

1. Report No. FHWA/TX-85/34+344-1	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Guidelines for Installing Traffic Signals at Diamond Interchanges		5. Report Date November 1984	6. Performing Organization Code
7. Author(s) Myung-Soon Chang and Carroll J. Messer		8. Performing Organization Report No. Research Report 344-1	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Texas Transportation Institute The Texas A&M University System College Station, TX 77843		10. Work Unit No.	11. Contract or Grant No. Study No. 2-18-83-344
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation; Transportation Planning Division P.O. Box 5051 Austin, TX 78763		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Interim -- September 1982 to November 1984	
14. Sponsoring Agency Code			
15. Supplementary Notes Research performed in cooperation with DOT, FHWA. Research Study Title: Guidelines for Diamond Interchange Control			
16. Abstract <p>This report presents the findings from a research project entitled, "Guidelines for Diamond Interchange Control", sponsored by the State Department of Highways and Public Transportation in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration.</p> <p>The report contains the data collection methods and procedures employed in the study to evaluate the operational effects of stop sign and signal control at diamond interchanges. An assessment of traffic control alternatives is described in terms of operational effects of queues and travel speed.</p> <p>Guidelines for installing signal control at diamond interchanges are provided in terms of internal volume, left turn proportion within internal volume, and the sum of internal and external volume. The specific traffic volume guidelines were developed based on a combination of these variables affecting operational performance.</p>			
17. Key Words Diamond Interchanges, Traffic Control, Stop Sign, Signal Guidelines.		18. Distribution Statement No restriction. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 45	22. Price

**GUIDELINES FOR INSTALLING
TRAFFIC SIGNALS
AT DIAMOND INTERCHANGES**

by

**Myung-Soon Chang
Assistant Research Specialist**

and

**Carroll J. Messer
Research Engineer**

**Research Report Number 344-1
Research Study Number 2-18-83-344**

Sponsored by

Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation

**In Cooperation with
U. S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration**

**Texas Transportation Institute
The Texas A&M University System
College Station, Texas**

November 1984

ABSTRACT

This report presents the findings from a research project entitled "Guidelines for Diamond Interchange Control," sponsored by the State Department of Highways and Public Transportation in cooperation with the U. S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration.

The report contains the data collection methods and procedures employed in the study to evaluate the operational effects of stop sign and signal control at diamond interchanges. An assessment of traffic control alternatives is described in terms of operational effects of queues and travel speed.

Guidelines for signalization at diamond interchanges are provided in terms of internal volume, left turn proportion within internal volume, and the sum of internal and external volume. The specific traffic volume guidelines were developed based on a combination of these variables affecting operational performance.

KEY WORDS: Diamond Interchange, Traffic Control, Stop Sign, Signal Guidelines.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The continued demand for efficient traffic control at diamond interchanges requires that effective traffic control strategies be employed. In recognition of this need, the State Department of Highways and Public Transportation (SDHPT) sponsored a cooperative research project with the Texas Transportation Institute entitled, "Guidelines for Diamond Interchange Control." This report describes Phase 1 research results concerning the relative performance of stop sign or signal control at diamond interchanges.

The first major section of this report describes the types of traffic control at diamond interchanges. The four sites studied are then described in terms of their locations, geometric features, and traffic characteristics. In addition, data collection methods and procedures employed for the study are described.

A detailed discussion of the operational effects of stop sign and signal control at diamond interchanges is presented in a subsequent section. General descriptions are presented of the traffic volumes, traffic queues, and speed characteristics observed for both stop sign and signal control at the four diamond interchanges. An assessment of traffic control alternatives is described in terms of operational effects on queues and travel speed.

Guidelines for signalization control at diamond interchanges are provided in terms of internal volume, the proportion of left turns within internal volume, and the sum of internal and external volumes. The specific traffic volume guidelines for installing signals at diamond interchanges were developed based on a combination of these variables affecting operational performance.

IMPLEMENTATION

The operational effects of stop sign and signal control provided in this report should be useful for guiding the selection and operation of traffic control at diamond interchanges.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Texas Transportation Institute wishes to express its appreciation to the following individuals and organizations for their help in providing assistance, cooperation, and technical comments for the study: Herman E. Haenel, Alvin R. Luedecke, Blair G. Marsden and Henry A. Thomason, Jr., Austin Headquarters of the Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation; Stephen L. Cohen, Federal Highway Administration; traffic engineers and technicians in the cities of Abilene, Houston and Fort Worth; and in Districts 2, 8 and 12 of SDHPT.

DISCLAIMER

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the opinions, findings, and conclusions presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Federal Highway Administration, or the State Department of Highways and Public Transportation. This report does not constitute a standard, a specification, or a regulation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	ii
Executive Summary	iii
Introduction	1
Experimental Plan and Analysis Approach	4
Study Results	12
Conclusions	35
Recommendations	36
References	37

LIST OF TABLES

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.	Study Design Conducted for Diamond Interchange Traffic Control Alternative Evaluation	5
2.	Operational Performance Data Collected at Study Sites	8
3.	Ranking of Four Interchanges by Observed Total Interchange Hourly Volume Per Lane	13
4.	Traffic Control Alternative Performance Based on Queue Only as Related to Total Interchange Volume	21
5.	Guidelines for Installing Traffic Signals at Diamond Interchanges	29
6.	Simplified Guidelines for Installing Traffic Signals at Diamond Interchanges	30
7.	MUTCD Minimum Vehicular Volumes for Warrant 1	32

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.	Travel Time Recording Form	7
2.	Queue Versus Volume by Stop Sign and Signal Control in Abilene, Texas	16
3.	Queue Versus Volume by Stop Sign and Signal Control in Houston, Texas	17
4.	Queue Versus Volume by Stop Sign and Signal Control	20
5.	Travel Speed Versus Volume for Arterial Through Traffic by Stop Sign and Signal Control	23
6.	Travel Speed Versus Volume for Left Turn Traffic by Stop Sign and Signal Control	24
7.	Adjustment Effect of Queue and Travel Speed	28

INTRODUCTION

Diamond interchanges are widely used in urban areas as a means to transfer freeway traffic to and from the surface street system. The selection of the proper traffic control system for each diamond interchange is a challenging task for the State Department of Highways and Public Transportation (SDHPT). When and where to use stop signs or signals for traffic control at a significant number of diamond interchanges is a principal concern. This report deals with the complex subject and seeks to provide useful information for guiding future engineering decisions in the selection of the appropriate diamond interchange control method.

This section will review the types of diamond interchange controls and their impacts on traffic operations at diamond interchanges. This perspective may be helpful in evaluating the present alternative traffic control strategies and in planning for future needs.

STUDY PROBLEM STATEMENT

There are two types of traffic controls - stop signs and traffic signals - that are applicable to diamond interchanges. It is generally agreed that when traffic volume at a diamond interchange becomes heavy, there arises a need to install traffic signals because stop sign control cannot effectively handle heavy traffic demands. This is an expected consequence of stop sign control performance due to the difference in capacity between stop sign and signal controlled intersections, given identical geometric and traffic conditions.

Signalization of a diamond interchange is often resorted to after public pressure is applied and one or both sides of the interchange are warranted by the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Device (MUTCD) (1) or the Texas Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Device (TMUTCD) (2) standards for a single

intersection. However, the MUTCD and TMUTCD warrants for signalization neither explicitly reflect the operational characteristics of diamond interchanges nor are they sensitive to the traffic patterns associated with the two intersections at a diamond interchange.

Research conducted by the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) regarding the operational characteristics of diamond interchange controllers led to a better understanding of different phasing patterns, development of frontage road progression strategies, and a diamond interchange signal optimization and analysis program for timing pretimed diamond interchanges (3, 4, 5).

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) also sponsored a series of research studies on signalized diamond interchanges with a particular emphasis on signal phasing (6, 7, 8).

The MUTCD (1) provides national standards for determining when a signal is warranted at an intersection. The Texas Manual (2) includes all eight MUTCD warrants plus an actuated control warrant. Neither manual, however, specifically considers diamond interchanges, and their special requirements. One case study of a diamond interchange in Texas (9) illustrated a signal warranting situation where one side of an interchange was warranted and the other fell short. This study found that current signal warrant conditions do not seem to adequately address the different traffic movement patterns associated with two intersections at a diamond interchange.

The development of clear and effective guidelines for installing all-way stop signs or signals for traffic control at a significant number of diamond interchanges, whose traffic patterns and geometric physical characteristics vary quite widely between interchanges, would be a significant contribution to the traffic engineering technology used by SDHPT traffic engineers.

STUDY OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this study were as follows: (1) conduct an operational evaluation of the two types of traffic control (i.e., all-way stop and traffic signals) to include comparisons of vehicular delay and stops at diamond interchanges under various types of geometric and traffic patterns; (2) analyze operational results to determine the relative efficiency of each type of control; and (3) develop guidelines to aid in the selection of the appropriate control method for isolated interchanges.

EXPERIMENTAL PLAN AND ANALYSIS APPROACH

TYPE OF CONTROL

An experimental plan was developed to field evaluate the operational performance of two types of diamond interchange control strategies: namely, (1) all-way stop sign control and (2) traffic signal control. To provide a general guideline for signal control, signal operations were neither confined to a single controller type nor to a single phase pattern. Signal control in this study encompassed pretimed control, actuated control, three-phase operation, and four-phase with overlaps operation.

STUDY SITES

Field studies were conducted to evaluate the operational performance of stop sign and signal control. Four sites were selected following a site selection trip made by TTI research staff and SDHPT traffic engineers. The sites were selected to provide a variety of geometric and traffic conditions.

The locations of the four sites and the overall field data collection effort, as conducted, are summarized in Table 1. A wide variety of geometrics, traffic volumes and traffic patterns were provided by the four sites. Two interchanges were underpasses and the other two interchanges were overpasses. Separation between intersections ranged from 260 to 480 feet. The number of lanes for each approach at the four interchanges ranged from one to three.

Besides all being located in major Texas cities, there were some other similarities in the four sites. All frontage roads were continuous through the interchanges without any U-turn lanes. U-turn lanes have been added to the interchange of US 59 at Jetero since the field studies were conducted, however. All interchanges studied, except I20 at Trail Lake, had left turn bays between the two intersections.

TABLE 1. STUDY DESIGN CONDUCTED FOR DIAMOND INTERCHANGE TRAFFIC CONTROL ALTERNATIVE EVALUATION.

Interchange Location	Intersection Separation	Traffic Control
US 83 @ South 7th in Abilene	440'	Stop sign, 3-phase, and 4-phase with overlaps
US 59 @ Jetero Blvd. in Houston	480'	Stop sign and 4-phase with overlaps
I10 @ T. C. Jester in Houston	350'	Stop sign and 4-phase with overlaps
I20 @ Trail Lake in Fort Worth	260'	Stop sign and 4-phase with overlaps

Traffic control was varied among the interchanges. Some interchanges had a protective left turn only phase, while others had protective and permissive left turn phases. Except at Abilene, stop sign performance was observed before signal installation. For Abilene, signal control was converted to stop sign control for a day, and the performance was observed the next day. All pretimed signals were operated at a 60 second cycle length. The signal at I20 at Trail Lake was the only actuated signal observed. Neither interchange design features nor signal control promoted highly efficient signal operations.

The study plan called for data to be collected for four hours per day from 7-8 a.m., 10-11 a.m., 12-1 p.m., and 5-6 p.m., or some reasonable on-site modification if deemed appropriate.

Several types of performance data were to be collected. The initial plan called for tracing vehicles through the interchange to obtain their travel time or travel speed along with their stopped delay. This was performed by recording an arrival time to the interchange influence zone, stopping times at Intersections 1 and 2, and departure times at Intersections 1 and 2. The form shown in Figure 1 was used to obtain the travel time of a vehicle. The count of the number of stopped vehicles on each approach was added later. Table 2 shows the performance data collected for alternative traffic controls at each interchange.

Traffic volumes were collected manually or by using automatic counters on all four inbound approaches to the interchange and on both interior intersection approaches. Two people, one for each intersection, were used to manually count traffic volume. Each approach flow was obtained for 15-minute time periods and expanded to an equivalent hourly volume.

Additional manual observations were made every 15 seconds during the study by 6 persons to determine the number of vehicles stopped on each of the

DIAMOND INTERCHANGE CONTROL

Travel Time Recording Form

Texas Transportation Institute


Study No: 2-18-83-344

City: _____

Location: _____

Time: _____

Recorder: _____



Approach Influence Zone Arrival Time	1st Intersection		2nd Intersection		Direction Codes ^a R, T, LT, LL, TT, TL	Stop Delay			Travel Time
	Stop Time	Departure Time	Stop Time	Departure Time		1st	2nd	Total	

- a:
- R =Right turn
 - T =Through
 - LT=Left-through
 - LL=Left-left
 - TT=Through-through
 - TL=Through-left

Figure 1. Travel Time Recording Form.

TABLE 2. OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE DATA COLLECTED AT STUDY SITES.

Interchange Locations	Queue Counts		Travel Time	
	Stop Sign	Signal	Stop Sign	Signal
I20 @ Trail Lake in Fort Worth	NA	NA	X	X
US 83 @ South 7th in Abilene	X	X	X	X
US 59 @ Jetero Blvd. in Houston	X	X	NA	NA
I10 @ T. C. Jester in Houston	NA	NA	X	X

NA : Not Available


6 intersection approaches. Stopped vehicle data were recorded on scribble pads and then later reduced in the office. A 15-minute time interval was used as the time base for data analysis.

The study supervisor observed general characteristics of traffic flow on the cross street and ramp traffic. Particular attention was paid to the effect of internal volume and its left turn volume on traffic flow at an interchange.


ANALYSIS APPROACH

To provide guidelines for traffic control alternatives at diamond interchanges, the following three methods appear to be relevant:


1. Provide guidelines by separate signal control methods. For example, the figure below illustrates this method.



2. Provide guidelines by controller types.



3. Provide guidelines by general control alternatives.




Since the study objective was to provide general guidelines for stop sign versus signal control, the third method was used throughout the study. However, every effort was made to distinguish performance differences between stop sign and signal control due to different interchange geometric and traffic characteristics.

APPROACH USED TO DEVELOP GUIDELINES

It is emphasized that guidelines should distinguish different geometric and traffic characteristics between different interchanges. Each approach traffic volume was normalized with respect to approach lanes (i.e., each approach traffic volume was divided by its number of lanes) to distinguish geometric differences in the number of lanes on each approach among different interchanges. Thus, the **Total Interchange Hourly Volume per Lane**, which is the basic interchange volume used throughout this report, was defined as the sum of the six intersection approach volumes per lane. Further, to distinguish different traffic patterns among different interchanges, two variables characterizing the diamond interchange traffic movement were introduced:

1. Ratio of internal volume per lane to external volume per lane (RIE).



$$\text{RIE} = \frac{\text{Internal Volume Per Lane}}{\text{External Volume Per Lane}} = \frac{V_5 + V_6}{V_1 + V_2 + V_3 + V_4}$$

The RIE variable reflects observations that stop sign control causes more delay to internal traffic and, subsequently, to overall interchange traffic than does signal control. Stop sign control requires double stops for all external volumes using both intersections; whereas, signal control usually provides progression through the interchange.

2. Composition of left turn and through volume within internal volume.

The reason for distinguishing left turn from through volume within the internal traffic is that as more traffic turns left within the internal stations, overall interchange operation appears to be affected. Another reason for this distinction is to reflect the advantages and disadvantages of U-turn lanes to accommodate double left turning traffic coming from frontage roads.

STUDY RESULTS

A presentation of the results of the field studies follows. A general description of the traffic volumes, travel speeds, and queue characteristics observed at each diamond interchange will introduce the findings. Detailed statistical analyses to assess stop sign and signal control and their results by type of traffic control conclude this section.

TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Table 3 presents the range of interchange traffic volumes observed at the four interchanges. The four interchanges are sequenced according to the rank of highest volume levels. Observed total interchange hourly volume per lane at the four interchanges ranged between 600 and 2000 vehicles.

TRAVEL SPEEDS

Travel times were traced at each of the four external stations at each interchange. The reference point from which traffic is assumed to be influenced by traffic control (stop sign or signal) was established as a utility pole or sign pole located approximately 300 to 500 feet away from the stopline on each approach. When a vehicle passed the reference point, its time was recorded. The vehicle was traced with regard to its travel time and direction of movement, until it was completely out of the interchange (see Figure 1). The stop delay is the sum of the differences between the departure time and stop time at an intersection within the interchange. Travel time is the difference in time between arrival time to the outer reference point and the departure time from the last intersection.

To normalize the differences in distances traveled by a vehicle at each interchange, all travel times were converted to travel speeds. Further, those directional movements passing through two intersections were distinguished to

TABLE 3. RANKING OF FOUR INTERCHANGES BY OBSERVED TOTAL INTERCHANGE HOURLY VOLUME PER LANE.

Rank	Interchange Location	Volume	
		Highest	Lowest
1	US 59 at Jetero Blvd in Houston	1999	692
2	I-20 at Trail Lake in Fort Worth	1773	889
3	US 83 at South 7th in Abilene	1658	886
4	I-10 at T. C. Jester in Houston	855	607

reflect the diamond interchange characteristics. In addition, through and left turn movements were separated because their speeds appeared to be affected differently by the traffic control alternatives.

Travel speeds involving left turning vehicles, observed at the four interchanges, ranged from 26.9 fps (feet per second) to 4.4 fps for stop sign control, and from 29.1 fps to 5.0 fps for signal control. For cross-street through traffic, travel speeds observed ranged from 23.1 fps to 5.6 fps for stop sign control, and from 29.4 fps to 6.2 fps for signal control. Generally, travel speeds were observed to decrease as total interchange traffic volume increased.

QUEUE CHARACTERISTICS

It was noted in the previous discussion that the number of stopped vehicles were observed at six interchange stations (or approaches). Two stations, Stations 1 and 2, were on the arterial cross street, and another two stations, Stations 3 and 4, were located on the frontage roads. The remaining two stations, Stations 5 and 6, were located between the traffic signals. To account for the different number of traffic lanes on each approach, the number of stopped vehicles was divided by the number of lanes on each approach.

Total Interchange Queue is defined as the sum of the average number of vehicles observed to be stopped per lane at the six stations of the interchange. Traffic queue on an approach (station) is an average value across all lanes and not a critical lane value. Queue counts were taken every 15 seconds and averaged over 15-minute intervals.

Overall, less queue was observed for stop sign control than signal control when interchange traffic volume was low. As interchange traffic increased, such as during peak hours, more queue was observed for stop sign control than for signal control. These general trends were observed for all

interchanges studied.

Figure 2 presents the queue characteristics observed at the interchange in Abilene, Texas. It revealed the following characteristics:

- As traffic volume increased, signal control was a more effective alternative in reducing queue than stop sign control.
- As traffic volume increased over 1100 vehicles per hour per lane, signal control was more effective than stop sign control.

Figure 3 presents the queue characteristics observed at the interchange in Houston, Texas. It revealed the following characteristics:

- It confirmed the general expectations that as traffic volume increases, traffic signal control is more effective in reducing queue than stop sign control.
- As traffic increased beyond 600 vehicles per hour per lane, traffic signals were more effective than stop signs.

Comparing Figure 2 for Abilene with Figure 3 for Houston, it is noted that the intersecting point, having approximately equal queue generation for both stop signs and signal controls, is different between the interchanges. These differences are caused in part by different interchange traffic patterns. This consequence is reflected in the development of guidelines on when and where a stop sign or traffic signal is preferred.

ASSESSMENT OF TRAFFIC CONTROL ALTERNATIVES

The assessment of traffic control alternatives involves two areas. The first examines performance differences between stop sign and signals for their effects on queue. The second evaluates differences between stop sign and signals for their effects on travel speed and travel time. These two areas of interest initially will be analyzed separately. Later, the queue and travel




Figure 2. Queue Versus Volume by Stop Sign and Signal Control in Abilene, Texas.




Figure 3. Queue Versus Volume by Stop Sign and Signal Control in Houston, Texas.

speed information will be combined to suggest volume guidelines for signal control.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN QUEUE AND VOLUME BY TRAFFIC CONTROL

The initial data analysis from Abilene and Houston revealed that when more traffic flows between the two intersections (such as left turns from the ramp and through traffic on the arterial), traffic signals are more effective at lower interchange volumes than in the case of traffic using only a single intersection (such as through traffic from ramps and right turn traffic from arterials).

The queues observed from Abilene and Houston were pooled together. Two dimensional plots of queue versus total interchange traffic volume per hour per lane indicated that an exponential function would fit the observed data well. Another variable characterizing traffic movements encompassing two intersections between signals, the ratio of internal volume to external volume, was added. The exponential form used is as follows:

$$Q = \text{Exp}(a + bV + c\text{RIE})$$
$$Q = A \text{Exp}(bV + c\text{RIE}) \quad (1)$$

where

Q = total interchange traffic queue stopped per lane
as observed each 15 seconds.

V = total interchange traffic volume per hour per lane.

RIE = ratio of internal volume to external volume.

A,a,b,c = derived coefficients.

Logarithm transformation of Equation 1 can be linearized as $\log Q = a+bV+c\text{RIE}$. Using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) (10), a model for stop sign and signal control was derived. The model to describe the total number of stopped vehicles at interchange per lane was developed as follows:

$$\text{Stop Sign: } Q_p = 0.26 \text{ Exp}(1.89 V/1000 + 0.94 \text{ RIE})$$

$$\text{Signal Control: } Q_s = 0.29 \text{ Exp}(1.25 V/1000)$$

The coefficients of determination (R^2) for stop sign and signal control were 0.95 and 0.93, respectively. All variables are significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ level. The RIE variable for signal control was not statistically significant ($\alpha = 0.25$). Signal progression apparently handles substantial internal traffic more efficiently than stop sign control.

Plots of queue versus volume for stop sign and signal control are shown in Figure 4. The plot of stop sign control is represented by the typical ratio of internal volume to external volume observed in the field (i.e., four cases of $\text{RIE}=0.4, 0.5, 0.6,$ and 0.7). Note in Figure 4 that as more internal traffic occurs at an interchange (i.e., larger RIE), the sooner signal installation is needed.

Specifically, the models and plots of queue performance revealed the preferences to the type of traffic control shown in Table 4. Note in Table 4 that the diamond interchange should be considered as a special category different from intersections in which interchange operation is very sensitive to the degree of internal traffic movements between the two signals.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRAVEL SPEED AND VOLUME BY TRAFFIC CONTROL

Travel speed is analyzed by traffic movements because the travel speed for through movements on the cross street is different from traffic movements involving left turns from the cross street and ramps. Further, it is hypothesized that travel time is affected by the degree of internal traffic at an interchange. The model used to evaluate the travel speed at an interchange was developed as follows:




Figure 4. Queue Versus Volume by Stop Sign and Signal Control.

TABLE 4. TRAFFIC CONTROL ALTERNATIVE PERFORMANCE BASED ON QUEUE ONLY AS RELATED TO TOTAL INTERCHANGE VOLUME.

RIE	Shorter Queue During Stop Sign Control	Shorter Queue During Traffic Signal Control
0.4	Volume < 1140	Volume > 1140
0.5	Volume < 990	Volume > 990
0.6	Volume < 840	Volume > 840
0.7	Volume < 690	Volume > 690

Note: Total interchange volume is the sum of internal and external traffic volume per hour per lane at an interchange.

- Arterial Through Traffic Movements

Stop Sign: $U_p = 26.61 - 9.07 V/1000$

Signal Control: $U_s = 81.93 \text{ Exp}(-0.53 V/1000 - 1.62 \text{ RIE})$

- Left Turn Traffic Movements

Stop Sign: $U_p = 28.93 - 10.17 V/1000$

Signal Control: $U_s = 39.66 \text{ Exp}(-0.35 V/1000 - 0.88 \text{ RIE})$

where

U_p = travel speed for stop sign, fps.

U_s = travel speed for signal control, fps.

V = total interchange traffic volume per hour per lane.

RIE = ratio of internal traffic volume to external traffic volume.

Travel speed for stop sign control did not statistically depend on the degree of internal traffic movements. The reason appears to be that the relative stop delay for stop sign control is not sensitive enough due to its regularity by all approach traffic. However, travel speed for signal control is sensitive to internal traffic movements because they influence progression speed from the cross street and ramps.

Plots of travel speed versus volume for left turn and arterial through traffic are shown in Figures 5 and 6, respectively. The model and plot of travel speed performance revealed the following:

- For arterial through traffic, signalization appears to perform better than stop sign control unless internal volume reaches 70% of external traffic. The reason appears that signal control can maintain relatively good progression until internal volume becomes substantial to affect external approach traffic.

- Arterial Through Traffic Movements

Stop Sign: $U_p = 26.61 - 9.07 V/1000$

Signal Control: $U_s = 81.93 \text{ Exp}(-0.53 V/1000 - 1.62 \text{ RIE})$

- Left Turn Traffic Movements

Stop Sign: $U_p = 28.93 - 10.17 V/1000$

Signal Control: $U_s = 39.66 \text{ Exp}(-0.35 V/1000 - 0.88 \text{ RIE})$

where

U_p = travel speed for stop sign, fps.

U_s = travel speed for signal control, fps.

V = total interchange traffic volume per hour per lane.

RIE = ratio of internal traffic volume to external traffic volume.

Travel speed for stop sign control did not statistically depend on the degree of internal traffic movements. The reason appears to be that the relative stop delay for stop sign control is not sensitive enough due to its regularity by all approach traffic. However, travel speed for signal control is sensitive to internal traffic movements because they influence progression speed from the cross street and ramps.

Plots of travel speed versus volume for left turn and arterial through traffic are shown in Figures 5 and 6, respectively. The model and plot of travel speed performance revealed the following:

- For arterial through traffic, signalization appears to perform better than stop sign control unless internal volume reaches 70% of external traffic. The reason appears that signal control can maintain relatively good progression until internal volume becomes substantial to affect external approach traffic.




Figure 5. Travel Speed Versus Volume for Arterial Through Traffic by Stop Sign and Signal Control.




Figure 6. Travel Speed Versus Volume for Left Turn Traffic by Stop Sign and Signal Control.

- For left-turning traffic, stop signs appears to perform better than signal control unless interchange traffic and internal traffic reach critical volume levels. The reason appears to be that left-turning traffic often has to wait a cycle with signal control while stop sign control does not require this traffic to wait a cycle.

DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES COMBINING QUEUE AND TRAVEL SPEED RESULTS

A sample problem is introduced to illustrate the procedure employed to develop volume guidelines of signal control considering the queue and travel speed findings. A complete set of guideline volumes will be presented after the sample problem illustration.

Assume an interchange has a RIE (i.e., the ratio of internal volume over external volume) equal to 0.50. The volume guideline for signalization at this interchange would be 990 vehicles per hour per lane if queue were the only measure of effectiveness considered. See Figure 4 and Table 4.

Considering travel speed or travel time, signals are more efficient for arterial through traffic, but stop signs are more efficient for left turning traffic at this volume level. See Figures 5 and 6.

Adjustment Procedure for Travel Speed

Assume that 40% of internal traffic turns left and the other 60% goes through. The speed ratio observed between stop sign and signal control for left turn and arterial through traffic is:

(1) Left Turn Speed Ratio.

$$\frac{\text{Stop}}{\text{Signal}} = \frac{28.93 - 10.17 \times \text{Volume}/1000}{39.66 \text{ Exp}(-0.35 \text{ V}/1000 - 0.88 \text{ RIE})}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{28.93 - 10.17 \times 0.99}{39.66 \text{ Exp}(-0.35 \times 0.99 - 0.88 \times 0.5)} \\
&= \frac{18.9}{18.1} = 1.04
\end{aligned}$$

(2) Arterial Through Traffic Speed Ratio.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\text{Stop}}{\text{Signal}} &= \frac{26.61 - 9.07 \text{ V}/1000}{81.93 \text{ Exp}(-0.53 \text{ V}/1000 - 1.62 \text{ RIE})} \\
&= \frac{26.61 - 9.07 \times 0.99}{81.93 \text{ Exp}(-0.53 \times 0.99 - 1.62 \times 0.5)} \\
&= \frac{17.6}{21.6} = 0.81
\end{aligned}$$

Since there is 40% left turn and 60% through traffic at this interchange, the adjustment ratio is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\text{Stop}}{\text{Signal}} &= 40\% \times \text{left turn ratio} + 60\% \times \text{through ratio} \\
&= 0.4 \times 1.04 + 0.6 \times 0.81 \\
&= 0.90
\end{aligned}$$

This means that a signal is more efficient than stop signs in travel speed for this traffic pattern. Specifically, signal control is 11% faster (i.e., $1/0.90 = 1.11$) than stop sign control.

Considering this travel speed efficiency, traffic engineers would like to install signal sooner than the 990 volume level. This means that an adjustment should be made reflecting travel speed efficiency in addition to queue considerations as follows:

$$\text{Guideline Based on Travel Speed} = 990 \times 0.90 = 890 \text{ vehicles}$$

Figure 7 illustrates the adjustment effect based on travel speed. Assuming an equal weight between queue and travel speed performance, the guideline would be about 940 vehicles (i.e., $(990 + 890)/2$) in this example.

SIGNALIZATION GUIDELINES

Following the procedure illustrated in the above example, various combinations of internal traffic and left turn traffic observed in the field were considered. RIE from 0.4 to 0.7 were evaluated together with left turn proportions from 30% to 70%. The results obtained are presented in Table 5 illustrating the recommended volume guidelines for installing signals at diamond interchanges.

If the suggested guideline volumes presented in Table 5 are applied following MUTCD practice, then these volume levels must be exceeded for each of any 8 hours of an average day. However, the exact number of hours required to meet the guideline volume levels for implementation should be determined from further study and testing in practice.

SIMPLIFIED GUIDELINES

It is seen in Table 5 that the interchange volume guidelines for signal control are practically insensitive to left turn proportion within internal volume. Considering the effort required to collect the data, the left turn proportion could be practically negligible for implementation. From these considerations, the simplified guidelines given in Table 6 are also provided for this practical reason.

COMPARISON WITH MUTCD WARRANTS

The MUTCD states that traffic control signals should not be installed unless one or more of the signal warrants in the manual are met. Two of the warrants in the manual are related to traffic volume.




Figure 7. Adjustment Effect of Queue and Travel Speed.

TABLE 5. GUIDELINES FOR INSTALLING TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT DIAMOND INTERCHANGES.

RIE	Left Turn %	Minimum Interchange Volume For Signal Control
0.4	30	1005
	50	1035
	70	1060
0.5	30	935
	50	955
	70	980
0.6	30	850
	50	865
	70	885
0.7	30	750
	50	760
	70	775

where:

RIE = Sum of internal traffic volume per hour per lane / sum of external traffic volume per hour per lane

Left Turn (%) = Proportion of left turn traffic within internal traffic

Interchange Volume For Signal Control = Sum of internal and external traffic per hour per lane at an interchange

Internal Traffic = Traffic at Stations 5 and 6

External traffic = Traffic at Stations 1, 2, 3, and 4




TABLE 6. SIMPLIFIED GUIDELINES FOR INSTALLING TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT DIAMOND INTERCHANGES.

RIE	Minimum Interchange Volume For Signal Control
0.4	1050
0.5	950
0.6	850
0.7	750


where:

RIE = Sum of internal traffic volume per hour per lane / sum of external traffic volume per hour per lane

Interchange Volume = Sum of internal and external traffic per hour per lane at an interchange For Signal Control

Internal Traffic = Traffic at Stations 5 and 6

External Traffic = Traffic at Stations 1, 2, 3, and 4




The first warrant, Minimum Vehicular Volume, is intended for application where the volume of intersecting traffic is the principal reason for signal installation. The warrant is satisfied when, for each of any 8 hours of an average day, the traffic volumes given in Table 7 exist on the major street and on the higher-volume minor street approach to the intersection.

The second warrant, Interruption of Continuous Traffic, applies to operating conditions where the volume on the major street is so heavy that traffic on the minor intersecting street suffers excessive delay or hazard in entering or crossing the major street. Thus, the second warrant is only applicable to two-way stop sign control. Therefore, the second warrant is not applicable to all-way stop sign control at diamond interchanges.

Examples will be used to compare the MUTCD warrant with the guidelines derived from this study (which will be called Diamond Interchange guidelines).

(1) Example 1: One lane for all approaches having traffic volumes.




Since the major street carries 450 vehicles and the minor street carries 100 vehicles, neither intersection will satisfy MUTCD warrant 1. However, since the total interchange volume is 1100 vehicles per lane at an internal ratio of 0.6, this example interchange will satisfy the Diamond Interchange guidelines.

TABLE 7. MUTCD MINIMUM VEHICULAR VOLUMES FOR WARRANT 1.


Number of Lanes for Moving Traffic on Each Approach		Vehicles Per Hour on Major Street (Total of Both Approaches)	Vehicles Per Hour on Higher-Volume Minor Street Approaches
Major Street	Minor Street		(One Direction Only)
1	1	500	150
2 or more	1	600	150
2 or more	2 or more	600	200
1	2 or more	500	200

(2) Example 2: Two lanes for all approaches having traffic volumes.




Since the major street carries 800 vehicles and the minor street carries 100 vehicles, neither intersection completely satisfies the warrant. However, since the total interchange volume is 900 vehicles per lane at an internal ratio of 0.8, this example interchange will satisfy the Diamond Interchange guidelines.

(3) Example 3: Unbalanced traffic flow.



Intersection 1 satisfies MUTCD warrant 1 but intersection 2 does not. The option of installing two separate traffic controls (e.g., signals at Intersection 1 and stop signs at Intersection 2) at the interchange is too risky to use. Assume that signals are installed at this interchange since Intersection 1 warrants signalization. However, since the diamond interchange carries 825 vehicles per lane at an internal ratio of 0.5, this interchange will not satisfy the Diamond Interchange guidelines for signalization.

(4) Example 4: MUTCD warrant is met but Diamond Interchange guidelines are not met.



Since the major street carries 600 vehicles and the minor street carries 200 vehicles, both intersections meet MUTCD warrant 1 for signalization. However, since the interchange carries 800 vehicles per lane at an internal ratio of 0.45, it does not meet the Diamond Interchange guidelines.

Numerous other examples can be illustrated in which the following four cases exist:

1. MUTCD warrant is met, but Diamond Interchange guidelines are not met.
2. MUTCD warrant is not met, but Diamond Interchange guidelines are met.
3. MUTCD warrant is met for one intersection and is not met for another intersection, but Diamond Interchange guidelines are met.
4. MUTCD warrant is met for one intersection and is not met for another intersection, but Diamond Interchange guidelines are not met.

From these possible cases, it is seen that the two intersections at a diamond interchange cannot be separated regarding their operational characteristics. The independent treatment of two intersections at a diamond interchange is improper. Thus, diamond interchanges should be treated as a separate warrant category in the MUTCD. The interchange traffic volume levels provided in Table 5 or 6 are recommended to be considered as signal guideline volumes for diamond interchanges.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were drawn from the data collected and field observations made within this study. They apply within the operational environment of one-way frontage roads.

1. Although each side of a diamond interchange is an intersection, a diamond interchange operates much differently than would two isolated intersections due to the close spacing.
2. Since diamond interchanges operate different from isolated intersections, criteria for warranting diamond interchange signalization should be a separate MUTCD procedure from that for isolated intersections.
3. Diamond interchange models that uniquely combine the complex interactions of internal and external traffic appears to be the most representative approach upon which to base diamond interchange guidelines for signalization.
4. There is a discriminating diamond interchange volume level beyond which traffic signal control is better than stop sign control in terms of the combined performance of queue and travel speed. The specific volume levels proposed for considering implementation of signalization at diamond interchanges are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The guidelines presented in Table 5 or 6 are recommended for implementation and testing to ascertain their acceptability for determining when and where installation of traffic signalization is needed at diamond interchanges in Texas.
2. Separate signalization warrants for diamond interchanges are recommended. The guidelines provided in Table 5 or 6 should be considered in the development of diamond interchange signal warrants in the MUTCD and Texas MUTCD.
3. Further research is recommended to determine the exact number of hours during the average day that should meet the guideline volume levels for implementation purposes.

REFERENCES

1. Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) for Streets and Highways. Federal Highway Administration, 1978.
2. Texas Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways. Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation, 1980.
3. Pinnell, C. and D. C. Capelle. Operational Study of Signalized Diamond Interchanges. HRB, Bulletin 324, 1962, pp. 38-72.
4. Messer, C. J., Whitson, R. H., and J. D. Carvell. Real-Time Frontage Road Progression Analysis and Control Strategy. TRB, Transportation Research Record 503, 1974, pp. 1-12.
5. Messer, C. J., Fambro, D. B., and S. H. Richards. Optimization of Pretimed Signalized Diamond Interchanges. TRB, Transportation Research Record 644, 1977, pp. 78-84.
6. Munjal, P. K., et al. Design Manual for Traffic Signal Control of Diamond Interchange Complexes. FHWA Report No. TM-4601/007/03, PB 217518, June 1972.
7. Control Strategies for Signalized Diamond Interchange, Executive Summary. FHWA-TS-78-207, April 1978.
8. Diamond Interchange Program - User's Manual. FHWA-IP-80-4, December 1980.
9. Jenkins, R. and R. Wiles. Case Study of a Diamond Interchange. TexITE, April 1982.
10. SAS User's Guide: Basics and Statistics. SAS Institute, Cary, North Carolina, 1982.