

City of Hamilton
Red Hill Valley Parkway Safety Review (DRAFT)
B000325 | July 2013
B000325

DO NOT DELETE THIS PAGE FROM YOUR WORD DOCUMENT

REPLACE THE TEXT ABOVE TO CREATE THE HEADER

HEADER: The information above will create the header for your document. Change this information and the header will be modified on all pages of your document. **When you do not have information to place in a header, insert a space.** You will notice that the three first lines make up the header whereas "CIMA+ Proposal number" appears on the inside margin of the document because it is only useful to CIMA+, and not part of the request for proposal (RFP). Pay attention to the styles that are applied because they determine the position and format of the information in the header. Should the header not show up right away, click on « Print Preview » to validate.

DOUBLE-SIDED: This document was created to be printed double-sided. If your document needs to be printed on one side only, click on "Page Set-up", select the "Layout" tab, and uncheck "Different Even and Uneven". Apply to the entire document.

TIP: We strongly recommend you read the user guide. It contains tips on how to proceed efficiently.

CONTENTS: This document is a template for creating presentations and proposals. It already contains the company's general information. Select the profile that best suits the needs for the proposal and adjust it if necessary.

The tender document remains your guide. If the tender document limits the number of pages to be used, modify the normal style's line spacing to single line spacing.

When assembling the printed document, remove this page.

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE DOCUMENT

These fields are updated automatically, therefore, you will be able to keep track of the last modifications brought to the document as well as who made the changes. In case the information is not updated, save your document then place the cursor on the field to update and click on F9.

Last saved by: Brian Applebee

Date of last save: 7/26/2013 1:58:00 PM~~7/26/2013 11:21:00 AM~~~~7/25/2013 4:38:00 PM~~~~7/24/2013 3:17:00 PM~~

File path: P:\Project\Active\Transportation\B000325_Hamilton - Redhill Safety Study\080_REPORTS\B000325_RHVP_Safety_Review_Draft_Report_e00v01.docx

B000325

B000325

Table of Contents

1. Introduction and Background	1
2. Study Objectives and Limitations	1
2.1 Study Objectives	1
2.2 Study Limitations	2
3. Scope and Study Area	3
3.1 Study Scope.....	3
3.2 Study Area.....	3
4. Safety Review	4
4.1 Collision Analysis.....	4
4.1.1 Methodology	4
4.1.2 Collision Analysis Results	6
Breakdown of Collisions.....	7
Findings Summary	10
4.2 Safety Analysis Using the Enhanced Interchange Safety Analyst Tool (ISATe).....	11
4.2.1 Methodology	11
Limitations of ISATe.....	13
4.2.2 ISATe Tool Results	13
4.3 Traffic Operations.....	15
4.4 Illumination Review	16
4.4.1 Methodology	16
4.4.2 Illumination Results.....	17
4.5 Field Investigation and Human Factors Assessment	18
4.5.1 Methodology	18
4.5.2 Field Investigation Results – Overall Systematic Findings	18
Signage.....	18
Evidence of Roadway Departure Collisions.....	20
4.5.3 Field Investigation Results – Location Specific Issues	21
RHVP Southbound Mainline	21
RHVP Northbound Mainline.....	24
Dartnall Road W-E Off-Ramp (Ramp 1)	27
Dartnall Road S-E On-Ramp (Ramp 2)	27
Mud Street W-E Off-Ramp (Ramp 5).....	28
Mud Street E-W On-Ramp (Ramp 6).....	28



Mud Street E-N On-Ramp (Ramp 7a)	29
Stone Church Road East N-S Off-Ramp & Mud Street N-E Off-Ramp (Ramp 8)	31

5. Summary of Findings33

6. Potential Countermeasures and Benefit-Cost Analysis36

6.1 Overall Study Area Countermeasures	37
6.1.1 Illumination	37
Benefit-Cost Ratio	37
6.1.2 Permanent Raised Pavement Markings (PRPM)	37
Benefit-Cost Ratio	37
6.1.3 Wide Pavement Markings (102 mm to 150 mm)	38
Benefit-Cost Ratio	38
6.1.4 Perform Friction Testing	38
Cost-Benefit Ratio	38
6.1.5 Undertake Drainage Review	38
Cost-Benefit Ratio	39
6.1.6 Install Wc-105 Slippery When Wet Signs	39
Cost-Benefit Ratio	39
6.1.7 Enforcement of Travel Speeds	39
Benefit-Cost Ratio	39
6.1.8 Rationalization of Trailblazer Signs	39
Benefit-Cost Ratio	40
6.1.9 Remove Lane Exits Signs from Ramps	40
Cost-Benefit Ratio	40
6.2 Dartnall Segments 1 & 2	40
6.3 Dartnall Segments 3, 4 & 5	40
6.3.1 Extend Solid White Line from Gore Area on Dartnall S-E Ramp	40
Cost-Benefit Ratio	41
6.3.2 Relocate Deer Warning Sign	41
Cost-Benefit Ratio	41
6.3.3 Correct Alignment Discontinuity in Southbound Direction	41
Cost-Benefit Ratio	41
6.4 Mud Segments 1, 2 & 3	41
6.4.1 Flatten Slope or Raise Guiderail in Northbound Direction	42
Cost-Benefit Ratio	42
6.5 Mud Segments 4, 5 & 6	42
6.5.1 Relocate "ENGINE BRAKES" Sign (Northbound)	42
Cost-Benefit Ratio	42

B000325

6.5.2	Remove "Slower Traffic Keep Right" Sign at Stone Church / Mud Diverge (Southbound)	42
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	43
6.5.3	Relocate Object Marker Sign (Southbound)	43
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	43
6.6	Greenhill Segments 1 to 4	43
6.7	Ramps 1 & 2	43
6.7.1	Redesign / Replace Guiderail End Treatment (Ramp 1)	43
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	43
6.7.2	Redesign End Treatment on Guiderail (Ramp 2)	43
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	44
6.8	Ramps 3 & 4	44
6.9	Ramp 5 44	
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	44
6.10	Ramp 6 44	
6.10.1	Install High Friction Pavement on Approach to and through Curve	44
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	45
6.10.2	Install Progressively Larger Chevron Signs	45
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	45
6.10.3	Install Pavement Marking Text	45
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	45
6.10.4	Install Dynamic / Variable Warning Sign	45
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	46
6.10.5	Install Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Signs	46
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	46
6.10.6	Install Flashing Amber Beacons on Signs	46
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	46
6.10.7	Relocate Signs	46
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	47
6.11	Ramp 7a & 7b	47
6.11.1	Relocate Signs as per Ramp 6	47
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	47
6.11.2	Replace Merge Sign with Lane Ends Sign	47
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	48
6.11.3	Replace Object Markers and Delineators	48
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	48
6.12	Ramp 8 48	
6.12.1	Replace Road Name Signs with Advance Diagrammatic Sign	48
	Cost-Benefit Ratio	494

B000325

6.12.2 Install Consistent Curve Warning Signage	49
Cost-Benefit Ratio	49
6.13 Ramps 9 & 10	49
6.14 Summary of Potential Countermeasures and B/C Ratios	49

List of Appendices

B000325

1. Introduction and Background

The Red Hill Valley Parkway (RHVP) has a long history in Hamilton. In December of 1982, the original Environmental Assessment (EA) documents were filed by the former Region that outlined the need, scope and timing for the expansion of the Regional road network. The EA identified that a roadway connecting Highway 403 in Ancaster to the QEW in east Hamilton was required. The original design for the roadway was completed in 1985, and the EA was approved by the Province in 1987. A subsequent Preliminary Design Report for ~~the road~~RHVP was completed in January of 1990.

Commented [N1]: Hamilton?

~~Construction of the Valley portion of the Parkway was begun in the early as 1990's. Some aspects of~~
~~, but the Provincial government redacted its funding, (but not its approvals, were halted) and work~~
~~was halted and the project not restarted until in the mid-2000's. However, construction of the~~
Lincoln Alexander Parkway portion of the roadway went ahead and was completed in 1997, extending from Highway 403 to Dartnall Road.

In the early 1990's, the City entered into discussions with the Provincial government on how to further reduce impacts to the environment within the Valley section of the road. As a result of these discussions, in 1996, the City requested from the Province that they be allowed to undertake changes to the original designs and undertake a new EA. The Province approved this request in 1997 and work on the design changes and the new EA were begun and the City's undertook a Impact Assessment and Design Process (IADP).

~~In However, in 1999 the project was subject to panel hearing under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA), and the matter was taken to Federal court. Construction in the Valley~~
~~During this time the project was placed on hold until 2002 when issues were the case was resolved.~~
In 2003 the design changes and the IADP was completed and construction on the Parkway recommenced. ~~Then in 2004, environmentalist and First Nations groups once again stalled construction. The City obtained injunctions and began working with the First Nations representatives.~~ In 2007, the Red Hill Valley Parkway was opened to traffic and has been in operation ever since.

Commented [N2]: I think we shorten this section. Although it is good background information, It is too long.

This safety study was commenced by the City following a motion put forward by City Council to investigate a section of the RHVP. The motion came as a result of residents' input relating primarily to illumination around the Mud Street interchange, visibility of signage and pavement markings and a need to review of other potential devices to assist motorists in safely traversing the roadway. The City proactively decided to undertake a safety and operational review of a portion of the parkway to examine the issues put forward by the motion as well as other aspects.

2. Study Objectives and Limitations

2.1 Study Objectives

The objectives of this study are to review a portion of the RHVP between Dartnall Road and Greenhill Road to determine the existing safety performance of the roadway since opening in 2007

and recommend viable potential measures that could be implemented to increase the safety performance and/or drivers' sense of security.

2.2 Study Limitations

~~When conducting road safety studies one generic area of review At first glance, an obvious item to review in a safety study such as this~~ is roadway geometries and design. However, as part of the Parkway's long history, the road design has been analyzed and refined several times, up to and including the design changes put forward in 2003, ~~which formed party of the and~~ critical environmental agreements and approvals have been made.

~~Design choices on the facility were intimately linked to approvals. Reference materials note:~~ "The sole reason for making design changes was to reduce environmental impacts."¹ The Valley section of the Parkway traverses the Niagara Escarpment, a UNESCO World Biosphere Reserve, designated for its unique landform characteristics and the presence of a provincial land use plan to guide development in its area. It is one of only 16 biosphere reserves in Canada, and is part of a network of 598 in 117 countries. It is a rich mosaic of forests, farms, recreation areas, scenic views, cliffs, streams, wetlands, rolling hills, waterfalls, mineral resources, wildlife habitats, historic sites, villages, towns and cities. The Escarpment is home to more than 300 bird species, 53 mammals, 36 reptiles and amphibians, 90 fish and 100 varieties of special interest flora including 37 types of wild orchids. The Escarpment is home to almost 40% of Ontario's rare flora².

Because of this unique area, and because of the costs associated with building a roadway on the escarpment, the City identified several design refinements to the alignment of the roadway within the Valley. These refinements, "...consider environmental benefits, driver safety, and construction cost..."³ and include the following specific to this review:

- + Reducing through lanes from 3 northbound and 3 southbound to 2 northbound (with a truck climbing lane from Greenhill Avenue to Dartnall Road) and 2 southbound to reduce the footprint of the road and increase potential areas for restoration and reforestation; and
- + Redesigning the interchange with Greenhill Avenue (from a loop interchange to a diamond interchange) to reduce the required area (which protects specialized dry meadow, marsh and Escarpment habitats) and reduce the speed of vehicles existing and entering the Parkway.

Through the City's IADP, these design changes were well scrutinized and the following⁴ was found:

- + The four-lane facility could safely accommodate 2021 projected traffic volumes;

¹ Red Hill Valley Impact and Design Process, City of Hamilton, Page 3

² <http://www.escarpment.org/about/overview/index.php>, Accessed July 2013

³ Red Hill Valley Impact and Design Process, City of Hamilton, Page 6

⁴ Red Hill Valley Impact and Design Process, City of Hamilton, Page 106



- + The Parkway could operate at the 90 km/h posted speed during peak hours in the year 2021;
- + Interchanges at Mud Street and Greenhill Avenue would operate within an acceptable level of service;
- + The design of the Parkway has taken into consideration the posted 90 km/h speed;
- + Redesigns of the interchanges has considered the level of service; and
- + The Parkway will operate safely.

Given the extensive history of the Parkway, the unique geography that it traverses, the many design refinements and assessments undertaken over the years, the many environmental agreements and approvals required and the “urban expressway” nature of the design, it was determined that **a review of the fundamental roadway design geometry basic design** of the roadway **was beyond the scope of this would not be undertaken as part of this study**.

Formatted: Highlight

Commented [N3]: Must add context of lighting. This was another element that we restricted by the E/A and is out of scope.

3. Scope and Study Area

3.1 Study Scope

The scope of this study included the review, analysis, development and assessment of the following key aspects:

- + Review and analysis of traffic volumes, speed and collisions;
- + Review and analysis of signs and markings;
- + Review of human factors (and road user security);
- + Review of roadside safety and hardware;
- + Review of illumination;
- + Development of a long-list of viable potential countermeasures;
- + Assessment of countermeasures using collision modification factors where available;
- + Assessment of cost-benefit of countermeasures; and
- + Recommendation of viable countermeasures.

3.2 Study Area

The study area included the RHVP between Dartnall Road and Greenhill Avenue as well as the Mud Street/Stone Church Road intersection. **Figure 1** illustrates the basic study area.



Figure 1 - Study Area

4. Safety Review

4.1 Collision Analysis

4.1.1 Methodology

Collision data were obtained from the City for a five-year period from October 10, 2008 to October 9, 2013. The collisions were provided for ten (10) ramps and a four kilometre stretch of RHVP from Dartnall Road to Greenhill Avenue.

The identification of collision trends within the study area was performed through a collision data review which considered descriptive statistics of collision conditions and locations. To help summarize collision data and to facilitate the identification of collision patterns, each collision was mapped and assigned to a road element; either a ramp or a mainline segment. The various road elements included in the study area are listed in **Table 1** and illustrated in **Figure 2**.

Table 1 – List of Road Elements Included in the Study Area

Ramp Names	Mainline
+ Ramp #1: Dartnall Rd EB-SB off ramp	+ Lincoln Parkway west of Dartnall Rd
+ Ramp #2: Dartnall Rd NB-EB on ramp	+ Lincoln Parkway between Dartnall Rd and

Commented [N4]: It would be beneficial to provide a paragraph which highlight the type of analysis is conducted for this section.

Commented [N5]: I think the rest of the section covers that adequately.

Commented [N6]: How did we do the segmentation? We should explain how the study are was broken to different segments.

Commented [N7]: I think the previous sentence is enough for that. The breakdown is relatively intuitive.



Ramp Names	Mainline
+ Ramp #3: Dartnall Rd NB-WB Loop on ramp	Mud St.
+ Ramp #4: Dartnall WB off ramp	+ RHVP between Mud St. and 0.8 km South of Greenhill Ave
+ Ramp #5: Mud NB-EB off ramp	+ RHVP North 0.8 km South of Greenhill Ave
+ Ramp #6: Mud	
+ Ramp #7: Mud WB-NB on ramp	
+ Ramp #8: Mud SB-EB off ramp	
+ Ramp #9: RHVP NB to Greenhill	
+ Ramp #10: Greenhill to RHVP SB	




Figure 2 - Road Elements Included in the Study Area

As part of this collision analysis, the potential contributing factors reviewed included:

- + **Collision** Severity: property damage only (PDO), non-fatal injury and fatal collisions;
- + **Collision** Impact Type: single-motor vehicle (SMV), side swipe, rear-end, overtaking, head-on, right-turn, pedestrian and other collisions;
- + Lighting: daylight and non-daylight; and
- + Road Surface: dry, snow/ice, wet and other.

Commented [N8]: For clarity, this should be a bigger image, perhaps with the table merged into it

Commented [N9]: Agree with Ali's comment. A couple of sentences on what review is doing it needed.

Commented [N10]: This is not clear. We have to explain why we are doing this type of analysis to find the overrepresented collision types.

B000325



4.1.2 Collision Analysis Results

The study area experienced a total of 186 collisions in the five years period reviewed, of which 82 occurred on ramps and the remaining 104 occurred on mainline segments. The collision distribution is shown in **Table 2**.

Table 2 - Collision Distribution on Ramps and Mainline Segments

Road Elements	Length (m)	No. of Collisions	Proportion
Ramps			
Ramp #1	285	3	4%
Ramp #2	300	0	0%
Ramp #3	490	0	0%
Ramp #4	585	0	0%
Ramp #5	160	7	9%
Ramp #6	450	41	50%
Ramp #7	850	12	15%
Ramp #8	420	2	2%
Ramp #9	390	16	20%
Ramp #10	305	1	1%
Total (Ramps)	4,235	82	100%
Mainline Segments			
West of Dartnall Rd	240	13	13%
Between Dartnall Rd and Mud St.	1,160	29	28%
Between Mud St. and 0.8 km South of Greenhill Ave	1,400	45	43%
North 0.8 km South of Greenhill Ave	1,200	17	16%
Total (Mainline)	4,000	104	100%

B000325



During the study period, no collisions were observed on Ramps 2, 3 and 4, and just two collisions were observed on Ramp 8 and one collision on Ramp 10. However, it is important to note that Half of all the ramps collisions reported were observed on Ramp 6 (from Mud Street westbound to the Linc westbound).

For mainline, the segment that experienced the highest proportion of collisions (43%) was between Mud Street and 0.8 km South of Greenhill Avenue, which also represents the longest segment with a total length of 1.5 kilometres. The next highest segment was between Dartnall Road and Mud Street which experienced 28% of the mainline collisions.

Breakdown of Collisions

The following collision bar diagrams for each road element in the study area are provided in this section and document the severity, impact type, lighting and road surface.

COLLISION SEVERITY

Figure 3 provides collision bar diagrams for each collision severity attribute (PDO, non-fatal injury and fatal).




Figure 3 - Collision Bar Diagrams – Severity

Only one fatal collision occurred during the study period. The fatal collision was observed on the mainline segment of the RHVP between Mud Street and 0.8 km South of Greenhill Avenue.

Commented [N11]: We should have collision numbers for each bar.

Commented [N12]: Agree. The "Scale" immediately indicated to me that there were 10 fatalities. Drop the scale and use #'s on each bar.

B000325

The overall proportion of non-fatal injury collision within the study area is 34%.

For two of the mainline segments, the Linc between Dartnall Rd and Mud Street and RHVP between Mud Street and 0.8 km South of Greenhill Avenue, the proportion of non-fatal injury collision is much higher than the study area average, with 41% and 44% respectively.

COLLISION IMPACT TYPE

Figure 4 provides collision bar diagrams for each collision impact type attribute (single motor vehicle [SMV], side swipe, rear-end, overtaking, head-on, right-turn, pedestrian and other).




Figure 4 - Collision Bar Diagram - Impact Type

The most common impact type observed within the study area is SMV, with an overall proportion of 63%. This proportion of SMV collisions is significantly higher on Ramp 6, where more than 90% of collisions are SMVs. These findings are is is finding is notable, especially when compared to the 2010 Provincial average⁵, which is 24%.

Commented [N13]: NO, this is proportion of non-fatal per section, is it not? So these figures are useful.

Commented [N14]: I am troubled with this analysis. Shouldn't our analysis per km? If your road segment is longer, obviously the longer section will potentially experience more collisions

Commented [N15]: Sasme coments re: numbers

Commented [N16]: Higher than what?

Commented [N17]: This might be misleading. The OSAR is looking at all collisions, including at intersections, so the higher proportion on controlled access highways would be expected to be much higher given the absence of conflicting vehicle movements??

⁵ Ontario Road Safety Annual Report (ORSAR), Ontario Ministry of Transportation, 2010



LIGHTING

Figure 5 provides collision bar diagrams for each collision impact type attribute (daylight and non-daylight), where non-daylight includes dusk/dawn as well as dark conditions.




Figure 5 - Collision Bar Diagram – Lighting

The study area experienced an atypically high proportion of non-daylight collisions. In fact, according to the 2010 Ontario Road Safety Annual Report (ORSAR)⁶, less than 30% of all collisions in Ontario occurred during non-daylight conditions. However, in comparison with the proportion of non-daylight collisions observed within the study area (53%), there is a difference of more than 23% with the Provincial average. The road element that experienced the greatest proportion of non-daylight collisions is Ramp 6, with a proportion of 71%.

Commented [N18]: The same comment as above.

ROAD SURFACE

Figure 6 provides the collision bar diagram for collision road surface attribute (dry, snow/ice, wet and other).

⁶ Ontario Road Safety Annual Report (ORSAR), Ontario Ministry of Transportation, 2010




Figure 6 - Collision Bar Diagram – Road Surface

The study area overall average of collisions that occurred under wet road surface condition is 45%. When compared to the Provincial average of 17.4%⁷, the proportion of collisions under wet road surface is significantly higher. This difference is mainly attributable to Ramp 6 and the mainline segment of RHVP between Mud Street and 0.8 km South of Greenhill Avenue, where the proportions of collisions that occurred under wet road surface conditions are 68% and 49%, respectively.

Commented [N19]: This whole area is on a curve, so it stands to reason that the proportion should be compared to wet-road collisions on curves? Not the straight + curve provincial average

Findings Summary

The following bullets summarize the most notable findings of the collision analysis:

- + Among the ten ramps included in the study area, 50% of the ramp collisions were recorded on Ramp #6;
- + The proportion of non-fatal injury collisions for the mainline segments between Dartnall Road and Mud Street and Mud Street and 0.8 km south of Greenhill Avenue is much higher than the study area average;

⁷ Ontario Road Safety Annual Report (ORSAR), Ontario Ministry of Transportation, 2010

- + The most common impact type observed within the study area is SMV, with an overall proportion of 63%;
- + The proportion of SMV collisions on Ramp 6 is more than 90%;
- + The proportion of non-daylight conditions (53%), and the proportion of non-daylight collisions on Ramp 6 (71%) are much greater than the Provincial average proportion of collisions which is approximately 30%; and
- + The proportion of collisions that occurred under wet road surface for Ramp 6 and the mainline segment of RHVP between Mud Street and 0.8 km South of Greenhill Avenue are 68% and 49%, respectively, which is much greater than the Provincial average of 17.4%.

4.2 Safety Analysis Using the Enhanced Interchange Safety Analyst Tool (ISATe)

4.2.1 Methodology

ISATe is an automated tool for assessing the safety of freeway facilities, including mainline sections and interchanges. This tool is intended to assist designers in making more informed decisions about the level of safety of design alternatives. Three main types of analysis can be performed using ISAT, including:

- + Reconstruction Project Prioritization: to estimate the safety performance of a facility by determining its priority for reconstruction;
- + System Safety Management: to evaluate the safety performance of several facilities and determine what countermeasures and where to implement them so that the greatest impact on safety is achieved; and
- + Economic Analyst: to estimate the cost associated with the expected total number of collisions or to evaluate the safety benefits due to the number of collisions saved after the implementation of a countermeasure.

Commented [N20]: Reference?

ISATe incorporates the safety prediction method which is included in Part C of the Highway Safety Manual (HSM). It uses a disaggregate safety evaluation approach. Freeway facilities are disaggregated into ~~several~~ freeway mainline sections and/or interchanges, and an interchange ~~subsequently is~~ disaggregated into ramps, collector-distributor (C-D) roads and crossroad terminals. Therefore, a safety analysis performed using ISATe can include the following basic roadway facility components:

- + Freeway sections (with or without speed-change lanes);
- + Ramps or C-D roads; and,
- + Crossroads ramp terminals.

Each component is further divided into segments or intersections as individual sites. The corresponding safety performance functions (SPFs) and collision modification factors (CMFs) are then used to evaluate the predicted average collision frequency at a site. The disaggregate approach

also provides the ability to estimate the impacts on safety (collision frequency, type and severity) of modifying a specific geometric element (shoulder width, presence of a barrier, curve length, curve radius, speed-change lane, etc.).

The following provides a list of the different road characteristics that were to develop the SPFs available ISATe:

- + For freeway segments:
 - Site types: freeway segment, ramp-entrance speed-change lane, ramp-exit speed-change lane
 - Severity: fatal and injury, property damage only
 - Area type: rural, urban
 - Freeway through lanes: 4, 6, 8, 10
 - Crash type: multiple vehicle, single vehicle
- + For Ramps:
 - Site types: entrance ramp, exit ramp, C-D road
 - Severity: fatal-and-injury (FI), property-damage-only (PDO)
 - Area type: rural and urban
 - Ramp through lanes: 1 and 2
 - Crash type: multiple vehicle, single vehicle

The CIMA team obtained all of the required input information and entered it into ISATe for the RHVP study area. In addition, the data needed to be segmented into homogeneous sections. A homogeneous section is one where the key characteristics of traffic volume, key geometric design features, and traffic control are unchanged throughout the section.

For the RHVP study area, the corridor needed to be segmented as shown in Figure 7. This segmentation of the RHVP resulted in creating 15 freeway segments and 8 ramp segments.

Commented [N21]: Be consistent either use crash or collision throughout the report.

Commented [N22]: We should provide reference since I think the text is mostly taken from the guideline. I hope we did not copy word to word from there.

Commented [N23]: This should be moved to the beginning of this chapter since our collision analysis is based on these homogenous sections.

Commented [N24]: It seems this does not match the segmentation that was reported for our collision analysis. Why? Shouldn't our collision analysis be based on homogenous sections?

B000325






Figure 7 - Segmentation for the ISATe Tool

Limitations of ISATe

The use of ISATe to ~~calculate the number of predicted and expected collisions~~ conduct safety analysis has one significant limitation. The SPFs used in ISATe are not calibrated for the collision experience in Hamilton. Calibration ensures that the evaluation results are meaningful and accurate for a specific jurisdiction. The default SPFs found in ISATe are calibrated for the U.S. through NCHRP Project 17-45. Therefore, when one compares the observed number of collisions to the predicted number of collisions, one is comparing local Hamilton data against the overall average number of collisions.

~~found at freeways and ramps in states in the U.S.~~ This means that the output of ISATe is suitable only for relative rankings and not for absolute collision values.

There is insufficient data in the current study to calibrate the SPFs in ISATe for the Hamilton. The ISATe User Manual states that for each site type there should be at least 100 collisions per year. For the RHVP study corridor there were only 160 total collisions for all site types spread over five years.

4.2.2 ISATe Tool Results

ISATe was used to calculate the ~~predicted and expected number of collisions~~ as provided in **Table 3** for freeway segments and **Table 4** for ramp segments.

- Commented [N25]:** Not clear to me?
- Commented [N26]:** ??
- Commented [N27]:** I don't know what you mean by relative ranking? Relative ranking to what? Aren't we comparing observed to expected? Then how relative ranking is playing a role here? Not clear?
- Commented [N28]:** I think Ron asked this question before. Can you explain the developed SPFs for what type of ramp configuration
- Commented [N29]:** That cannot be the only reason. You need more locations for calibration of the SPFs.
- Commented [N30]:** What is predicted or expected? We have not introduced these terms to the reader. How do we calculate them?
- Commented [N31]:** I agree, these terms can be easily confuses and need a brief explanation, perhaps in an appendix.
 Relation of Observed needed too.
- Commented [N32]:** Should add what the meaning of the relationship between predicted and expected is in the table. i.e. is it better or worse if predicted is higher than expected?

B000325

Table 3 - Observed, predicted and expected number of collisions for the freeway segments

Freeway Segments									
Description	Lanes	Length (mi)	Observed Number of Collisions					Predicted	Expected
			Daylight	Non-Daylight	SMV	Multi-Vehicles	Total Observed		
Dartnall 1	4	0.150	1	4	1	4	5	15.4	8.9
Dartnall 2	4	0.170	6	4	5	5	10	17.1	12.5
Dartnall 3	4	0.100	3	0	1	2	3	9.9	6.1
Dartnall 4	4	0.190	3	3	4	2	6	30.9	14.0
Dartnall 5	5	0.210	5	5	5	5	10	22.3	12.8
Mud 1	5	0.220	6	9	8	7	15	16.5	15.9
Mud 2	5	0.150	5	1	5	1	6	8.0	7.3
Mud 3	5	0.120	2	3	4	1	5	8.0	6.4
Mud 4	6	0.100	6	6	6	6	12	6.6	8.9
Mud 5	6	0.060	4	2	6	0	6	9.0	6.4
Mud 6	5	0.210	4	7	6	5	11	51.0	16.4
Greenhill 1	5	0.240	2	3	1	4	5	26.4	13.7
Greenhill 2	5	0.440	4	9	5	8	13	43.2	25.3
Greenhill 3	5	0.100	1	0	0	1	1	8.8	4.5
Greenhill 4	4	0.210	4	0	1	3	4	17.8	10.2

Commented [N33]: Can we convert this to KM?

Commented [N34]: Is this per direction? Or for both directions?

B000325

Table 4 - Observed, predicted and expected number of collisions for the ramp segments

Ramp Segments									
Description	Lanes	Length (mi)	Observed Number of Collisions					Predicted	Expected
			Daylight	Non-Daylight	SMV	Multi-Vehicles	Total Observed		
Ramp #3	1	0.3	1	0	1	0	1	40.1	7.6
Ramp #5	2	0.1	4	1	2	3	5	2.0	2.6
Ramp #7a	1	0.37	2	1	3	0	3	6.4	5.1
Ramp #7b	1	0.13	5	2	6	1	7	1.9	3.7
Ramp #6	1	0.259	11	29	37	3	40	23.3	37.1
Ramp #8	2	0.31	0	1	1	0	1	11.4	6.0
Ramp #9	1	0.22	3	1	3	1	4	1.4	1.8
Ramp #10	1	0.17	1	0	1	0	1	0.9	1.0

Overall the number of observed collisions is much less than the predicted number of collisions, except for the following locations:

- + Freeway segment Mud 4;
- + Ramps 5, 6, 7b 9 and 10.

This difference between the expected and predicted number of collisions is referred to as the potential for a safety improvement (PSI) and also referred to as the excess number of collisions in the Highway Safety Manual. In other words these locations stand out as performing worse than a typical location of the same facility type with similar traffic volume. These locations deserve special consideration since the number of collisions which have occurred is worse than average.

4.3 Traffic Operations

A high level review of traffic operations was undertaken for the study area. Highway Capacity Software (HCS) 2010 was utilized to examine the mainline and the ramps during the AM and PM peak periods. It was found that, generally, the study area operates well with most segments and ramps experiencing LOS "C" or better, although there are some exceptions. Figure 8 summarizes the LOS for the various elements for the AM and PM peak periods.

Commented [N35]: What happened to Ramp 4, 1, & 2? It is very confusing.

Commented [N36]: Shouldn't we analyze one of these rows?

Commented [N37]: 10 are just slightly over, is it worth listing it as an exception?

Commented [N38]: As I said before. The reader won't have any idea what we are talking about if they have no knowledge of EB method. Are we explaining everything in Appendix?

Commented [N39]: What is the benchmark?

Commented [N40]: It seems you have F(D) for Ramp 7a and 7b. Ramp 9 is performing at D. What is the explanation for this?

B000325




Figure 8 - Results of Operational Analysis for AM and PM Peak Periods

Commented [N41]: Which one is AM? Which one is PM? Need a foot note

4.4 Illumination Review

4.4.1 Methodology

The primary objective of illumination is to increase safety by providing drivers with improved nighttime visibility of roadway conditions and potential hazards. However, while illumination may improve visibility at night, it may also create the situation where drivers' eyes must adjust back to darkness when leaving the illumination portion of the roadway. Therefore, the decision to provide roadway lighting should be looked using sound criteria, but also in the context of the whole roadway network.

Another consideration is roadside safety. Luminaires must be installed in safe locations that recognize their potential hazard to vehicles. Their location must also take into account the need to maintain the lights on a regular basis, meaning they must be accessible to workers.

Commented [N42]: ??

Additional consideration must be given to other environmental factors as well, including "light pollution". Light pollution is often a concern of neighbours living adjacent to a roadway facility. This excess light may detract from the enjoyment of the nighttime setting, but it also has been shown by recent research to have negative effects on biological systems. Therefore, the reduction in light pollution should be a major consideration in the installation of illumination.

Commented [N43]: Reference?

Commented [N44]: Must add any limitations that exist w.r.t lighting that we know of from the EA approvals

In order to determine whether additional illumination should be considered for installation within the study area, the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) Roadway Lighting Guide was used⁸. This policy is based on an analytical approach where several factors have been incorporated. The

⁸ Guide for the Design of Roadway Lighting, Transportation Association of Canada (TAC), 2006

B000325



factors included in the warrants require the collection of the following types of data: geometric, operational, environmental, and collision data.

The guide differentiates the following four types of illumination: full lighting, partial interchange lighting, continuous lighting, and transition lighting.

Full Lighting

Full lighting refers to lighting of the entire width within a defined area in a uniform manner, beginning at the start of the warranted area and ending where lighting is no longer warranted.

Partial Interchange Lighting

Refers to lighting at decision points where identification is required, typically at on-ramps and off-ramps. Few luminaires are needed for partial interchange lighting than for full lighting.

Continuous Lighting

Continuous lighting is defined as the full lighting between intersections or interchanges that are fully lighted.

Transition Lighting

Refers to lighting at locations where a continuously lighted roadway tapers to fewer lanes, or locations where the continuous lighting ends and the road continues. This type of lighting assists the road users to adapt from a lighted area to an unlighted area.

Warrants

The determination of the need for illumination on freeway interchanges and freeways is performed through the use of warrants. Based on the factors included in the warrants, a rating of between 1 and 5 is assigned depending on the conditions encountered. The higher the rating, greater the hazard and the more critical is the need for illumination. To each factor a weight is also attributed, to indicate its relative importance. When factors vary for within the portion of roadway for which the warrant is being undertaken, the worst case rating is recommended for the entire segment.

The forms used to determine the lighting need for freeway interchange (mainline interchange segments) and freeway (mainline segments) are provided in **Appendix XX**.

Full lighting is warranted when a total point score of 60 or more is achieved, or when the night-to-day collision ratio is 2:1 or greater (which is not the case for the study area – night-to-day collision ratio is 1.10:1).

4.4.2 Illumination Results

The full illumination justification was completed for three interchanges; Dartnall Road, Mud Street and Greenhill Avenue, as well as for the entire study area. The two factors included in the warrants with the highest weights are the proportion of night collisions and the presence of curves, followed by the night-time operational Level of Service.

When calculating the full lighting warrant for freeways, the total point score achieved was 55.4. However, this results from the assumption that Level of Service during night periods is C. If, at any night hour, the Level of Service falls to E, the total point score increases to 61.5 and full lighting is warranted. Considering the fact that during winter the sun sets between 4 p.m. and 5 p.m., it is reasonable to expect that Level of Service E will be achieved during night hours. Based on the TAC warrant, continuous, full illumination is suggested in the whole study area.

Commented [N45]: So what is 55.4? Is it good or bad? Is it warranted or not?

Commented [N46]: Shouldn't we talk about the environmental constraint? Didn't we get a report that highlights that we cannot do full lighting.

Commented [N47]: Yes, we can't conclude this if there are specific constraints on the study area which we previously acknowledge.

At the least we must follow this conclusion with a recognition that the achievement of the warrant does NOT mean that they are being recommended. They need to be assessed in relation to the approvals constraints.

4.5 Field Investigation and Human Factors Assessment

4.5.1 Methodology

The daytime field investigation took place on Tuesday, May 14, 2013, during morning peak and off-peak periods (07:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.) and during the afternoon peak (4:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.). At the time of the investigation the weather was cool and cloudy with no precipitation. One nighttime site investigation was also conducted during the early morning hours of Tuesday, May 14, 2013 during dark lighting conditions. At the time of the investigation the weather was cool, cloudy, with no precipitation.

High Definition video and a picture inventory from the perspective of a driver, from each lane, was collected for each of the mainline and ramp sections, and for all of the ramps from all lanes was collected during the field review. Stationary observations were also undertaken from four separate locations along the mainline; from the pedestrian bridge overpass between the Dartnall Road and Mud Street interchanges, from the Pritchard Road overpass, from the east end of Mud Street (Mountain Brow Boulevard - view of the Mud Street E-W on-ramp, and from the Greenhill Avenue overpass.

4.5.2 Field Investigation Results – Overall Systematic Findings

This section describes systemic findings that were identified within the study area overall.

Signage

One of the critical tasks that a road user must complete it to collect, understand, make decisions about and react to information obtained from various sources, including regulatory, warning, information and guide signs. Therefore, it is critical that these signs present the needed information quickly, effectively, and in a timely manner. This must be accomplished without overloading, confusing, preoccupying or distracting the road user.

Generally, it was found that the freeway is over-signed, sSigns are not advantageously positioned and in some instances, not required. In a few locations (sometimes where critical decisions are required to be made by drivers), signs are so closely spaced that they eclipse each other and/or send a convoluted message. Additional details are provided in latter sections of this report.

Commented [N48]: Some things noted are maintenance issue as opposed to incorrect installation choices. Bent signs and damaged guiderail etc... and all the former, and should have a simple reminder to correct – separate from the more important "change your design" action need in cases where the wrong sign is used.

Commented [N49]: This is a negative tone. Perhaps start with the positive.
-Uses appropriate guidance
-Follows Placement principles
... then move to negatives
-IN some cases more signing than needed appears to ahv eben palce
Positioning could be improved.....

Commented [N50]: This is a slam that will need examples.

TRAILBLAZER INFORMATION SIGN DISPLAYS

The primary purpose of a guide or information sign is to direct road users along a roadway. As noted, guide signs must present the needed information quickly, effectively, and in a timely manner.

The trailblazer information sign displays for the RHVP and the Linc contain a lot of information for an approaching road user to read, process, and make an appropriate decision. The displays contain varying colours, shapes, text sizes, and individual signs separated by borders and copy faces. Each display contains a number of individual pieces of information, and in some, a number of different physical signs. The displays are located at decision points where an unfamiliar driver must make a determination in which direction they are intending to travel. Figure 9 illustrates some instances of the identified cases. For example, the sign on the far left includes specific direction to the QEW and 403. For an unfamiliar driver, this information is important and is missing on the sign in the middle. Also note that in the far right photo the largest font for the sign at Mud Street is for the word "TO".



Figure 9 - Trailblazer Information Sign Displays (Various Locations Leading to RHVP/Link On-Ramps)

The information on the Trailblazer Information sign for the "Mohawk 4 Ice Centre" appears to be too small. Figure 10 provides an illustrative example of this case.



Figure 10 - Trailblazer Information Sign Display for the "Mohawk 4 Ice Centre"

LANE EXIT SIGNS

This sign is normally reserved for freeway mainlines to provide advance warning where an entire lane exits from the one side of the road and leads to a different destination from that of the remaining lanes comprising the through roadway. This sign is used in a few instances on ramps where the driver has already made the decision to leave the mainline and there is no through roadway. Figure 11 provides an illustrative example of one such case.

Commented [N51]: Are these headers covering all signing, or just "problems" ?

Commented [N52]: Some truth to this issue, but I think we are over emphasizing it. ... in essence, the RHVP and LAP signs are just messy logos and read as a single symbol.... So the message is not that confusing. Basically, drivers are not expected to read the complete text. They work like a coat of arms, lots of detail that merges into a simple image. The fact is these logos are not going to change.

Commented [N53]: Isn't that the purpose?

Commented [N54]: So?

Commented [N55]: This is a trivial item I would drop

B000325



Figure 11 - Lane Exit Warning Sign on Ramp (Off-Ramp to Stone Church Road)

During our field investigation, we observed on three separate occasions, trucks parked on the roadside shoulder

Commented [N56]: Relevance, in relation to lane exit warning signs? What are we suggesting?

Evidence of Roadway Departure Collisions

Roadside steel beam guide rail systems and concrete barriers contain evidence of impacting collisions at a number of locations. For the steel beam guide rail systems, depending on the severity, the damage could impede the structural integrity of the system. This could cause the system to function unexpectedly on a subsequent impact. **Figure 12** through **Figure 14** provides illustrative examples of some of the identified cases. Also, a number of plough markers mounted in advance of guide rail system end treatments were damaged and/or not vertically plumb.



Figure 12 - Dartnall E-S OFF Ramp (View West from the Off-Ramp)

B000325



Figure 13 - NB Main Line (View North from the Mainline); SB Mainline just west of Dartnall off-ramp (View West from the Mainline)



Figure 14 - Dartnall S-W Ramp (View North from the On-Ramp); Dartnall westbound on-ramp (View West from the On-Ramp)

4.5.3 Field Investigation Results – Location Specific Issues

This section describes issues identified throughout the study area by location.

RHVP Southbound Mainline

ALIGNMENT DISCONTINUITY THROUGH MAINLINE CURVE (DARTNALL 5)

The mainline alignment discontinues through the horizontal curve just south of the Pritchard Road overpass. The horizontal curve contains a tangent section part way through the curve. The

Commented [N57]: These are the SET1 or the RAMP?MANLINE coding numbers.

B000325

discontinuity is very noticeable when viewed from the Pritchard Road overpass. **Figure 15** provides an illustrative example of this issue.



Figure 15 - View of Discontinuity in Horizontal Curve on the Mainline (View West from Pritchard Road Overpass)

Many drivers were observed traversing or closely approaching the inside (median) edge line of the highway. Some vehicles were observed driving over the rumble strips and then overcorrecting to position themselves back into their travel lane. Overcorrection actions were observed less often during the peak hours, possibly due to lower speeds. **Figure 16** provides illustrative examples of this case.




Figure 16 - Observed Cases of Swerve- and Overcorrection-Manoeuvres (View West from Pritchard Road Overpass)

In the figures, the photos illustrate drivers approaching the edge lines (emphasized with the red-coloured arrow). The picture on the right illustrates the overcorrection manoeuver made by the driver



in the garbage truck in the center lane of the mainline. Subsequent to the initial correction manoeuver and as a result of overcorrection, the driver had veered close to the right outer side of the lane (emphasized with the orange-coloured arrow).

It is important to note that no collisions were attributable to this issue, nor does this issue appear as significant in the northbound lanes.

Commented [N58]: ... so let's drop this one to the bottom of the observation list, not the top.

CLOSELY-SPACED SIGNAGE AND "SLOWER TRAFFIC KEEP RIGHT" SIGN AT DIVERGE POINT (MUD 5)

A group of closely-spaced signs exists between immediately upstream of the Stone Church Road and Mud Street off-ramp. Given the amount of information in a short stretch of road and the fact that this is a critical decision point on the mainline, the message of each sign could be lost and could contribute to driver confusion. **Figure 17** provides an illustrative example. There is also a "SLOWER TRAFFIC KEEP RIGHT" sign installed essentially right at the diverge point for the Stone Church Road / Mud Street diverge point where the right lane becomes a dedicated exit lane. This message may be confusing to road users, and could possibly lead to weaving conflicts. **Figure 18** provides an illustrative example.



Figure 17 - Closely-Spaced Signage Upstream of the Stone Church Road and Mud Street Off-Ramp (View South from the Mainline)



Figure 18 - "SLOWER TRAFFIC KEEP RIGHT" Sign Upstream of the Stone Church Road and Mud Street Off-Ramp (View South from the Mainline)

OBSCURED FREEWAY EXIT SIGN (MUD 5)

The Freeway Exit sign in the gore area of the Stone Church Road / Mud Street off-ramp is partially eclipsed by the Object Marker warning sign on approach. **Figure 19** provides an illustrative example.



Figure 19 - Freeway Exit sign Partially Eclipsed by the Object Marker Warning Sign (View South from the Mainline)

RHVP Northbound Mainline

OBSCURED INFORMATION SIGN (DARTNALL 4)

The information sign for Stone Church Road / Mud Street located approximately 500 metres upstream of the Stone Church Road / Mud Street off-ramp is marginally eclipsed by the Deer Crossing warning sign immediately in advance. **Figure 20** provides an illustrative example of this case.

B000325





Figure 20 - Deer Crossing Warning Sign Obscuring Information Sign (View North from the Mainline)

POTENTIALLY RESTRICTED SIGHTLINES FOR MERGING TRAFFIC (DARTNALL 4)

The on-ramp merge lane is located within a horizontal curve in the mainline. Vehicles northbound on the mainline and upstream of the ramp may not be easily visible by a merging driver given the curvature of the road and the angle of approach. Many drivers were observed merging onto the mainline immediately downstream of the gore area, even where short gaps were available, which could lead to sideswipe collisions, rear-end collisions or SMV collisions if evasive manoeuvres are undertaken. **Figure 21** provides an illustrative example.



Figure 21 - Potentially Restricted Sightlines for Merging Traffic

UNEVEN TERRAIN IN FRONT OF GUIDE RAIL (MUD 1)

The terrain is uneven immediately in front of the steel beam guide rail system in the median downstream of the Stone Church Road / Mud Street diverge point. The purpose of the guide rail system is to shield errant vehicles from the columns of the Stone Church Road / Mud Street overpass structure. If an errant vehicle were to run off the road in this location, they would ride up on the uneven grassy terrain in front of the barrier causing the vehicle to strike the system at a higher point than it is designed for. This could lead to the overturning of a vehicle, and possibly continuation into the column being shielded. **Figure 22** provides an illustrative example.

Commented [N59]: Is this really unique to this site? Since we're not altering geometry what are we doing with this?



Figure 22 - Uneven Terrain Immediately In Front of the Steel Beam Guide Rail System (View North from the Mainline)

CLOSELY SPACED SIGNAGE (MUD 5)

A “PLEASE AVOID USE OF ENGINE BRAKES” Regulatory sign located downstream of the Mud Street on-ramp between a Lane Drop and Bridge Ices warning sign. These signs are closely spaced and within the vicinity of a complex merging area where drivers from Mud Street are required to perform two consecutive merging maneuvers; one from the Stone Church on-ramp and then another onto the mainline of the RHVP. A curve warning sign also exists on the left side of the road in this area. Given the nature of the location, the warning signs are the highest priority and require the immediate attention of drivers. In its current configuration, the signage in this area could potentially lead to driver-overload and possible conflicts. **Figure 23** provides an illustrative example.

Commented [N60]: No curve warning non right? Does this not violate OTM?



Figure 23 - Closely Spaced Signs within the Vicinity of a Complex Merging Area (View North from the Mainline)

B000325



Dartnall Road W-E Off-Ramp (Ramp 1)

POORLY DESIGNED AND DAMAGED GUIDE RAIL END TREATMENT

The Eccentric Loader steel beam guide rail end treatment on the outer edge of the Dartnall Road off-ramp is damaged, does not contain a sufficient flat run-out area behind the system, and the system itself on the approach end is leaning out and is not vertically plumb. A vehicle striking this system may not be shielded from the slope as intended. **Figure 24** provides an illustrative example.



Figure 24 - Damaged and Poorly Designed Guide Rail End Treatment

Dartnall Road S-E On-Ramp (Ramp 2)

LUMINAIRE WITHIN DEFLECTION AREA OF APPROACH ECCENTRIC LOADER END TREATMENT

The luminaire pole adjacent to the guide rail system at the beginning of the Dartnall Road on-ramp is within the run-out area of the Eccentric Loader approach end treatment. If the end treatment is stuck, it is possible that the vehicle will also come into contact with the luminaire. **Figure 25** provides an illustrative example.



Figure 25 - Pole within Deflection Area of Approach Eccentric Loader End Treatment (View North from Beginning of Off-Ramp)

Mud Street W-E Off-Ramp (Ramp 5)

The outside (right) lane ends within the horizontal curve downstream of the mainline. The taper ending the lane is fairly short and exists along the length of the curve. This lane essentially ends at the beginning of the curve, forcing traffic to merge within the curve which requires a driver to perform two workload intensive maneuvers at the same time. **Figure 26** provides an illustrative example.




Figure 26 - Outside Lane Ends within Horizontal Curve

Mud Street E-W On-Ramp (Ramp 6)

CLOSELY-SPACED AND ECLIPSING SIGNAGE

A group of closely-spaced signage exists in the ramp gore area (near Winterberry Drive). Many of the signs eclipse each other on approach, most notably the information sign for the Linc and the Lane Drop warning sign are not clearly visible to drivers but provide valuable information that needs to be legible. **Figure 27** provides illustrative examples of this signage configuration from two vantage points.

B000325





Figure 27 - Closely-Spaced and Eclipsing Signage (View West from Beginning of On-Ramps)

EVIDENCE OF LANE DEPARTURES

Evidence of vehicles departing the travel lane was identified on the outside of the ramp. In this case, if a vehicle were to leave the traveled portion of the road, it would likely result in damage to a vehicle and possibly injury to its occupants. **Figure 28** provides an illustrative example.



Figure 28 - Evidence of Lane Departures

Mud Street E-N On-Ramp (Ramp 7a)

CLOSELY-SPACED AND “BACK-DROPPED” SIGNAGE

As noted for the Mud Street E-W on-ramp, a group of closely-spaced signage exists in the ramp gore area. The 40 km/h advisory signage for this ramp is placed amongst signage for the Mud Street E-W on-ramp and is easily lost in the jumble. Although sign-eclipsing isn't an issue here, the signs are back-dropped by the information sign for the Linc. Also, the Lane Ends warning sign for the Mud Street E-W on-ramp is located between the Freeway Exit sign and the Mud Street E-W on-ramp information sign, which could cause further confusion. **Figure 29** provides an illustrative example.

B000325



Figure 29 - Closely-Spaced and Eclipsing Signage (View West from Beginning of On-Ramp)

INAPPROPRIATE WARNING SIGN FOR CONFIGURATION

The Merge warning sign on approach to the Stone Church Road East S-N on-ramp is inappropriate for the configuration. The driver on the E-N ramp is the one who is merging onto the S-N ramp. This sign indicates that another lane is joining from the right and could cause driver confusion. A Lane Ends warning sign is required, as opposed to the Merge warning sign. **Figure 30** provides an illustrative example.



Figure 30 – Inappropriate Merge Warning Sign (View North from On-Ramp)

OBJECT MARKERS, AND POST-MOUNTED DELINEATORS

The Object Marker warning sign immediately in advance of the Extruder guide rail end treatment downstream of the Stone Church Road / Mud Street merge lane is damaged and not vertically plumb. **Figure 31** provides an illustrative example.

B000325





Figure 31 - Object Marker Damaged and Not Vertically Plumb (View North from the Mainline)

DAMAGED POST-MOUNTED DELINEATORS

A number of post-mounted delineators on the outside of the ramp curves appear to have been struck by vehicles and are not vertically plumb. **Figure 32** provides an illustrative example.



Figure 32 - Damaged Post-Mounted Delineators

Stone Church Road East N-S Off-Ramp & Mud Street N-E Off-Ramp (Ramp 8)

LOCATION OF INFORMATION SIGNS

The information and lane designation signs at the diverge point from RHVP indicates both ramp lanes to lead to Mud Street and Stone Church Road. Small information signs indicating that the left lane leads to Mud Street and the right lane leads to Stone Church Road are located approximately 160 metres upstream of the forced diverge point for Mud Street and Stone Church Road, are directly behind curve warning signs and immediately before a curve. Since the information signs are small there is a good chance that a driver will not detect them. Also, due to the horizontal curvature of the ramp, the signs are not visible very far in advance (they fall outside the driver's cone of vision through the curve), and as a result, sudden lane changes and potentially related conflicts, may occur in this area.

If the small information signs are missed the next available signage to inform road users of the appropriate lane decision are located at the diverge point. However, similar to the previous information signs, given the horizontal curvature of the ramp, the signs are not visible in advance of their placement and sudden lane changes, and potentially related conflicts, may occur in this area. **Figure 33** provides illustrative examples of the drivers' approach to the diverge area.



Figure 33 - Information Signs Leading to Mud Street and Stone Church Road (View South Successively Traveling South)

INCONSISTENT CURVE WARNING SIGNS ON THE RAMP

The curve warning signs on either side of the road on the off-ramp provide inconsistent information regarding the severity of the curve. It is important that consistent and appropriate warning the severity of a curve be provided to a driver in order to assist them in making the appropriate decisions to safely navigate through the curve. **Figure 34** provides an illustrative example of this case.



Figure 34 - Conflicting Curve Warning Signs on the Ramp

B000325

5. Summary of Findings

This section summarizes the findings from the collision, ISATe and field reviews. Where possible, road sections have been grouped by similar characteristics and findings, similar to the more aggregated sections shown in **Figure 2** earlier in the report.

Overall, it was found that the RHVP is operating safely with the calculated **expected number of collisions** being lower than the **predicted number of collisions for a roadway with similar characteristics** in most segments. During the study period, no collisions were observed on Ramps 2, 3 and 4, and just two collisions were observed on Ramp 8 and one collision on Ramp 10. However, it is important to note that half of the ramps collisions were observed on Ramp 6 (from Mud Street westbound to the Linc westbound).

Commented [N61]: I hat these terms!

Commented [N62]: EXPECTED??

For mainline, the segment that experienced the highest proportion of collisions (43%) was between Mud Street and 0.8 km South of Greenhill Avenue, which also represents the longest segment with a total length of 1.5 kilometres. The next highest segment was between Dartnall Road and Mud Street which experienced 28% of the mainline collisions.

The output of the ISATe tool indicated that freeway segment Mud 4 and ramps 5, 6, 7b 9 and 10 have **an excess number of collisions as indicated by** a positive difference between the expected and predicted number of collisions. This **is indicative of a indicates** a potential for a safety improvement (PSI), **or an excess number of collisions**. In other words, these locations stand out as performing worse than a typical location of the same facility type with similar traffic volume.

It is also noteworthy that the collisions that are occurring on the RHVP show **an atypically high proportion of SMV, wet road surface and non-daylight collisions** when compared to the Provincial average.

Commented [N63]: I question this w.r.t the SMV

The TAC illumination warrants were examined as part of this study and it was determine that the RHVP would meet the justification for full illumination on all ramps and through the **mainline**.

Commented [N64]: Context needed

Table 5 summarizes the road segment findings and **Table 6** summarizes the ramp findings.

Table 5 - Summary of Road Segment Findings

Road Segment	Collisions				Field
	Obs.	Pred.	Exp.	Pattern	
Dartnall 1 & 2	15	32.5	21.4	+ None	+ No major findings
Dartnall 3, 4 & 5	19	63.1	32.8	+ 48% SMV	+ Potentially restricted sightlines for merging traffic from Dartnall onto NB RHVP + Placement of exit information sign potentially confusing NB RHVP + Exit information sign partially obscured NB RHVP + Alignment discontinuity in SB direction
Mud 1, 2 & 3	26	32.5	29.6	+ 60% SMV + 50% non-daylight	+ Unshielded hazard SB + Uneven terrain in front of guiderail NB
Mud 4, 5 & 6	29	66.6	31.6	+ Exp. >. Pred. @ Mud 4 + Primarily SMV + High proportion of non-daylight & wet surface	+ Closely spaced & obscured signage at critical decision points NB & SB + Potentially confusing "keep right" sign NB
Greenhill 1 to 4	23	96.2	53.8	+ None	+ No major findings

B000325



Table 6 - Summary of Ramp Findings

Ramp	Collisions				Field
	Obs.	Pred.	Exp.	Pattern	
Ramp 1 & 2	n/a	n/a	n/a	+ n/a	+ Poorly designed and damaged guiderail end treatment (Ramp 1) + Luminaire within deflection area of approach eccentric loader end treatment (Ramp 2)
Ramp 3	1	40.1	7.6	+ n/a	+ No major findings
Ramp 4	n/a	n/a	n/a	+ n/a	+ No major findings
Ramp 5	5	2.0	2.6	+ n/a	+ Lane ends within curve
Ramp 6	40	23.3	37.1	+ Exp. > Pred. + 65% of all ramp collisions + High proportion & frequency of SMV, non-daylight & wet surface	+ Closely spaced / eclipsing signage at diverge point + Evidence of lane departures
Ramp 7a 7 7b	10	8.3	8.8	+ Exp. > Pred. + 80% of collisions SMV + High proportion of non-daylight & wet surface	+ Closely spaced & back dropped signage at diverge + Inappropriate merge sign + Damaged object markers and delineators
Ramp 8	1	0.9	1	+ Exp. > Pred. , however very low # of collisions	+ Location and size of information signs + Inconsistent curve warning signs

B000325



Ramp 9	4	1.4	1.8	+ Exp. > Pred., however very low # of collisions	+ No major findings
Ramp 10	1	0.9	1.0	+ Exp. > Pred., however very low # of collisions	+ No major findings

6. Potential Countermeasures and Benefit-Cost Analysis

~~In order to assist in the mitigation of the issues that were identified through our collision and field analysis, a~~ list of potential countermeasures was developed ~~to address the issues that were found in the previous sections.~~ In keeping within the limitations of this study, the countermeasures that were developed do not propose to alter the geometry of the lanes and curves on the RHVP.

In order to assist in determining the effectiveness of a countermeasure, collision modification factors (CMFs) were utilized where available. CMFs were examined from a number of sources including the HSM, the FHWA CMF Clearinghouse and the MTO SafetyAnalyst project. The CMF of a countermeasure can assist in determining safety benefits of the countermeasure over the analysis period by calculating the expected number of collisions reduced. There are a number of countermeasures for which CMFs were not available. The CMF values are applicable to all collision types that occur at a site, unless the CMF is specific to the related collision impact type(s) (e.g., single-vehicle collision with fixed object).

The Benefit-Cost (B/C) ratio is the ratio of the present value of the safety benefit of a given countermeasure calculated for its service life to the present value of the cost of the countermeasure. A B/C ratio of greater than 1.0 represents an economically efficient countermeasure. In this criterion, the monetary value of the collisions reduced as a result of implementation of a countermeasure is considered as the benefit of the countermeasure. A comparison between the B/C ratios of the alternative countermeasures proposed for a site leads to the most economically efficient countermeasure. The alternative countermeasure with a higher B/C is considered as the preferred alternative. For the purposes of calculating the societal costs of collisions, Transport Canada costs were utilized and projected to 2013 dollars. The resultant costs are summarized in Table 7.

Commented [N65]: Reference?

Commented [N66]: I thought we were planning to sue MTO's costs.

B000325

Table 7 - Annual Societal Costs of Collisions

Annual Societal Costs of Collisions (inflated from 2004)	2013	Proportion of Collisions
Fatal	\$1,308,127	0.5%
Injury	\$31,599	34%
PDO	\$9,654	65.5%

6.1 Overall Study Area Countermeasures

The following potential countermeasures should be installed as an overall measure due to the need to create consistency throughout the RHVP.

6.1.1 Illumination

The outcome of the TAC illumination warrant indicated that full illumination of the corridor and ramps is justified. Illumination increases a drivers' preview area and increases safety by providing drivers with improved nighttime visibility of roadway conditions and potential hazards. However, sporadic installation of illumination should be avoided as it creates dark spots that require drivers' eyes to readjust to the low-light levels, temporarily reducing their visibility even further.

Commented [N67]: The same comment as above. I thought we cannot have full illumination for the study area.

Commented [N68]: We must balance this off with a clear understanding that we're not suggesting consideration of full illumination.

Benefit-Cost Ratio

The CMF used for this assessment was 0.6 and is related to all types of nighttime collisions. The calculated benefit would be a reduction of 48.5 collisions over a five-year period. The expected service life for this countermeasure is 20 years, for a total benefit of \$4,692,624. The costs associated with this countermeasure are expected to be \$1,100,000. The B/C ratio is expected to be 4.27.

Commented [N69]: Did you use present/future values to calculate this figure I assume?

Commented [N70]: For what year?

Commented [N71]: WE can't report this if we can't recommend it because it's out of scope.

6.1.2 Permanent Raised Pavement Markings (PRPM)

PRPMs are delineation devices that are often used to improve preview distances and guidance for drivers in inclement weather and low-light conditions. Given the wet roadway condition and non-daylight trend in collisions along the RHVP, combined with the curvilinear geometry of the roadway, PRPMs have the potential to positively affect the collision experience on the roadway as well as increase driver security.

Benefit-Cost Ratio

The CMF used for this assessment was 0.94 and is related to all collision types. The calculated benefit would be a reduction of 10.2 collisions over a five-year period. The expected service life for this countermeasure is 5 years, for a total benefit of \$245,593. The costs associated with this countermeasure are expected to be \$74,700. The B/C ratio is expected to be 3.29.

B000325

6.1.3 Wide Pavement Markings (102 mm to 150 mm)

Wide pavement markings can be used to improve preview distances and guidance for drivers in inclement weather and low-light conditions. Given the wet roadway condition and non-daylight trend in collisions along the RHVP, combined with the curvilinear geometry of the roadway, wide pavement markings have the potential to positively affect the collision experience on the roadway as well as increase driver security.

Benefit-Cost Ratio

The CMF used for this assessment was 0.96 and is related to fatal and injury collision types. The calculated benefit would be a reduction of 2.6 collisions over a five-year period. The expected service life for this countermeasure is 5 years, for a total benefit of \$135,537. The costs associated with this countermeasure are expected to be \$40,000. The B/C ratio is expected to be 3.39.

6.1.4 Perform Friction Testing

Pavement friction plays a vital role in keeping vehicles on the road by enabling the drivers to control/maneuver the vehicle in a safe manner (in both the longitudinal and lateral directions). Several methods and devices are available for measuring pavement frictional characteristics. Pavement surface texture is influenced by many factors, including aggregate type and size, mixture proportions, and texture orientation and details. Texture is defined by two levels of texture: microtexture and macrotexture. Currently, there are no direct means for measuring microtexture in the field. However because microtexture is related to low slip speed friction, it can be estimated using a surrogate device. Macrotexture is characterized by the mean texture depth and the mean profile depth; several types of equipment are available for measuring these indices. Because of the high proportion of wet surface condition and SMV collisions, the City could consider undertaking pavement friction testing on the asphalt to get a baseline friction coefficient for which to compare to design specifications.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no specific CMF for friction testing, however the costs to undertake these tests are not expected to exceed \$10,000. For this price, the City would receive valuable information regarding the dry friction values on the asphalt. Based on the results, the City may be in a better position to determine if further action is required.

Commented [N72]: Sounds too low

6.1.5 Undertake Drainage Review

Water films develop on the pavement surface during natural rainfall and tend to increase in thickness along the water drainage or flow path. At the onset of rainfall, the water first occupies the macrotexture of the pavement surface and is contained within the macrotexture of the pavement surface or is drained from the surface through grooves or internal drainage. With increasing rainfall, a film of water forms above the macrotexture. The flow of water on the pavement surface is called

B000325



sheet flow; the depth of the sheet flow tends to increase in the direction of the drainage path. The depth of the sheet flow is critically important because the depth of this flow controls the skid resistance of the pavement and the tendency for hydroplaning. Given the high proportion of wet surface collisions, the City could examine the undertaking of a drainage review to determine the adequacy of the surface drainage of the pavement.

Commented [N73]: Do we have any valid way to assess this is a problem or is it just a guess. The entire area is a curve, so wet road collision can be expected to be higher, no?

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no specific CMF for a drainage review; however the costs to undertake this review are not expected to exceed \$20,000. For this price, the City would receive valuable information regarding the drainage conditions on the surface of the asphalt. Based on the results, the City may be in a better position to determine if further action is required.

6.1.6 Install Wc-105 Slippery When Wet Signs

The purpose for the Slippery When Wet sign is to advise drivers that the surface of the roadway has a significantly reduced wet weather skid resistance. Competent drivers are aware that the friction of the road surface is reduced in wet weather; therefore this sign is reserved for use where the skid resistance of the road is reduced to an expectantly low level. Given the high proportion of wet surface collisions, it may be determined through friction testing that the skid resistance of the roadway surface is lower than normally encountered. If this is determined, the City could examine the installation of the Wc-105 sign for the northbound and southbound directions.

Commented [N74]: Where, each ramp and each section? What about overload?

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no specific CMF for the installation of these signs. However the costs to install signs are not likely to exceed \$5,000.

6.1.7 Enforcement of Travel Speeds

The exact relation between speed and crashes depends on many factors. However, in a general sense the relation is very clear: if on a road the driven speeds become higher, the crash rate will also increase. Therefore, targeted enforcement of known high crash areas can be an effective means to reduce the crash rate.

Benefit-Cost Ratio

There is no CMF or cost for this countermeasure. Speed enforcement is a regular activity undertaken by the Police, therefore targeting specific areas should not increase costs.

6.1.8 Rationalization of Trailblazer Signs

The trailblazer information sign displays for the RHVP and the Linc contain a lot of information for an approaching road user to read, process, and make an appropriate decision. The displays contain varying colours, shapes, text sizes, and individual signs separated by borders and copy faces. Each display contains a number of individual pieces of information, and in some, a number of different

B000325

physical signs. The City could examine reducing the complexity of the trailblazer signs and possibly adding the QEW and 403 signs to each of the markers as well to assist unfamiliar drivers to determine if they should be taking the RHVP or the Linc to reach their intended destination.

Benefit-Cost Ratio

These trailblazer signs cannot be directly linked to any specific collisions, nor is there a corresponding CMF. However, the costs to replace or add signs would not be expected to exceed \$2,000, and because they are not on the mainline, special traffic protection would not be required to install the signs.

6.1.9 Remove Lane Exits Signs from Ramps

The Lane Exits sign exists in several locations on ramps where its use is not intended. The City could examine the potential to remove these signs.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

These Lane Exits signs cannot be directly linked to any specific collisions, nor is there a corresponding CMF. However, the costs to remove the sign would not be expected to exceed \$1,000, and because they are not on the mainline, special traffic protection would not be required to install the signs.

6.2 Dartnall Segments 1 & 2

There were no major collision or field findings in this segment.

6.3 Dartnall Segments 3, 4 & 5

The main collision finding through these segments was the high proportion SMV type collisions, at 48%, as well as a significant number of wet road condition collisions. In the field, sightline challenges as well as the placement of several signs were the primary findings, as well as the alignment discontinuity in the southbound mainline. The following improvements could be considered for implementation.

6.3.1 Extend Solid White Line from Gore Area on Dartnall S-E Ramp

Due to the angle of approach of the northbound mainline drivers to the drivers merging from the Dartnall Road S-E ramp, it can be challenging for the merging drivers to properly detect a safe gap in traffic. It was observed in the field that drivers tended to enter the through lane abruptly at the beginning of the broken line. If the solid line were extended further from the gore area, it would encourage drivers to utilize more of the speed change lane, which would have the effect of bringing their speed up more in line with the through vehicles (reducing the speed variance), as well as improving their chances of detecting a safe gap in traffic in which to merge.

Commented [N75]: I would start with a section titled "Site Specific Countermeasures". We should explain that we will look it localized countermeasures for each section....

Commented [N76]: Hard to understand.

B000325



Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however the costs are not expected to exceed \$500.

Commented [N77]: So we recommend implementing this countermeasure.

6.3.2 Relocate Deer Warning Sign

The Stone Church Road / Mud Street exit information sign located within the taper for the Dartnall S-E on-ramp is partially obscured by a Deer Warning sign. The City could consider removing (there were no animal related collisions in five years) or relocating the Deer Warning sign to a point beyond the information sign.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however the costs are not expected to exceed \$500.

Commented [N78]: The same comment as above.

6.3.3 Correct Alignment Discontinuity in Southbound Direction

In the southbound direction there is an alignment discontinuity that occurs wherein there is a tangent section of roadway between two curves, but within an intended smooth curve. We are unsure why the roadway was built this way as the design drawings do not show this occurring. It is difficult to attribute any collisions to this geometric aspect, however, it is clear that it catches drivers off-guard and leads to wandering in the lanes. The City could consider smoothing out the alignment through the use of pavement markings by shifting the flat area by approximately 1.6 metres, as shown in **Figure 35**. This would allow the outside yellow line to fall within the existing roadway platform.

Commented [N79]: That sounds easy. Is it that simple?



Figure 35 - Potential Pavement Marking Adjustment

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$4,000.

Commented [N80]: I assume the countermeasures for SMV and nighttime collisions are explained in the overall countermeasure sections. It would good to remind the reader.

6.4 Mud Segments 1, 2 & 3

The main collision finding through these segments was the high proportion SMV type collisions as well as non-daylight collisions. The field investigation revealed minor deficiencies relating primarily to a guiderail installation in the northbound direction.

B000325

6.4.1 Flatten Slope or Raise Guiderail in Northbound Direction

In the northbound direction within the median downstream of the Stone Church Road / Mud Street diverge point there is a guiderail system with a mound of terrain immediately adjacent to the front of the system. If an errant vehicle were to run off the road in this location, they would ride up on the uneven grassy terrain in front of the barrier causing the vehicle to strike the system at a higher point than it is designed for. This could lead to the overturning of a vehicle, and possibly continuation into the column being shielded. The City could examine the possibility to either lower the terrain or raise the guiderail system.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There have not been any collisions associated with this guiderail, nor are there any CMFs directly related to regarding the terrain adjacent to a guiderail. However, this could be considered maintenance of the system and the costs are expected to be low.

6.5 Mud Segments 4, 5 & 6

Similar to other segments, the main collision finding through these segments was the high proportion SMV type as well as wet surface and non-daylight collisions. Of additional note, the segment Mud 4 shows a [positive](#) PSI. The field review found issues with closely spaced and potentially confusing signage installations.

6.5.1 Relocate “ENGINE BRAKES” Sign (Northbound)

A “PLEASE AVOID USE OF ENGINE BRAKES” Regulatory sign located downstream of the Mud Street on-ramp between a Lane Drop and Bridge Ices warning sign. A curve warning sign also exists on the left side of the road in this [area](#). These signs are closely spaced and within the vicinity of a complex merging area where drivers from Mud Street are required to perform two consecutive merging maneuvers. Given the nature of the location, the warning signs are the highest priority and require the immediate attention of drivers. In its current configuration, the signage in this area could potentially lead to driver-overload and possible conflicts. The City could consider relocating the “ENGINE BRAKES” sign further north beyond the end of the taper.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$500.

6.5.2 Remove “Slower Traffic Keep Right” Sign at Stone Church / Mud Diverge (Southbound)

There are a number of Slower Traffic Keep Right signs in the northbound direction through the study area. While this is generally good advice, there is one sign posted immediately before the Stone Church Road / Mud Street diverge point where the right lane becomes a dedicated exit lane for the freeway exit. Providing this message at this point may be confusing to road users, and could possibly lead to weaving conflicts. This sign is also part of a group of closely spaced signs in the area. The

Commented [N81]: Don't we need one right side too?

B000325



City could consider removing the sign located immediately upstream of the Stone Church Road / Mud Street diverge.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$500.

6.5.3 Relocate Object Marker Sign (Southbound)

The Freeway Exit sign in the gore area of the Stone Church Road / Mud Street off-ramp is partially eclipsed by the Object Marker warning sign on approach. The City could consider relocating the object marker sign to the post of the exit sign.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$500.

6.6 Greenhill Segments 1 to 4

There were no major collision or field findings in this segment.

6.7 Ramps 1 & 2

There were no major collision findings for these ramps, however, during the field review it was noted that there are a couple of minor issues with roadside elements.

6.7.1 Redesign / Replace Guiderail End Treatment (Ramp 1)

The Eccentric Loader steel beam guide rail end treatment on the outer edge of the Dartnall Road off-ramp is damaged, does not contain a sufficient flat run-out area behind the system, and the system itself on the approach end is leaning out and is not vertically plumb. A vehicle striking this system may not be shielded from the slope as intended. The City could consider replacing the existing damaged end treatment with an extruder end treatment and ensure that there is sufficient run-out for the particular anchoring and deflection properties of the system.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$5,000.

6.7.2 Redesign End Treatment on Guiderail (Ramp 2)

The luminaire pole adjacent to the guide rail system at the beginning of the Dartnall Road on-ramp is within the run-out area of the Eccentric Loader approach end treatment. If the end treatment is stuck, it is possible that the vehicle will also come into contact with the luminaire. An extruder end treatment demands less adjacent deflection area upon impact than the Eccentric Loader, preventing an impacted vehicle from traveling through the breakaway area of the system. The City could consider replacing the eccentric loader with an extruder end treatment.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$11,000.

6.8 Ramps 3 & 4

There were no major collision or field findings for these ramps.

6.9 Ramp 5

There were no major collision findings for this ramp; however it was noted during the field investigation that the two lane off-ramp diverges into one lane for Stone Church Road and two lanes that merge to one lane for Mud Street. This merge on the Mud Street section of the ramp occurs within a curve immediately downstream of the diverge point of the ramps. The City could consider restriping the entire ramp to have one lane exit to Stone Church Road and one lane exit to Mud Street thereby eliminating the need for the merge on the curve on approach to Mud Street.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$4,000.

6.10 Ramp 6

This ramp was found to be the poorest performing segment of the RHVP that was reviewed for this assignment and was noted as having a [positive](#) PSI. This ramp has experienced [65%](#) of all collisions occurring on ramps, and like other areas, has a high proportion of SMV, wet surface and non-daylight collisions. The field review noted evidence of run off the road collisions, as well as some closely spaced and eclipsing signage at the diverge point from Ramp 7a.

It must be noted that the City has installed improved signage on the ramp in the recent past. Because this signage was installed after the period for which collisions were available for this review, any effect that this improved signage may have on collisions on the ramp cannot be quantified in this review.

6.10.1 Install High Friction Pavement on Approach to and through Curve

In locations where drivers may brake excessively; for example, when going around curves; the road surface can become prematurely polished, reducing the pavement friction and allowing vehicles to skid when drivers brake. Drivers may also be speeding or distracted, contributing to the [high-crash collision](#) rates in this location. Wet road surfaces can also reduce pavement friction and cause skidding or hydroplaning. High friction surface (HFS) treatment is an emerging technology that dramatically and immediately reduces crashes. With friction demands far exceeding conventional pavement friction, high-quality aggregate is applied to existing or potential high-crash areas to help motorists maintain better control in dry and wet driving conditions. While the initial costs are higher than conventional pavement, however, the long-lasting durability of HFS treatment and limited use in critical locations makes the product a low-cost option over its life cycle. The City could consider installed a HFS treatment on approach to and through the curve at the end of the ramp.

Commented [N82]: Isn't it 50%

B000325



Cost-Benefit Ratio

The CMF used for this assessment was 0.76 and is related to all collision types. The calculated benefit would be a reduction of 8.9 collisions over a five-year period. The expected service life for this countermeasure is 5 years, for a total benefit of \$215,212. The costs associated with this countermeasure are expected to be \$92,863. The B/C ratio is expected to be 2.32.

Commented [N83]: Round off

6.10.2 Install Progressively Larger Chevron Signs

Inappropriate speeds are expected to be the major cause of the run-off-the-road type collisions occurring at this ramp. Since driving is a task with a substantial contribution from vision, the use of lighting and visual information such as signage can assist in providing appropriate cues to encourage appropriate driving speeds. Modifying the use of chevrons to employ progressively-increasing sizes throughout a curve, and adjusting the spacing of them to provide an appearance consistent with a smaller radius curve (about two-thirds the radius of the original curve) can increase perceptions of sharpness by drivers, and can result in greater speed reductions. The City could consider installing modified chevron signs along the curve.

Commented [N84]: What about solar-LED chevrons as are in place at the lower end of RHVP at QEW-Toronto ramp?

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$4,000.

6.10.3 Install Pavement Marking Text

A pavement marking placed on the roadway indicating that the driver should reduce speed for an upcoming curve is being promoted in the U.S. on sections of roads or corridors with higher than average numbers of crashes having roadway curvature as a contributing factor. The pavement marking consists of a "SLOW" legend and an arrow indicating the direction of the upcoming curve. The overall objective is to reduce the upper percentile speed, thus reducing the number of vehicles leaving the roadway and being involved in a collision. The City could consider installing these pavement markings to reinforce to drivers that they must reduce their speed for the curve.

Commented [N85]: Optical speed bars?

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$1,500.

6.10.4 Install Dynamic / Variable Warning Sign

Dynamic or variable warning signs are widely used to convey all manners of information to drivers. In order to reinforce the need for drivers to slow their vehicles for the curve, these warning signs could be used to:

- + Display the vehicle's speed versus the posted warning speed;
- + Display a message "SLOW DOWN" "TOO FAST" (or other) to vehicles travelling over a set speed threshold;
- + Etc.

These signs have proven to be effective in reducing the speed of vehicles. The City could consider installing a dynamic / variable warning sign on approach to the curve in the ramp.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure, however costs are not expected to exceed \$7,000 including solar power option, wiring, installation, etc.

6.10.5 Install Retroreflective Strips on Chevron Signs

To assist in increasing the conspicuity of the chevron signs, the City could consider adding retroreflective tape (or other) to the chevron signs.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$500.

6.10.6 Install Flashing Amber Beacons on Signs

Using flashing beacons with a warning sign is another way to gain motorists' attention. The beacons are typically used with one of the advance Horizontal Alignment signs for a horizontal curve. One factor limiting their use is the availability of an accessible power source, although solar power panel systems can be used as well. The beacons can be flashed either alternately or simultaneously. The safety effectiveness of this particular treatment is yet to be established, but a 1970s study evaluated the effects of signing to warn drivers of wet weather skidding hazards at horizontal curves. The study concluded that agencies could significantly reduce vehicle speed by adding flashing beacons on curve warning signs. The City could consider adding flashing beacons to the warning signs and/or the chevron signs, similar to what the MTO has implemented on a ramp at the north end of the RHVP.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure on its own; however, in combination with advance intersection warning signs and chevron signs, CMFs for the devices installed collectively show a positive reduction in collisions at a curve. Costs per beacon are not expected to exceed \$3,000.

6.10.7 Relocate Signs

There are several signs located within the gore area at the diverge between ramps 6 & 7a. Some of these signs are related to ramp 6 while other are related to ramp 7a. The City could consider making the following adjustments as illustrated in **Figure 36**:

- + Relocate the merge sign from the wood post to the luminaire pole (it is related to ramp 6, not important for ramp 7a);
- + Relocate the exit sign closer to the area where the grass begins; and
- + Relocate the Linc sign further down the ramp or combine with the upstream RHVP sign.

Commented [N86]: Place this next to the chevrons above.

B000325






Figure 36 - Possible Signage Adjustments

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$2,000.

6.11 Ramp 7a & 7b

Similar to other sites, this ramp has a very high proportion of SMV (80%), wet surface and non-daylight collisions, and was found to have a PSI. The field review noted evidence of run off the road collisions, as well as some closely spaced and backdropped signage at the diverge point from Ramp 6 and an inappropriate merge sign.

6.11.1 Relocate Signs as per Ramp 6

The changes to the signage discussed for ramp 6 are directly applicable to ramp 7a.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$2,000, but would only need to be done once (i.e. through ramp 6).

6.11.2 Replace Merge Sign with Lane Ends Sign

The Merge warning sign on approach to the Stone Church Road East S-N on-ramp is inappropriate for the configuration. The driver on the E-N ramp is the one who is merging onto the S-N ramp. This sign indicates that another lane is joining from the right and could cause driver confusion. A Lane

B000325

Ends warning sign is required, as opposed to the Merge warning sign. The City could consider replacing the merge sign with a Wa-123 Lane Ends sign.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$500.

6.11.3 Replace Object Markers and Delineators

Many of the signs on this ramp have been damaged through collisions with them. The City could consider replacing damaged markers and delineators.

Cost-Benefit Ratio

The cost is variable and could be done as maintenance.

6.12 Ramp 8

The collision review indicated a PSI for this ramp, however the actual number of observed collisions is low. The field review highlighted the need for some sign rationalization throughout the ramp.

6.12.1 Replace Road Name Signs with Advance Diagrammatic Sign

Small information signs indicating that the left lane leads to Mud Street and the right lane leads to Stone Church Road are located approximately 160 metres upstream of the forced diverge point for Mud Street and Stone Church Road, are directly behind curve warning signs and immediately before a curve. Since the information signs are small there is a good chance that a driver will not detect them. If the small information signs are missed the next available signage to inform road users of the appropriate lane decision are located at the diverge point. However, similar to the previous information signs, given the horizontal curvature of the ramp, the signs are not visible in advance of their placement and sudden lane changes, and potentially related conflicts, may occur in this area. To assist drivers, the City could consider installing a ground mounted advance diagrammatic sign (similar to example in **Figure 37**) on the right side of the road in the location of the existing small signs.



Figure 37 - Example of Diagrammatic Sign

Commented [N87]: Isn't this specific example for an overhead freeway to freeway split. Better to use an example from Hamilton, Shown in the drop in





Formatted: Normal, Left

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$2,000.

6.12.2 Install Consistent Curve Warning Signage

The curve warning signs on either side of the road on the off-ramp provide inconsistent information regarding the severity of the curve. It is important that consistent and appropriate warning the severity of a curve be provided to a driver in order to assist them in making the appropriate decisions to safely navigate through the curve. It appears that the sign on the left is attempting to indicate that the left lane has a tighter radius than the right lane. The City could consider undertaking a ball-bank test of the curve and installing consistent and appropriate curve warning signs.

Commented [N88]:

Commented [N89]: We did not do that?

Cost-Benefit Ratio

There is no CMF for this countermeasure; however, costs are not expected to exceed \$1,000.

6.13 Ramps 9 & 10

There were no major collision or field findings for these ramps, although they indicate a PSI, the number of collisions is very low.

6.14 Summary of Potential Countermeasures and B/C Ratios

Table 8 summarizes the countermeasures and b/c ratios for the overall study area, Table 9 summarizes the same information for road segments and Table 10 summarizes the same information for ramps.

Table 8 - Summary of Countermeasures & B/C for Overall Study Area

Countermeasure	B/C Ratio [Cost]
Illumination	4.27
PRPM	3.29

Commented [N90]: Careful....!!!!

B000325

Countermeasure	B/C Ratio [Cost]
Wide Markings	3.39
Friction Testing	[\$10,000]
Drainage Review	[\$20,000]
Slippery When Wet Signs	[\$5,000]
Enforcement of Travel Speeds	n/a
Trailblazer Signage	[\$2,000]
Remove Lane Exit Signs	[\$1,000]

Table 9 - Summary of Countermeasures & B/C for Road Segments

Road Segment	Collisions	Field	Countermeasure	B/C
Dartnall 1 & 2	+ None	+ No major findings	+ n/a	+ n/a
Dartnall 3, 4 & 5	+ 48% SMV	+ Potentially restricted sightlines for merging traffic from Dartnall onto NB RHVP	+ Extend solid white line from gore	+ [\$500]
		+ Exit information sign partially obscured NB RHVP	+ Relocate Deer Warning sign	+ [\$500]
		+ Alignment discontinuity in SB direction	+ Alter SB alignment with pavement markings	+ [\$4,000]
Mud 1, 2 & 3	+ 60% SMV + 50% non-daylight	+ Uneven terrain in front of guiderail NB	+ Flatten terrain or raise guiderail NB	+ n/a
Mud 4, 5 & 6	+ Exp. > Pred. @ Mud 4	+ Closely spaced & obscured signage at critical decision points SB	+ Relocate "ENGINE BRAKES" sign SB	+ [\$500]

B000325

Road Segment	Collisions	Field	Countermeasure	B/C
	+ Primarily SMV + High proportion of non-daylight & wet surface	+ Potentially confusing "keep right" sign NB	+ Remove "Slower Traffic" sign SB	+ [\$500]
		+ Closely spaced & obscured signage at critical decision points NB	+ Place "Object Marker" sign on same post as "Exit" sign SB	+ [\$500]
Greenhill 1 to 4	+ None	+ No major findings	+ n/a	+ n/a

Table 10 - Summary of Countermeasures & B/C for Ramps

Ramp	Collisions	Field	Countermeasure	B/C
Ramp 1 & 2	+ n/a	+ Poorly designed and damaged guiderail end treatment (Ramp 1)	+ Change guiderail end treatment	+ [\$5,000]
		+ Luminaire within deflection area of approach eccentric loader end treatment (Ramp 2)	+ End guiderail and change end treatment	+ [\$11,000]
Ramp 3	+ n/a	+ No major findings	+ n/a	+ n/a
Ramp 4	+ n/a	+ No major findings	+ n/a	+ n/a
Ramp 5	+ n/a	+ Lane ends within curve	+ Restripe to one lane for each ramp	+ [\$4,000]
Ramp 6	+ Exp. > Pred. + 65% of all ramp collisions + High proportion & frequency of SMV, non-daylight & wet surface	+ Closely spaced / eclipsing signage at diverge point + Evidence of lane departures	+ Install high-friction pavement approaching and through curve	+ 2.32
			+ Install progressively larger chevrons	+ [\$4,000]
			+ Install pavement marking text	+ [\$1,500]
			+ Install dynamic / variable speed warning sign	+ [\$7,000]
			+ Install retroreflective strips on chevron signs	+ [\$500]
			+ Install flashing amber beacons on signs	+ [\$3,000]
			+ Relocate signs	+ [\$2,000]

B000325



Ramp	Collisions	Field	Countermeasure	B/C
Ramp 7a 7 7b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Exp. > Pred. + 80% of collisions SMV + High proportion of non-daylight & wet surface 	+ Closely spaced & back dropped signage at diverge	+ Relocate signs	+ [\$2,000]
		+ Inappropriate merge sign	+ Replace merge sign with Wa-123 Lane Ends sign	+ [\$500]
		+ Damaged object markers and delineators	+ Replace object markers and delineators	+ n/a
Ramp 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Exp. > Pred., however very low # of collisions 	+ Size of information signs	+ Replace road name information signs with advance diagrammatic sign	+ [\$2,000]
		+ Inconsistent curve warning signs	+ Determine appropriate curve warning sign and make both consistent	+ [\$1,000]
Ramp 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Exp. > Pred., however very low # of collisions 	+ No major findings	+ n/a	+ n/a
Ramp 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Exp. > Pred., however very low # of collisions 	+ No major findings	+ n/a	+ n/a

B000325

