



I-76 Operating Speed and Speed Limit SPEED Compliance Study

SESSION 3E TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING AND SAFETY CONFERENCE

December 6, 2018



LIMIT





Project Overview

2

- Quantify effects of speed limit increase
- Speed compliance and crash history analysis
- Supplement analysis performed by LTI in a previous study
- 65 mph to 70 mph July 2014





Project Overview

• Study area

- Blue Mountain IC (MP 201) to
- Morgantown IC (MP 298)
- Data collected using Wavetronix devices
 - 48 hours (min.) data collection periods
 - Data recorded by lane
 - Data recorded in five-minute increments with time stamps





Project Location





Data Collection Locations



Project Overview

DENNA Z

PIKE

Pennoni

Data Collection Dates

• "Before" - 06/17/2014

• SPEED LIMIT CHANGE TO 70 MPH - July 2014

- "After 1" 09/29-30/2014
- "After 2" 05/28/2015
- "After 3"
 - 05/09-10/2018
 - 05/15-16/2018
 - 06/07/2018
 - 07/24-25/2018





Overview of Speed Limit Compliance Analysis

- Compare speeds before and after the speed limit change in July 2014
- "Before" data was taken from the LTI study
- Speed data were collected in work zone and nonwork zone locations





Parameters Investigated

Four speed-related parameters were investigated:

- 1. Mean speed
- 2. Speed variance
- 3. 85th percentile speed
- 4. Proportion of observed vehicles exceeding the posted speed limit



Tests for Statistical Significance

- Independent samples t-test for mean speeds
- Independent samples t-test for 85th percentile speeds
- F-test for speed variance
- Z-test for the proportion of vehicles exceeding the posted speed limit





Before and After Speed Non-Work Zone Locations – Before and After

Location	Time Period	Sample	Mean Speed (mph)	85 th % Speed (mph)	Variance (mph ²)	% Exceeding Speed Limit (mph)
212 EB	Before	100	66.5	73	33.1	51
	After 1	100	70.0	74	22.1	60
	After 3	1918	76.7	81	23.0	92
222 EB	Before	100	68.1	73	30.5	70
	After 1	100	66.1	73	45.2	28
	After 3	1971	72.4	78	27.8	69
COMBINED	Before	200	67.3	73	32.2	61
	After 1	200	68.1 (+1%)	74 (+1%)	37.2(+16%)	39 (-36%)
	After 3	3889	74.5 (+11%)	80 (+10%)	30.1 (-7%)	80 (+31%)



Work Zone Speed Data

Location	Sample Size	Mean (mph)	85% (mph)	Variance (mph ²)	% Exceeding Speed Limit
202.5 EB Construction Total Reconstruction	1721	63.8	67.0	7.8	95.0
269.6 EB & WB – Construction Single Lane (nighttime hours)	1890	67.0	71.0	27.3	93.0
287.7 EB Maintenance Single Lane (daylight hours)	5966	55.4	60.5	33.6	54.4



AFTER 2

- May 2015 MP 207.7 westbound
- May 2015 MP 256.9 eastbound
- May 2015 MP 276 eastbound
- May 2015 MP 278.7 eastbound

AFTER 3

- May 2018 MP 207.8 westbound
- May 2018 MP 256.9 eastbound
- May 2018 MP 275.9 eastbound
- July 2018 MP 278.2 eastbound
- May 2018 MP 287.7 eastbound



After 2 and After 3 Speed Additional Non-Work Zone Locations

Location	Time Period	Sample	Mean Speed (mph)	85 th Percentile (mph)	Speed Variance (mph ²)	% Exceeding Speed Limit
207.8, 256.9, 275.9,	After 2	800	69.7	75	24.7	44.6
278.2 COMBINED	After 3	12,061	74.0 (+6%)	76 (+1%)	24.9 (+1%)	71.3 (+60%)
207.8, 256.9, 275.9,	After 2	800	69.7	75	24.7	44.6
278.2 <i>,</i> 287.7 COMBINED	After 3	16,457	73.7 (+6%)	78 (+4%)	23.5 (-5%)	71.5 (+60%)



Select PSP Activity on I-76

Select PSP Activity on I-76



PIKE

Conclusions to Speed Study

- Speeds have increased
- Increase is generally proportional to speed limit increase
- More drivers are exceeding the speed limit
- Lower speed limit may lower mean and 85th percentile speed, but may have higher variance
- Work zone compliance is best in short-term, one lane open
- Where work zone speed compliance was not as good, drivers did slow, just not to the speed limit





Crash Analysis

Crash Analysis Study Area

- Originally MP 201 to MP 298, Pared Down Based on the Following Major Construction Projects During the Study Period (Widening to Six Lanes):
 - 2009 = MP 210-215
 - 2012 = MP 215-220
 - 2013 = MP **199**-202
 - 2014 = MP 206-210
 - 2016 = MP 250-**252**
 - 2017 = MP 220-227
 - 2018 = MP 243-245
- Final Study Area = 252 to 298
- Two Interchanges (Lebanon Lancaster and Reading)
- Two Service Plazas (Lawn and Bowmansville)



Previous Work by LTI Compared to Proposed Work

- Empirical Bayes methodology was identified for follow-up analysis when **"After"** data were available
- Proposed Analysis Study Periods
 - Before 2009 8 /2014
 - After 8/2014 4/ 2016
- Also performed analysis with "After" period extending to end of 2017
- Results were very similar to "After" period ending 4/2016



Background on Empirical Bayes

Safety Performance Function (SPF), calibrated to existing crash history, used to predict crashes before and after the change. "After" experience then compared to actual.

$$N_{total} = e^{-8.885} \times L^{0.871} \times AADT^{1.009} \times e^{-0.522 \times FN} \times e^{0.115 \times DC}$$

Where:

 N_{total} = expected number of total crashes per year for a roadway segment L = segment length (miles) FN = friction number indicator (1 if FN is greater than 32; 0 otherwise) AADT = average annual daily traffic (vehicles per day) DC = degree of curvature

Crash Analysis



Odds Ratio and Experience Across Turnpike

- Crash Rate Before = 0.33 crashes / MVMT (million vehiclemiles traveled)
- Crash Rate After = 0.27 crashes / MVMT (before-to-after ratio of 0.82)
- Crash Rate After/Before Experience Across Turnpike
 - To West = 0.92
 - To East = 0.79
 - Combined = 0.86
- Odds Ratio = 0.82 / 0.86 = 0.95
- 0.95 < 1.0, conclude that increase in speed limit did not cause increase in crashes





Crash Analysis Conclusions

Analysis suggests a reduction in crashes in the after period

• Crashes were down on the Turnpike as a whole

Crash experience not negatively impacted by the increase in speed limit







Findings

Mean and 85th Percentile - Non-Work Zone Locations





Findings

Percent Exceeding – Non-Work Zone Locations



Mean and 85th Percentile – Work Zone Locations



Single Lane Mean Speed (mph) ■ 85th Percentile Speeds (mph)



Single Lane

Findings

Percent Exceeding – Work Zone Locations



Crash Rates in Control Sections









Questions?