing yellow arrow
- Deployed by SHA since 1989
- Typical reasoning for FRA installations on SHA roads:
  - Crash pattern on an EP controlled LT movement (existing signals)
  - Original equipment for newly designed signals
- Temporary or permanent solution
- Can work part-, or full time, depending on the need and conditions. Uses standard LT signal heads and controller

Distribution by # of legs

# LOCATIONS

### To date, TDSD/TOD identified 60 Intersections with FRA

Known FRA Locations by District





Distribution by # of opposing thru lanes



### LOCATIONS



### **RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

What is the effect of Flashing Red Arrow on crashes?

Can FRA improve one crash pattern but have a negative impact elsewhere?

How can we control for the effect of just the LT display?

### **BEFORE-AFTER STUDY SELECTION CRITERIA**

#### • SATISFY THE MAIN RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

- Accept locations where FRA was the sole improvement at the time of deployment (replacement for 5-head EP display)
- Accept all intersection layouts (half-signal, T or 4-leg; 1-,2-, or 3 opposing lanes
- Accept temporary or permanent installations
- Reject previously unsignalized intersections
- Generally, reject part-time FRA's (However, possible inclusion after careful time-of-day filtering of the crash data)

#### CRASH DATA RELIABILITY

- 3 calendar years of crash data for both 'before', and 'after' condition
- Reject 'too old' installations (before 2000) due to potentially unreliable 'before' crash data.
- Reject 'too new' installations (after 2013) due to insufficient 'after' data.

### FINAL LIST

Location	District	Leg	Opposing thru lane	Date of approval	Date of installation
MD 8 @ MD 18	2	4	2	3/1/2009	3/25/2009
US 50 @ Dutchmanns	2	4	2	10/1/2012	9/30/2013
US 50 @ MD328	2	4	3	10/1/2012	12/11/2012
US 50 @ MD 331	2	4	3	10/1/2012	12/11/2012
MD 450 @ I 495	3	3	3	2/1/2003	7/19/2003
MD 26 @ Johnsville	7	4	2	3/14/2012	6/14/2012
MD 85 @ Guilford Dr	7	4	2	11/16/2007	04/11/2008
MD 103 @ Brightfield Rd	7	4	1	1/7/2010	5/14/2010
MD 108 @ Lark Brown Rd	7	4	2	4/1/2012	10/23/2012
MD 150 @ Kingston Rd	4	3	2	1/3/2012	7/13/2012
US 40 @ Marriottsville Rd	7	4	2	12/1/2008	2/26/2009



■ leftturn\_before ■ leftturn\_after



#### NOT significantly different

readend\_before rearend\_after



■total\_before ■total\_after

### CONCLUSIONS

- Left-turn related and total number of crashes decreased after the FRA treatment
- No change in the number of rear-end crashes
- Gathering a larger sample expected to yield a more statistically convincing argument and allow for CMF development

### FUTURE DIRECTIONS

- The Crash Modification Factors for FRA will be developed to systematically model the effect on safety
- As the sample increases, consider expanding the study onto more strictly defined sub-groups of intersections (e.g. previously unsignalized, T-only, effect of number of opposing lanes, etc.)

What to look forward to in 2017:

- OOTS Application Guideline on FRA Signal Display (TDSD)
- Research paper documenting this study in detail (TDSD/UMD)

### **QUESTIONS?**





