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Chapter 3  Planning

Chapter 1 presented a range of roundabout categories, and suggested typical daily service volume thresholds below which four-leg roundabouts may be expected to operate, without requiring a detailed capacity analysis. Chapter 2 introduced roundabout performance characteristics, including comparisons with other intersection forms and control, which will be expanded upon in this chapter. This chapter covers the next steps that lead up to the decision to construct a roundabout with an approximate configuration at a specific location, preceding the detailed analysis and design of a roundabout. By confirming that there is good reason to believe that roundabout construction is feasible and that a roundabout offers a sensible method of accommodating the traffic demand, these planning activities make unnecessary the expenditure of effort required in subsequent chapters.

Planning for roundabouts begins with specifying a preliminary configuration. The configuration is specified in terms of the minimum number of lanes required on each approach and, thus, which roundabout category is the most appropriate basis for design: urban or rural, single-lane or double-lane roundabout. Given sufficient space, roundabouts can be designed to accommodate high traffic volumes. There are many additional levels of detail required in the design and analysis of a high-capacity, multi-lane roundabout that are beyond the scope of a planning level procedure. Therefore, this chapter focuses on the more common questions that can be answered using reasonable assumptions and approximations.

Feasibility analysis requires an approximation of some of the design parameters and operational characteristics. Some changes in these approximations may be necessary as the design evolves. A more detailed methodology for performing the operational evaluation and geometric design tasks is presented later in Chapters 4 and 6 of this guide, respectively.

3.1 Planning Steps

The following steps may be followed when deciding whether to implement a roundabout at an intersection:

- Step 1: Consider the context. What are there regional policy constraints that must be addressed? Are there site-specific and community impact reasons why a roundabout of any particular size would not be a good choice? (Section 3.2)

- Step 2: Determine a preliminary lane configuration and roundabout category based on capacity requirements (Section 3.3). Exhibit 3-1 will be useful for making a basic decision on the required number of lanes. If Exhibit 3-1 indicates that more than one lane is required on any approach, refer to Chapters 4 and 6 for the more detailed analysis and design procedures. Otherwise, proceed with the planning procedure.

- Step 3: Identify the selection category (Section 3.4). This establishes why a roundabout may be the preferred choice and determines the need for specific information.
• Step 4: Perform the analysis appropriate to the selection category. If the selection is to be based on operational performance, use the appropriate comparisons with alternative intersections (Section 3.5).

• Step 5: Determine the space requirements. Refer to Section 3.6 and Appendix B for the right-of-way widths required to accommodate the inscribed circle diameter. Determine the space feasibility. Is there enough right-of-way to build it? This is a potential rejection point. There is no operational reason to reject a roundabout because of the need for additional right-of-way; however, right-of-way acquisition introduces administrative complications that many agencies would prefer to avoid.

• Step 6: If additional space must be acquired or alternative intersection forms are viable, an economic evaluation may be useful (Section 3.7).

The results of the steps above should be documented to some extent. The level of detail in the documentation will vary among agencies and will generally be influenced by the size and complexity of the roundabout. A roundabout selection study report may include the following elements:

• It may identify the selection category that specifies why a roundabout is the logical choice at this intersection;

• It may identify current or projected traffic control or safety problems at the intersection if the roundabout is proposed as a solution to these problems;

• It may propose a configuration, in terms of number of lanes on each approach;

• It may demonstrate that the proposed configuration can be implemented feasibly and that it will provide adequate capacity on all approaches; and

• It may identify all potential complicating factors, assess their relevance to the location, and identify any mitigation efforts that might be required.

Agencies that require a more complete or formal rationale may also include the following additional considerations:

• It may demonstrate institutional and community support indicating that key institutions (e.g., police, fire department, schools, etc.) and key community leaders have been consulted;

• It may give detailed performance comparisons of the roundabout with alternative control modes;

• It may include an economic analysis, indicating that a roundabout compares favorably with alternative control modes from a benefit-cost perspective; and

• It may include detailed appendices containing traffic volume data, signal, or all-way stop control (AWSC) warrant analysis, etc.

None of these elements should be construed as an absolute requirement for documentation. The above list is presented as a guide to agencies who choose to prepare a roundabout study report.
3.2 Considerations of Context

3.2.1 Decision environments

There are three somewhat different policy environments in which a decision may be made to construct a roundabout at a specific location. While the same basic analysis tools and concepts apply to all of the environments, the relative importance of the various aspects and observations may differ, as may prior constraints that are imposed at higher policy levels.

A new roadway system: Fewer constraints are generally imposed if the location under consideration is not a part of an existing roadway system. Right-of-way is usually easier to acquire or commit. Other intersection forms also offer viable alternatives to roundabouts. There are generally no field observations of site-specific problems that must be addressed. This situation is more likely to be faced by developers than by public agencies.

The first roundabout in an area: The first roundabout in any geographic area requires an implementing agency to perform due diligence on roundabouts regarding their operational and design aspects, community impacts, user needs, and public acceptability. On the other hand, a successfully implemented roundabout, especially one that solves a perceived problem, could be an important factor in gaining support for future roundabouts at locations that could take advantage of the potential benefits that roundabouts may offer. Some important considerations for this decision environment include:

- Effort should be directed toward gaining community and institutional support for the selection of a site for the first roundabout in an area. Public acceptance for roundabouts, like any new roadway facility, require agency staff to understand the potential issues and communicate these effectively with the impacted community;
- An extensive justification effort may be necessary to gain the required support;
- A cautious and conservative approach may be appropriate; careful consideration should be given to conditions that suggest that the benefits of a roundabout might not be fully realized. Collecting data on current users of the facility can provide important insights regarding potential issues and design needs;
- A single-lane roundabout in the near-term is more easily understood by most drivers and therefore may have a higher probability of acceptance by the motoring public;
- The choice of design and analysis procedures could set a precedent for future roundabout implementation; therefore, the full range of design and analysis alternatives should be explored in consultation with other operating agencies in the region; and
- After the roundabout is constructed, evaluating its operation and the public response could provide documentation to support future installations.

Retrofit to an existing intersection in an area where roundabouts have already gained acceptance: This environment is one in which a solution to a site-specific problem is being sought. Because drivers are familiar with roundabout operation, a less intensive process may suffice. Double-lane roundabouts could be considered, and the regional design and evaluation procedures should have already been agreed
upon. The basic objectives of the selection process in this case are to demonstrate the community impacts and that a roundabout will function properly during the peak period within the capacity limits imposed by the space available; and to decide whether one is the preferred alternative. If the required configuration involves additional right-of-way, a more detailed analysis will probably be necessary, using the methodology described in Chapter 4.

Many agencies that are contemplating the construction of their first roundabout are naturally reluctant to introduce complications, such as double-lane, yield-controlled junctions, which are not used elsewhere in their jurisdiction. It is also a common desire to avoid intersection designs that require additional right-of-way, because of the effort and expense involved in right-of-way acquisition. Important questions to be addressed in the planning phase are therefore:

- Will a minimally configured roundabout (i.e., single-lane entrances and circulatory roadway) provide adequate capacity and performance for all users, or will additional lanes be required on some legs or at some future time?
- Can the roundabout be constructed within the existing right-of-way, or will it be necessary to acquire additional space beyond the property lines?
- Can a single-lane roundabout be upgraded in the future to accommodate growth?

If not, a roundabout alternative may require that more rigorous analysis and design be conducted before a decision is made.

### 3.2.2 Site-specific conditions

Some conditions may preclude a roundabout at a specific location. Certain site-related factors may significantly influence the design and require a more detailed investigation of some aspects of the design or operation. A number of these factors (many of which are valid for any intersection type) are listed below:

- Physical or geometric complications that make it impossible or uneconomical to construct a roundabout. These could include right-of-way limitations, utility conflicts, drainage problems, etc.
- Proximity of generators of significant traffic that might have difficulty negotiating the roundabout, such as high volumes of oversized trucks.
- Proximity of other traffic control devices that would require preemption, such as railroad tracks, drawbridges, etc.
- Proximity of bottlenecks that would routinely back up traffic into the roundabout, such as over-capacity signals, freeway entrance ramps, etc. The successful operation of a roundabout depends on unimpeded flow on the circulatory roadway. If traffic on the circulatory roadway comes to a halt, momentary intersection gridlock can occur. In comparison, other control types may continue to serve some movements under these circumstances.
- Problems of grades or unfavorable topography that may limit visibility or complicate construction.
- Intersections of a major arterial and a minor arterial or local road where an unacceptable delay to the major road could be created. Roundabouts delay and deflect all traffic entering the intersection and could introduce excessive delay or speed inconsistencies to flow on the major arterial.
• Heavy pedestrian or bicycle movements in conflict with high traffic volumes. (These conflicts pose a problem for all types of traffic control. There is very little experience on this topic in the U.S., mostly due to a lack of existing roundabout sites with heavy intermodal conflicts).

• Intersections located on arterial streets within a coordinated signal network. In these situations, the level of service on the arterial might be better with a signalized intersection incorporated into the system. Chapter 8 deals with system considerations for roundabouts.

The existence of one or more of these conditions does not necessarily preclude the installation of a roundabout. Roundabouts have, in fact, been built at locations that exhibit nearly all of the conditions listed above. Such factors may be resolved in several ways:

• They may be determined to be insignificant at the specific site;
• They may be resolved by operational modeling or specific design features that indicate that no significant problems will be created;
• They may be resolved through coordination with and support from other agencies, such as the local fire department; and
• In some cases, specific mitigation actions may be required.

All complicating factors should be resolved prior to the choice of a roundabout as the preferred intersection alternative.

The effect of a particular factor will often depend on the degree to which roundabouts have been implemented in the region. Some conditions would not be expected to pose problems in areas where roundabouts are an established form of control that is accepted by the public. On the other hand, some conditions, such as heavy pedestrian volumes, might suggest that the installation of a roundabout be deferred until this control mode has demonstrated regional acceptance. Most agencies have an understandable reluctance to introduce complications at their first roundabout.

3.3 Number of Entry Lanes

A basic question that needs to be answered is how many entry lanes a roundabout would require to serve the traffic demand. The capacity of a roundabout is clearly a critical parameter and one that should be checked at the outset of any feasibility study. Chapter 4 offers a detailed capacity computation procedure, mostly based on experiences in other countries. Some assumptions and approximations have been necessary in this chapter to produce a planning-level approach for deciding whether or not capacity is sufficient.

Since this is the first of several planning procedures to be suggested in this chapter, some discussion of the assumptions and approximations is appropriate. First, traffic volumes are generally represented for planning purposes in terms of Average Daily Traffic (ADT), or Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT). Traffic operational analyses must be carried out at the design hour level. This requires an assumption of a K factor and a D factor to indicate, respectively, the proportion of the AADT
assigned to the design hour, and the proportion of the two-way traffic that is assigned to the peak direction. All of the planning-level procedures offered in this chapter were based on reasonably typical assumed values for $K$ of 0.1 and $D$ of 0.58.

There are two site-specific parameters that must be taken into account in all computations. The first is the proportion of traffic on the major street. For roundabout planning purposes, this value was assumed to lie between 0.5 and 0.67. All analyses assumed a four-leg intersection. The proportion of left turns must also be considered, since left turns affect all traffic control modes adversely. For the purposes of this chapter, a reasonably typical range of left turns were examined. Right turns were assumed to be 10 percent in all cases. Right turns are included in approach volumes and require capacity, but are not included in the circulating volumes downstream because they exit before the next entrance.

The capacity evaluation is based on values of entering and circulating traffic volumes as described in Chapter 4. The AADT that can be accommodated is conservatively estimated as a function of the proportion of left turns, for cross-street volume proportions of 50 percent and 67 percent. For acceptable roundabout operation, many sources advise that the volume-to-capacity ratio on any leg of a roundabout not exceed 0.85 (1, 2). This assumption was used in deriving the AADT maximum service volume relationship.

### 3.3.1 Single- and double-lane roundabouts

The resulting maximum service volumes are presented in Exhibit 3-1 for a range of left turns from 0 to 40 percent of the total volume. This range exceeds the normal expectation for left turn proportions. This procedure is offered as a simple, conservative method for estimating roundabout lane requirements. If the 24-hour volumes fall below the volumes indicated in Exhibit 3-1, a roundabout should have no operational problems at any time of the day. It is suggested that a reasonable approximation of lane requirements for a three-leg roundabout may be obtained using 75 percent of the service volumes shown on Exhibit 3-1.

If the volumes exceed the threshold suggested in Exhibit 3-1, a single-lane or double-lane roundabout may still function quite well, but a closer look at the actual turning movement volumes during the design hour is required. The procedures for such analysis are presented in Chapter 4.

### 3.3.2 Mini-roundabouts

Mini-roundabouts are distinguished from traditional roundabouts primarily by their smaller size and more compact geometry. They are typically designed for negotiation speeds of 25 km/h (15 mph). Inscribed circle diameters generally vary from 13 m to 25 m (45 ft to 80 ft). Mini-roundabouts are usually implemented with safety in mind, as opposed to capacity. Peak-period capacity is seldom an issue, and most mini-roundabouts operate on residential or collector streets at demand levels well below their capacity. It is important, however, to be able to assess the capacity of any proposed intersection design to ensure that the intersection would function properly if constructed.

At very small roundabouts, it is reasonable to assume that each quadrant of the circulatory roadway can accommodate only one vehicle at a time. In other words,
a vehicle may not enter the circulatory roadway unless the quadrant on both sides of the approach is empty. Given a set of demand volumes for each of the 12 standard movements at a four-leg roundabout, it is possible to simulate the roundabout to estimate the maximum service volumes and delay for each approach. By making assumptions about the proportion of left turns and the proportion of cross street traffic, a general estimate of the total entry maximum service volumes of the roundabout can be made, and is provided in Exhibit 3-2. AADT maximum service volumes are represented based on an assumed K value of 0.10. Note that these volumes range from slightly more than 12,000 to slightly less than 16,000 vehicles per day. The maximum throughput is achieved with an equal proportion of vehicles on the major and minor roads, and with low proportions of left turns.

Exhibit 3-1. Maximum daily service volumes for a four-leg roundabout.

For three-leg roundabouts, use 75 percent of the maximum AADT volumes shown.

Exhibit 3-2. Planning-level maximum daily service volumes for mini-roundabouts.
3.4 Selection Categories

There are many locations at which a roundabout could be selected as the preferred traffic control mode. There are several reasons why this is so, and each reason creates a separate selection category. Each selection category, in turn, requires different information to demonstrate the desirability of a roundabout. The principal selection categories will be discussed in this section, along with their information requirements.

A wide range of roundabout policies and evaluation practices exists among operating agencies within the U.S. For example, the Florida Department of Transportation requires a formal “justification report” to document the selection of a roundabout as the most appropriate traffic control mode at any intersection on their State highway system. On the other hand, private developers may require no formal rationalization of any kind. It is interesting to note that the Maryland Department of Transportation requires consideration of a roundabout as an alternative at all intersections proposed for signalization.

It is reasonable that the decision to install a roundabout should require approximately the same level of effort as the alternative control mode. In other words, if a roundabout is proposed as an alternative to a traffic signal, then the analysis effort should be approximately the same as that required for a signal. If the alternative is stop sign control, then the requirements could be relaxed.

The following situations present an opportunity to demonstrate the desirability of installing a roundabout at a specific location.

3.4.1 Community enhancement

Roundabouts have been proposed as a part of a community enhancement project and not as a solution to capacity problems. Such projects are often located in commercial and civic districts, as a gateway treatment to convey a change of environment and to encourage traffic to slow down. Traffic volumes are typically well below the thresholds shown in Exhibit 3-1; otherwise, one of the more operationally oriented selection categories would normally be more appropriate.

Roundabouts proposed for community enhancement require minimal analysis as a traffic control device. The main focus of the planning procedure should be to demonstrate that they would not introduce traffic problems that do not exist currently. Particular attention should be given to any complications that would imply either operational or safety problems. The urban compact category may be the most appropriate roundabout for such applications. Exhibit 3-3 provides an example of a roundabout installed primarily for community enhancement.

3.4.2 Traffic calming

The decision to install a roundabout for traffic calming purposes should be supported by a demonstrated need for traffic calming along the intersecting roadways. Most of the roundabouts in this category will be located on local roads. Examples of conditions that might suggest a need for traffic calming include:

- Documented observations of speeding, high traffic volumes, or careless driving activities;
3.4.3 Safety improvement

The decision to install a roundabout as a safety improvement should be based on a demonstrated safety problem of the type susceptible to correction by a roundabout. A review of crash reports and the type of accidents occurring is essential. Examples of safety problems include:

- High rates of crashes involving conflicts that would tend to be resolved by a roundabout (right angle, head-on, left/through, U-turns, etc.);
- High crash severity that could be reduced by the slower speeds associated with roundabouts;

Capacity should be an issue when roundabouts are installed for traffic calming purposes only because traffic volumes on local streets will usually be well below the level that would create congestion. If this is not the case, another primary selection category would probably be more suitable. The urban mini-roundabout or urban compact roundabout are most appropriate for traffic calming purposes. Exhibit 3-4 provides an example of roundabouts installed primarily for traffic calming.

Safety issues that roundabouts may help correct.
Chapter 5 should be consulted for a more detailed analysis of the safety characteristics of roundabouts. There are currently a small number of roundabouts and therefore a relatively small crash record data base in the U.S. Therefore, it has not been possible to develop a national crash model for this intersection type. Roundabout crash prediction models have been developed for the United Kingdom (3). Crash models for conventional intersections in the United States are available (4, 5). Although crash data reporting may not be consistent between the U.K. and the U.S., comparison is plausible. The two sets of models have a key common measure of effectiveness in terms of injury and fatal crash frequency.

Therefore, for illustrative purposes, Exhibit 3-5 provides the results of injury crash prediction models for various ADT volumes of roundabouts versus rural TWSC intersections (6). The comparison shown is for a single-lane approach, four-leg roundabout with single-lane entries, and good geometric design. For the TWSC rural intersection model, the selected variables include rolling terrain, the main road as major collector, and a design speed of 80 km/h (50 mph). Rural roundabouts may experience approximately 66 percent fewer injury crashes than rural TWSC intersections for 10,000 entering ADT, and approximately 64 percent fewer crashes for 20,000 ADT. At urban roundabouts, the reduction will probably be smaller.

Also for illustration, Exhibit 3-6 provides the results of injury crash prediction models for various average daily traffic volumes at roundabouts versus rural and urban signalized intersections (6). The selected variables of the crash model for signalized (urban/suburban) intersections include multiphase fully-actuated signal, with a speed of 80 km/h (50 mph) on the major road. The 20,000 entering ADT is applied to single-lane roundabout approaches with four-legs. The 40,000 ADT is applied to double-lane roundabout approaches without flaring of the roundabout entries. In comparison to signalized intersections, roundabouts may experience approximately
33 percent fewer injury crashes in urban and suburban areas and 56 percent fewer crashes in rural areas for 20,000 entering ADT. For 40,000 entering ADT, this reduction may only be about 15 percent in urban areas. Therefore, it is likely that roundabout safety may be comparable to signalized intersections at higher ADT (greater than 50,000).

These model comparisons are an estimation of mean crash frequency or average safety performance from a random sample of four-leg intersections from different countries and should be supplemented by engineering judgment and attention to safe design for all road users.
3.4.4 Operational improvement

A roundabout may be considered as a logical choice if its estimated performance is better than alternative control modes, usually either stop or signal control. The performance evaluation models presented in the next chapter provide a sound basis for comparison, but their application may require more effort and resources than an agency is prepared to devote in the planning stage. To simplify the selection process, the following assumptions are proposed for a planning-level comparison of control modes:

1. A roundabout will always provide a higher capacity and lower delays than AWSC operating with the same traffic volumes and right-of-way limitations.
2. A roundabout is unlikely to offer better performance in terms of lower overall delays than TWSC at intersections with minor movements (including cross street entry and major street left turns) that are not experiencing, nor predicted to experience, operational problems under TWSC.
3. A single-lane roundabout may be assumed to operate within its capacity at any intersection that does not exceed the peak-hour volume warrant for signals.
4. A roundabout that operates within its capacity will generally produce lower delays than a signalized intersection operating with the same traffic volumes and right-of-way limitations.

The above assumptions are documented in the literature (7) or explained by the analyses in Section 3.5. Collectively, they provide a good starting point for further analysis using procedures in Chapter 4. Although a roundabout may be the optimal control type from a vehicular operation standpoint, the relative performance of this control alternative for other modes should also be taken into consideration, as explained in Chapter 4.

3.4.4.1 Roundabout performance at flow thresholds for peak hour signal warrants

There are no warrants for roundabouts included in the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) (8), and it may be that roundabouts are not amenable to a warranting procedure. In other words, each roundabout should be justified on its own merits as the most appropriate intersection treatment alternative. It is, however, useful to consider the case in which the traffic volumes just meet the MUTCD warrant thresholds for traffic signals. For purposes of this discussion, the MUTCD peak hour warrant will be applied with a peak hour factor (PHF) of 0.9. Thus, the evaluation will reflect the performance in the heaviest 15 minutes of the peak hour.

Roundabout delays were compared with the corresponding values for TWSC, AWSC, and signals. A single-lane roundabout was assumed because the capacity of a single lane roundabout was adequate for all cases at the MUTCD volume warrant thresholds. SIDRA analysis software was used to estimate the delay for the various control alternatives because SIDRA was the only program readily available at the time this guide was developed that modeled all of the control alternatives (9).

The MUTCD warrant thresholds are given in terms of the heaviest minor street volume and sum of the major street volumes. Individual movement volumes may be obtained from the thresholds by assuming a directional factor, D, and left turn proportions. A “D” factor of 0.58 was applied to this example. Left turns on all approaches were assumed to be 10 to 50 percent of the total approach volume. In...
determining the MUTCD threshold volumes, two lanes were assumed on the ma-

Based on these assumptions, the average delays per vehicle for signals and round-

Similar comparisons are not presented for TWSC, because the capacity for minor street vehicles entering the major street was exceeded in all cases at the signal warrant thresholds. AWSC was found to be feasible only under a limited range of conditions: a maximum of 20 percent left turns can be accommodated when the major street volume is low and only 10 percent can be accommodated when the major street volume is high. Note that the minor street volume decreases as the major street volume increases at the signal warrant threshold.

This analysis of alternative intersection performance at the MUTCD peak hour volume signal warrant thresholds indicates that the single-lane roundabout is very competitive with all other forms of intersection control.

3.4.5 Special situations

It is important that the selection process not discourage the construction of a roundabout at any location where a roundabout would be a logical choice. Some flexibility must be built into the process by recognizing that the selection categories above are not all-inclusive. There may still be other situations that suggest that a roundabout would be a sensible control choice. Many of these situations are associated with unusual alignment or geometry where other solutions are intractable.
3.5 Comparing Operational Performance of Alternative Intersection Types

If a roundabout is being considered for operational reasons, then it may be compared with other feasible intersection control alternatives such as TWSC, AWSC, or signal control. This section provides approximate comparisons suitable for planning.

3.5.1 Two-way stop-control alternative

The majority of intersections in the U.S. operate under TWSC, and most of those intersections operate with minimal delay. The installation of a roundabout at a TWSC intersection that is operating satisfactorily will be difficult to justify on the basis of performance improvement alone, and one of the previously described selection categories is likely to be more appropriate.

The two most common problems at TWSC intersections are congestion on the minor street caused by a demand that exceeds capacity, and queues that form on the major street because of inadequate capacity for left turning vehicles yielding to opposing traffic. Roundabouts may offer an effective solution to traffic problems at TWSC intersections with heavy left turns from the major route because they provide more favorable treatment to left turns than other control modes. “T” intersections are especially good candidates in this category because they tend to have higher left turning volumes.

On the other hand, the problems experienced by low-volume cross street traffic at TWSC intersections with heavy through volumes on the major street are very difficult to solve by any traffic control measure. Roundabouts are generally not the solution to this type of problem because they create a significant impediment to the major movements. This situation is typical of a residential street intersection with a major arterial. The solution in most cases is to encourage the residential traffic to enter the arterial at a collector road with an intersection designed to accommodate higher entering volumes. The proportion of traffic on the major street is an important consideration in the comparison of a roundabout with a conventional four-leg intersection operating under TWSC. High proportions of minor street traffic tend to favor roundabouts, while low proportions favor TWSC.

An example of this may be seen in Exhibit 3-8, which shows the AADT capacity for planning purposes as a function of the proportion of traffic on the major street. The assumptions in this exhibit are the same as those that have been described previously in Section 3.3. Constant proportions of 10 percent right turns (which were ignored in roundabout analysis) and 20 percent left turns were used for all movements. As expected, the roundabout offers a much higher capacity at lower proportions of major street traffic. When the major and minor street volumes are equal, the roundabout capacity is approximately double that of the TWSC intersection. It is interesting to note that the two capacity values converge at the point where the minor street proportion becomes negligible. This effect confirms the expectation that a roundabout will have approximately the same capacity as a stop-controlled intersection when there is no cross street traffic.
3.5.2 All-way stop-control alternative

When cross street traffic volumes are heavy enough to meet the MUTCD warrants for AWSC control, roundabouts become an especially attractive solution because of their higher capacities and lower delays. The selection of a roundabout as an alternative to AWSC should emphasize cost and safety considerations, because roundabouts always offer better performance for vehicles than AWSC, given the same traffic conditions. Roundabouts that are proposed as alternatives to stop control would typically have single-lane approaches.

A substantial part of the benefit of a roundabout compared to an all-way stop intersection is obtained during the off-peak periods, because the restrictive stop control applies for the entire day. The MUTCD does not permit stop control on a part-time basis. The extent of the benefit will depend on the amount of traffic at the intersection and on the proportion of left turns. Left turns degrade the operation of all traffic control modes, but they have a smaller effect on roundabouts than on stop signs or signals.

The planning level analysis that began earlier in this chapter may be extended to estimate the benefits of a roundabout compared to AWSC. Retaining the previous assumptions about the directional and temporal distribution factors for traffic volumes (i.e., \( K=0.1, \ D=0.58 \)), it is possible to analyze both control modes throughout an entire 24-hour day. Only one additional set of assumptions is required. It is necessary to construct an assumed hourly distribution of traffic throughout the day that conforms to these two factors.

A reasonably typical sample distribution for this purpose is illustrated in Exhibit 3-9, which would generally represent inbound traffic to employment centers, because of the larger peak in the AM period, accompanied by smaller peaks in the noontime and PM periods. Daytime off-peak periods have 4 percent of the AADT per hour, and late-night off-peak periods (midnight to 6 AM) have 1 percent.
The outbound direction may be added as a mirror image of the inbound direction, keeping the volumes the same as the inbound during the off-peak periods and applying the D factor of 0.58 during the AM and PM peaks. This distribution was used in the estimation of the benefits of a roundabout compared to the AWSC mode. It was also used later for comparison with traffic signal operations. For purposes of estimating annual delay savings, a total of 250 days per year is assumed. This provides a conservative estimate by eliminating weekends and holidays.

The comparisons were performed using traffic operations models that are described in Chapter 4 of this guide. The SIDRA model was used to analyze both the roundabout and AWSC operation, because SIDRA was the only model readily available at the time this guide was developed that treated both of these types of control. SIDRA provides an option to either include or omit the geometric delay experienced within the intersection. The geometric delay was included for purposes of estimating annual benefits. It was excluded in Section 3.4.4.1 that dealt with driver-perceived approach delay.

The results of this comparison are presented in Exhibit 3-10 and Exhibit 3-11 in terms of potential annual savings in delay of a single-lane roundabout over an AWSC intersection with one lane on all approaches, as a function of the proportion of left turning traffic for single-lane approaches for volume distributions of 50 percent and 65 percent on the major street, respectively. Each exhibit has lines representing 10 percent, 25 percent, and 33 percent left turn proportions.

Note that the potential annual benefit is in the range of 5,000 to 50,000 vehicle-hours per year. The benefit increases substantially with increasing AADT and left turn proportions. The comparison terminates in each case when the capacity of the AWSC operation is exceeded. No comparisons were made beyond 18,000 AADT, because AWSC operation is not practical beyond that level.
3.5.3 Signal control alternative

When traffic volumes are heavy enough to warrant signalization, the selection process becomes somewhat more rigorous. The usual basis for selection here is that a roundabout will provide better operational performance than a signal in terms of stops, delay, fuel consumption, and pollution emissions. For planning purposes, this may generally be assumed to be the case provided that the roundabout is operating within its capacity. The task then becomes to assess whether any roundabout configuration can be made to work satisfactorily. If not, then a signal or grade separation are remaining alternatives. As in the case of stop control, intersections with heavy left turns are especially good roundabout candidates.

Exhibit 3-10. Annual savings in delay of single-lane roundabout versus AWSC, 50 percent of volume on the major street.

The delay-reduction benefit of roundabouts, compared to AWSC, increases as left-turn volumes, major street proportion, and AADT increase.

Exhibit 3-11. Annual savings in delay of single-lane roundabout versus AWSC, 65 percent of volume on the major street.
The graphical approximation presented earlier for capacity estimation should be useful at this stage. The results should be considered purely as a planning level estimate, and it must be recognized that this estimate will probably change during the design phase. Users of this guide should also consult the most recent version of the *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM) (10) as more U.S. data and consensus on modeling U.S. roundabout performance evolves.

As in the case of AWSC operations, some of the most important benefits of a roundabout compared to a traffic signal will accrue during the off-peak periods. The comparison of delay savings discussed previously has therefore been extended to deal with traffic signals as well as stop signs. The same temporal distribution of traffic volumes used for the roundabout-AWSC comparison was assumed.

The signal timing design was prepared for each of the conditions to accommodate traffic in the heaviest peak period. The traffic actuated controller was allowed to respond to fluctuations in demand during the rest of the day using its own logic. This strategy is consistent with common traffic engineering practice. All approaches were considered to be isolated and free of the influence of coordinated systems. Left turn protection was provided for the whole day for all approaches with a volume cross-product (i.e., the product of the left turn and opposing traffic volumes) of 60,000 or greater during the peak period. When left turn protection was provided, the left turns were also allowed to proceed on the solid green indication (i.e., protected-plus-permitted operation).

The results of this comparison are presented in Exhibit 3-12 for 50 percent major street traffic and Exhibit 3-13 for 65 percent major street traffic. Both cases include AADT values up to 34,000 vehicles per day. Single-lane approaches were used for both signals and roundabouts with AADTs below 25,000 vehicles per day. Two-lane approaches were assumed beyond that point. All signalized approaches were assumed to have left turn bays.

Benefits may continue to accrue beyond the 34,000 AADT level but the design parameters for both the signal and the roundabout are much more difficult to generalize for planning level analyses. When AADTs exceed 34,000 vehicles per day, performance evaluation should be carried out using the more detailed procedures presented in Chapter 4 of this guide.

The selection of a roundabout as an alternative to signal control will be much simpler if a single-lane roundabout is estimated to have adequate capacity. If, on the other hand, it is determined that one or more legs will require more than one entry lane, some preliminary design work beyond the normal planning level will generally be required to develop the roundabout configuration and determine the space requirements.
3.6 Space Requirements

Roundabouts that are designed to accommodate vehicles larger than passenger cars or small trucks typically require more space than conventional intersections. However, this may be more than offset by the space saved compared with turning lane requirements at alternative intersection forms. The key indicator of the required space is the inscribed circle diameter. A detailed design is required to determine the space requirements at a specific site, especially if more than one lane is needed to accommodate the entering and circulating traffic. This is, however, another case in which the use of assumptions and approximations can produce

Exhibit 3-12. Delay savings for roundabout vs. signal, 50 percent volume on major street.

When volumes are evenly split between major and minor approaches, the delay savings of roundabouts versus signals are especially notable on two-lane approaches with high left turn proportions.

Exhibit 3-13. Delay savings for roundabout vs. signal, 65 percent volume on major street.

When the major street approaches dominate, roundabout delay is lower than signal delay, particularly at the upper volume limit for single-lane approaches and when there is a high proportion of left turns.

The design templates in Appendix B may be used to determine initial space requirements for the appropriate roundabout category.
preliminary values that are adequate for planning purposes. For initial space requirements, the design templates in Appendix B for the most appropriate of the six roundabout categories for the specific site may be consulted.

One important question is whether or not the proposed roundabout will fit within the existing property lines, or whether additional right-of-way will be required. Four examples have been created to demonstrate the spatial effects of comparable intersection types, and the assumptions are summarized in Exhibit 3-14. Note that there are many combinations of turning volumes that would affect the actual lane configurations and design storage lengths. Therefore, these examples should not be used out of context.

As can be seen in Exhibit 3-15 through Exhibit 3-18, roundabouts typically require more area at the junction than conventional intersections. However, as capacity needs increase the size of the roundabout and comparable conventional (signalized) intersection, the increase in space requirements are increasingly offset by a reduction in space requirements on the approaches. This is because the widening or flaring required for a roundabout can be accomplished in a shorter distance than is typically required to develop left turn lanes and transition tapers at conventional intersections.

As can be seen in Exhibit 3-18, flared roundabouts offer the most potential for reducing spatial requirements on the approaches as compared to conventional intersections. This effect of providing capacity at the intersections while reducing lane requirements between intersections, known as “wide nodes and narrow roads,” is discussed further in Chapter 8.

## 3.7 Economic Evaluation

Economic evaluation is an important part of any public works planning process. For roundabout applications, economic evaluation becomes important when compar-
Exhibit 3-15. Area comparison: Urban compact roundabout vs. comparable signalized intersection.

Exhibit 3-16. Area comparison: Urban single-lane roundabout vs. comparable signalized intersection.
Urban flared roundabouts in particular illustrate the “wide nodes, narrow roads” concept discussed further in Chapter 8.
ing roundabouts against other forms of intersections and traffic control, such as comparing a roundabout with a signalized intersection.

The most appropriate method for evaluating public works projects of this type is usually the benefit-cost analysis method. The following sections discuss this method as it typically applies to roundabout evaluation, although it can be generalized for most transportation projects.

### 3.7.1 Methodology

The benefit-cost method is elaborated on in detail in a number of standard references, including the ITE *Transportation Planning Handbook* (11) and various American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) publications (12, 13). The basic premise of this method of evaluation is to compare the incremental benefit between two alternatives to the incremental costs between the same alternatives. Assuming Alternatives A and B, the equation for calculating the incremental benefit-cost ratio of Alternative B relative to Alternative A is given in Equation 3-1.

\[
\frac{\text{Benefits}_B - \text{Benefits}_A}{\text{Costs}_B - \text{Costs}_A} = \frac{B/C_{BA}}{B/C_{AB}} = \frac{\text{Benefits}_B - \text{Benefits}_A}{\text{Costs}_B - \text{Costs}_A}
\]

Benefit-cost analysis typically takes two forms. For assessing the viability of a number of alternatives, each alternative is compared individually with a no-build alternative. If the analysis for Alternative A relative to the no-build alternative indicates a benefit-cost ratio exceeding 1.0, Alternative A has benefits that exceed its costs and is thus a viable project.

For ranking alternatives, the incremental benefit-cost ratio analysis is used to compare the relative benefits and costs between alternatives. Projects should not be ranked based on their benefit-cost ratio relative to the no-build alternative. After eliminating any alternatives that are not viable as compared to the no-build alternative, alternatives are compared in a pair-wise fashion to establish the priority between projects.

Since many of the input parameters may be estimated, a rigorous analysis should consider varying the parameter values of key assumptions to verify that the recommended alternative is robust, even under slightly varying assumptions, and under what circumstances it may no longer be preferred.

### 3.7.2 Estimating benefits

Benefits for a public works project are generally comprised of three elements: safety benefits, operational benefits, and environmental benefits. Each benefit is typically quantified on an annualized basis and so is readily usable in a benefit-cost analysis. The following sections discuss these in more detail.
3.7.2.1 Safety benefits

Safety benefits are defined as the assumed savings to the public due to a reduction in crashes within the project area. The general procedure for determining safety benefits is as follows:

- Quantify the existing safety history in the study area in terms of a crash rate for each level of severity (fatal, injury, property damage). This rate, expressed in terms of crashes per million entering vehicles, is computed by dividing the number of crashes of a given severity that occurred during the “before” period by the number of vehicles that entered the intersection during the same period. This results in a “before” crash rate for each level of severity.

- Estimate the change in crashes of each level of severity that can be reasonably expected due to the proposed improvements. As documented elsewhere in this guide, roundabouts tend to have proportionately greater reductions in fatal and injury crashes than property damage crashes.

- Determine a new expected crash rate (an “after” crash rate) by multiplying the “before” crash rates by the expected reductions. It is best to use local data to determine appropriate crash reduction factors due to geometric or traffic control changes, as well as the assumed costs of various severity levels of crashes.

- Estimate the number of “after” crashes of each level of severity for the life of the project by multiplying the “after” crash rate by the expected number of entering vehicles over the life of the project.

- Estimate a safety benefit by multiplying the expected number of “after” crashes of each level of severity by the average cost of each crash and then annualizing the result. The values in Exhibit 3-19 can provide a starting point, although local data should be used where available.

**Exhibit 3-19. Estimated costs for crashes of varying levels of severity.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash Severity</th>
<th>Economic Cost (1997 dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Death (per death)</td>
<td>$980,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury (per injury)</td>
<td>$34,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only (per crash)</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Safety Council (14)

3.7.2.2 Operational benefits

The operational benefits of a project may be quantified in terms of the overall reduction in person-hours of delay to the public. Delay has a cost to the public in terms of lost productivity, and thus a value of time can typically be assigned to changes in estimated delay to quantify benefits associated with delay reduction.

The calculation of annual person-hours of delay can be performed with varying levels of detail, depending on the availability of data. For example, the vehicle-hours of delay may be computed as follows. The results should be converted to person-hours of delay using appropriate vehicle-occupancy factors (including transit), then adding pedestrian delay if significant.
• Estimate the delay per vehicle for each hour of the day. If turning movements are available for multiple hours, this estimate can be computed directly. If only the peak hour is available, the delay for an off-peak hour can be approximated by proportioning the peak hour turning movements by total entering vehicles.

• Determine the daily vehicle-hours of delay by multiplying the estimated delay per vehicle for a given hour by the total entering vehicles during that hour and then aggregating the results over the entire day. If data is available, these calculations can be separated by day of week or by weekday, Saturday, and Sunday.

• Determine annual vehicle-hours of delay by multiplying the daily vehicle-hours of delay by 365. If separate values have been calculated by day of week, first determine the weekday vehicle-hours of delay and then multiply by 52.1 (365 divided by 7). It may be appropriate to use fewer than 365 days per year because the operational benefits will not usually apply equally on all days.

3.7.2.3 Environmental benefits
The environmental benefits of a project are most readily quantified in terms of reduced fuel consumption and improved air quality. Of these, reductions in fuel consumption and the benefits associated with those reductions are typically the simplest to determine.

One way to determine fuel consumption is to use the same procedure for estimating delay, as described previously. Fuel consumption is an output of several of the models in use today, although the user is cautioned to ensure that the model is appropriately calibrated for current U.S. conditions. Alternatively, one can estimate fuel consumption by using the estimate of annual vehicle-hours of delay and then multiplying that by an assumed fuel consumption rate during idling, expressed as liters per hour (gallons per hour) of idling. The resulting estimate can then be converted to a cost by assuming an average cost of fuel, expressed in dollars per liter (dollars per gallon).

3.7.3 Estimation of costs
Costs for a public works project are generally comprised of two elements: capitalized construction costs and operations and maintenance (O&M) costs. Although O&M costs are typically determined on an annualized basis, construction costs are typically a near-term activity that must be annualized. The following sections discuss these in more detail.

3.7.3.1 Construction costs
Construction costs for each alternative should be calculated using normal preliminary engineering cost estimating techniques. These costs should include the costs of any necessary earthwork, paving, bridges and retaining walls, signing and striping, illumination, and signalization.
To convert construction costs into an annualized value for use in the benefit-cost analysis, a *capital recovery factor* (CRF) should be used, shown in Equation 3-2. This converts a present value cost into an annualized cost over a period of *n* years using an assumed discount rate of *i* percent.

\[
CRF = \frac{i(1 + i)^n}{i(1 + i)^n - 1}
\]  

(3-2)

where:  
*i* = discount rate  
*n* = number of periods (years)

### 3.7.3.2 Operation and maintenance (O&M) costs

Operation and maintenance costs vary significantly between roundabouts and other forms of intersection control beyond the basic elements. Common elements include signing and pavement marking maintenance and power for illumination, if provided.

Roundabouts typically have a slightly higher illumination power and maintenance costs compared to signalized or sign-controlled intersections due to a larger number of illumination poles. Roundabouts have slightly higher signing and pavement marking maintenance costs due to a higher number of signs and pavement markings. Roundabouts also introduce additional cost associated with the maintenance of any landscaping in and around the roundabout.

Signalized intersections have considerable additional cost associated with power for the traffic signal and maintenance costs such as bulb replacement, detection maintenance, etc. Power costs vary considerably from region to region and over time and should be verified locally. For general purposes, an annual cost of $3,000 for providing power to a signalized intersection is a reasonable approximation.
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Chapter 4  Operation

This chapter presents methods for analyzing the operation of an existing or planned roundabout. The methods allow a transportation analyst to assess the operational performance of a facility, given information about the usage of the facility and its geometric design elements. An operational analysis produces two kinds of estimates: (1) the capacity of a facility, i.e., the ability of the facility to accommodate various streams of users, and (2) the level of performance, often measured in terms of one or more measures of effectiveness, such as delay and queues.

The Highway Capacity Manual (1) (HCM) defines the capacity of a facility as “the maximum hourly rate at which persons or vehicles can reasonably be expected to traverse a point or uniform section of a lane or roadway during a given time period under prevailing roadway, traffic, and control conditions.” While capacity is a specific measure that can be defined and estimated, level of service (LOS) is a qualitative measure that “characterizes operational conditions within a traffic stream and their perception by motorists and passengers.” To quantify level of service, the HCM defines specific measures of effectiveness for each highway facility type. Control delay is the measure of effectiveness that is used to define level of service at intersections, as perceived by users. In addition to control delay, all intersections cause some drivers to also incur geometric delays when making turns. A systems analysis of a roadway network may include geometric delay because of the slower vehicle paths required for turning through intersections. An example speed profile is shown in Chapter 6 to demonstrate the speed reduction that results from geometric delay at a roundabout.

While an operational analysis can be used to evaluate the performance of an existing roundabout during a base or future year, its more common function in the U.S. may be to evaluate new roundabout designs.

This chapter:
• Describes traffic operations at roundabouts;
• Lists the data required to evaluate the performance of a roundabout;
• Presents a method to estimate the capacity of five of the six basic roundabout configurations presented in this guide;
• Describes the measures of effectiveness used to determine the performance of a roundabout and a method to estimate these measures; and
• Briefly describes the computer software packages available to implement the capacity and performance analysis procedures.

Appendix A provides background information on the various capacity relationships.
4.1 Traffic Operation at Roundabouts

4.1.1 Driver behavior and geometric elements

A roundabout brings together conflicting traffic streams, allows the streams to safely merge and traverse the roundabout, and exit the streams to their desired directions. The geometric elements of the roundabout provide guidance to drivers approaching, entering, and traveling through a roundabout.

Drivers approaching a roundabout must slow to a speed that will allow them to safely interact with other users of the roundabout, and to negotiate the roundabout. The width of the approach roadway, the curvature of the roadway, and the volume of traffic present on the approach govern this speed. As drivers approach the yield line, they must check for conflicting vehicles already on the circulating roadway and determine when it is safe and prudent to enter the circulating stream. The widths of the approach roadway and entry determine the number of vehicle streams that may form side by side at the yield line and govern the rate at which vehicles may enter the circulating roadway. The size of the inscribed circle affects the radius of the driver's path, which in turn determines the speed at which drivers travel on the roundabout. The width of the circulatory roadway determines the number of vehicles that may travel side by side on the roundabout.

The British (2), French (3), and German (4) analytical procedures are based on empirical relationships that directly relate capacity to both traffic characteristics and roundabout geometry. The British empirical relationships reveal that small sublane changes in the geometric parameters produce significant changes in capacity.

For instance, if some approaches are flared or have additional short lanes, these provide considerably more capacity for two reasons. First, wider entries require wider circulatory roadway widths. This provides for more opportunities for the circulatory traffic to bunch together, thus increasing the number of acceptable opportunities to enter, thereby increasing capacity. Second, the typical size of groups of drivers entering into acceptable opportunities in the circulatory traffic is quite small, so short lanes can be very effective in increasing group sizes, because the short lane is frequently able to be filled.

The British (2) use the inscribed circle diameter, the entry width, the approach (road) half width, the entry radius, and the sharpness of the flare to define the performance of a roundabout. The sharpness of the flare, S, is a measure of the rate at which the extra width is developed in the entry flare. Large values of S correspond to short, severe flares, and small values of S correspond to long, gradual flares (5).

The results of the extensive empirical British research indicate that approach half width, entry width, average effective flare length and entry angle have the most significant effect on entry capacity. Roundabouts fit into two general classes: those with a small inscribed circle diameter of less than 50 m (165 ft.) and those with a diameter above 50 m. The British relationships provide a means of including both of these roundabout types. The inscribed circle diameter has a relatively small effect for inscribed diameters of 50 m (165 ft) or less. The entry radius has little effect on capacity provided that it is 20 m (65 ft) or more. The use of perpendicular entries (70

Approach speed is governed by:
- Approach roadway width
- Roadway curvature
- Approach volume

Geometric elements that affect entry capacity include:
- Approach half width
- Entry width
- Entry angle
- Average effective flare length
degrees or more) and small entry radii (less than 15 m [50 ft]) will reduce capacity. The presence of the geometric parameters in the British and French models allow designers to manipulate elements of their design to determine both their operational and safety effects. German research has not been able to find the same influence of geometry, although this may be due to the relatively narrow range of geometries in Germany (4).

Thus, the geometric elements of a roundabout, together with the volume of traffic desiring to use a roundabout at a given time, may determine the efficiency with which a roundabout operates.

4.1.2 Concept of roundabout capacity

The capacity of each entry to a roundabout is the maximum rate at which vehicles can reasonably be expected to enter the roundabout from an approach during a given time period under prevailing traffic and roadway (geometric) conditions. An operational analysis considers a precise set of geometric conditions and traffic flow rates defined for a 15-minute analysis period for each roundabout entry. While consideration of Average Annual Daily Traffic volumes (AADT) across all approaches is useful for planning purposes as provided in Exhibit 1-13 and Chapter 3, analysis of this shorter time period is critical to assessing the level of performance of the roundabout and its individual components.

The capacity of the entire roundabout is not considered, as it depends on many terms. However, Exhibit 1-13 provides threshold average daily traffic volumes for the various categories of roundabouts, assuming four legs. Below these thresholds, a four-legged roundabout with roadways intersecting perpendicularly should have adequate capacity (provided the traffic volumes are reasonably balanced and the geometry does not deviate substantially from those shown on the design templates in Exhibits 1-7 through 1-12). The focus in this chapter on the roundabout entry is similar to the operational analysis methods used for other forms of unsignalized intersections and for signalized intersections. In each case, the capacity of the entry or approach is computed as a function of traffic on the other (conflicting) approaches, the interaction of these traffic streams, and the intersection geometry.

For a properly designed roundabout, the yield line is the relevant point for capacity analysis. The approach capacity is the capacity provided at the yield line. This is determined by a number of geometric parameters in addition to the entry width. On multilane roundabouts it is important to balance the use of each lane, because otherwise some lanes may be overloaded while others are underused. Poorly designed exits may influence driver behavior and cause lane imbalance and congestion at the opposite leg.

4.2 Data Requirements

The analysis method described in this chapter requires the specification of traffic volumes for each approach to the roundabout, including the flow rate for each directional movement. Volumes are typically expressed in passenger car vehicles per hour (vph), for a specified 15-minute analysis period. To convert other vehicle types to passenger car equivalents (pce), use the conversion factors given in Exhibit 4-1.
Exhibit 4-1. Conversion factors for passenger car equivalents (pce).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Passenger Car Equivalent (pce)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-unit truck or bus</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck with trailer</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle or motorcycle</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (6), (7)

Traffic volume data for an urban roundabout should be collected for each directional movement for at least the morning and evening peak periods, since the various movements, and thus approach and circulating volumes, may peak at different times. At rural roundabouts, the analyst should check the requirements of the agency with the jurisdiction of the site. The reader is referred to the Manual of Transportation Engineering Studies (8) for a complete discussion of traffic volume data collection methods. Typically, intersection volume counts are made at the intersection stop bar, with an observer noting the number of cars that pass that point over a specified time period. However, particularly with respect to cases in which demand exceeds capacity (when queues do not dissipate within the analysis period), it is important to note that the stop bar counts reflect only the volume that is served, not the demand volume. In this case, care must be taken to collect data upstream of the end of a queue so that true demand volumes are available for analysis.

The relationship between the standard origin-to-destination turning movements at an intersection and the circulating and entry flows at a roundabout is important, yet is often complicated to compute, particularly if an intersection has more than four approaches. For conventional intersections, traffic flow data are accumulated by directional turning movement, such as for the northbound left turn. For roundabouts, however, the data of interest for each approach are the entry flow and the circulating flow. Entry flow is simply the sum of the through, left, and right turn movements on an approach. Circulating flow is the sum of the vehicles from different movements passing in front of the adjacent upstream splitter island. At existing roundabouts, these flows can simply be measured in the field. Right turns are included in approach volumes and require capacity, but are not included in the circulating volumes downstream because they exit before the next entrance.

For proposed or planned four-legged roundabouts, Equations 4-1 through 4-4 can be applied to determine conflicting (circulating) flow rates, as shown graphically in Exhibit 4-2.

\[
V_{EB, circ} = V_{W,LT} + V_{S,LT} + V_{S,TH} + V_{NB, U-turn} + V_{W, U-turn} + V_{S, U-turn} \\
V_{WB, circ} = V_{EB, LT} + V_{NB, LT} + V_{NB, TH} + V_{S, U-turn} + V_{EB, U-turn} + V_{NB, U-turn} \\
V_{NW, circ} = V_{EB, LT} + V_{EB, TH} + V_{S, LT} + V_{W, U-turn} + V_{S, U-turn} + V_{EB, U-turn} \\
V_{SB, circ} = V_{W, LT} + V_{W, TH} + V_{NB, LT} + V_{W, U-turn} + V_{NB, U-turn} + V_{W, U-turn}
\]
For existing roundabouts, when approach, right-turn, circulating, and exit flows are counted, directional turning movements can be computed as shown in the following example. Equation 4-5 shows the through movement flow rate for the eastbound approach as a function of the entry flow rate for that approach, the exit flow rate for the opposing approach, the right turn flow rate for the subject approach, the right turn flow rate for the approach on the right, and the circulating flow rate for the approach on the right. Other through movement flow rates can be estimated using a similar relationship.

\[ V_{EB,TH} = V_{EB,entry} + V_{WB,exit} - V_{EB,RT} - V_{NB,RT} - V_{NB,circ} \]  

(4-5)

The left turn flow rate for an approach is a function of the entry flow rate, the through flow rate, and the right turn flow rate for that same approach, as shown in Equation 4-6. Again, other movements’ flows are estimated using similar equations.

\[ V_{EB,LT} = V_{EB,entry} - V_{EB,TH} - V_{EB,RT} \]  

(4-6)

While this method is mathematically correct, it is somewhat sensitive to errors and inconsistencies in the input data. It is important that the counts at all of the locations in the roundabout be made simultaneously. Inconsistencies in the data from counts taken on different days can produce meaningless results, including negative volumes. At a minimum, the sum of the entering and exiting volumes should be checked and adjustments should be made if necessary to ensure that the same amount of traffic enters and leaves the roundabout.
4.3 Capacity

The maximum flow rate that can be accommodated at a roundabout entry depends on two factors: the circulating flow on the roundabout that conflicts with the entry flow, and the geometric elements of the roundabout.

When the circulating flow is low, drivers at the entry are able to enter the roundabout without significant delay. The larger gaps in the circulating flow are more useful to the entering drivers and more than one vehicle may enter each gap. As the circulating flow increases, the size of the gaps in the circulating flow decrease, and the rate at which vehicles can enter also decreases. Note that when computing the capacity of a particular leg, the actual circulating flow to use may be less than demand flows, if the entry capacity of one leg contributing to the circulating flow is less than demand on that leg.

The geometric elements of the roundabout also affect the rate of entry flow. The most important geometric element is the width of the entry and circulatory roadways, or the number of lanes at the entry and on the roundabout. Two entry lanes permit nearly twice the rate of entry flow as does one lane. Wider circulatory roadways allow vehicles to travel alongside, or follow, each other in tighter bunches and so provide longer gaps between bunches of vehicles. The flare length also affects the capacity. The inscribed circle diameter and the entry angle have minor effects on capacity.

As at other forms of unsignalized intersection, when traffic flows on an approach exceed approximately 85 percent of capacity, delays and queue lengths vary significantly from their mean values (with standard deviations of similar magnitude as the means). For this reason, the analysis procedures in some countries (Australia, Germany, and the United Kingdom), and this guide, recommend that roundabouts be designed to operate at no more than 85 percent of their estimated capacity.

As performance data become available for roundabouts designed according to the procedures in this guide in the United States, they will provide a basis for development of operational performance procedures specifically calibrated for U.S. conditions. Therefore, analysts should consult future editions of the Highway Capacity Manual.

4.3.1 Single-lane roundabout capacity

Exhibit 4-3 shows the expected capacity for a single-lane roundabout for both the urban compact and urban/rural single-lane designs. The exhibit shows the variation of maximum entry flow as a function of the circulating flow on the roundabout. The calculation of the circulating flow was described previously. The capacity forecast shown in the chart is valid for single-lane roundabouts with inscribed circle diameters of 25 m to 55 m (80 ft to 180 ft). The capacity forecast is based on simplified British regression relationships in Appendix A, which may also be derived with a gap-acceptance model by incorporating limited priority behavior.
Note that in any case, the flow rate downstream of the merge point (between the entry and the next exit) should not be allowed to exceed 1,800 veh/h. Exceeding this threshold may indicate the need for a double-lane entry.

The urban compact design is expected to have a reduced capacity, but has significant benefits of reduced vehicle speeds through the roundabout (per the German equations in Appendix A). This increases safety for pedestrians and bicyclists compared with the larger single lane roundabouts. Mini-roundabout capacities may be approximated using the daily maximum service volumes provided for them in Chapter 3, but in any case should not exceed the capacity of the urban compact design.

Circulating flow should not exceed 1,800 veh/h at any point in a single-lane roundabout. Exit flows exceeding 1,200 veh/h may indicate the need for a double-lane exit.

Exhibit 4-3. Approach capacity of a single-lane roundabout.

The slope of the upper line changes because circulating flow downstream from a roundabout entry should not exceed 1,800 veh/h.
4.3.2 Double-lane roundabout capacity

Exhibit 4-4 shows the expected capacity of a double-lane roundabout that is based on the design templates for the urban/rural double-lane roundabouts. The capacity forecast shown in the chart is valid for double-lane roundabouts with inscribed circle diameters of 40 m to 60 m (130 ft to 200 ft). The capacity forecast is based on simplified British regression relationships in Appendix A, which may also be derived with a gap-acceptance model by incorporating limited priority behavior. Larger inscribed diameter roundabouts are expected to have slightly higher capacities at moderate to high circulating flows.

4.3.3 Capacity effect of short lanes at flared entries

By flaring an approach, short lanes may be added at the entry to improve the performance. If an additional short lane is used, it is assumed that the circulatory road width is also increased accordingly. The capacity of the entry is based on the assumption that all entry lanes will be effectively used. The capacity is given by the product of the appropriate factor in Exhibit 4-5 and the capacity of a two-lane roundabout in Exhibit 4-4. Refer to Appendix A for a derivation of these factors (9).
4.3.4 Comparison of single-lane and double-lane roundabouts

Exhibit 4-6 shows a comparison of the expected capacity for both the single-lane and double-lane roundabouts. Again, it is evident that the number of lanes, or the size of the entry and circulating roadways, has a significant effect on the entry capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of vehicle spaces in the short lane, (n_f)</th>
<th>Factor (applied to double-lane approach capacity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 *</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Used for the case of a single lane entry to a double-lane roundabout.

Exhibit 4-5. Capacity reduction factors for short lanes.

The use of short lanes can nearly double approach capacity, without requiring a two-lane roadway prior to the roundabout.

Exhibit 4-6. Capacity comparison of single-lane and double-lane roundabouts.

Source (10)
4.3.5 Pedestrian effects on entry capacity

Pedestrians crossing at a marked crosswalk that gives them priority over entering motor vehicles can have a significant effect on the entry capacity. In such cases, if the pedestrian crossing volume and circulating volume are known, the vehicular capacity should be factored (multiply by $M$) according to the relationship shown in Exhibit 4-7 or Exhibit 4-8 for single-lane and double-lane roundabouts, respectively. Note that the pedestrian impedance decreases as the conflicting vehicle flow increases. The *Highway Capacity Manual* (1) provides additional guidance on the capacity of pedestrian crossings and should be consulted if the capacity of the crosswalk itself is an issue.

Exhibit 4-7. Capacity reduction factor $M$ for a single-lane roundabout assuming pedestrian priority.

The effects of conflicting pedestrians on approach capacity decrease as conflicting vehicular volumes increase, as entering vehicles become more likely to have to stop regardless of whether pedestrians are present.

Source: (10)
4.3.6 Exit capacity

An exit flow on a single lane of more than 1,400 veh/h, even under good operating conditions for vehicles (i.e., tangential alignment, and no pedestrians and bicyclists) is difficult to achieve. Under normal urban conditions, the exit lane capacity is in the range of 1,200 to 1,300 veh/h. Therefore, exit flows exceeding 1,200 veh/h may indicate the need for a double-lane exit (11).

4.4 Performance Analysis

Three performance measures are typically used to estimate the performance of a given roundabout design: degree of saturation, delay, and queue length. Each measure provides a unique perspective on the quality of service at which a roundabout will perform under a given set of traffic and geometric conditions. Whenever possible, the analyst should estimate as many of these parameters as possible to obtain the broadest possible evaluation of the performance of a given roundabout design. In all cases, a capacity estimate must be obtained for an entry to the roundabout before a specific performance measure can be computed.

Key performance measures for roundabouts:

- Degree of saturation
- Delay
- Queue length

Exhibit 4-8. Capacity reduction factor $M$ for a double-lane roundabout assuming pedestrian priority.
4.4.1 Degree of saturation

Degree of saturation is the ratio of the demand at the roundabout entry to the capacity of the entry. It provides a direct assessment of the sufficiency of a given design. While there are no absolute standards for degree of saturation, the Australian design procedure suggests that the degree of saturation for an entry lane should be less than 0.85 for satisfactory operation. When the degree of saturation exceeds this range, the operation of the roundabout will likely deteriorate rapidly, particularly over short periods of time. Queues may form and delay begins to increase exponentially.

4.4.2 Delay

Delay is a standard parameter used to measure the performance of an intersection. The *Highway Capacity Manual* (1) identifies delay as the primary measure of effectiveness for both signalized and unsignalized intersections, with level of service determined from the delay estimate. Currently, however, the *Highway Capacity Manual* only includes control delay, the delay attributable to the control device. Control delay is the time that a driver spends queuing and then waiting for an acceptable gap in the circulating flow while at the front of the queue. The formula for computing this delay is given in Equation 4-7 (12, based on 13; see also 14). Exhibit 4-9 shows how control delay at an entry varies with entry capacity and circulating flow. Each curve for control delay ends at a volume-to-capacity ratio of 1.0, with the curve projected beyond that point as a dashed line.

\[
d = \frac{3600}{c_{m,x}} + 900T \times \left[ \frac{v_x}{c_{m,x}} - 1 + \left( \frac{v_x}{c_{m,x}} - 1 \right)^2 \right] + \frac{3600}{450T} \left( \frac{v_x}{c_{m,x}} \right)^2
\]

where:  
- \(d\) = average control delay, sec/veh;  
- \(v_x\) = flow rate for movement \(x\), veh/h;  
- \(c_{m,x}\) = capacity of movement \(x\), veh/h; and  
- \(T\) = analysis time period, h (\(T = 0.25\) for a 15-minute period).
Note that as volumes approach capacity, control delay increases exponentially, with small changes in volume having large effects on delay. An accurate analysis of delay under conditions near or over saturation requires consideration of the following factors:

- **The effect of residual queues.** Roundabout entries operating near or over capacity can generate significant residual queues that must be accounted for between consecutive time periods. The method presented above does not account for these residual queues. These factors are accounted for in the delay formulae developed by Kimber and Hollis (15); however, these formulae are difficult to use manually.

- **The metering effect of upstream oversaturated entries.** When an upstream entry is operating over capacity, the circulating volume in front of a downstream entry is less than the true demand. As a result, the capacity of the downstream entry is higher than what would be predicted from analyzing actual demand.

For most design applications where target degrees of saturation are no more than 0.85, the procedures presented in this section are sufficient. In cases where it is desired to more accurately estimate performance in conditions near or over capacity, the use of software that accounts for the above factors is recommended.

Geometric delay is the additional time that a single vehicle with no conflicting flows spends slowing down to the negotiation speed, proceeding through the intersection, and accelerating back to normal operating speed. Geometric delay may
be an important consideration in network planning (possibly affecting route travel times and choices) or when comparing operations of alternative intersection types. While geometric delay is often negligible for through movements at a signalized or stop-controlled intersection, it can be more significant for turning movements such as those through a roundabout. Calculation of geometric delay requires an estimate of the proportion of vehicles that must stop at the yield line, as well as knowledge of the roundabout geometry as it affects vehicle speeds during entry, negotiation, and exit. Procedures for calculating the number of stops and geometric delay are given in the Australian design guide (16).

### 4.4.3 Queue length

Queue length is important when assessing the adequacy of the geometric design of the roundabout approaches.

The average queue length \( L \) vehicles) can be calculated by Little’s rule, as shown in Equation 4-8 (17):

\[
L = v \cdot \frac{d}{3600}
\]  

(4-8)

where:

- \( v \) = entry flow, veh/h
- \( d \) = average delay, seconds/veh

Average queue length is equivalent to the vehicle-hours of delay per hour on an approach. It is useful for comparing roundabout performance with other intersection forms, and other planning procedures that use intersection delay as an input.

For design purposes, Exhibit 4-10 shows how the 95th-percentile queue length varies with the degree of saturation of an approach (18, 19). The x-axis of the graph is the degree of saturation, or the ratio of the entry flow to the entry capacity. Individual lines are shown for the product of \( T \) and entry capacity. To determine the 95th-percentile queue length during time \( T \), enter the graph at the computed degree of saturation. Move vertically until the computed curve line is reached. Then move horizontally to the left to determine the 95th-percentile queue length. Alternatively, Equation 4-8 can be used to approximate the 95th-percentile queue. Note that the graph and equation are only valid where the volume-to-capacity ratio immediately before and immediately after the study period is no greater than 0.85 (in other words, the residual queues are negligible).
\[ Q_{95} = 900T \left[ \frac{V_x}{C_{m,x}} - 1 + \sqrt{1 - \left( \frac{V_x}{C_{m,x}} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{3600}{C_{m,x}} \right) \left( \frac{V_x}{C_{m,x}} \right)} \right] \] (4-9)

where:
- \( Q_{95} \) = 95th percentile queue, veh,
- \( V_x \) = flow rate for movement x, veh/h,
- \( C_{m,x} \) = capacity of movement x, veh/h, and
- \( T \) = analysis time period, h (0.25 for 15-minute period).

Source: (19)

**Exhibit 4-10.** 95th-percentile queue length estimation.
4.4.4 Field observations

The analyst may evaluate an existing roundabout to determine its performance and whether changes to its design are needed. Measurements of vehicle delay and queuing can be made using standard traffic engineering techniques. In addition, the analyst can perform a qualitative assessment of the roundabout performance. The following list indicates conditions for which corrective design measures should be taken (20). If the answers to these questions are negative, no corrective actions need be taken.

- Do drivers stop unnecessarily at the yield point?
- Do drivers stop unnecessarily within the circulating roadway?
- Do any vehicles pass on the wrong side of the central island?
- Do queues from an external bottleneck back up into the roundabout from an exit road?
- Does the actual number of entry lanes differ from those intended by the design?
- Do smaller vehicles encroach on the truck apron?
- Is there evidence of damage to any of the signs in the roundabout?
- Is there any pedestrian activity on the central island?
- Do pedestrians and cyclists fail to use the roundabout as intended?
- Are there tire marks on any of the curb surfaces to indicate vehicle contact?
- Is there any evidence of minor accidents, such as broken glass, pieces of rim, etc., on the approaches or the circulating roadway?
- Is there any gravel or other debris collected in nontraveled areas that could be a hazard to bicycles or motorcyclists?
- Are the vehicle speeds appropriate?

4.5 Computer Software for Roundabouts

While the analytical procedures of different countries are not very complex, they are repetitive and time consuming, so most of these procedures have been implemented in software. A summary of current (as of 1999) software products and the analytical procedures that they implement is presented in Exhibit 4-11. The reader is also advised to consult the latest version of the U.S. Highway Capacity Manual. While the procedures provided in this chapter are recommended for most applications covered by this guide, models such as ARCADY, RODEL, SIDRA, KREISEL, or GIRABASE may be consulted to determine the effects of geometric parameters, particularly for multilane roundabouts outside the realm of this guide, or for fine-tuning designs to improve performance. Note that many of these models represent different underlying data or theories and will thus produce different results. Chapter 8 provides some information on microscopic simulation modeling which may be useful alternatives analysis in systems context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Application and Qualities (1999 versions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCADY</td>
<td>All configurations</td>
<td>British method (50 percent confidence limits). Capacity, delay, and queuing. Includes projected number of crashes per year. Data were collected at extensive field studies and from experiments involving drivers at temporary roundabouts. Empirical relationships were developed from the data and incorporated into ARCADY. This model reflects British driving behavior and British roundabout designs. A prime attribute is that the capacities it predicts have been measured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RODEL</td>
<td>All configurations including multiple roundabout interactions</td>
<td>British method (user-specified confidence limits). Capacity, delay, and queuing. Includes both an evaluation mode (geometric parameters specified) and a design mode (performance targets specified). Includes a crash prediction model. RODEL uses the British empirical equations. It also assists the user in developing an appropriate roundabout for the traffic conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDRA</td>
<td>All configurations and other control types</td>
<td>Australian method, with analytical extensions. Capacity, delay, queue, fuel, and environmental measures. Also evaluates two-way stop-controlled, all-way stop controlled, and signalized intersections. It also gives roundabout capacities from U.S. HCM 1997 and German procedures. SIDRA is based on gap acceptance processes. It uses field data for the gap acceptance parameters to calibrate the model. There has been limited field evaluation of the results although experience has shown that the results fit Australian and U.S. single-lane (21) roundabout conditions satisfactorily. An important attribute is that the user can alter parameters to easily reflect local driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCS-3</td>
<td>Single-lane roundabouts with a limited range of volumes</td>
<td>U.S. HCM 1997 method. Limited to capacity estimation based on entering and circulating volume. Optional gap acceptance parameter values provide both a liberal and conservative estimate of capacity. The data used to calibrate the models were recorded in the U.S. The two curves given reflect the uncertainty from the results. The upper-bound average capacities are anticipated at most roundabouts. The lower bound results reflect the operation that might be expected until roundabouts become more common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KREISEL</td>
<td>All configurations</td>
<td>Developed in Germany. Offers many user-specified options to implement the full range of procedures found in the literature from U.S. (including this chapter), Europe, Britain, and Australia. KREISEL gives the average capacity from a number of different procedures. It provides a means to compare these procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIRABASE</td>
<td>All configurations</td>
<td>French method. Capacity, delay, and queuing projections based on regression. Sensitive to geometric parameters. Gives average values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Roundabouts may improve intersection safety by:

- Eliminating or altering conflicts
- Decreasing speeds into and through the intersection
- Decreasing speed differentials

Chapter 5 Safety

Roundabouts may improve the safety of intersections by eliminating or altering conflict types, by reducing speed differentials at intersections, and by forcing drivers to decrease speeds as they proceed into and through the intersection. Though roundabout crash records in the United States are limited, the experiences of other countries can be used to help design roundabouts in this country. Understanding the sensitivity of geometric element parameters, along with the crash experience, will assist the designer in optimizing the safety of all vehicle occupants, pedestrians, and bicyclists.

5.1 Introduction

Many studies have found that one of the benefits of roundabout installation is the improvement in overall safety performance. Several studies in the U.S., Europe, and Australia have found that roundabouts perform better in terms of safety than other intersection forms (1, 2, 3, 4). In particular, single-lane roundabouts have been found to perform better than two-way stop-controlled (TWSC) intersections in the U.S. (5). Although the frequency of reported crashes is not always lower at roundabouts, the reduced injury rates are usually reported (6). Safety is better at small and medium capacity roundabouts than at large or multilane roundabouts (1, 7). While overall crash frequencies have been reduced, the crash reductions are most pronounced for motor vehicles, less pronounced for pedestrians, and equivocal for bicyclists, depending on the study and bicycle design treatments (4, 6, 7). Crash statistics for various user groups are reported in Section 5.3.

The reasons for the increased safety level at roundabouts are:

- Roundabouts have fewer conflict points in comparison to conventional intersections. The potential for hazardous conflicts, such as right angle and left turn head-on crashes is eliminated with roundabout use. Single-lane approach roundabouts produce greater safety benefits than multilane approaches because of fewer potential conflicts between road users, and because pedestrian crossing distances are short.

- Low absolute speeds associated with roundabouts allow drivers more time to react to potential conflicts, also helping to improve the safety performance of roundabouts.

- Since most road users travel at similar speeds through roundabouts, i.e., have low relative speeds, crash severity can be reduced compared to some traditionally controlled intersections.

- Pedestrians need only cross one direction of traffic at a time at each approach as they traverse roundabouts, as compared with unsignalized intersections. The conflict locations between vehicles and pedestrians are generally not affected by the presence of a roundabout, although conflicting vehicles come from a more defined path at roundabouts (and thus pedestrians have fewer places to check for conflicting vehicles). In addition, the speeds of motorists entering and exiting a roundabout are reduced with good design. As with other crossings
requiring acceptance of gaps, roundabouts still present visually impaired pedestrians with unique challenges, as described in Chapter 2.

For the design of a new roundabout, safety can be optimized not only by relying on recorded past performance of roundabouts in general, but primarily by applying all design knowledge proven to impact safety. For optimum roundabout safety and operational performance the following should be noted:

• Minimizing the number of potential conflicts at any geometric feature should reduce the multiple vehicle crash rate and severity.

• Minimizing the potential relative speed between two vehicles at the point of conflict will minimize the multiple vehicle crash rate and severity (it may also optimize capacity). To reduce the potential relative speed between vehicles, either the absolute speeds of both vehicles need to be reduced or the angle between the vehicle paths needs to be reduced. Commuter bicyclist speeds can range from 20 to 25 km/h (12 to 15 mph) and designs that constrain the speeds of motor vehicles to similar values will minimize the relative speeds and improve safety. Lower absolute speeds will also assist pedestrian safety.

• Limiting the maximum change in speed between successive horizontal geometric elements will minimize the single vehicle crash rate and severity.

5.2 Conflicts

The frequency of crashes at an intersection is related to the number of conflict points at an intersection, as well as the magnitude of conflicting flows at each conflict point. A conflict point is a location where the paths of two motor vehicles, or a vehicle and a bicycle or pedestrian queue, diverge, merge, or cross each other.

Besides conflicts with other road users, the central island of a roundabout presents a particular hazard that may result in overrepresentation of single-vehicle crashes that tend to occur during periods of low traffic volumes. At cross intersections, many such violations may go unrecorded unless a collision with another vehicle occurs.

The following sections present a variety of conflicts among vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. Both legal conflicts (queuing at an intersection, merging into a traffic stream) and conflicts prohibited by law or by traffic control devices (failure to yield to pedestrians, running a stop sign) have been included for completeness. Even though traffic control devices can significantly reduce many conflicts, they can not eliminate them entirely due to violations of those devices. Many of the most serious crashes are caused by such violations.

As with crash analyses, conflict analyses are more than the simple enumeration of the number of conflicts. A conflict analysis should account for the following factors:

• Existence of conflict point;
• Exposure, measured by the product of the two conflicting stream volumes at a given conflict point;
• Severity, based on the relative velocities of the conflicting streams (speed and angle); and
• Vulnerability, based on the ability for a member of each conflicting stream to survive a crash.

5.2.1 Vehicle conflicts

5.2.1.1 Single-lane roundabouts

Exhibit 5-1 presents a diagram of vehicle-vehicle conflict points for a traditional three-leg (“T”) intersection and a three-leg roundabout. As the figure shows, the number of vehicle-vehicle conflict points for roundabouts decreases from nine to six for three-leg intersections. Note that these diagrams do not take into account the ability to separate conflicts in space (through the use of separate left or right turning lanes) or time (through the use of traffic control devices such as stop signs or traffic signals).

Roundabouts bring the simplicity of a “T” intersection to intersections with more than three legs.

Exhibit 5-1. Vehicle conflict points for “T” Intersections with single-lane approaches.

Exhibit 5-2 presents similar diagrams for a traditional four-leg (“X” or “cross”) intersection and a four-leg roundabout. As the figure shows, the number of vehicle-vehicle conflict points for roundabouts decreases from 32 to 8 for four-leg intersections.

Conflicts can be divided into three basic categories, in which the degree of severity varies, as follows:

- **Queuing conflicts.** These conflicts are caused by a vehicle running into the back of a vehicle queue on an approach. These types of conflicts can occur at the back of a through-movement queue or where left-turning vehicles are queued waiting for gaps. These conflicts are typically the least severe of all conflicts because the collisions involve the most protected parts of the vehicle and the relative speed difference between vehicles is less than in other conflicts.

- **Merge and diverge conflicts.** These conflicts are caused by the joining or separating of two traffic streams. The most common types of crashes due to merge conflicts are sideswipes and rear-end crashes. Merge conflicts can be more severe than diverge conflicts due to the more likely possibility of collisions to the side of the vehicle, which is typically less protected than the front and rear of the vehicle.

- **Crossing conflicts.** These conflicts are caused by the intersection of two traffic streams. These are the most severe of all conflicts and the most likely to involve injuries or fatalities. Typical crash types are right-angle crashes and head-on crashes.

As Exhibit 5-1 and Exhibit 5-2 show, a roundabout reduces vehicular crossing conflicts for both three- and four-leg intersections by converting all movements to right turns. Again, separate turn lanes and traffic control (stop signs or signalization) can often reduce but not eliminate the number of crossing conflicts at a traditional intersection by separating conflicts in space and/or time. However, the most severe crashes at signalized intersections occur when there is a violation of the traffic control device designed to separate conflicts by time (e.g., a right-angle collision due to running a red light, and vehicle-pedestrian collisions). Therefore, the ability of single-lane roundabouts to reduce conflicts through physical, geometric features has been demonstrated to be more effective than the reliance on driver obedience of traffic control devices.
5.2.1.2 Double-lane roundabouts

In general, double-lane roundabouts have some of the same safety performance characteristics as their simpler single-lane counterparts. However, due to the presence of additional entry lanes and the accompanying need to provide wider circulatory and exit roadways, double lane roundabouts introduce additional conflicts not present in single-lane roundabouts. This makes it important to use the minimum required number of entry, circulating and exit lanes, subject to capacity considerations. For example, according to United Kingdom roundabout crash models, for a 10,000 entering Average Daily Traffic (ADT), flaring the entry width from one to two lanes is likely to increase injury crashes by 25 percent (8).

The number of vehicular and pedestrian conflicts points in both conventional intersections and roundabouts increases considerably when they have additional approach lanes. The designer is encouraged to graphically determine conflicts for a particular location, as this information can raise awareness of design issues and may be useful in public presentations.

The types of conflicts present in multilane roundabouts that do not exist in single-lane roundabouts occur when drivers use the incorrect lane or make an improper turn. These types of conflicts are depicted in Exhibit 5-3 and Exhibit 5-4, respectively. While these types of conflicts can also be present in other intersection forms, they can be prevalent with drivers who are unfamiliar with roundabout operation. The conflicts depicted in Exhibit 5-4, in particular, can be created by not providing a proper design geometry that allows vehicles to travel side-by-side throughout the entire roundabout (see Chapter 6). Crashes resulting from both types of conflicts can also be reduced through proper driver education.

Double-lane roundabouts have some of the same safety performance characteristics as single-lane roundabouts, but introduce additional conflicts.

Incorrect lane use and incorrect turns are multilane roundabout conflicts that do not exist in single-lane roundabouts.

Exhibit 5-3. Improper lane-use conflicts in double-lane roundabouts.
As with single-lane roundabouts, the most severe vehicular crossing conflicts are eliminated and replaced by less severe merging conflicts. The additional conflicts unique to multilane roundabouts are generally low-speed sideswipe conflicts that typically have low severity. Therefore, although the number of conflict points increases at multilane roundabouts when compared to a single lane roundabouts, the overall severity of conflicts is generally less than alternative intersection control.

5.2.2 Pedestrian conflicts

Vehicle-pedestrian conflicts can be present at every intersection, even those with minimal pedestrian volume. The following sections examine pedestrian conflicts at signalized intersections and at roundabouts.

Signaled intersections offer the opportunity to reduce the likelihood of pedestrian-vehicle conflicts through the use of signal phasing that allows only a few movements to move legally at any given time. Exhibit 5-5 summarizes the typical pedestrian conflicts present on one approach to a signalized intersection. As the exhibit shows, a pedestrian crossing at a typical signalized intersection (permitted or protected-permitted left turns, right turns on red allowed) faces four potential vehicular conflicts, each coming from a different direction:

- Crossing movements on red (typically high-speed, illegal)
- Right turns on green (legal)
- Left turns on green (legal for protected-permitted or permitted left turn phasing)
- Right turns on red (typically legal)

In terms of exposure, the illegal movements should be accorded a lower weight than legal conflicts. However, they may be accorded an offsetting higher weight in terms of severity. For an intersection with four single-lane approaches, this results in a total of 16 pedestrian-vehicle conflicts.
Pedestrians at roundabouts, on the other hand, face two conflicting vehicular movements on each approach, as depicted in Exhibit 5-6:

- Conflict with entering vehicles; and
- Conflict with exiting vehicles.

At conventional and roundabout intersections with multiple approach lanes, an additional conflict is added with each additional lane that a pedestrian must cross.

Exhibit 5-5. Vehicle-pedestrian conflicts at signalized intersections.

The direction conflicting vehicles will arrive from is more predictable for pedestrians at roundabouts.

Exhibit 5-6. Vehicle-pedestrian conflicts at single-lane roundabouts.
5.2.3 Bicycle conflicts

Bicycles face similar conflicts as motor vehicles at both signalized intersections and roundabouts. However, because bicyclists typically ride on the right side of the road between intersections, they face additional conflicts due to overlapping paths with motor vehicles. Conflicts unique to bicyclists occur on each approach to conventional four-leg intersections, as depicted in Exhibit 5-7 (showing left turns like motor vehicles or left turns like pedestrians).

Exhibit 5-7. Bicycle conflicts at conventional intersections (showing two left-turn options).

At roundabouts, bicycles may be provided the option of traveling as a vehicle or as a pedestrian. As a result, the conflicts experienced by bicyclists are dependent on how they choose to negotiate the roundabout, as shown in Exhibit 5-8. When traveling as a vehicle at a single-lane roundabout, an additional conflict occurs at the point where the bicyclist merges into the traffic stream; the remainder are similar to those for motor vehicles. At double-lane and larger roundabouts where bicycles are typically traveling on the outside part of the circulatory roadway, bicyclists face a potential conflict with exiting vehicles where the bicyclist is continuing to circulate around the roundabout. Bicyclists may feel compelled to “negotiate” the circle (e.g., by indicating their intentions to drivers with their arms) while avoiding conflicts where possible. Bicyclists are less visible and therefore more vulnerable to the merging and exiting conflicts that happen at double-lane roundabouts.

Bicycles can be provided with the option of traveling as either a vehicle or a pedestrian through a roundabout.

When traveling as a pedestrian, an additional conflict for bicyclists occurs at the point where the bicyclist gets onto the sidewalk, at which point the bicyclist continues around the roundabout like a pedestrian. On shared bicycle-pedestrian paths or on sidewalks, if bicyclists continue to ride, additional bicycle-pedestrian conflicts occur wherever bicycle and pedestrian movements cross (not shown on the exhibit).
5.3 Crash Statistics

This section summarizes the overall safety performance of roundabouts in various countries (including the U.S.) and then examines the detailed collision types experienced in France and Queensland, Australia. Pedestrian and bicycle crash statistics are discussed separately, including design issues for visually impaired pedestrians.

5.3.1 Comparisons to previous intersection treatment

Exhibit 5-9 shows the crash frequencies (average annual crashes per roundabout) experienced at eleven intersections in the U.S. that were converted to roundabouts. As the exhibit shows, both types of roundabouts showed a reduction in both injury and property-damage crashes after installation of a roundabout. It should be noted that due to the small size of the data sample, the only result that is statistically significant is the injury crash reduction for small and moderate roundabouts.

Exhibit 5-8. Bicycle conflicts at roundabouts (showing two left-turn options).

Bicycle-pedestrian conflicts can also occur on shared pathways adjacent to the roundabout.
Exhibit 5-9. Average annual crash frequencies at 11 U.S. intersections converted to roundabouts.

Notes:
1. Mostly single-lane roundabouts with an inscribed circle diameter of 30 to 35 m (100 to 115 ft).
2. Multilane roundabouts with an inscribed circle diameter greater than 50 m (165 ft).
3. Inj. = Injury crashes
4. PDO = Property Damage Only crashes
5. Only injury crash reductions for small/moderate roundabouts were statistically significant.
Source: (9)

Compared to results from Australia, France, and the United Kingdom, these crash frequencies are quite high. Annual crash frequencies in France, Australia, and United Kingdom of 0.15, 0.6, and 3.31 injury crashes per roundabout, respectively, have been reported (1, 10). The reader should note that the UK has many high-volume, multilane roundabouts.

In spite of the higher frequencies, injury crash rates, which account for traffic volume exposure, are significantly lower at U.S. roundabout sites. In a recent study of eight single-lane roundabouts in Maryland and Florida, the injury crash rate was found to be 0.08 crashes per million entering vehicles (5). By comparison, the injury crash rate was reported to be 0.045 crashes per million entering vehicles in France and 0.275 crashes per million entering vehicles in the United Kingdom (1, 10).

Experiences in the United States show a reduction in crashes after building a roundabout of about 37 percent for all crashes and 51 percent for injury crashes. These values correspond with international studies with much larger sample sizes, as shown in Exhibit 5-10.

Exhibit 5-10. Mean crash reductions in various countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Mean Reduction (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>41 - 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>25 - 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (2), France: (11)
The findings of these studies show that injury crashes are reduced more dramatically than crashes involving property damage only. This again is in part due to the configuration of roundabouts, which eliminates severe crashes such as left turn, head-on, and right angle collisions. Most of these studies also show that crash reduction in rural areas is much higher than in urban areas.

Note that the geometry of many studied sites may not necessarily conform to good roundabout design. Improved design principles, such as an emphasis on achieving consistent speeds, may result in better safety performance. It should also be noted that these crash reductions are generally for sites where roundabouts were selected to replace problem intersections. Therefore, they do not necessarily represent a universal safety comparison with all other intersection types.

Collisions at roundabouts tend to be less severe than at conventional intersections. Most crashes reported at roundabouts are a result of drivers failing to yield on entry, referred to as entering-circulating crashes. In addition, rear-end collisions and single vehicle crashes have been reported in many studies. Exhibit 5-11 shows the percentage of the three main crash types reported in different countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Crash Description</th>
<th>Type of Roundabout</th>
<th>Entering-circulating</th>
<th>Rear-end</th>
<th>Single Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>All crashes</td>
<td>Single and multilane</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Injury crashes</td>
<td>Single and multilane</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>All crashes</td>
<td>Single lane</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>All crashes</td>
<td>Single and multilane</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Injury crashes</td>
<td>Single and multilane</td>
<td>20 - 71%</td>
<td>7 - 25%</td>
<td>8 - 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Percentages do not necessarily sum to 100% because only three major crash categories are shown. Source: (10)

### 5.3.2 Collision types

It is instructive for designers to examine details of collision types and location at roundabouts. Statistics are available for roundabouts designed according to local practices in France, Queensland (Australia), and the United Kingdom. It should be noted that the reported frequencies are to some extent related to the specific design standards and reporting processes used in these countries.

Exhibit 5-12 presents a summary of the percentage of crashes by collision type. The numbered items in the list correspond to the numbers indicated on the diagrams given in Exhibit 5-13 as reported in France. The French data illustrate collision types for a sample of 202 injury crashes from 179 urban and suburban roundabouts in France for the period 1984–1988 (12). For comparison purposes, data
from Queensland, Australia (13) and the United Kingdom (1) have been superimposed onto the same classification system.

The results in Exhibit 5-12 are instructive for a number of reasons:

- A variety of collision types can take place at roundabouts. A designer should be aware of these collision types when making decisions about alignment and location of fixed objects. It is recommended that these collision types be adopted as conflict types in the U.S. to conduct traffic conflict analysis and report crashes at roundabouts.

- Although reporting methodologies may vary somewhat, crash experience varies from country to country. This may be due to a combination of differences in driver behavior, and design features.

Exhibit 5-12. Comparison of collision types at roundabouts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collision Type</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Failure to yield at entry</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Single-vehicle run off the circulatory roadway</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Single vehicle loss of control at entry</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rear-end at entry</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Circulating-exiting</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pedestrian on crosswalk</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Single vehicle loss of control at exit</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Exiting-entering</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rear-end in circulatory roadway</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Rear-end at exit</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Passing a bicycle at entry</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Passing a bicycle at exit</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Weaving in circulatory roadway</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Wrong direction in circulatory roadway</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Pedestrian on circulatory roadway</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Pedestrian at approach outside crosswalk</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other collision types</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sideswipe crashes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Data are for “small” roundabouts (curbed central islands > 4 m [13 ft] diameter, relatively large ratio of inscribed circle diameter to central island size).
2. Reported findings do not distinguish among single-vehicle crashes.
3. Reported findings do not distinguish among approaching crashes.
4. Reported findings do not distinguish among pedestrian crashes.
Sources: France (12), Australia (13), United Kingdom (1)
Exhibit 5-13. Graphical depiction of collision types at roundabouts.

Source (8)
Three of the predominant types of collision are: (1) failures to yield at entry to circulating vehicles, (2) single vehicle run-off the circulatory roadway, and (3) single vehicle run-into the central island. A more recent crash study (14) confirmed a high proportion of single vehicle crashes: 49 percent in rural areas, versus 21 percent in urban areas. According to crash models from the United Kingdom, single vehicle crashes range between 20 and 40 percent depending on traffic and design characteristics of sites. In the United Kingdom models, separation by urban and rural areas is not provided.

To reduce the severity of single vehicle crashes, special attention should be accorded to improving visibility and avoiding or removing any hard obstacles on the central island and splitter islands in both urban and rural environments. A French study (14) identified a number of major obstacles that caused fatalities and injuries: trees, guardrail, concrete barriers, fences, walls, piers, sign or light poles, landscaping pots or hard decorative objects, and steep cross-slopes on the central island.

In rural areas, the benefit of lighting has not yet been quantified. In France, only 36 percent of the rural sites are lighted. At these sites, 46 percent of all crashes, and 49 percent of single vehicle crashes occur at night (14).

The French study (7) in 15 towns of 202 urban roundabout crashes compared with all crossroads reported the percentage of crashes by user type, as shown in Exhibit 5-14. The percentage of crashes concerning pedestrians was similar to all crossroads. However, the percentage of crashes involving bicycles and mopeds was larger—15.4 percent for urban crossroads overall versus 24.2 percent for roundabouts, i.e., almost 60 percent more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User</th>
<th>All Crossroads</th>
<th>Roundabouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycles</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mopeds</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor cycles</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility vehicles</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy goods vehicles</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/coach</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (7)
5.3.3 Pedestrians

As was described previously, vehicular injury crashes normally decrease when roundabouts are installed at an existing intersection. The safety benefits of roundabouts have been found to generally carry over to pedestrians as well, as shown in British statistics of Exhibit 5-15. This may be due to the reduced speeds at roundabouts as compared with the previous intersection forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Type</th>
<th>Pedestrian Crashes per Million Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini-roundabout</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional roundabout</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flared roundabout</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signals</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (1, 15)

For pedestrians, the risk of being involved in a severe collision is lower at roundabouts than at other forms of intersections, due to the slower vehicle speeds. Likewise, the number of conflict points for pedestrians is lower at roundabouts than at other intersections, which can lower the frequency of collisions. The splitter island between entry and exit allows pedestrians to resolve conflicts with entering and exiting vehicles separately.

A Dutch study of 181 intersections converted to roundabouts (4) found reductions (percentage) in all pedestrian crashes of 73 percent and in pedestrian injury crashes of 89 percent. In this study, all modes shared in the safety benefits to greater (passenger cars) or lesser extents (bicycles), as shown in Exhibit 5-16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>All Crashes</th>
<th>Injury Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger car</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moped</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (4)
A risk analysis of 59 roundabouts and 124 signalized intersections was carried out on crash data in Norway between 1985 and 1989. Altogether, 33 crashes involving personal injury were recorded at the 59 roundabouts. Only 1 of these crashes involved a pedestrian, compared with the signalized intersections, where pedestrians were involved in 20 percent of the personal injury crashes (57 of 287 injury crashes) (16).

Further, there is no quantitative evidence of increased safety for pedestrians at roundabouts with striped (zebra) crossings, where pedestrians have priority. Therefore, striped crossings have generally not been used in other countries. However, in the U.S., it is recommended that all crosswalks be striped except at rural locations with low pedestrian volumes. Although this is not their intended function, striped crosswalks may further alert approaching drivers to a change in their appropriate speed near the yield point.

Crash data have not been collected to indicate whether a pedestrian has a disability, and no studies have focused specifically on the safety of visually impaired pedestrians at roundabouts. This is an area requiring further research.

5.3.3.1 Information access for blind or visually impaired pedestrians

Roundabout crossing skills may be difficult for disabled pedestrians to perform without assistance. For example, audible pedestrian-activated signals may be considered on an approach, although this treatment is not typical. Any leg of any roundabout could be equipped with a pedestrian-activated signal at the pedestrian crossing, if a balanced design requires providing assistance to pedestrians at that location. For example, motorized volume that is too heavy at times to provide a sufficient number of gaps acceptable for pedestrians may warrant a pedestrian signal equipped with audible devices to assist people with visual disabilities.

When crossing a roundabout, there are several areas of difficulty for pedestrians who are blind or visually impaired. It is desirable that a visually impaired pedestrian with good travel skills should be able to arrive at an unfamiliar intersection and cross it with pre-existing skills and without special, intersection-specific training. Roundabouts pose problems at several points of the crossing experience, from the perspective of their access to information:

- The first task of the visually impaired pedestrian is to locate the crosswalk. This can be difficult if the roundabout is not properly landscaped and if the curb edge of the ramp is not marked with a detectable warning surface (see Chapter 6). The crosswalk direction must also be unambiguous.

- Depending upon whether the visually impaired pedestrian is crossing the roundabout in a clockwise or counterclockwise direction, they must listen for a safe gap to cross either the entrance or exit lane(s). The primary problem is the sound of traffic on the roundabout, which may mask the sound of cars approaching the
crosswalk. While crossing the exit lane poses the greater hazard to the pedestrian who is visually impaired because of the higher speed of the vehicles, crossing the entrance may also pose significant problems. Entering traffic, while slower, may also be intimidating as it may not be possible to determine by sound alone whether a vehicle has actually stopped or intends to stop. Sighted pedestrians often rely upon communication through eye contact in these situations; however, that is not a useful or reliable technique for the pedestrian who is visually impaired. Both these problems are further exacerbated at roundabouts with multilane entrances and exits. In these roundabouts, a stopped car in the near lane may mask the sounds of other traffic. It may also block the view of the driver in the far lane of the cane or guide dog of a person who is visually impaired who begins to cross (this is also a problem for children and people using wheelchairs on any crossing of a multilane road).

- The third task is locating the splitter island pedestrian refuge. If this refuge is not ramped, curbed, or equipped with detectable warnings, it is not detectable by a pedestrian who is visually impaired.
- Crossing the remaining half of the crossing (see the second bullet above).
- Locating the correct walkway to either continue their path or locate the adjacent crosswalk to cross the next leg of the roundabout.

Unless these issues are addressed by a design, the intersection is “inaccessible” and may not be permissible under the ADA. Chapters 6 and 7 provide specific suggestions to assist in providing the above information. However, more research is required to develop the information jurisdictions need to determine where roundabouts may be appropriate and what design features are required for people with disabilities. Until specific standards are adopted, engineers and jurisdictions must rely on existing related research and professional judgment to design pedestrian features so that they are usable by pedestrians with disabilities.

Possible design remedies for the difficulties faced by pedestrians include tight entries, raised speed tables with detectable warnings, treatments for visually impaired pedestrians to locate crosswalks, raised pavement markers with yellow flashing lights to alert drivers of crossing pedestrians, pedestrian crossings with actuated signals set sufficiently upstream of the yield line to minimize the possibility of exiting vehicle queues spilling back into the circulatory roadway (6). However, the safety of these treatments at roundabouts has not been tested in the United States.
5.3.4 Bicyclists

As shown in Exhibit 5-17, at British roundabouts bicyclists fare worse in terms of crashes at roundabouts than at signalized intersections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Type</th>
<th>Bicyclists</th>
<th>Motorcyclists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini-roundabout</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional roundabout</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flared roundabout</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signals</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (1, 15)

A French study (7) compared the crashes in 1988 in 15 towns in the west of France at both signalized intersections and roundabouts, as shown in Exhibit 5-18. The conclusions from the analysis were:

- There were twice as many injury crashes per year at signalized intersections than at roundabouts;
- Two-wheel vehicles were involved in injury crashes more often (+77 percent) at signalized intersections than on roundabouts;
- People were more frequently killed and seriously injured per crash (+25 percent) on roundabouts than at signalized intersections;
- Proportionally, two-wheel vehicle users were more often involved in crashes (16 percent) on roundabouts than at signalized intersections. Furthermore, the consequences of such crashes were more serious.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Signalized Crossroads</th>
<th>Roundabouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of crossroads</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of personal injuries</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of crashes involving 2-wheel vehicles</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal injury crashes/year/crossroad</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-wheel vehicle crashes/year/crossroad</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crashes to 2-wheel vehicles per 100 crashes</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious crashes/year/crossroad</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious crashes to 2-wheel vehicles/year/crossroad</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious crashes/100 crashes</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious crashes to 2-wheel vehicles/100 crashes to a 2-wheel vehicle</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (7)
All European countries report that a more careful design is necessary to enhance bicyclists' safety. The type of bicycle crashes depends on the bicycle facilities provided at the roundabout. If there are no bicycle facilities, or if there is a bike lane on the outer area of the circulatory roadway, crashes typically occur between entering cars and circulating bicyclists as well as between cars heading into an exit and circulating bicyclists. Improperly placed signs on the splitter island may also be a contributing factor.

As a result, most European countries have the following policies:

- Avoid bike lanes on the outer edge of the circulatory roadway.

- Allow bicyclists to mix with vehicle traffic without any separate facility in the circulatory roadway when traffic volumes are low, on single lane roundabouts operating at lower speeds (e.g., up to 8,000 vehicles per day in the Netherlands (4)).

- Introduce separated bicycle facilities outside the circulatory roadway when vehicular and bicycle volumes are high. These separated bicycle facilities cross the exits and entries at least one car length from the edge of the circulatory roadway lane, adjacent to the pedestrian crossings. In some countries, bicyclists have priority over entering and exiting cars, especially in urban areas (e.g., Germany). Other countries prefer to give priority to car traffic showing a yield sign to bicyclists (e.g., Netherlands). The latter solution (i.e., separate bicycle facilities with vehicular traffic priority at the crossing points) is the standard solution for rural areas in most European countries.

Speed is a fundamental risk factor in the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians. Typical bicyclist speeds are in the range of 20 to 25 km/h (12 to 15 mph), and designs that constrain the speeds of vehicles to similar values will minimize the relative speeds and thereby improve safety. Design features that slow traffic such as tightening entry curvature and entry width, and radial alignment of the legs of a roundabout, such as with the urban compact design, are considered safe treatments for bicyclists (17).

In the Netherlands, a 90 percent decrease in injury crashes was experienced with separate bicycle paths around roundabouts where bicyclists do not have right-of-way at the crossings (17).

A bicycle crash prediction model from Sweden has been validated against data for Swedish, Danish, and Dutch roundabouts (18). The model provides reasonable results for roundabouts with up to 12,000 vehicles per day and 4,000 bicycles per day. The model tends to over-predict crashes (i.e., is conservative) for roundabouts carrying more than 12,000 vehicles per day that are also designed with separate bicycle paths with crossings on the approach legs. It is calibrated for crossroad intersections as well as roundabouts. To obtain the expected cycling crashes per year at roundabouts, the value derived from the general junction model is factored by 0.71, implying that bicycle crashes at roundabouts are 71 percent less frequent than at junctions in general. However, the reader is cautioned when extrapolating European bicycling experience to the U.S., as drivers in Europe are more accustomed to interacting with bicyclists.
5.4 Crash Prediction Models

Crash prediction models have been developed for signalized intersections in the U.S., as discussed previously in Chapter 3. However, no crash prediction models exist yet for U.S. roundabouts and driver behavior. Given the relatively recent introduction of roundabouts to the U.S. and driver unfamiliarity with them, crash prediction models from other countries should be used cautiously. As reported earlier in Section 5.3, crash statistics vary from country to country, both in terms of magnitude and in terms of collision types. Consequently, the application of a crash prediction model from another country may not accurately predict crash frequencies at U.S. locations. Nonetheless, these crash prediction models from other countries can be useful in understanding the relative effects of various geometric features on the number of crashes that might be expected. The user is thus cautioned to use these models only for comparative purposes and for obtaining insights into the refinement of individual geometric elements, not to use them for predicting absolute numbers of crashes under U.S. conditions.

Crash models relating crash frequency to roundabout characteristics are available from the United Kingdom. The sample consisted of 84 four-leg roundabouts of all sizes, small to large and with various number of approach lanes and entry lanes (flared or parallel entries) (1). Approach speeds were also evenly represented between 48 to 64 km/h (30 to 40 mph) and 80 to 113 km/h (50 to 70 mph). Crash data were collected for periods of 4 to 6 years, a total of 1,427 fatal, serious, and slight injuries only. The proportion of crashes with one casualty was 83.7 percent, and those with two casualties was 12.5 percent. The models are based on generalized linear regression of the exponential form, which assumes a Poisson distribution. Their goodness of fit is expressed in terms of scaled deviations that are moderately reliable. No additional variables, other than those listed below, could further improve the models significantly (see also (8)).

The British crash prediction equations (1), for each type of crash are listed in Equations 5-1 through 5-5. Note that these equations are only valid for roundabouts with four legs. However, the use of these models for relative comparisons may still be reasonable.

Entry-Circulating:

\[ A = 0.052Qe^{0.7}Q_c^{0.4} \exp(-40C_e + 0.14e - 0.007v) - \frac{1}{1 + \exp(4R - 7)} + 0.2P_m - 0.01\theta) \]

where: 
- \( A \) = personal injury crashes (including fatalities) per year per roundabout approach;
- \( Q_e \) = entering flow (1,000s of vehicles/day)
- \( Q_c \) = circulating flow (1,000s of vehicles/day)
- \( C_e \) = entry curvature = 1/\( R_e \)
- \( e \) = entry width (m)
- \( v \) = approach width (m)
- \( R \) = ratio of inscribed circle diameter/central island diameter
- \( P_m \) = proportion of motorcycles (%)
- \( \theta \) = angle to next leg, measured centerline to centerline (degrees)
Approaching:  
\[ A = 0.00570 Q_e^{0.7} \exp(20C_e - 0.1e) \]  
\[(5-2)\]

where:  
- \( A \) = personal injury crashes (including fatalities) per year at roundabout approach or leg
- \( Q_e \) = entering flow (1,000s of vehicles/day)
- \( C_e \) = entry curvature = \( 1/R_e \)
- \( R_e \) = entry path radius for the shortest vehicle path (m)
- \( e \) = entry width (m)

Single Vehicle:  
\[ A = 0.0064Q_e^{0.8} \exp(25C_e + 0.2V - 45C_e) \]  
\[(5-3)\]

where:  
- \( A \) = personal injury crashes (including fatalities) per year at roundabout approach or leg
- \( Q_e \) = entering flow (1,000s of vehicles/day)
- \( C_e \) = entry curvature = \( 1/R_e \)
- \( R_e \) = entry path radius for the shortest vehicle path (m)
- \( V \) = approach width (m)
- \( C_a \) = approach curvature = \( 1/R_a \)
- \( R_a \) = approach radius (m), defined as the radius of a curve between 50 m (164 ft) and 500 m (1,640 ft) of the yield line

Other (Vehicle):  
\[ A = 0.0064Q_e^{0.8} \exp(25C_e + 0.2V - 45C_e) \]  
\[(5-4)\]

where:  
- \( A \) = personal injury crashes (including fatalities) per year at roundabout approach or leg
- \( Q_{ec} \) = product \( Q_e \) \( Q_c \)
- \( Q_e \) = entering flow (1,000s of vehicles/day)
- \( Q_c \) = circulating flow (1,000s of vehicles/day)
- \( P_m \) = proportion of motorcycles

Pedestrian:  
\[ A = 0.029Q_{e+}^{0.5} \]  
\[(5-5)\]

where:  
- \( A \) = personal injury crashes (including fatalities) per year at roundabout approach or leg
- \( Q_{ew} \) = product \( Q_e \) \( Q_p \)
- \( Q_e \) = entering flow (1,000s of vehicles/day)
- \( Q_p \) = exiting flow (1,000s of vehicles/day)
- \( Q_w \) = pedestrian crossing flow (1,000s of pedestrians/day)

According to the U.K. crash models, the major physical factors that were statistically significant are entry width, circulatory width, entry path radius, approach curvature, and angle between entries. Some of the effects of these parameters are as follows:

- **Entry width:** For a total entry flow of 20,000 vehicles per day, widening an entry from one lane to two lanes is expected to cause 30 percent more injury crashes. At 40,000 vehicles per day, widening an entry from two lanes to three lanes will cause a 15 percent rise in injury crashes. Moreover, the models could not take into account the added hazard to bicyclists and pedestrians who will have to travel longer exposed distances. (8)
The circulatory width: Widening the circulatory roadway has less impact on crashes than entry width. Crashes are expected to rise about 5 percent for a widening of two meters. (8)

Entry path radius: Entry-circulating collision type increases with entry path radius (for the fastest path), while single vehicle and approach collision types decrease. For a double-lane approach, an optimum entry path radius is 50 to 70 m (165 to 230 ft). (8)

Approach curvature: Approach curvature is safer when the approach curve is to the right and less so when the curve is to the left. This implies that a design is slightly safer when reverse curves are provided to gradually slow drivers before entry. For a double-lane approach roundabout with entering flow of 50,000 vehicles per day, changing a straight approach to a right-turning curve of 200 m (650 ft) radius reduces crash frequency by 5 percent. (8)

Angle between entries: As the angle between entries decreases, the frequency of crashes increases. For example, an approach with an angle of 60 degrees to the next leg of the roundabout increases crash frequency by approximately 35 percent over approaches at 90-degree angles. Therefore, the angle between entries should be maximized to improve safety.

Maximize angles between entries.

An approach suggested in Australia (13) differs from the British approach in that the independent variables are based on measures related to driver behavior. For instance, the collision rate for single vehicle crashes was found to be:

\[ A_{se} = 1.64 \times 10^{-15} \times Q^{1.17} \times L \times (S + \Delta S)^{1.72} / R^{1.91} \] (5-6)

and

\[ A_{sa} = 1.79 \times 10^{-8} \times Q^{0.91} \times L \times (S + \Delta S)^{1.93} / R^{5.45} \] (5-7)

where:
- \( A_{se} \) = the number of single vehicle crashes per year per leg for vehicle path segments prior to the yield line.
- \( A_{sa} \) = the number of single vehicle crashes per year per leg for vehicle path segments after the yield line.
- \( Q \) = the average annual daily traffic in the direction considered—one way traffic only (veh/d).
- \( L \) = the length of the driver’s path on the horizontal geometric element (m).
- \( S \) = the 85th-percentile speed on the horizontal geometric element (km/h).
- \( \Delta S \) = the decrease in the 85th-percentile speed at the start on the horizontal geometric element (km/h). This indicates the speed change from the previous geometric element.
- \( R \) = the vehicle path radius on the geometric element (m).

These equations demonstrate a direct relationship between the number of crashes, overall speed magnitudes, and the change in speed between elements. Therefore, this equation can be used to estimate the relative differences in safety benefits between various geometric configurations by estimating vehicle speeds through the various parts of a roundabout.
5.5 References


