RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

# Roadway Geometric Design Research for Improved Safety and Operations

Vishal Babu*, Satish Kumar**
**M. Tech. (Pursuing) Department of Civil Engineering, Rama University, Kanpur*
*** Department of Civil Engineering, Rama University, Kanpur*

*Safety in Geometric style Standards 3 Anecdotes -:*
*Many believe that roads designed to standards area unit safe roads. within the companion paper the claim are going to be created that such roads area unit neither safe nor unsafe; that their safety is essentially unpremeditated. Here I relate 3 historical anecdotes to encourage the claim. The anecdotes speak of 3 outstanding geometric standards: vertical crest curves, lane dimension and horizontal curves. In every case the planning standards were written and repeatedly rewritten while not factual data of their repercussions on crash frequency and severity*

---

Date of Submission: 01-09-2020 Date of Acceptance: 16-09-2020

---

**The case of the dead dog.**

The first report is concerning the quality that pertainsto the look of vertical crest curves. It shows however a thought concerning why crashes occur hasshaped the evolution of a typical within which factual information of safety was neither needed nor compete a discernible role.

The vertical alignment of a road is formed up ofstraight lines connected by parabolic curves. On the straight section the motive force will see asfar as vision and visibility allow. On the crest curve portion of the road, sight distance is also restricted by the form ofthe parabolic curve. This form is chosen by the designer and ruled by choice standards. From the earliest time, road style standards dictate that the conic section be sufficiently shallow in order that, if there's some object of specified height within the path of the vehicle, it are often seen from way enough for the motive force to prevent safely. during this manner, the quality is driven by an exact concern for safety.

The distance required for a safe stop (the ‘stopping sight distance’) is easily calculated from Newtonian mechanics once the speed, the grade of the road, the time interval of the motive force and therefore the friction between the tyres and therefore the road area unit given. what is more, if the peak of the item to be seen and therefore the height ofthe driver’s eye on top of the road area unit given, the remainder is AN exercise in coordinate geometry. therefore the core of the quality area unit the ‘design speed’ and some ‘parameters’ (the time interval, pavement-tire friction, eye height and object height). the remainder could be a matter of computation supported physics and arithmetic. The designer will reckon (look up in a very table) what form of the conic can satisfy the stopping sight distance demand.

All this seems utterly wise. Note that to erect this logical construction it had been not necessary to use data regarding however crash frequency or severity rely upon the form of the crest parabolas. All that was required was to imagine what situation on crest curves may lead to crashes. during this case the conjecture was that sight distance limitations area unit a very important explanation for crashes on crest curves.

From time-to-time additional analysis is finished regarding what ‘reaction time’ or ‘deceleration rate’ ought to be utilized in the computation of the ‘stopping distance’, or regarding what ‘driver eye height’ or ‘object height’ ought to be blocked into the formula crucial from however way the thing is seen. The last suggested revision makes for somewhat shallower (longer) crest curves. The authors (Fambro, Fitzpatrick, and Koppa, 1997, p. 80) justifiedly note that “these recommendations area unit supported driver capabilities and performance instead of on a necessity for added safety.” That is, within the absence of a tested relationship between sight distance and therefore the frequency or severity of crashes on crest curves, the parameter values to be used don't have any familiar touching on safety. It follows that, in spite of appearances, the planning procedure for crest curves isn't driven by safety however by alternative issues. To cater to those ‘other concerns’ the planning ritual could also be adequate. However, since the planning ritual isn't supported information of road safety, one might not claim that it builds into the road AN applicable quantity of safety.

**How wide should lanes be?**

Standards committee selected to believe that the larger the separation between oncoming vehicles the higher for safety. yet the on the market empirical proof substance caution, consecutive committees stuck to the present regressive belief and wrote standards on its basis. The Committees believed that lanes but eleven feet give dangerously inadequate clearances between vehicles. Since several roads with nine and ten foot lanes existed and were being engineered, laborious decisions had to be created regarding minimum acceptable lane widths. despite the fact that the essence of the trade off was between crashes and cash, there's no proof that in setting minimum lane breadth standards the committees used the then on the market info regarding what gave the impression to be the connection between lane breadth and crash frequency. The historical roots of the lane-width normal return to the amount of 1938-1944 once seven 'geometric style policies' were written by the Committee on designing and style Policies of the yank Association of thruway officers. This cluster of policies was assembled into one volume in 1950 and printed with revisions as a 'Policy on Geometric style of Rural Highways' in 1954. The 'Policy' was revised and reissued in 1965, 1984, 1990 and 1994.

About lane width the 1954 Policy says

: "No feature of a highway has a greater influence on safety and comfort of driving than the width of the surface. . . . Ten- to 12-foot lane width are now standard and the tendency istoward the larger value. . . . Observations on 2-lane two-way rural highways show that hazardous conditions exist on surfaces less than 22 feet (1) wide carrying even moderate volumes of mixed traffic and that, to permit desired clearance between commercial vehicles, a 24-foot surface isrequired . . . Fromthis and similar studies it has been concluded and generally accepted that lane width of 11 feet and preferably 12 feetshould be provided on modern main highways." (Pp. 192-193).

**The 1954 Policy says any that:**

". . .it is not economically possible nor excusable to utilize these standards (12 foot lanes with ten foot shoulders) for all highways. A logical approach is to see minimum . . . standards in reference to traffic demands . . . " (p. 223).

It is not possible to understand what members of the Committees knew concerning the link between lane-width and crash frequency. Going by what they wrote implies that until 1994 they relied solely on Taragin's 1944 conjecture. The judgement that the Committee members had to form (about what lane dimension is even in what conditions) isn't a simple one. Arguments of price, capacity, safety and luxury should be thought-about, and it's not clear however way quantitative price profit calculations is pushed. it's clear, however, that the security portion of the argument ought to be supported crash frequency and severity. If the security portion relies on the conjecture concerning separation between oncoming vehicles, and since the link between separation and safety is unknown, safety isn't very being taken under consideration and therefore the ensuing customary builds Associate in Nursing unpremeditated quantity of safety into roads.

**Crashes on curves.**

The third story is concerning horizontal curves. It shows with clarity the prototypal paradigm guiding the minds of writers of geometric style standards:
1-assume however failure arises ¸
2-use physical sciences and arithmetic to represent the failure scenario ¸
3-postulate 'design loads' and select 'conservative' values for parameters ¸
4-compute values for style.

At first sight, the assumed mode of failure on that the planning of a horizontal curve is predicated is obviously logical. to maneuver around a curve, any object (here a vehicle) should be pushed by a ample external force acting toward the centre of curvature. If the offered force is short, the vehicle can drift to the skin of the curve and leave the road. this is often thought to represent 'failure' during this case. The quicker the vehicle travels, the larger the specified force. Conversely, the larger the radius of curvature the lesser is that the needed force. the specified force is provided part by the tire-road friction and part by the banking of the road (the 'superelevation'). For the assumed mode of failure (drifting out of the curve because of short centripetal force), the laws of physics specify the link between speed, radius, superelevation and aspect friction

Interestingly, the 'conservative' price for aspect friction isn't what can be encountered on "pavements that area unit glazed or harm . . . as a result of these conditions area unit avertable and geometric style ought to be supported acceptable surface conditions" (Policy, 1984, pp.165-166). Rather, it's primarily based the ascertained driver behaviour and derived from tests conducted regarding the number of aspect friction that drivers can settle for while not deceleration down once going spherical curves at, what they suppose, area unit safe speeds. These friction factors area unit conservative as a result of they're still believed to “provide ample margin of safety against skidding” (p. 166).

The immediate reason for the tragic disjunction is that, as within the earlier anecdotes regarding vertical curves and lane dimension, no empirical data regarding crash prevalence has been wont to develop the look procedure for horizontal curves. Nor did anyone appear to contemplate however crash frequency and severity rely upon curve radius or superelevation. The exploit of planning for safety while not victimization the existing empirical data of safety was expedited by the apparent legitimacy of the aforesaid style paradigm

First, it absolutely was assumed to be obvious that failure results once there's meager force to stay AN object moving at the look speed on a circular path. during this entirely mechanistic conception there looks to be no area for the motive force WHO should really steer the vehicle on the falciform path at AN applicable speed. indeed an outsized proportion of crashes on curves occur once the motive force didn't anticipate the curve properly and didn't follow the curve of the road. tardy reaction usually ends up in over-correction and loss of management. In these instances the supply of AN adequate centripetal force on AN assumed circular path has very little influence

Second, the role of the ‘design load’ within the general paradigm is compete here by the ‘design speed’. Normally, style masses square measure thus elite that their chance of being exceeded is sufficiently little. solely then will failure be fitly rare. however {the style|theplanning|the look} speed utilized in geometric design standards has solely the vaguest relationship to any real rarity of prevalence

The design speed is outlined somewhat circuitously as “the most safe speed which will one be maintained over a nominative section of road . . . ”(Policy, 1984, page 60). However, in fact, the speed at that drivers talk terms curves habitually exceeds the planning speed. Krammes (1994) reports that the eighty fifth score speed exceeded the planning speed on the big majority (about 90%) of curves wherever measurements were created. Similar findings for Australia were revealed by McLean (1981) that's, rather more than V-J Day of the drivers traverse curves at speeds that square measure larger than what has been assumed for style. this can be on no account a rare prevalence. Naturally, the motive force will don't have any data of the ‘design speed’ that has been utilized in the designer’s calculations. Since the planning speed has no clear relationship to either the ordinance or the speed expected to be exceeded by solely a really little proportion of drivers, it's entirely unclear what it represents or why it got to be relevant to curve style.

These 3 aspects of reality maybe make a case for the circumstances during which the rift between the intent and action evolved. However, they're not a spare excuse. A road may be aartificial product. In use, roads square measure famed to be harmful to health. it's not acceptable to supply roads and to place them into use while not providing for a calculated quantity of safety

. Finally, associate apology is due. there's a component of the unfair in my target the succession of committees that wrote the geometric style standards for AASHO and later AASHTO. After all, there are several standards apart from those for geometric style that have solely a tenuous link to safety. Thus, e.g., it appears acceptable to use medical opinion as a decent basis of the static sharp-sightedness needs for driver licensing, although its correlation to crash expertise is weak to nonexistent. My excuse is that I even have drawn my examples from what i'm acquainted with, and that i wrote concerning what considerations ME - the role of civil engineers within the delivery of road safety. (“Only you probably did i do know of all the families of the planet, this can be why on you i will be able to visit all of your sins.” Amos, 3, 2). There was no intent to be important of either persons or organizations that acted within the same method as several others do. the article during this paper is to produce the psychological feature foundation for the claim that roads designed to standards ar neither safe nor befittingly safe. The claim is corroborated a lot of formally within the companion paper during this volume. There I conjointly explore the chances for reforming the road style method.