

the mind of movement

USER GROUP MEETING

05th November 2017 Hyderabad

Environmental Consideration in Assessing LOS of a Signalized Intersection



School of Planning and Architecture, Delhi Siva Thoyyeti, Dr Sewa Ram, Dr Anuradha Shukla





- 1 INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY
- 2 DATA COLLECTION
- 3 DATA ANALYSIS
- 4 MICROSIMULATION MODEL
- **5** CALIBRATION & VALIDATION
- 6 RESULTS & OUTCOMES

INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY

Introduction

AIM

To asses and to arrive at the Level of service of a Signalized Intersection considering the factors of Environment

OBJECTIVES

- To study various models that consider environment effect.
- To establish an Inter-relationship between LOS of an Intersection and Environment Parameters considered.
- To arrive at the Level of Service standards of a Signalized Intersection using suitable methods.
- To Develop a Simulation Model that can be utilized to test various traffic (future scenarios) & Signal conditions
- To incorporate the Environmental Factor as a quantifiable traffic parameter (in terms of Vehicle Carbon Monoxide Emissions)



Literature Comparison

| I | Author / Publication | Cycle Length (or) Delay | LOS Norms | Vehicular Emission | Fuel Consumption | Vehicle Speed, Acceleration & Deceleration Condition |
|---|---|----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---|
| n | Highway Capacity Manual | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |
| t | FHWA Model (from HCM) | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |
| e r | Indonesian Highway Capacity Manual | Yes | Yea | No | No | No |
| o sd e e c l t s n s | Analysis Of Emissions At Congested And Uncongested Intersections Using Moves 2010: Papson, A., S. Hartley, K. Kuo | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | yes |
| | Tsai-Yun Liao , Randy B. Machemehl, The University of Texas at Austin , Department of Civil Engineering , Austin Tx, USA | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| | Fuel Wastage at Signals KP Tiwari , RN Singh , J B Balwanshi, Indore | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| | Dr Anuradha Shukla, Masood Alam, CRRI | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |

• Comparison Assessment of Literature Studies for Multiple Parameters

Survey Locations/Intersections

| Parameter | KG Marg Intersection | Escorts Hospital Intersection | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Location | New Delhi | South Delhi | | |
| Type of Network | Arterial- Arterial | Arterial Sub Arterial | | |
| Adjoining Land Use | Residential | Mixed Land Use | | |
| No. of Arms | 4 Arm | 4 Arm | | |
| Type of Intersection | Isolated | Non Isolated | | |
| Signalling Condition | 3 Phase | 4 Phase | | |
| Cycle Length | 192 Sec | 156 Sec | | |
| Channelizing Islands | No | Yes, Two Sides | | |
| Median | Only at the Mouth of Intersection for 10 meters from stop- line | Present for the entire length of the road Sections with gap In Median | | |

KG Marg- Feroz Shah Road



Escorts Hosp Intersection



Primary Data

Secondary Data



PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

Peak Hour Traffic Shares

ESCORT HOSPITAL INTERSECTION





KG MARG- HOSPITAL INTERSECTION





Vehicle Idling Surveys

Escort Hospital Intersection



• The general trend follows 3rd degree parabola.

Vehicle Idling Surveys





• The general trend follows 3rd degree parabola.

Stopped Delay vs Queue Length

Escort Hospital Intersection



- As the Queue length keeps on Increasing, the Average Delay reduces and later on Increases. •
- This is due to the fact that the veh. at back of queue had to stop for second red phase. Minimum average delay was found to be similar to the red time of signal
- •

Stopped Delay vs Queue Length

Kg Marg - Feroz Shah Road Intersection



- As the Queue length keeps on Increasing, the Average Delay reduces and later on Increases. •
- This is due to the fact that the veh. at back of queue had to stop for second red phase. Minimum average delay was found to be similar to the red time of signal
- •

Mode wise Speeds

MODE WISE SPEED IN KMPH



| KG Marg - Firoz shah Road and Escort Hospital Intersection | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------------------|------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Mode | KG Marg Speeds | Escorts Hospital Speeds | Difference | Percentage Difference | | | | |
| 2W | 38.86 | 30.0 | 8.8 | 29% | | | | |
| 3W | 41.62 | 26.2 | 15.4 | 59% | | | | |
| Car | 44.40 | 28.8 | 15.6 | 54% | | | | |
| Bus | 34.60 | 24.0 | 10.6 | 44% | | | | |

Vehicle Fuel Base



Escort Hospital Intersection

Kg Marg - Feroz Shah Road Intersection







- In KG Marg Intersection, Petrol Vehicles was observed to decrease over time but CNG vehicles show increased trend.
- In Escorts Hosp Int. the diesel vehicles show an Increased Trend.
- KG marg has CNG vehicles 4% higher to that of Escorts Hosp.

Vehicular Emissions



- CO values of KG Marg are higher since KG Marg has 4 percent Higher of CNG Vehicles to that of Escort Hospital Intersection.
- Nox of Escorts Hospital Intersection is comparatively higher as the Buses are higher by 4% in number.
- Gasoline and CNG emits about 9 to 20 times more CO than Other Fuel Types*

***Source:** Comparison of emissions from Heavy, Medium and Light Vehicles for CNG, Diesel, and Gasoline Vehicles by Abdulla Yasar.

MICROSIMULATION MODEL

Microsimulation Model

- Compare and validate the Ground count and Simulated Model Emissions.
- To compare the future scenarios or by changing the Input parameters like the Signal Timing, Vehicle composition to get the Emissions





Emissions Modeling- Enviver Pro

| | Enviver (Pro)(Online) [<new project="">]</new> | - 0 × |
|---|--|--|
| File Traffic View Windows Help | | |
| Selecter Selecter | Text file (".tzp Vissim export) Ctrl+1 | |
| Regor Ma Vehicle-class assignments Ctrl+V | numbers functions anough efforth in the first of the firs | |
| Calculate emissions F5 | | |
| -\$- Maps [2-0] Ctrl+M | | |
| a-v distribution plot Ctrl+A | | |
| ting tops start I | | |
| | | |
| Time span | | |
| 00.00-00-00.00 | | |
| | | |
| Types & classes | | |
| Sampled vehicles | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Vehicle types | | |
| se po Light Duty City A se po HD Medium Ci | | |
| Bus City 2013 | | |
| 9 St HD_Medum_Hi | | |
| 9 12 HD Medum Hi | | |
| 9 13 Light Duty_Hig 9 14 HD How chu | | |
| +ID_Heavy_Hig + | | |
| | <unknown database="" simulation=""></unknown> | Trips: 0 Samples: 0 Enviver (Pro)(Online): 4.4.0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

35 40

Emissions Modeling- Enviver Pro

| | | | Enviver (Pro)(Onlir | | | | |
|----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | nfc | | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Date: | 27-02-2015 | | | | | | |
| Description: | - | | | | | | |
| Remarks: | | | | | | | |
| Traffic data: | | ISSIII 7 (ESCOILS HOSP (ESCOILS F | losp Juncuon_070.12p | | | | |
| Application version: | 4.4.0 [Release date: 14-05-2014] | | | | | | |
| RSIT+micro version: | TNO Versit+micro [Release date: 29-8-2013] | | | | | | |
| Licenced for: | School Deini - Siva Teja Thoyyeti Mplan Transportation Planning | | | | | | |
| | Ehologi Ranning and Architecture, Delhi. | | | | | | |
| | CO 2 | NO X | PM 10 | | | | |
| | 412.939 kg | 4023.491 g | 130.800 g | | | | |
| | 2511.116 kg/h | 24.467 kg/h | 795.405 g/h | | | | |
| | 834.637 g/km | 8.132 g/km | 264.374 mg/km | | | | |
| Fra | 2015 | | | | | | |
| Time span: | 12:00:04-12:09:56 | | | | | | |

| | Traffic | data | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|---------|
| | | Total | | Calculated Ex | | | Exclude | xcluded | |
| | Trips Samples Distance | | Trips | Samples | Distance | Trips | Samples | Distance | |
| Light_Duty_City_2013 | 127 | 5954 | 77.5 km | 127 | 5954 | 77.5 km | 0 | 0 | 0.0 km |
| HD_Medium_City_2013 | 684 | 30807 | 417.3 km | 684 | 30807 | 417.3 km | 0 | 0 | 0.0 km |
| Unassigned | 149 | 8775 | 82.2 km | 0 | 0 | 0.0 km | 149 | 8775 | 82.2 km |
| Total | 960 | 45536 | 577.0 km | 811 | 36761 | 494.8 km | 149 | 8775 | 82.2 km |
| | Emission totals per class | | | | | | | | |
| | CO 2 NO X PM 10 | | | | | | D | | |
| Light_Duty_City_2013 | 20.890 kg | | | 37.455 g | | | 4.717 g | | |
| | | 5.1% | | | 0.9% | | 3.6% | | |
| HD_Medium_City_2013 | | 392.049 k | g | 3986.035 g | | | 126.083 g | | |
| | | 94.9% | | | 99.1% | | 96.4% | | |
| Total | | 412.939 k | g | 4023.491 g | | | 130.800 g | | |
| | Emissi | ion per cl | ass per ho | our | | | | | |
| | | CO 2 | | | NO X | | | PM 10 | D |
| Light_Duty_City_2013 | | 127.036 kg | /h | 227.770 g/h | | 28.685 g/h | | | |
| HD_Medium_City_2013 | | 2384.080 k | g/h | 24.239 kg/h | | | 766.721 g/h | | |
| Emission per class per km. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | CO 2 | | | NO X | | | PM 1 | D |
| Light_Duty_City_2013 | | 269.567 g/ | km | | 483.322 mg | /km | | 60.868 mg/ | km |
| HD_Medium_City_2013 | | 939.586 g/ | km | | 9.553 g/kr | n | | 302.171 mg | /km |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Emissions Modeling- Model Calibration



| | Escort | : Hosp | KG Marg | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Peak Hour Totals | Morning Emissions | Evening Emissions | Morning Emissions | Evening Emissions | | |
| Calc. NOX (mg/h) | 1905.78 | 2546.68 | 2577.18 | 2477.64 | | |
| Simulated Nox (mg/h) | 1987.16 | 2313.38 | 2789.86 | 2105.57 | | |
| Change in Sim vs Obs | 4.3 | -9.2 | 8.3 | -15.0 | | |
| GEH (Index) | 1.8 | 4.7 | 4.1 | 7.8 | | |

22

Noise Emissions





| Location | Data Point | Peak Intensity (dB) | L equivalent (db) |
|----------|---------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| | 1 | 113.1 | 79.7 |
| Escort | 2 | 113.1 | 79.1 |
| Hospital | 3 | 102.1 | 73.9 |
| | 4 | 104.1 | 72.3 |
| | 1 | 112.7 | 75.9 |
| | 2 | 110.7 | 79.5 |
| KG Marg | 3 | 113.3 | 76.9 |
| | 4 | 107.5 | 74.4 |
| | | | |

Arriving at Level of Service



Conversion of Vehicular Emissions to Ambient Air Pollution

- CALINE4 a dispersion model that predicts carbon Monoxide (CO) and PM impacts along and near roadways.
- To anticipate adverse effects of excessive CO & PM exposure.
- Simple line source Gaussian plume dispersion model.
- Inputs required are
 - roadway geometry,
 - worst-case meteorological parameters,
 - anticipated traffic volumes,
 - receptor positions.

| Meteorological Factors | Escort Hospital Intersection | KG Marg- Feroz Shah Road Intersection |
|--|---------------------------------|--|
| Wind Direction Angle | 292 | 292 |
| Atmospheric Stability Class (fn of wind speed) | 5 | 5 |
| Mixing Height (m) | 1500 | 1000 |
| Ambient Temperature (Deg. Centigrade) | 27 | 27 |
| Ambient CO Concentration (PPM) | 3.25 | 3.25 |





Emission Dispersion Results- CALINE 4



| LOS Standards | CO in mg/m^3 | PM 2.5 in ug/m^3 | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Α | Up to 3.25 | 55 | | | |
| В | 3.25 to 5 | 55 to 60 | | | |
| С | 5 to 7.5 | 60 to 65 | | | |
| D | 7.5 to 9.5 | 65 to 70 | | | |
| E | 9.5 to 12 | 70 to 75 | | | |
| F | > 12 | >75 | | | |
| | Ambient Air Concentrations | | | | |

| LOS Criteria | iteria Average Stopped Delay (Sec per Vehicle) Noise Em (dB | | CO in mg/m^3 | PM 2.5 in ug/m^3 |
|--------------|--|--------------|--------------|------------------|
| LOS A | Up to 20 | Up to 60 | Up to 3.25 | Up to 55 |
| LOS B | 21 to 35 | 60 to 65 | 3.25 to 5 | 55 to 60 |
| LOS C | 36 to 50 | 65 to 68 | 5 to 7.5 | 60 to 65 |
| LOS D | 50 to 70 | 68 to 70.5 | 7.5 to 9.5 | 65 to 70 |
| LOS E | 71 to 100 | 70.5 to 71.6 | 9.5 to 12 | 70 to 75 |
| LOS F | >100 | Over 71.6 | > 12 | >75 |

Road User Criteria Survey for Level of Service

Around 100 samples for criteria of each Intersection LOS with respect to various modes like

- 3 Wheeler
- 2 Wheeler
- 4 Wheeler drivers
- NMT Pullers
- Pedestrians





Averages

| | | Avg Stopped | | | Noise Level | | | PM 2.5 | | |
|------------|--------------|----------------|---------|-----------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| K | LOS | Delay | | LOS | Range in dB | | LOS | (ug/m^3 | CO in PPN | 1 |
| G | | (sec/veh) | | | (L50) | | |) | | |
| | A | Upto 20 | _ | A | Upto 60 | | A | up to 55 | Up to 3.25 | 5 |
| М | В | 21 to 35 | | В | 60 to 68.4 | | В | 55 to 60 | 3.25 to 5 | |
| а | С | 36 to 50 | | С | 68.4 to 69 | | С | 60 to 65 | 5 to 7.5 | |
| r | D | 50 to 70 | | D | 69 to 70.5 | | D | 65 to 70 | 7.5 to 9.5 | |
| | Е | 71 to 100 | _ | E | 70.5 to 71.6 | | E | 70 to 75 | 9.5 to 12 | |
| y | F | >100 | LOS | F | Over 71.6 | | F | > 75 | > 12 | |
| | Calculated | | | Calculated LOS | D | | Calculated | | | |
| Futon | LOS of | C | Fator | of Intersection | – | 4 | LOS of | 4 | 5 | E |
| Enter | Intersection | <mark>ו</mark> | 3 Enter | Critorio | 21.4 | Enter | Intersection | | | |
| | Criteria | 33 | | Criteria | 51.4 | | Criteria | 17.80 | 17.8 | 35.6 |
| | | | | Final R | tesult | | | | | |
| | | | | Combined | | | | | | |
| | | | | Result | Combined LOS | | | | | |
| | | | | 5 | E | | | | | |
| _ | | Aver Stonwood | _ | | Noise Level | | | DM4.2.5 | | _ |
| н | 105 | Avy Stopped | | 105 | Range in dR | | 105 | | , CO in | |
| Εo | 105 | (sec/yeh) | | 105 | (150) | | 103 | (ug/iii··s | PPM | |
| | Δ | Unto 20 | | Δ | Unto 60 | | Α | up to 55 | Up to 2 | |
| 5 5 6 D | B | 21 to 35 | | B | 60 to 68.4 | - | B | 55 to 60 | 2 to 4 | |
| | C | 36 to 50 | | C | 68.4 to 69 | - | C | 60 to 65 | 4 to 7.5 | |
| 01 | | | | | | - | | | 7.5 to | |
| r t | D | 50 to 70 | | D | 69 to 70.5 | | D | 65 to 70 | 9.5 | |
| t a | Е | 71 to 100 | | E | 70.5 to 71.6 | - | Е | 70 to 75 | 9.5 to 12 | |
| 1 | F | >100 | | F | Over 71.6 | - | F | > 75 | > 12 | |
| | Calculated | | | | | | | | | |
| | LOS of | | | Calculated LOS | | | Calculated | | | - |
| Enter | Intersectio | C | Enter | of Intersection | C | Enter | LOS of | 3 | 6 | E |
| | n | | 3 | | | 3 | Intersection | י | | |
| | Criteria | 33 | | Criteria | 31.4 | | Criteria | 17.80 | 0 17.80 | 35.6 |
| | | | | Final | Result | | | | | |
| | | | | Combined | | | | | | |
| | | | | Result | Combined LOS | | | | | |
| | | | | 4 | D | | | | | |

Acknowledgement

PT









the mind of movement

GROUP



For more details, please e-mail at *t.sivateja@live.com*