



Raised Median Islands and Pedestrian Safety

Presented by:

Charlie Zegeer UNC Highway Safety Research Center

Sheila Lyons Oregon Department of Transportation

Gary Sokolow Florida Department of Transportation

Jack Ecklund City of University Place

May 30, 2012



Today's presentation

Introduction and housekeeping

- Audio issues? Dial into the phone line instead of using "mic & speakers"
- ⇒ PBIC Trainings

http://www.walkinginfo.org/training

Registration and Archives at

http://www.walkinginfo.org/webinars

Questions at the end

Follow-up E-mail with certificate of attendance for 1.5 hours of instruction and link to download slides



Medians and Median Islands

Overview and Effectiveness

Basic Street Crossing Techniques

- Crosswalks
- Illumination
- Signs
- Striping
- Medians/pedestrian islands
- Signals
- Over/undercrossings

Need for Medians & Islands

Pedestrian crashes are correlated with ADT & number of travel lanes.



Atlanta GA

Definitions of Medians & Islands

- A median is an area between opposing lanes of traffic, excluding turn lanes that can be open (pavement markings only) or channelized (raised medians or islands) to separate road users
- Pedestrian refuge islands (center islands, refuge islands, pedestrian islands, median slow points) are raised islands that are placed on a street to separate crossing pedestrians from motor vehicles



Step 1: look at traffic on left

Eugene OR



Step 2: cross first half

Eugene OR

Step 3: look at traffic on right

Eugene OR



Step 4: cross second half

Eugene OR



People figure out on their own how to use a median to cross in two steps

Honolulu HI

FHWA Guidance: Medians & Islands

- Should be considered on curbed sections of multi-lane roads in urban and suburban areas
- Most beneficial for ADT's of 12,000 or above and/or high vehicle speeds
- Should be at least 4 feet wide, but although 8 feet preferred to allow for pedestrians to wait for gaps in traffic
- Should conform to ADA requirements



A flush median is not a refuge

Atlanta GA



Add a raised island

Atlanta GA



Crossing island at marked crosswalk - same principle: Breaks long complex crossing into two simpler crossings

Option: stagger or angle cut-through so pedestrians face oncoming traffic before 2nd crossing

Asheville NC



Medians:

Why do medians reduce pedestrian crashes?

- They reduce crossing distance and break up an otherwise complex task into 2 simpler crossings
- What is the crash reduction factor?
 - At marked crosswalks CMF = 0.54 (CRF = 46%) At unmarked crosswalks CMF = 0.61 (CRF = 39%)



Stage 1: Ped stops traffic in one direction

Bellevue WA



Stage 1: Ped crosses to median island

Bellevue WA



Stage 1 over: Traffic in one direction resumes

Bellevue WA



Stage 2: Ped stops traffic in other direction

Bellevue WA



Stage 2 over: Traffic resumes

Bellevue WA



Detail 1: Requires ped push button on island

Bellevue WA



Detail 2: Fences force peds to walk against on-coming traffic

Bellevue WA



Phoenix, AZ – W. Van Buren Street. Before: 1/2mile signal spacing; high-volume, high-speed; marked crosswalks at unsignalized intersections

Van Buren St

Phoenix AZ

Designing for Pedestrian Safety – Crossing Countermeasures

19 000



Before: No frills marked crosswalk at intersection

Phoenix AZ

Before: Challenging 6-lane crossing at Community Center

6 TITER

CONNUMITY CONTRA

Phoenix AZ



After: Raised median with stagger, Advance stop lines (not visible), Location near destination

Phoenix AZ

Medians and Crossing Islands can:

- Reduce pedestrian crashes by 39 to 46 percent
- Decrease motorist delay by 30%
- Provide a safe place for peds.
- Enhance visibility of pedestrians
- Reduce vehicle speeds
- Provide access management
- Provide space for signs

Oregon DOT – Pedestrian Islands Three Types Continuous Medians Pedestrian Crossing Islands Pork Chop Islands

Oregon DOT – Pedestrian Islands Three Types Continuous Medians Pedestrian Crossing Islands Pork Chop Islands

FHWA Publication HRT-04-100 September 2005 Charles Zeeger

Safety Effects of Marked Versus Unmarked Crosswalks at Uncontrolled Locations

Final Report and Recommended Guidelines

FHWA PUBLICATION NUMBER: HRT-04-100

SEPTEMBER 2005



Federal Highway Administration

Research, Development, and Technology Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center 6300 Georgetown Pike McLean, VA 22101-2296



Significant findings

Most important correlate between crashes and other factors: ADT & number of travel lanes.

This confirms observations made on urban state highways in Oregon & other studies

Marked Crosswalks should not be used:

Speed Limit > 40 MPH

Without a **median** on a multi-lane roadway with ADT > 12,000

On multi-lane roadways with ADT >15,000 (with or without a median)

In close proximity to a signalized intersection

The following treatments are recommended:

- Raised Medians/Islands on multi-lane roads
- •Traffic and ped signals where warranted
- Crossing exposure reduction
 - Medians/Islands
 - Curb Extensions
- Lane Reduction (width, number)
 Locate bus stops on far side of uncontrolled intersections
- Traffic Calming
 - Raised Crosswalks
 - Street Narrowing
 - Diverters/traffic circles
- •Illumination
Conclusions/recommendations

- OK to mark crosswalks at ADT <10,000 w/o median*
- OK to mark crosswalks at ADT <15,000 w/ median*
- Medians reduce crash risk significantly
- High ADT roadways require added mitigation
- Signalization or other treatments should be considered where large portion of pedestrians are young and/or elderly
- * Raised Median

Provides methodology for determining what type of crossing treatment to use to improve safety of crossings on high speed high volume roadways

Recommends modifications to the MUTCD pedestrian signal warrant (Now in the 2009 MUTCD)

Includes research review and Field Studies



Oregon DOT Policies

Oregon DOT Traffic Manual

O

http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/TRAFFIC-ROADWAY/docs/pdf/Traffic_Manual_09.pdf

Marking Crosswalks at Uncontrolled Intersections

Oregon DOT Traffic Manual Section 6.6.1.2)

Engineering study required. Location must meet the following criteria:

- Good Sight Distance (Stopping SD as Min.)
- No alternative crossing location
- There is established pedestrian traffic
- Posted Speeds are 40 MPH or less
- ADT < 10,000 ADT

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

If ADT ≥ 10,000 median Island is required

On multi-lane highways additional features (medians, curb extensions, lighting) are encouraged

Marking Crosswalks at Mid-Block Locations

(Section 6.6.1.3)

- Engineering study required. Location must meet the following criteria:
- 1. Good Sight Distance (Stopping SD as Min.)
- 2. No alternative crossing location
- 3. There is established pedestrian traffic
- 4. Posted Speeds are 40 MPH or less
- 5. ADT < 10,000 ADT
- 6. If ADT ≥ 10,000 median Island is require
- 7. Location is >300' from a traffic signal
- 8. Curb extensions should be considered
- 9. There are adjacent bus stops

Other Considerations

Opportunity to concentrate ped x-ings

Free turning movements or other traffic characteristics inhibit x-ing opportunities at nearest intersection







Bailey Hill Rd Eugene, OR - Before



53rd St, Benton County, OR







Seven Pedestrian Islands were installed on 99W in Corvallis in 2005, along a 2 mile segment.

•All mid-block

•Paired with transit stops

•All have median islands

•Four with pole mounted pedestrian activated amber flashers

Sheila's Observations (personal & tape analysis)

Traffic has slowed 3 – 5 MPH

Pedestrian crossings are concentrated at islands (85 observed 5-7-07)(over 200 peds walked past camera)

Stopping compliance improved

Crash data shows increase in rear-enders – as expected

Very young children have been observed using Overall improvement to pedestrian environment

Oregon DOT – Pedestrian Islands Three Types Continuous Medians Pedestrian Crossing Islands Pork Chop Islands

Oregon DOT Highway Design Manual

- •Used when a right turn pocket is present
- •Used whenever there is real estate available
- •Current policy is to use cut-thrus for wheelchairs
- •Provides a place to locate signal poles

http://egov.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/ENGSERVICES/hwy_manuals.shtml

Pedestrian Islands

Benefits: Separate conflicts & decision points 44 0 0 **Reduce crossing** distance dD Improve signal timin 0 Reduce crashes -00-



Imagine the signal timing withoutPhiladelphia PAisland





Drivers naturally trace perfect island...



Should we mark this crosswalk?



What does the MUTCD say?

- "Crosswalks should be marked at all intersections where there is substantial conflict between vehicular and pedestrian movements."
- "Marked crosswalks also should be provided at other appropriate points of pedestrian concentration, such as loading islands, midblock pedestrian crossings, or where pedestrians could not otherwise recognize the proper place to cross."

Should we mark this crosswalk?

Oregon DOT Traffic Manual

- •Policy is to mark the crosswalk
- •Signalization is optional









Worlds Tallest Man on a Bicycle





Multilane Median Policy (1993)

Directs all Department multi-lane projects over 40 mph in design speed to have a restrictive median

It also directs our designers to find ways to use restrictive medians in **all** multi-lane projects, even those below the 40 mph design speed.

http://www.dot.state.fl.us/rddesign/PPMManual/2011/Volume1/Chap02.pdf Now in the Plans Preparation Manual 2.2.2
















5



























































Deaths hy		rote	cting left turns and Pedestria	ins.
Deaths by		Subcos	tion E. Activity Loading to Death	
		Crash	tion 5 Activity Leading to Death	
Name	Age	date	Accident description	
23. Mireya Maria Velez	00	10/10/01	Driving east, they to turn left, struck by westbound car.	
24. Tracee Lanay Daugett	21	1/20/03	Driving west, struck eastbound car that tried to turn left,	
26. Madeline Rivera	30	1/20/03	Passenger in eastbound car that struck eastbound car that tried to turn left	
27 Gricelda Rodriguez	15	1/20/03	Decenger in methound car that tried to turn left, struck buwerthound car	
28 Felix & Aquilar Trevino	22	1/20/03	Passenger in eastbound car that tried to turn left, Struck by Westbound car.	
20. Alvin Serrano	37	7/24/02	Driving asst tried to turn right left roadway struck a tree	
30 Charles Alexander	15	10/1/02	Struck by car while walking across to south side	
31. Byron I. Williams	24	10/19/03	Driving west struck by easthound truck that tried to turn left	
32. Charles F. Woods	59	8/11/01	Struck by car while walking across to south side.	
33. Mary G. Cudd	73	5/2/03	Driving east, struck by westbound car forced across median by truck turning left.	
34. Arthur Zamorano	31	10/26/02	Driving motorcycle west, struck by southbound truck.	
35. Jayson Lee Echevarria	23	6/30/04	Driving motorcycle west, struck car that tried to turn left.	
36. Yull Aleiandro Toro	28	6/30/04	Driving motorcycle west, struck car that tried to turn left.	
37. Ronald Lee Alford	36	12/16/02	Struck by car while walking across to north side.	
38. William Ehart	35	3/11/03	Struck by car while walking across to south side.	
39. Richard L. Williams	27	12/1/02	Struck by car while walking across to south side.	
40. Michael Duane Larson	37	10/9/01	Struck by car while walking across to south side.	
1. Bernice Falk	90	11/7/03	Struck by car while walking across to south side.	
12. Unidentified	na	4/18/01	Struck by car while walking across to south side.	
43. Paul Frank Wadman	55	8/17/01	Struck by unknown vehicle while walking across to north side.	
44. Dany Toribio	23	12/2/02	Stopped easthound for red light, struck from behind by easthound car.	
45. Marissa Irene Herzer	21	1/25/03	Waiting for southbound red light, struck by eastbound car that left roadway.	
46. Robert John Vale	21	1/25/03	Passenger at southbound red light, struck by eastbound car that left roadway.	
47. Christopher D. Brown	21	6/16/02	Passenger on easthound motorcycle, struck by westhound truck making U-trum	
48. Cathy A. Selie	45	10/23/02	Struck by car while walking across to north side.	
9. Cathy Flaine Sproule	21	4/28/01	Driving east, struck by westbound car that crossed median.	
0. Royane Whitemore	15	11/3/04	Passenger in easthound car that turned left, struck by westhound car	



University Place Bridgeport Way Case Study



Washington State



University Place



University Place, WA

- Located SW of Tacoma
- On Puget Sound
- Incorporated: August 31, 1995
- Population: 31,140
- Median Age: 36.5
- Elevation: Sea Level to 500 Ft
- 5 % Undeveloped

University Place



















Make University Place a safe attractive city that provides a supportive environment for all citizens to work, play, get an education and raise families.





- Create a Sense of Place
- Establish City Identity that Embodied the Community Values





It Starts with the Street



Bridgeport Way

Create a Main Street and Town Center that Provides Residents and Visitors a Comfortable, Convenient, Efficient, Safe, Secure and Welcoming Place to Shop, Play, Work and Live.



Timeline

• Aug 1995-City Incorporation

Vision

- Aug 1996-City Vision Statement Adopted
- Nov 1996-Bridgeport Way Charrette
- Feb 1999-Bridgeport 1A (35th-4oth) Complete
- Feb 2000-Bridgeport 1B (27th-35th) Complete
- Jun 2002-Bridgeport 2 (40th-Cirque) Complete
- August 2010-Bridgeport 3 (Cirque-54th) Complete



- Improve Safety For Motorists, Pedestrians and Bicyclists.
- Improve Mobility Of Children, Adults, Disabled and Seniors.
- Create Welcoming Public Spaces.
- Provide Choice in Transportation.
- Provide for Economic Growth.
- Provide a Walkable, Transit, Bicycle and Pedestrian Friendly Community.



<u>Design Elements</u>

- Continuous Landscaped Median
- Sidewalks
- Bike Lanes
- Planter strips
- Streetlights
- U-Turn Pockets at intersections
- Mid-Block Pedestrian Crossings





<u>Critics</u>

- Will Kill Business
- Waste of Money No One Walks or Bikes
- Merely "Making it Pretty"
- Would "Clog-up" Traffic
- Unsafe





Bridgeport (Before)



Bridgeport (Now)





Accident Data: 20% reduction in accidents in corridor 40% reduction in injuries in corridor 75% reduction in mid-block accidents 80% reduction in mid-block injuries


Economic Data*:

7.73% Increase in Sales in 1998 (after phase 1A)
5.64% Increase in Sales in 1999 (during phase 1B construction)
8.39% Increase in Sales in 2000 (after phase 1B)

*Based on Sales Tax Revenue Collected

Pedestrian Safety – Mid Block Crossings

FD

4 C3

Emergency Vehicle Accommodatio

Transportation Success

- Safety
 - Mid-Block Crashes Reduced by 75 %
 - Separated Pedestrians from Vehicular Traffic
 - Streetlights Added

Business Access

Sales Volume Increased

Mobility

- Reduced Side Friction from Cross Traffic
- Added Bike Lanes which Increased Width
- U-Turns at Signalized Intersections
- Improved Bus Stop Locations

Bridgeport Way Project

Phase 2: 40th to Cirque Length: 0.50 Miles Cost: \$3,348,458 Work Start: Sep 2001 Work Complete: Jun 2002 Phase 1A: 35th to 40th Length: 0.50 Miles Cost: \$2,215,103 Work Start: Jun 1998 Work Complete: Feb 1999 Phase 1B: 27th to 35th Length: 0.50 Miles Cost: \$2,672,955 Work Start: Jun 1999 Work Complete: Feb 2000

Phase 3A: Cirque to 54th Length: 0.4 Miles Cost: \$2,024,214 Work Start: Aug 2009 Work Complete: Aug 2010

©Aerolistphoto.com



- Stay Dedicated to Vision
- Have the Courage to Implement Change
- Pay Attention to Details
- Build it



Thank you!

⇒ Archive at

- walkinginfo.org/training/pbic/pedfocus_webinars.cfm
- Downloadable and streaming recording and presentation slides
- ⇒ Questions?
 - Charlie Zegeer zegeer@hsrc.unc.edu
 - Sheila Lyons sheila.a.lyons@odot.state.or.us
 - Gary Sokolow gary.sokolow@dot.state.fl.us
 - Jack Ecklund jecklund@cityofup.com
 - Other webinars@hsrc.unc.edu

