Navigation Signing for Roundabouts Study Performed for: Traffic Control Devices Pooled Fund Study

TRB National Roundabouts Conference Vail, Colorado May 24, 2005

Vaughan W. Inman, PhD. SAIC Bryan J. Katz, PE, PTOE SAIC

Problem

Growing and Widespread Adoption of Roundabouts
No Standard for Navigation Signing at

Roundabouts

Approach

 State of Practice Review of Roundabout Navigation Signage Selection of Four Representative Signing Approaches for Evaluation Conduct Laboratory Evaluation of **Comprehension of Representative** Signs

Four Signing **Alternatives** • Conventional Maryland Diagrammatic New York

Conventional

- Boron

Route Number Shields on One Assembly, Destination Names on Separate Guide Sign

EAST SOUTH WEST 460 221 460 •

Maryland

1 221 SOUTH

460

460 EAST Boron

WEST

Diagrammatic



辺

New York





WEST 460

labout

DRAF

Evaluation Method

- Study Conducted in FHWA Sign Research Laboratory
- Signs Presented in Context with NCUTCD Proposed Lane Markings
- 64 Participants, 16 in Each of 4 Sign Type Groups
- Measure Accuracy, Latency, and Confidence in:

Lane ChoiceLeg Identification

Anatomy of a Trial

- Destination Displayed Until Participant Presses Key – Participant Reads Name Aloud
- 2. Signs shown for 2 s Each
- 3. Roundabout Approach with Lane Markings Shown Until Participant Makes Lane Selection
- 4. Roundabout Diagram Shown Until Participant Makes Leg Identification

Navigation Sign Route-Destination Combinations

Number of	Number of	Items of
Names	Route Shields	Information
0	3	3 Con
1	3	4 fere
2	3	5 ice
3	3	6 005
3	2	5 DR/
3	1	4 F
3	0	3

Turn Restriction Lane Markings (5)

1. Destination

Your Destination Is:

Sanan

ndabout (

05

DRAF

2. Navigation Sign(s)



labout

TTA

3. Lane Choice



oundabout

05 DRAF

3b. Confidence Rating

How confident are you in the lane choice you just made?



4. Leg Choice

On which leg of the roundabout will you exit?



undabout Co

2005 DRAF

4b. Leg Choice Confidence

How confident are you in the lane choice you just made?

Indabout Co

005

DRAF



Customized Keyboard



labout \bigcirc 05 DRAF

Lane Choice Findings

- Participants Chose the Correct Lane Only 68.6 Percent of the Time
 Performance Only 3.6 Percent Above Chance
 - With 3 equally probable choices chance performance would be 33.3 percent
 However, assuming right lane for right turns, left lane for left turns, and either lane for straight through, chance performance would be 65 percent

N

Lane Choice by Number of Items on Sign

Accuracy with 4 items was better than with 6



Speed in Making Lane Selection

Younger Group Responded More Quickly Than the Older Group to the Conventional and Maryland Type Signs
Responses to New York and Maryland Sign Responses were Slower than to Conventional or Diagrammatic Signs

Lane Choice Response Times (< 65 Years of Age)



Lane Choice Response Times (≥ 65 Year of Age)



Confidence Ratings

Despite High Error Rates, Participants Were Confident in Their Lane Choices
Confidence in Choices was Significantly Lower for New York and Maryland Signs than to Conventional and Diagrammatic

Lane Choice Confidence

labout

005

DRAF



Leg Choice

Leg Choices Accuracy was High Except for the New York Signs

New York Sign Only One that Contains No Leg Information

Best Performance was with Diagrammatic Sign, but Not Significantly Better than with Conventional Sign

Leg Choice Accuracy



Roundabout Confe 2005 DRAFT

Leg Choice Speed

 Leg Selections Took Significantly Longer for Maryland and New York Signs Compared to Conventional and Diagrammatic

 Response Time Differences between Sign Types were Limited to Older Driver Group and Largest for Signs with 5 and 6 Items

Z

Leg Choice Speed



Leg Choice Confidence

- With Conventional and Diagrammatic Signs Drivers were Very Confident of Leg Choices
- Drivers were Significantly Less
 Confident of Leg Choices with Maryland
 Signs
- Drivers were Least Confident with New York Sign (Significantly Less confident than with Maryland Sign)

Confidence in Leg Choice



Items (Destination Names + Route Shields)

Conclusions and Recommendations Conventional and Diagrammatic Signs are Recommended over the Maryland or New York Styles The Turn Restriction Markings were Not Effective - Either because they were noticed in context of this experiment, or - Traditional turn restriction markings are not appropriate for US roundabouts - Additional turn restriction research needed

刀