DEVELOPMENT OF A TOOL FOR ROAD CENTERLINE SELECTION AT CURVES AND GUIDELINE FOR PLACEMENT OF RELATED DANGER WARNING SIGNS

Aththanapola Arachchige Prematilake

(108617L)



Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa Sri Lanka

February 2014

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis/dissertation does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis/dissertation, in whole or in part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature: Date:



The above candidate has carried out research for the Masters Dissertation under my supervision.

Signature of the supervisor:	Date:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. J.M.S.J. Bandara for his excellent guidance and assistance extended throughout the research program. Prof. J.M.S.J. Bandara has been supportive as a supervisor and has given me encouragement and inspiration during the research.

My gratitude is extended to Dr. W.K Mampearachch, Course Coordinator, for the encouragement to complete my research work.

Special thanks to Mr. R.A.Sudath, Deputy Director Planning, Road Development Authority and Mr M S M Iqbal, Consultant CDB Projects for the support and guidance provided during this research program, and heartfelt thanks to Miss N. Tissra Project Director, CDB Projects, and Mr W.K. Kodituwakku, Project Director NHS Project for granting me required leave to follow this course.



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka. Electronic Theses & Dissertations www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

ABSTRACT

The main function of road signs and markings should be to guide the road user safely to the destination by optimizing the time consume for the journey. Placing the right sign or marking at the right place in the right manner will increase the efficiency on the road. Inappropriate marking or sign will tend to lose the credibility over them and increase the impatience of drivers by reducing the efficiency and safety on road.

Current Method for marking road centerlines and placement of danger warning signs is based on the Regulations of Gazette Notification No.444/18 published on 13th March 1987. Until now, this method has been practiced for more than 25 years. Marked centerlines and fixed warning signs on roads show remarkable deficiencies when practice. When travelling along roads, it is understood that some of road signs are decreasing the efficiency due to deficiencies and errors of markings or signs. Some instances, it can be noted that centerlines on roads are marked on a tryout basis due to lack of proper guidance in the current method. Road condition has remarkably improved and Traffic volume has gone up, when compare with the situation at the time of introducing the current method.

After realizing the shortcomings of the current method, in year 2007, then the Ministry of Transport & Highways and the Road Development Authority (RDA) have been focusing attention to introduce a Revised Method for Traffic Signs and Markings (Proposed Method) which is in conformity with the stipulations given in the Vienna Convention. As a result, Revised Traffic Regulations are in the threshold of publishing as an Act. This will replace the Regulations that are currently in use. A manual called **The Manual on Traffic Control Devices** has already been prepared by Roads Development Authority (RDA) fortusing in the future after coming in to effect of the above Revised Act.

This proposed method has been lifed out on some of the national roads. However, further continuation on other roads was stopped due to legal impediments.

When examining the roads used for trying out the proposed revised method, it is understood that still there are some practical deficiencies. As an example, the manual discuss about the placing of continuous line at horizontal and vertical curves by maintaining the visibility distance S for different vehicle speeds. However, maintaining this S value seems to be difficult to practice at the design stage or at the site due to practical difficulties in measuring it.

This research will make an effort limited to road curves to discuss existing identified conflicts and shortcomings in the current method in marking centerlines at curves and placing of related warning signs since every road encounters large number of curves. Further, this will discuss provisions in proposed method for marking centerlines at curves and placing of related warning signs for the better understanding of the suitability of this method. In addition, this will discuss drawbacks of the proposed method in marking centerline. As solutions to these drawbacks, this research will try to put forward a methodology.

The methodology contains,

- A computer program as a tool to mark road centerlines at vertical or horizontal curves by maintaining the S value specified in the proposed method.
- Suggestions as a guideline for placement of danger-warning signs related to curves based on the proposed method.

DEDICATION

To my wife and children



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	DECLA	RATION	i
	ACKNO	OWLEDGEMENT	. ii
	ABSTR	ACT	iii
	DEDICA	ATION	iv
	TABLE	OF CONTENTS	. v
	LIST OF	F FIGURES	vii
	LIST OF	TABLES	ix
1	CHAPT	ER 01: Introduction	. 1
	1.1 Roa	d Marking and Road Signs	. 3
	1.1.1	Road Marking	, <i>3</i>
	1.1.2	Road Signs	. 4
2	CHAPT	ER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	. 5
	2.1 Currelated II 2.1.1 2.1.2	rent Method for Marking Road Centerlines at curves and Placement of Danger Warning Signity of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka. Electronic Theses & Dissertations www.lib.mrt.ac.lk For placing danger warning signs.	. 5 . 5
	_	posed Method for Marking Road Centerlines at curves and Placement of Danger Warning Signs	
	2.2.1	Centerline	10
	2.2.2	Danger Warning Signs	16
	2.2.3	Additional panels for use with danger signs	17
	2.3 Prov	visions in Geometric Design Standards of Roads for centerline marking	18
	2.3.1	Recommendations for Centerline marking	18
3	PROBLI	EMS IN THE CURRENT METHOD	19
		rtcomings of the current method in marking road centerline at curves are	
	3.1.1	Shortcomings of the current method itself	19
	3.1.2	Implementation errors2	22

4	DISC	USSION
		Dealing with the Shortcomings in the current method by the proposed method
	4.1.1	Unnecessary extension of Continuous line beyond curves26
	4.1.2	Lack of guidance for selection of road markings27
	4.1.3	Criterion for application of Continuous Centerlines in proposed method
		27
	4.1.4	Road sign errors31
	4.1.5	Implementation errors
	4.1.6	Identified drawbacks of the proposed method33
5	MET	HODOLOGY DEVELOPED
	5.1 I	ntroduction
	5.2 I	Development of a tool for centerline marking at curves
	5.2.1	Road Centerline Finder (RCF)
	5.3 I	Recommendations for minimum langths of centerlines nka
	5.3.1	General Considerations Theses & Dissertations 58
	5.3.2	www.lib.mrt.ac.lk Recommendations
	5.3.3	Usage of Warning Marking LM-960
	5.4	Guideline to fix danger-warning signs related to curves
	5.4.1	General61
	5.4.2	Sign Sizes
	5.4.3	Siting of Danger Warning signs63
	5.4.4	Mounting heights65
	5.4.5	Mounting More Than One Sign on a post65
6	REFI	ERENCES
7	APPI	ENDICES

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1:	Centerline markings defined in the current method	. 6
Figure 2.2:	Danger warning signs related to curves defined in the current method	. 8
Figure 2.3:	Additional warning signs defined in the Current method related to curves	. 9
Figure 2.4:	Road signs defined in the proposed method	11
Figure 2.5:	Broken line (LM-1) marked on A- 010 road	12
Figure 2.6:	Continuous line (LM 8) marked on A-010 road	13
Figure 2.8:	Combination of Continuous line with broken line (LM 10) on A-010 Road	14
Figure 2.9.	Double Continuous line (LM 11) marked on A 010 road	15
<i>Figure 2.10:</i>	Danger warning signs defined in proposed method	16
Figure 2.1:	Additional panels used with danger warning signs in proposed method	17
Figure 3.1:	Horizontal curve to right side with continuous line (B 304 Road)	20
Figure 3.2:	Continuous line changed toa broken line. (B 214 road)	20
Figure 3.3:	Sign for closely located bends	21
Figure3.4:	Hairpin Bend warning signs in current method	22
Figure 3.5:	Horizontal and vertical combined mild curve on B.	23
Figure 3.6:	Horizontal and vertical combined mild curve on B. University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka. Commuous double marked on A-08 Road Electronic Theses & Dissertations	23
Figure 3.7:	Double bend to left ahead warning (B- 304 road).	24
Figure 3.8:	Bend to right ahead warning (A-04 Road)	
Figure 4.1:	Usage of LM5 road sign on A010 road	27
Figure 4.2:	Continuous lines overlap	29
Figure 4.3:	Continuous lines do not overlap	29
Figure 4.4:	Continuous lines overlap	30
Figure 4.5:	Continuous lines do not overlap	30
Figure 5.1:	RCF user interface Default view	36
Figure 5.2:	Parameter Frame <i>view of RCF</i>	37
Figure 5.3:	Curve Middle Chainage pop up window of RCF	38
Figure 5.4:	SSD for Different Grades pop up window of RCF	39
Figure 5.5:	Reference diagram for curve data pop up window of RCF	41
Figure 5.6:	Second sub frame view of RCF if "Know" is selected	41
Figure 5.7:	Second sub frame view of RCF if "Not Know" is selected	42
Figure 5.8:	Curve Data sub frame view of RCF	43
Figure 5.9:	Diagram of Obstruction data frame view of RCF	43
Figure 5 10.	Obstruction Data sub frame of RCF when selected	11

Figure 5.11:	Obstruction Data sub frame of RCF when selected By Distance	45
Figure 5.12:	Obstruction Data sub frame of RCF when selected	46
Figure 5.13:	Recommendation for frame view of RCF	46
Figure 5.14:	Recommendation for frame with table view of RCF	47
Figure 5.15:	Command Button view of RCF	47
Figure 5.16:	View of RCF with analysed data set	49
Figure 5.17:	View of Vertical Curve tab of RCF	50
Figure 5.18:	View of Input frame in Vertical Curve tab of RCF	51
Figure 5.19:	View of Results frame in Vertical Curve tab of RCF	54
Figure 5.20:	View of Command buttons in Vertical Curve tab of RCF	55
Figure 5.21:	View of Vertical Curve tab of RCF after analyzing	57



LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Centerline Types	5
Table 2.2: Warning Requirements	7
Table 2.3: Danger warning signs in the Current Method	7
Table 2.4: Warning requirements	8
Table 2.5: Centerline Types in the Proposed Method	10
Table 2.6: Design values for SSD, OSD and CSD	18
Table 4.1: Visibility distance for Prohibitory Markings	28
Table 4.2: Alternative values for S	28
Table 5.1: Australian Criteria	58
Table 5.2: State of California Criteria	59
Table 5.3: Recommendations for minimum lengths of centerlines	60
Table 5.1: Danger Warning Signs in the Manual on Traffic Control Devices	62
Table 5.2: Additional panels in the Manual on Traffic Control Devices	62
Table 5.3: Siting details of Warning Signs defined in the proposed method	64
Table A3-1: Coefficient Of Retroreflection R': C1., Unit: cd. lx-1. m-2University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.	73
Table A3-2: Coefficient Of Retroreflection R': G2. Unit: cd. lx-1 m-2	73
Table A3-3: Chromaticity and Luminance Factors Class C1 Material	
Table A3-4: Chromaticity And Luminance Factors Class C2 Material	74
Table A3-5: Choice Of Reflective Materials On Permanent Road Signs	75