# Engineer's Recommendation Intersection of Gray Road \& Range Road Cumberland, Maine 

Date: $\quad$ August 16, 2023<br>Subject:<br>Intersection Evaluation and Recommendations<br>Gray Road \& Range Road

To: Bill Shane, P.E., Cumberland Town Manager
From: Randy Dunton, PE, PTOE - Gorrill Palmer

## Introduction

The unsignalized intersection of Gray Road \& Range Road has a history of increasing crashes over the last five years with a significant increase in the \% injury. Currently, Range Road is 35 mph and is stop controlled with Gray Road being 50 mph and free flow conditions. MaineDOT has completed a very thorough review of the intersection including the potential impacts of converting the intersection from a two-way stopped controlled intersection to an all-way stop controlled intersection. This conversion includes; stop bars, additional signs (some with flags and some with LED lighting), and pavement markings.

## Recommendation

Based on a review of the information provided by MaineDOT (see attached "Cumberland - Intersection of Gray Road \& Range Road, Background Safety / Mobility Analysis", dated July 6, 2023), and discussions with their safety office as well as the Region Traffic Engineer, I concur with the MaineDOT's recommendation that the intersection be converted from a two-way stop controlled intersection to an all-way stop controlled intersection as identified in the attached power point.

## Attachments

Attachment A - MaineDOT power point presentation: "Cumberland - Intersection of Gray Road \& Range Road, Background Safety / Mobility Analysis", dated July 6, 2023
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## Attachment A

## MaineDOT Power Point

# Cumberland Intersection of Gray Road \& Range Road 

Background Safety/Mobility Analysis

July 6, 2023

## SAFETY PROBLEMS

-TYPES OF CRASHES

- SEVERITY OF CRASHES
-SIGHT DISTANCE
-? (HAVEN'T BEEN ON FIELD VISIT YET ${ }_{\text {case2 }}$ )



$\times a$








## Crashes By Year



| Year | Injury <br> Crash <br> Count | \% Injury |  |  |  | Number <br> of <br> Crashes |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2013 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| 2014 | 1 | $33.33 \%$ | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| 2015 | 2 | $40.00 \%$ | 2 | 3 | 5 |  |
| 2016 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| 2017 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| 2019 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| 2020 | 2 | $66.67 \%$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 2021 | 2 | $66.67 \%$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 2022 | 3 | $75.00 \%$ | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
|  | Crash Count | 4 | 6 | 13 | 23 |  |

## Injury Level



| Route - MP | Section U/R <br> Length |  | Total <br> Crashes | K |  |  |  | A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | B | C | PD | Percent |  |  |  |
| Injury |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Weather Condition



Road Surface Condition


## Day of Week



Day of Week

## Driver Age



## Crash Type



## HIGH SPEED ANGLE CRASH SEVERITY

"Angle" Crash Severity By Intersection Speed Limit

|  | Injury \% | K+A \% | K+A+B \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | $2596 \%$ | $0.98 \%$ | $630 \%$ |
| 30 | $43.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ |
| 35 | $31.65 \%$ | $2.01 \%$ | $9.53 \%$ |
| 40 | $34.25 \%$ | $2.53 \%$ | $11.96 \%$ |
| 45 | $40.68 \%$ | $4.38 \%$ | $15.82 \%$ |
| 50 | $45.27 \%$ | $5.55 \%$ | $18.28 \%$ |
| 55 | $49.42 \%$ | $6.26 \%$ | $22.74 \%$ |

THE INTERSECTION IS NOT A HIGH CRASH LOCATION (HCL) OR HAS HISTORY OF BEING HCL.



## HCM AM Existing Conditions Delays (sec/veh)

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




## ALTERNATIVES

-TRAFFIC SIGNAL - DID NOt meet any mutcd SIGNAL WARRANTS.

- ALL WAY STOP - met Warrant -IMPROVE INTERSECTION SIGHT DISTANCE


## HOW AWS CAME TO BE CONSIDERED AS AN ALTERNATIVE?

- REVIEWED MAINE EXAMPLES
- HISTORICAL DATA
- RECENT EXAMPLES
- NATIONAL STUDIES
- NORTH CAROLINA MEETING/STUDY


## ALL-WAY STOP LOCATIONS



OLDER EXAMPLE OF AWS

## NEWER TYPE INSTALLATIONS



## HISTORICAL MAINE BEFORE / AFTER

## -CRASH REDUCTION $=\underline{45 \%}$

-INJURY CRASH REDUCTION = $\underline{52 \%}$
$\cdot$-CRASH COST REDUCTION $=54 \%$

## NATIONAL CRASH REDUCTION CONVERT TWO-WAY TO ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL

-CRASH REDUCTION = 82\%/61 \% - INJURY CRASH REDUCTION = 87\%/72 \%

## Safety Study Results (2010 Data)

- Safety study of over 50 intersections in NC converted from 2-way stop to AWS.
- The study included a diverse group of four-leg intersections converted to AWS in urban, suburban, and rural areas (included some locations outside of Spot Safety).
- Intersections with a range of volumes and approach speeds were included.
- The study was comprised of locations both with and without overhead and/or sign mounted flashing beacons.
- The overall results indicate a:

68\% Reduction in Total Crashes 77\% Reduction in Fatal and Injury Crashes 75\% Reduction in Frontal Impact Crashes

There appears to be an even greater crash reduction at higher speed (45-55 mph) AWS sites.

## ncdot.gov

AWS Guidelines

## Crash Severity (2020 Data)

36 AWS Spot Safety Projects at 4-leg Intersections with Before \& After Crash Data


## Cost and Benefits (2020 Data)

36 AWS Spot Safety Projects at 4-leg Intersections with Before \& After Crash Data

BENEFITS: 26 Fatal \& Serious Injury Crashes reported before and NONE after.


COSTS: Median Installation Cost is roughly $\$ 20,000$

Never observed a Fatal Crash after AWS at ~100 intersections studied

## Casco Conversion - Route 11 / Route 121

CONVERTED OCTOBER 2019



## Casco Conversion - Route 11 / Route 121

CONVERTED OCTOBER 2019

CASCO 3-YEARS BEFORE


CASCO 3-YEARS AFTER


## Durham Conversion - Route 125 / Quaker Meetinghouse Rd CONVERTED MARCH 2018



## Durham Conversion - Route 125 / Quaker Meetinghouse Rd

## CONVERTED MARCH 2018

DURHAM 3-YEARS BEFORE


DURHAM 3-YEARS AFTER


## HCM AM Existing Conditions Delays (sec/veh)

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## All-Way Stop Forecast Delays (sec/veh)

PM Peak Hour 4:30 to 5:30


2023 AM DHV Hour 7:15-8:15

| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 12.5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection LOS |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Lane VIC Ratio | 0.201 | 0.037 | 0.116 | 0.61 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.2 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 14.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | B |
| HCM 95th-ile Q | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 4.3 |



## Cumberland Route 26 \& Range Road B/C Analysis

Benefit-Cost Analysis

| Alternative | Analysis Duration | Safety Benefit | Mobility Benefit | Net Benefit | Cost Estimate | Net Benefit-Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AWS | 10 Years | $\$ 2,892,280$ | $-\$ 175,450$ | $\$ 2,716,830$ | $\$ 20,000$ | 135.84 |

## BENEFITS OF AN ALL-WAY STOP

- SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION IN TOTAL CRASHES.
- SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION IN INJURY CRASH SEVERITY.
- ZERO FATAL CRASHES AT AWS SINCE 2003.
- HIGH SAFETY BENEFIT / COST RATIO.
- VEHICLES ENTER THE INTERSECTION AT LOW SPEEDS.
- MINIMAL DELAY WITH EACH CONVERSION.



## Crash Costs and Benefits of Intersection Alternatives



CHANGE INTERSECTION SIGHTDISTANCE
DESCRIPTION:
PRIOR CONDIIION: INTERSECTIONS WITH A BASESIGHT DISTANCE
CATEGORY:INIERSECTION GEOMETRY

STUDY: SAFETY EVAL UATION OF GEOMETRIC DESIGN CRITERIA: INTERSECTION SIGHT DISTANCE AT UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS, HIMESET AL., 2018


Crash Modification Factor (CMF)

$$
C M F_{T_{i}}=\frac{\exp \left(-0.021 \times P S L+\frac{7.194 \times P S L}{I S D_{i}}+\frac{-243.009 \times L^{2} A A A D T_{m a j}}{I S D_{i}}+\frac{-177.826 \times \text { MidAADT }_{m a j}}{I S D_{i}}\right)}{\exp \left(-0.021 \times P S L+\frac{7.194 \times P S L}{I S D_{\text {base }}}+\frac{-243.009 \times \text { LowAADT }_{m a j}}{I S D_{\text {base }}}+\frac{-177.826 \times \text { MidAADT }_{\text {maj }}}{I S D_{\text {base }}}\right)}
$$

where:
PSL = Posted speed (in mph),
$L O W A A D T_{m a j}=1$ if major road AADT $\leq 5,000$; otherwise 0 .
MidAADT $T_{m a j}=1$ if 5,000 < major road AADT $\leq 15,000$; otherwise 0.
$I S D_{i}=$ Proposed or existing available intersection sight distance for the condition of interest $i$ (where $i=1$ for proposed condition and $i=2$ for existing condition) (in feet).
$I S D_{\text {base }}=$ Base intersection sight distance for an approach direction (in feet). For practical applications, this value is assumed to be 1,320 feet.

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cumberland Route 26 / Range Road |  |  |  |
| Based on Posted Speed of 50 |  |  |  |
| Increasing Sight Distance from $\mathbf{3 0} \mathbf{~ m p h ~ t o ~} 50 \mathrm{mph}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0.621 |  |
|  |  | 37.9\% | Crash Reduction |
|  |  |  |  |
| Posted Speed Limit | 50 |  |  |
| Proposed Sight Distance | 555 |  |  |
| Low AADT | 0 |  |  |
| Mid AADT | 0 |  |  |
| Existing Sight Distance | 320 |  |  |



## Crash Costs and Benefits of Intersection Alternatives
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