

Presentation to IPENZ Transportation Conference
Auckland, Monday 28 March 2011

Improving Pedestrian LOS at Signals

Axel Wilke

ViaStrada Ltd, Christchurch

Jeanette Ward

ViaStrada Ltd, Christchurch

Susan McLaughlin

Christchurch City Council





www.viastrada.co.nz



Background

- Study of central Christchurch by Danish architect Jan Gehl
 - *Public Space Public Life* (2009)
 - High level look at how to further develop the central city
- CCC (Christchurch City Council) adopted implementation actions
 - *A City for People Action Plan* (2010)



Background (cont'd)

- Objective of action plan is to lay foundation “for future growth and prosperity” (Bob Parker)
- Action item – improve pedestrian level of service (LOS)

Pedestrian Friendly City		
ACTION		
#	Public Space Public Life Recommendations	A City for People Action Plan Recommendations
4	Increase pedestrian priority at intersections including reduced waiting times	<p>Review LTCCP levels of service to provide better recognition of pedestrians</p> <p>Review traffic light (SCATS) operations with the objective of providing higher pedestrian priority including extended 'green person' crossing times</p>



VIASTRADA

Study area

- Study area adopted from Gehl report
- 32 signalised intersections with
- 110 signalised pedestrian crossings



VIASTRADA

Methodology

Stage 1: conference paper

- Develop a pedestrian LOS process
- Measure LOS for the signalised pedestrian crossings in the study area
- Prepare a toolkit of measures to improve LOS
- Develop an implementation strategy

Stage 2: work undertaken since submitting paper

- Develop preferred option for each crossing
- Undertake network modelling
- Evaluate improvement



Defining level of service

- No recognised system available for measuring pedestrian LOS at signals
- Method developed for this study:
 1. Crossing distance: kerb to kerb distance
 2. Delay time: average length of time before walk phase begins
 3. Green time ratio: ratio of delay to green walk time
 4. Exposure to risk: conflicting turning volumes

Measuring level of service

- Review signal plans
- Site visits
 - ped counts, observations, hardware
- Data from the signals team
 - turning volumes, operational data
- Apply engineering judgement
 - exposure to risk
- LOS score for each crossing
 - spreadsheet analysis



LOS rating

- Spreadsheet analysis assigns points
 - Range 0 to 100 points
- Points ranges get translated to LOS rating


LOS	Range	
A	100	83
B	82.9	66
C	65.9	49
D	48.9	32
E	31.9	16
F	15.9	0

Observations on distribution

- Many LOS A crossings are on one-way approaches




VIASTRADA




Observations on distribution

- Many LOS A crossings are on one-way approaches
- Barnes Dance (pedestrian scramble phase) intersections have LOS B



Observations on distribution

- Many LOS A crossings are on one-way approaches
- Barnes Dance (pedestrian scramble phase) intersections have LOS A
- Two-way cross intersections often have a low LOS
 - Not a reflection of an inherent problem, rather a reflection how they are currently operated



Toolkit of measures to improve LOS

- Reduce the waiting time for pedestrians (through cycle time reductions)
- Lengthen the pedestrian phase (reduce perceived conflict created by the “flashing red man”, plus reduced delay)
- Give pedestrians an advance start ahead of vehicles (several different methods available)
- Increase geographic distribution and time schedule for automatic call of pedestrian signals
- More Barnes Dances
- ... and other measures

VIASTRADA

17



The most effective tool

- Cycle time reduction most effective
 - More effective than increasing walk time
 - Requires departure from current operating philosophy
 - Need to balance pedestrian benefits with impacts on driver delays / capacity
 - Often benefits motorists, too

VIASTRADA

18



Stage 2 – Implementation phase

- Not part of the written paper
- Hence will report results only
- Methodology
 - Study undertaken for each crossing
 - Considered most applicable tool(s) from Stage 1
 - Detailed proposals worked out
 - Network effects modelled in Paramics
- Final draft submitted to client

Stage 2 – Results

- The cycle time in the CBD would be reduced in the interpeak
- Some intersections and one corridor taken out of co-ordinated system
- Proposal would raise average LOS

	Existing	Proposed
Score	48.9	59.0
Rating	D	C

- Overall network performance for motorists remains fairly unchanged

Stage 2 – LOS comparison

- Average score 59 points – LOS C
- Significant pedestrian improvement without lowering vehicle performance

LOS	Number of crossings	
	Existing	Proposal
A	9	16
B	15	19
C	15	40
D	53	28
E	18	7
F	0	0

VIASTRADA

ch
ncil

Stage 2 – Implementation



- Implementation date uncertain



VIASTRADA

22

Discussion & thank you

- Questions please
- Thank you for listening
- Contact phone numbers:
 - Axel Wilke (027) 2929 810
 - Jeanette Ward (021) 2969 524
 - Susan McLaughlin (03) 941 8569