



National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices

17200 West Bell Road No.1135 * Surprise, Ariz. 85374
Telephone (623) 214-2403 * e-mail: ncutcd@aol.com

2 **TECHNICAL COMMITTEE : Joint Task Force on Optional Applications of**
3 **Pavement Markings and Delineators and Rumble Strip Markings in Combination**
4 **with Horizontal Curve Warning Signing - June 2012**

6 **TOPIC: Optional Applications of Pavement Markings and Delineators and**
7 **Rumble Strip Markings in Combination with Horizontal Curve Warning Signing**

9 **STATUS/DATE OF ACTION:**

10 TC Drafts	01/03/13;01/09/13
11 TC Approval:	1-10-13 (APPROVED BY RWSTC AND
	12 MARKINGS TECHNICAL COMMITTEES)
13 Transmitted to Sponsors:	READY FOR SPONSORS
14 Council Approval:	00/00/0000

16 **ORIGIN OF REQUEST: Task Force: Paul Carlson (Chair), Tom Heydel, Lee**
17 **Roadifer, Glass, Richard Porter, Mark**
18 **Nahra, Tom Grant, Dave Woodin, and Fred**
19 **Ranck**

21 **AFFECTED SECTIONS OF MUTCD: Section 2C.06 Horizontal Alignment**
22 **Warning Signs and Chapter 3B**

24 **SUMMARY:**

25 **Current Text of 2009 MUTCD:**

27 **Section 2C.06 Horizontal Alignment Warning Signs**

28 Support:

29 ⁰¹ A variety of horizontal alignment warning signs (see Figure 2C-1), pavement markings (see
30 Chapter 3B), and delineation (see Chapter 3F) can be used to advise motorists of a change in the
31 roadway alignment. Uniform application of these traffic control devices with respect to the
32 amount of change in the roadway alignment conveys a consistent message establishing driver
33 expectancy and promoting effective roadway operations. The design and application of
34 horizontal alignment warning signs to meet those requirements are addressed in Sections 2C.06
35 through 2C.15.

37 **Standard:**

38 ⁰² **In advance of horizontal curves on freeways, on expressways, and on roadways with**
39 **more than 1,000 AADT that are functionally classified as arterials or collectors, horizontal**

40 alignment warning signs shall be used in accordance with Table 2C-5 based on the speed
 41 differential between the roadway's posted or statutory speed limit or 85th-percentile speed,
 42 whichever is higher, or the prevailing speed on the approach to the curve, and the
 43 horizontal curve's advisory speed.

44 Option:

45 03 Horizontal Alignment Warning signs may also be used on other roadways or on arterial and
 46 collector roadways with less than 1,000 AADT based on engineering judgment.
 47

Table 2C-5. Horizontal Alignment Sign Selection

Type of Horizontal Alignment Sign	Difference Between Speed Limit and Advisory Speed				
	5 mph	10 mph	15 mph	20 mph	25 mph or more
Turn (W1-1), Curve (W1-2), Reverse Turn (W1-3), Reverse Curve (W1-4), Winding Road (W1-5), and Combination Horizontal Alignment/Intersection (W10-1) (see Section 2C.07 to determine which sign to use)	Recommended	Required	Required	Required	Required
Advisory Speed Plaque (W13-1P)	Recommended	Required	Required	Required	Required
Chevrons (W1-8) and/or One Direction Large Arrow (W1-6)	Optional	Recommended	Required	Required	Required
Exit Speed (W13-2) and Ramp Speed (W13-3) on exit ramp	Optional	Optional	Recommended	Required	Required

Note: Required means that the sign and/or plaque shall be used, recommended means that the sign and/or plaque should be used, and optional means that the sign and/or plaque may be used.

See Section 2C.06 for roadways with less than 1,000 ADT.

48
49

1. RWSTC and Council approved the following prior to to the 2009 MUTCD:

Table 2C-5. Horizontal Alignment Sign Selection

Type of Horizontal Alignment Sign	Difference Between Speed Limit and Advisory Speed				
	5 mph	10 mph	15 mph	20 mph	25 mph or more
Turn (W1-1), Curve (W1-2), Reverse Turn (W1-3), Reverse Curve (W1-4), Winding Road (W1-5), and Combination Horizontal Alignment/Intersection (W1-10) (see Section 2C.07 to determine which sign to use)	Option Recommended	Recommended Required	Required	Required	Required
Advisory Speed Plaque (W13-1P)	Option Recommended	Recommended Required	Required	Required	Required
Chevrons (W1-8) and/or One Direction Large Arrow (W1-6)	Optional	Option Recommended	Recommended Required	Required	Required

Exit Speed (W13-2) and Ramp Speed (W13-3) on exit ramp	Optional	Optional	Recommended	Recommended Required	Required
--	----------	----------	-------------	----------------------	----------

Note: Required means that the sign and/or plaque shall be used, recommended means that the sign and/or plaque should be used, and optional means that the sign and/or plaque may be used. See Section 2C.06 for roadways with less than 1,000 AADT.

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70

2. RWSTC and Council January 2011 previously approved the following changes to the 2009 MUTCD:

Section 2C.06 Horizontal Alignment Warning Signs, page 110

Standard:

In advance of horizontal curves on freeways, on expressways, and on roadways with more than 1,000 AADT that are functionally classified as arterials or collectors, horizontal alignment warning signs shall be used in accordance with Table 2C-5 based on the speed differential between the roadway’s posted or statutory speed limit ~~or 85th-percentile speed, whichever is higher, or the prevailing speed on the approach to the curve,~~ and the horizontal curve’s advisory speed.

RESEARCH:

Statistics from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) for 2008 were 34,017 fatal crashes with 17,818 of these being roadway departure crashes. Approximately 28 percent of these fatal crashes occurred along horizontal curves.

**FHWA Summary of Horizontal Curve Fatalities from FARS:
2007 Fatalities in Horizontal Curves**

	Blank	Straight	Curve	Unknown	total	fhwa % of fatalities that occur in curves
Vermont	0	39	48	0	87	55.17%
Montana	0	139	124	0	263	47.15%
West Virginia	0	223	185	2	410	45.12%
Maine	0	104	84	0	188	44.68%
New Hampshire	0	73	54	0	127	42.52%
Kentucky	0	535	378	0	913	41.40%
Oregon	0	279	194	4	477	40.67%
Virginia	0	570	389	4	963	40.39%
Wyoming	0	116	78	1	195	40.00%
Arkansas	0	407	256	2	665	38.50%
Washington	0	396	234	0	630	37.14%
Tennessee	1	821	465	0	1287	36.13%
Colorado	0	344	191	0	535	35.70%
Connecticut	1	190	106	4	301	35.22%

Pennsylvania	0	993	532	0	1525	34.89%
Idaho	0	175	92	0	267	34.46%
North Carolina	0	1023	536	0	1559	34.38%
Missouri	0	721	375	0	1096	34.22%
Georgia	0	1110	575	8	1693	33.96%
Alaska	0	49	25	0	74	33.78%
Rhode Island	0	55	26	0	81	32.10%
Alabama	0	843	364	1	1208	30.13%
Wisconsin	0	502	217	5	724	29.97%
New York	0	1042	413	1	1456	28.37%
Louisiana	0	704	278	0	982	28.31%
Minnesota	0	355	138	1	494	27.94%
Maryland	0	472	176	3	651	27.04%
Delaware	0	109	39	0	148	26.35%
Hawaii	0	118	42	1	161	26.09%
South Carolina	0	776	261	0	1037	25.17%
Ohio	0	922	311	5	1238	25.12%
Utah	0	217	70	0	287	24.39%
North Dakota	0	86	25	0	111	22.52%
South Dakota	0	148	43	0	191	22.51%
California	0	3263	953	20	4236	22.50%
Nevada	0	335	97	0	432	22.45%
New Mexico	0	379	104	1	484	21.49%
Indiana	0	701	188	10	899	20.91%
Oklahoma	0	606	158	1	765	20.65%
Mississippi	0	735	176	0	911	19.32%
Texas	0	2791	669	15	3475	19.25%
Illinois	0	1018	235	1	1254	18.74%
Arizona	0	940	241	107	1288	18.71%
Massachusetts	0	338	80	12	430	18.60%
Florida	0	2759	609	6	3374	18.05%
New Jersey	157	480	135	0	772	17.49%
Michigan	0	882	183	20	1085	16.87%
Kansas	0	394	74	0	468	15.81%
Iowa	0	375	64	0	439	14.58%
Nebraska	0	230	39	0	269	14.50%
District of Columbia	0	32	5	0	37	13.51%
Total	159	30914	11334	235	42642	26.58%

71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80

These crashes occurred predominantly on two-lane rural highways that are often not part of the state DOT system. Considering these statistics and that the average accident rate for horizontal curves is about three times the average accident rate for highway tangents (Glennon et al., 1983), implementing strategies designed to improve the safety at horizontal curves will help achieve the overall goal of the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

Approximately 76 percent of curve-related fatal crashes were single-vehicle crashes in

81 which the vehicle left the roadway and struck a fixed object or overturned, whereas
82 11 percent of curve-related fatal crashes were head-on crashes. Thus, ROR and head-on
83 crashes accounted for 87 percent of the fatal crashes at horizontal curves, and the
84 strategies for improving safety at horizontal curves focus on reducing the frequency and
85 severity of these types of crashes. These strategies may not eliminate crashes with other
86 vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and trains that may be directly in the path of the vehicle,
87 but crash statistics do not indicate that these types of collisions are prevalent on curves.
88

89 **2. NCHRP 500 Volume 7: A Guide for Reducing Collisions on** 90 **Horizontal Curves**

91 **Effectiveness of Traditional Advance Warning Treatments at Horizontal Curves**

92
93 “Research suggests that the proliferation of curve warning signs, especially those supplemented
94 with advisory speed plates, may have lessened the average motorist’s respect for the messages
95 that they convey (Lyles, 1980). However, because of tort liability concerns, many highway
96 agencies prefer to use traditional advance warning and curve signs even if research indicates
97 that these signs may be ineffective. The findings from studies that investigated the effectiveness
98 of traditional advance warning signs are summarized in the following paragraphs.
99

100 Lyles (1980) examined the effectiveness of five sign treatments for controlling driver speeds in
101 the vicinity of hazardous horizontal curves on rural two-lane highways. Sign treatments ranged
102 from the standard curve warning sign to a regulatory speed zone sign in conjunction with a
103 curve warning sign. The effectiveness of the signs was evaluated based on speeds of motorists
104 as they approached and negotiated the horizontal curves and whether vehicles crossed over
105 center and edgeline markings. Lyles found that no sign, or group of signs, was consistently
106 more effective than another in decreasing the potential hazard at horizontal curves.
107

108 Zwahlen (1983) examined the effectiveness of advisory speed plates in causing drivers to
109 reduce their speeds through curves. He concluded that advisory speed signs are not more
110 effective in causing drivers to reduce their speeds through curves than the curve signs alone
111 are, at least not in dry weather, and that further research was needed to determine the
112 effectiveness of advisory speed signs in adverse weather conditions. Zwahlen recommended that
113 advisory speed sign maintenance, especially new installations, be given a low priority.
114

115 Ritchie (1972) examined the choice of speed in driving through curves as a function of advisory
116 speed and curve signs. He found that motorists drove faster and produced more lateral
117 acceleration when (a) a curve sign was present, and (b) an advisory speed sign was present,
118 than under the opposite conditions. In addition, motorists exceeded advisory speed signs of
119 24 to 56 km/h (15 to 35 mph), but motorists did not exceed advisory speed signs of 72 to 80
120 km/h (45 to 50 mph). Ritchie concluded that advance warning signs serve to reduce uncertainty
121 and allow drivers to proceed with greater confidence.
122

123 One of the reasons for the low percentage of compliance with posted advisory speeds on
124 curves may be that the criteria for setting advisory speeds on curves are outdated due to
125 advances in vehicle characteristics. The current criteria for setting advisory speeds on curves
126 have remained essentially unchanged for more than 50 years. Chowdhury et al. (1998) evaluated

127 the validity of current criteria for determining advisory speeds on horizontal curves and
128 concluded that the criteria are not valid for modern vehicles. At most curves, posted advisory
129 speeds were well below the prevailing traffic speed and below the recommended values
130 suggested by the two methods for determining advisory speeds, namely the ball-bank indicator
131 and the *Traffic Control Devices Handbook* (TCDH) (Institute of Transportation Engineers,
132 2001). (1978 FHWA Traffic Control Devices Handbook +2001 ITE Traffic Control Devices
133 Handbook use 14, 12, 10 degrees of bank for recommended curve speeds with 14 degrees for
134 speeds below 20 mph, 12 degrees for 20-30 mph and 10 degrees for 35 mph or higher speeds).”
135

136 (Toward addressing the underlying issue of appropriate side friction values for design of
137 horizontal curves and appropriate later acceleration values and their associated ball bank values,
138 the Regulatory and Warning Signs Technical Committee of the National Committee on Uniform
139 Traffic Control Devices undertook a comprehensive review of available research and technical
140 knowledge applicable to horizontal curves in 2005 and 2006. Their recommendation in January
141 of 2007 which was subsequently approved by the full National Committee was to revise the ball
142 bank criteria to 16/14/12 degrees based upon published research by TTI. This change will
143 increase recommended curve speeds by 8 to 10 mph).
144

145 “While the previously mentioned studies suggest that traditional advance warning treatments
146 are not effective in decreasing the potential hazard at horizontal curves, several studies
147 suggest otherwise. Hammer (1968) evaluated the effectiveness of various types of minor
148 improvements in reducing accidents. Two of the minor improvements included in the evaluation
149 were the installation of curve warning signs and advisory speed signs at horizontal
150 curves. Hammer found that curve warning signs reduced accidents by 18 percent at horizontal
151 curves and that installation of both curve warning and advisory speed signs reduced accidents by
152 22 percent. Leisch (1971) also reported advisory speed signs to be effective in reducing accidents
153 at horizontal curves.
154

155 Hanscom (1976) evaluated a slightly different scenario. He evaluated the effects of signing to
156 warn drivers of wet weather skidding hazards at horizontal curves. Three curved highway
157 sections were treated using five experimental sign treatments. The primary measure of
158 effectiveness was mean speed at the critical curve locations. In particular, the target sample was
159 the highest quartile speed group of vehicles arriving in advance of the curve. Significant speed
160 reductions were observed at critical curve locations during conditions of wet pavements when
161 warning signs were supplemented with flashing beacons. Therefore, Hanscom recommended that
162 activated warning signs be used at critical curve locations as a skidding accident countermeasure.
163 Several other types of traditional advance warning treatments that have not necessarily
164 been evaluated for their safety effectiveness at horizontal curves include oversized warning
165 signs and double-posted signs. The MUTCD (USDOT, 2003) indicates that oversized
166 warning signs may be used where speed, volume, and other factors result in conditions
167 where greater visibility or emphasis would be desired, such as at unexpected or sharp horizontal
168 curves. Agencies have also double-posted warning signs to draw greater attention
169 to warning signs.
170

171 In summary, none of the studies designed to evaluate the effectiveness of traditional
172 advance warning treatments at horizontal curves question the importance of providing a

173 curve warning sign in advance of unexpected or sharp curves, but conflicting results have
174 been obtained on the effectiveness of advisory speed signs. The most recent studies suggest
175 that advisory speed signs do not garner respect from the average motorist. These studies
176 conclude that advisory speed signs do not effectively reduce speeds at horizontal curves.
177 Before drawing conclusions regarding the effectiveness of advisory speed signs on improving
178 safety at horizontal curves, two issues should be considered. First, of the studies cited
179 above, only Hammer evaluated the effectiveness of advisory speed signs using accident
180 data. The other studies used speed as the measure for evaluating the effectiveness for advisory
181 speed signs. Second, Hanscom is the only reference cited above that recommends targeting
182 the highest quartile speed group of vehicles when evaluating the effectiveness of
183 advance warning treatments based upon speed. He suggests that these vehicles are the
184 vehicles most likely to be involved in accidents at horizontal curves.

185

186 **Post-Mounted Delineators and Chevrons**

187 Post-mounted delineators and chevrons are two types of delineation treatments that are
188 installed outside of the roadway. They are intended to warn drivers of an approaching curve
189 and provide tracking information and guidance to the drivers. While they are intended to
190 act as a warning, it should also be remembered that the posts, placed along the roadside,
191 represent a possible object with which an errant vehicle can crash. Design of posts to
192 minimize damage and injury is an important part of the considerations to be made when
193 selecting these treatments.

194

195 In *NCHRP Report 440*, Fitzpatrick et al. (2000a) report the results of several studies on
196 postmounted delineators. They report that post-mounted delineators reduce the accident rate
197 only on relatively sharp curves during periods of darkness. In addition, highways with
198 postmounted delineators have lower accident rates than highways without post-mounted
199 delineators, and the cost of post-mounted delineators are justified for highways with
200 average daily traffic (ADT) exceeding 1,000 vehicles per day. Fitzpatrick et al. do not
201 quantify the effectiveness of post-mounted delineators in reducing curve-related crashes.
202 Bali et al. (1978) provide similar results.

203

204 Krammes and Tyler (1991) evaluated the operational effectiveness of raised pavement markers
205 as an alternative to post-mounted delineators at horizontal curves on two-lane rural highways.
206 They evaluated nighttime speed and lateral placement data from five sites. For both short-term
207 and intermediate-term analyses, vehicle operations with raised pavement markers compared
208 favorably with operations when post-mounted delineators were present. Vehicle operations
209 were not significantly affected on the inside lane of the curve, but significant differences were
210 observed on the outside lane of the curve. Speeds at the midpoint of the curve were consistently
211 1.6 to 4.8 km/h (1 to 3 mph) higher with the raised pavement markers, and the mean lateral
212 placement of vehicles was consistently 0.3 to 0.6 m (1 to 2 ft) further from the centerline at
213 the midpoint of the curve with the raised pavement markers than with the post-mounted
214 delineators.

215

216 In addition, the variability in lateral placement of vehicles at the midpoint of the curve
217 was less with raised pavement markers than with post-mounted delineators.

218

219 Zador et al. (1987) examined the short- and long-term effects of chevrons, post-mounted
220 delineators, and raised pavement markers on the speed and placement of vehicles traveling
221 on curves on rural two-lane highways. In general, all three delineation treatments affected
222 driver behavior at night. Vehicle paths were shifted away from the centerline on horizontal
223 curves where raised pavement markers and chevrons were installed and toward the centerline
224 on curves where post-mounted delineators were used. Vehicle speed and placement variability
225 were also slightly reduced with the use of chevrons and raised pavement markers.
226 Zador et al. did not conclude that one delineation treatment was superior to the others and
227 indicated that the primary benefit of any of these delineation treatments may simply be that
228 they help drivers better recognize that they are approaching a curve.
229

230 Agent and Creasey (1986) investigated the ability of various traffic control devices to delineate
231 horizontal curves so drivers would perceive the curve and slow to an appropriate speed and
232 so drivers would have improved guidance through the curve. The investigation consisted of
233 both laboratory tests and field data collection. The laboratory tests suggested that increasing
234 the height of the post-mounted delineator while maintaining the distance from the post to the
235 pavement edge, and keeping the post spacing constant, made a curve appear sharper than
236 other delineator devices. From speed data, encroachment data, and some accident data, Agent
237 and Creasey found that pavement markings had a greater effect on drivers than post-mounted
238 delineators installed on the roadside did. In addition, chevrons had slightly more influence on
239 speeds and encroachments than other post-mounted delineators did.
240

241 Jennings and Demetsky (1985) evaluated the effectiveness of three post-mounted delineator
242 systems in controlling ROR crashes. The post-mounted delineator systems were evaluated
243 based upon changes in speed and lateral placement of vehicles within the travel lane.
244 Jennings and Demetsky found that drivers reacted most favorably to chevron signs on sharp
245 curves greater than or equal to 7 degrees (radius of 250 m [820 ft]) and to standard postmounted
246 delineators on curves less than 7 degrees.”
247

248 Park, Carlson, Porter and Andersen (2011) reported consistent findings supporting the positive
249 safety effects of wider edge lines installed on rural, two-lane highways. Results of empirical
250 Bayes before-after evaluation of 1,626 segments (1,178 miles) of rural two-lane roadways in
251 Kansas found a 17.5% reduction in total crashes and a 36.5% reduction in fatal plus injury
252 crashes.
253

254 The findings from 253 segments (851.5 miles) in Michigan with 3 years of before and 3 years of
255 after crash data were a 27.4% reduction in total crashes and 15.4% reduction in fatal plus injury
256 crashes and a 19.4% reduction in total crashes and 16.1% reduction in fatal plus injury crashes
257 from a 2nd set of highway segments. The findings from Illinois crash data without animal
258 collisions were a 30.1% reduction in total crashes and a 37.7% reduction in fatal plus injury
259 crashes.

Table 8

Percent crash reduction estimates for wider edge lines on rural, two-lane highways based on the crash data from three states.

Crash type	Percent crash reduction			
	KS	MI (analysis 1)	MI (analysis 2)	IL (without
Total	17.5	27.4	19.4	30.1
Fatal plus injury	36.5	15.4	16.1	37.7
PDO	12.3	30.5	19.6	23.9
Day	28.6	20.3	12.0	29.1
Night	3.7	30.7	18.8	29.9
Daytime fatal plus injury	41.5	8.2	23.0	36.0
Nighttime fatal plus injury	12.7	22.6	-5.8	34.2
Wet	22.9	67.2	62.6	34.7
Wet night	24.3	76.9	79.2	35.7
Single vehicle	27.0	30.0	18.7	37.0
Single vehicle wet		73.8	65.9	32.8
Single vehicle night	18.4	29.4	18.0	29.5
Single vehicle fatal plus injury	36.8	10.0	-1.9	42.2
Single vehicle night fatal plus injury	18.7	9.7		36.3
Older driver				24.1
Fixed object	19.0			29.5

Note: Estimates in bold are significant at 95% confidence level.

260
261
262
263
264
265

2. More recent research as provided by the Crash Modification Clearinghouse (www.cmfclearinghouse.org) lists the following values for various warning signs, pavement markings, delineator, and rumble strip measures:

a. Install edgelines and centerlines

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.76 ^[B]	24	★★★★★	All	Serious injury, Minor injury	All	Rural	Elvik, R. and Vaa, T., 2004

266
267

b. Install edgelines, centerlines, and delineators

- Countermeasure: Install edgelines, centerlines, and post-mounted delineators

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.55 ^[B]	45	★★★★★	All	Serious Injury, Minor Injury	Not Specified	All	Elvik, R. and Vaa, T., 2004

268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280

281

c. Install Edgelines on Curves

- Countermeasure: Install edgelines (curves)

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.741	25.9	★★★★☆	All	All	Not Specified	Rural	Tsyganov et al., 2009
0.671	32.9	★★★★☆	All	All	Not Specified	Rural	Tsyganov et al., 2009
0.89	11	★★★★☆	Run off road	All	Not Specified	Urban	Tsyganov et al., 2009
0.873	12.7	★★★☆☆	Run off road	All	Not Specified	Rural	Tsyganov et al., 2009
0.963	3.7	★★★☆☆	Speed related	All	Not Specified	Rural	Tsyganov et al., 2009

282
283
284
285

d. Install wider edgelines (4" to 6")

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.929	7.1	★★★★★	All	All	All	Rural	Miles et al., 2010
0.829	17.1	★★★★★	All	Fatal, Serious injury, Minor injury	All	Rural	Miles et al., 2010

287
288

e. Install wider markings and either edgeline or shoulder rumble strips with resurfacing

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.903	9.7	★★★★★	All	Fatal, Serious injury	All	All	Potts, Hutton, Harwood, Bokenkroger, and Curtit, 2010
0.816	18.4	★★★★★	All	Fatal, Serious injury, Minor injury	All	All	Potts, Hutton, Harwood, Bokenkroger, and Curtit, 2010

290
291

f. Install wider markings without resurfacing

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.567	43.3	★★★★★	All	Fatal, Serious injury	All	All	Potts, Hutton, Harwood, Bokenkroger, and Curtit, 2010

292
293

g. Install Chevrons on Horizontal Curves

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.75	25	★★★★★	Nighttime, Non-intersection		All	All	Rural Srinivasan et al., 2009
0.78	22	★★★★★	Head on, Nighttime, Non-intersection, Run off road, Sideswipe		All	All	Rural Srinivasan et al., 2009

295
296
297

h. Install new or upgrade to fluorescent sheeting curve signs

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.82	18	★★★★★	Non-intersection		All	All	Rural Srinivasan et al., 2009
0.82	18	★★★★★	Head on, Non-intersection, Run off road, Sideswipe		All	All	Rural Srinivasan et al., 2009
0.75	25	★★★★★	Non-intersection	Fatal, Serious injury, Minor injury	All	All	Rural Srinivasan et al., 2009
0.66	34	★★★★★	Head on, Nighttime, Non-intersection, Run off road, Sideswipe		All	All	Rural Srinivasan et al., 2009

0.65	35		Nighttime, Non-intersection	All	All	Rural	Srinivasan et al., 2009
------	----	---	-----------------------------	-----	-----	-------	-------------------------

302
303

i. Install delineators

- Countermeasure: Install post-mounted delineators

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
1.04 ^[B*]	-4		All	Serious Injury, Minor Injury	Not Specified	Rural	Elvik, R. and Vaa, T., 2004
1.05 ^[B*]	-5		All	Property Damage Only (PDO)	Not Specified	Rural	Elvik, R. and Vaa, T., 2004

304
305
306
307
308


j. Install static Horizontal Curve Warning Signs

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.7	30	Cannot Be Rated	Run off road	All	All	All	Agent et al., 1996

309
310
311

k. Install Raised Pavement Markers and Transverse Rumble Strips on Approaches to Horizontal Curves

- Countermeasure: Install raised pavement markers and transverse rumble strips on approach to horizontal curves

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.94	6		Run off road	Serious injury, Minor injury	Not specified	Rural	Elvik, R. and Vaa, T., 2004

312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324

325
326

1. Edgeline Shoulder Rumble Strips

- Countermeasure: Install edgeline rumble strips

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.67	33	★★★★★	Run off road	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
0.61	39	★★★★★	Run off road	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
0.71	29	★★★★★	Run off road	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Principal Arterial Other Freeways and Expressways	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
0.75	25	★★★★★	Run off road	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Principal Arterial Other Freeways and Expressways	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
0.75	25	★★★★★	Run off road	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
0.7	30	★★★★★	Run off road	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
0.58	42	★★★★★	Run off road	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
1.31	-31	★★★★★	Run off road	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009

327
328
329
330

m. Centerline Rumble Strip on Horizontal Curves

- Countermeasure: Install centerline rumble strips on horizontal curves

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.53	47	★★★★★	Head on,Sideswipe	All	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
0.83	17	★★★★★	All	All	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
1.16	-16	★★★★★	All	All	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
1.03	-3	★★★★★	All	All	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
1.04	-4	★★★★★	All	All	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
0.63	37	★★★★★	All	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
1.1	-10	★★★★★	All	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
0.94	6	★★★★★	All	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
0.53	47	★★★★★	Head on,Sideswipe	All	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009
0.79	21	★★★★★	All	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Not Specified	Rural	Torbic et al., 2009

331
332
333

n. Shoulder and Centerline Strips

- Countermeasure: Install centerline and shoulder rumble strips

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.82	18	★★★★★	All	Fatal,Serious injury	Principal Arterial Other	Rural	Sayed et al., 2010
0.79	21.4	★★★★★	Cross median,Frontal and opposing direction sideswipe,Head on,Run off road	All	Principal Arterial Other		Sayed et al., 2010

334
335
336

o. Install Wider Edgeline Markings with Resurfacing

- Countermeasure: Install wider markings and either edgeline or shoulder rumble strips with resurfacing

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.903	9.7	★★★★★	All	Fatal, Serious injury	All	All	Potts, Hutton, Harwood, Bokenkroger, and Curtit, 2010
0.816	18.4	★★★★★	All	Fatal, Serious injury, Minor injury	All	All	Potts, Hutton, Harwood, Bokenkroger, and Curtit, 2010
0.789	21.1	★★★★★	All	Fatal, Serious injury	Principal Arterial Other Freeways and Expressways	Rural	Potts, Hutton, Harwood, Bokenkroger, and Curtit, 2010
0.787	21.3	★★★★★	All	Fatal, Serious injury, Minor injury	Principal Arterial Other Freeways and Expressways	Rural	Potts, Hutton, Harwood, Bokenkroger, and Curtit, 2010
0.822	17.8	★★★★★	All	Fatal, Serious injury, Minor injury	Principal Arterial Other Freeways and Expressways	Urban	Potts, Hutton, Harwood, Bokenkroger, and Curtit, 2010
0.794	20.6	★★★★★	All	Fatal, Serious injury, Minor injury	Not Specified	Rural	Hutton, Harwood, Bokenkroger, and Curtit, 2010
0.859	14.1	★★★★★	All	Fatal, Serious injury, Minor injury	Not Specified	Urban	Potts, Hutton, Harwood, Bokenkroger, and Curtit, 2010

337

338
339
340
341

p. Install wider edgelines without resurfacing

- Countermeasure: Install wider markings WITHOUT resurfacing

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.567	43.3	★★★★☆	All	Fatal,Serious injury	All	All	Potts, Hutton, Harwood, Bokenkroger, and Curtit, 2010
0.38	62	★★★★☆	All	Fatal,Serious injury	Principal Arterial Other Freeways and Expressways	Rural	Potts, Hutton, Harwood, Bokenkroger, and Curtit, 2010
0.441	55.9	★★★★☆	All	Fatal,Serious injury,Minor injury	Principal Arterial Other Freeways and Expressways	Urban	Potts, Hutton, Harwood, Bokenkroger, and Curtit, 2010

342
343
344
345

q. Increase Pavement Friction CMF=0.799

- Countermeasure: Improve pavement friction (increase skid resistance)

CMF	CRF(%)	Quality	Crash Type	Crash Severity	Roadway Type	Area Type	Reference
0.799	20.1	★★★★☆	All	All	Not Specified	All	Lyon and Persaud, 2008
0.76	24	★★★★★	All	All	All	All	Harkey et al., 2008
0.43	57	★★★★★	Wet road	All	All	All	Harkey et al., 2008
0.83	17	★★★★★	Rear end	All	All	All	Harkey et al., 2008
0.7	30	★★★★★	Single vehicle	All	All	All	Harkey et al., 2008
0.58	42	★★★★☆	Rear end	All	All	All	Harkey et al., 2008

347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354

3. The Highway Safety Manual (AASHTO 2009) provides methods to predict crashes for two lane rural highways and to quantify the effect of curvature for horizontal curves. For example for a typical 55 mph rural highway with 12 foot wide lanes and 6 foot wide paved shoulders,

For a Typical Rural 2-Lane Highway

Posted speed limit of 55 mph
 Total width (12 foot lane + 6 foot shoulders) =36
 feet
 Degree of Curve
 Superelevation
 Length of curve in feet
 Average Daily Traffic

36
 9
 6
 1,000 0.189
 5,000

Curve Recommended Speed (mph)	Differential Speed (mph) of tangent to curve	Radius (feet) at 6% superelevation	CMF without spiral transition	CMF with spiral transition
55	0	1065	1.257	1.216
50	5	835	1.327	1.286
45	10	660	1.414	1.373
40	15	510	1.536	1.495
35	20	380	1.719	1.678
30	25	275	1.993	1.953
25	30	185	2.477	2.436
20	35	115	3.376	3.335
15	40	65	5.203	5.162
10	45	15	19.213	19.172

355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366

From this analysis, for the typical horizontal curve without a spiral transition, annual crash frequency is 32.7% higher at 5 mph curve differential speed and 41.4% higher for 10 mph curve differential speed with even higher crash frequencies where the curve differential speeds are 15 mph or higher.

The overall safety effect of a horizontal curve on a two-lane rural highway is significant in that those horizontal curves with differential speeds of 15 mph to 25 mph have increased crash frequencies ranging from 50% to 99%

367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389

RECOMMENDED MUTCD PROVISIONS/ REVISIONS:

Note: Proposed changes to the MUTCD are shown in Underlined red and removed text are shown in ~~strike through Red. Blue strike through was adopted in 2011 by Council.~~

- 1. Revise Table 2C-5 by relaxing certain thresholds if combined with pavement marking treatments as identified in a new section of Part 3.

Section 2C.06 Horizontal Alignment Warning Signs

Standard:

02 In advance of horizontal curves on freeways, on expressways, and on roadways with more than 1,000 AADT that are functionally classified as arterials or collectors, horizontal alignment warning signs shall be used in accordance with Table 2C-5 based on the speed differential between the roadway’s posted or statutory speed limit or 85th percentile speed, whichever is higher, or the prevailing speed on the approach to the curve, and the horizontal curve’s advisory speed.

03 Horizontal Alignment Warning signs may also be used on other roadways or on arterial and collector roadways with less than 1,000 AADT based on engineering judgment.

Table 2C-5. Horizontal Alignment Sign Selection

Type of Horizontal Alignment Sign	Difference Between Speed Limit and Advisory Speed				
	5 mph	10 mph	15 mph	20 mph	25 mph or more
Turn (W1-1), Curve (W1-2), Reverse Turn (W1-3), Reverse Curve (W1-4), Winding Road (W1-5), and Combination Horizontal Alignment/Intersection (W1-10) (see Section 2C.07 to determine which sign to use)	Option Recommended	Recommended Required	Required	Required	Required
Advisory Speed Plaque (W13-1P)	Option Recommended	Recommended Required	Required	Required	Required
Chevrons (W1-8) and/or One Direction Large Arrow (W1-6)	Optional	Optional Recommended	Recommended or ☼ Optional Required	Required or ☼ Recommended	Required
Exit Speed (W13-2) and Ramp Speed (W13-3) on exit ramp	Optional	Optional	Recommended	Recommended Required	Required

Note: Required means that the sign and/or plaque shall be used, recommended means that the sign and/or plaque should be used, and optional means that the sign and/or plaque may be used. See Section 2C.06 for roadways with less than 1,000 AADT.

391
392
393

☼ When combined with at least one of the treatments listed in Section 3B.15.

394 **Revise 3A.06 as follows:**

395

396 **Section 3A.06 Functions, Widths, and Patterns of Longitudinal Pavement Markings**

397 **Standard:**

398 **01 The general functions of longitudinal lines shall be:**

- 399 **A. A double line indicates maximum or special restrictions,**
- 400 **B. A solid line discourages or prohibits crossing (depending on the specific application),**
- 401 **C. A broken line indicates a permissive condition, and**
- 402 **D. A dotted line provides guidance or warning of a downstream change in lane function.**

403

404 **02 The widths and patterns of longitudinal lines shall be as follows:**

- 405 **A. Normal line—4 to ~~6~~ 5 inches wide.**
- 406 **B. Wide line—6 inches or more in width at least twice the width of a normal line.**
- 407 **C. Double line—two parallel lines separated by a discernible space.**
- 408 **D. Broken line—normal line segments separated by gaps.**
- 409 **E. Dotted line—noticeably shorter line segments separated by shorter gaps than used for a**
- 410 **broken line. The width of a dotted line extension shall be at least the same as the width of**
- 411 **the line**
- 412 **it extends.**

413

414 **Support:**

415 **03 The width of the line indicates the degree of emphasis.**

416

417 *Guidance:*

418 *04 Broken lines should consist of 10-foot line segments and 30-foot gaps, or dimensions in a similar ratio*

419 *of line segments to gaps as appropriate for traffic speeds and need for delineation.*

420 **Support:**

421 **05 Patterns for dotted lines depend on the application (see Sections 3B.04 and 3B.08.)**

422

423 *Guidance:*

424 *06 A dotted line for line extensions within an intersection or taper area should consist of 2-foot line*

425 *segments and 2- to 6-foot gaps. A dotted line used as a lane line should consist of 3-foot line segments*

426 *and 9-foot gaps.*

427

428 **Support:**

429 **The marking applications identified below have been shown to be beneficial when applied in**

430 **combination with horizontal alignment warning signs to enhance safety around curves and areas**

431 **with run off the road accident history:**

432

433 **1. Wide Edge lines**

434 **2. Delineators**

435 **3. Raised Retroreflective Pavement Markers**

436 **4. Longitudinal Rumble Strips or Stripes**

437 **5. Speed Reduction Markings**

438 **6. Profiled Pavement Markings**

439 **7. or other treatments with demonstrated safety benefits in reducing horizontal curve**

440 **crashes such as Safety Edge, High Friction Surface Treatments**

441

442 **See Section 2C.06, Horizontal Alignment Warning Signs for information**

443 Add a new Section to Chapter 3B after Section 3B.14 as follows:

444 **New Section following existing Section 3B.15,**

445

446 **Section 3B.XX Application of Markings, Delineation, and Rumble Strips in Combination**
447 **with Horizontal Alignment Warning Signs**

448 **Option:**

449 **The following curve safety countermeasures may be used to relax to modify some curve**
450 **signing requirements as indicated in Table 2C-5.**

451 **1. Wide Edge lines**

452 **2. Delineators**

453 **3. Raised Retroreflective Pavement Markers**

454 **4. Longitudinal Rumble Strips or Stripes**

455 **5. Speed Reduction Markings**

456 **6. Profiled Pavement Markings**

457 **7. or other treatments with demonstrated safety benefits in reducing horizontal curve**
458 **crashes such as Safety Edge, High Friction Surface Treatments**

459

460

461

462 **Joint Task Force: VOTE FOR: Unanimous 1-9-13**

463

464 **Markings Technical Committee: 1-10-13 For: Unanimous**

465 **RWSTC 1-10-13 For: 24 Opposed: 0 Abstentions: 0**

466

467 **COUNCIL VOTE:**

468

469 **C:\ncutcd\January 2013\Joint Task Force on optional markings measures approved**

470 **RWSTC 1-10-13**