

An analysis of differences in driver speed and lane position for experienced and inexperienced drivers through high and low risk rural curves

by

Blair Matthew Turner

Thesis submitted to The University of Adelaide, Centre for Automotive

Safety Research

in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Submitted October 2017



CONTENTS

| CON. | TENTS | | i |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| LIST | OF FIGU | IRES | . iv |
| LIST | OF TABL | LES | . vi |
| ABS | ΓRACT | | vii |
| THES | SIS DECL | _ARATION | . ix |
| ACKI | NOWLED | OGEMENTS | x |
| 1 | INTROD | UCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4 | Backgrou Rural roa Research | undad safetyh need and objectivee of dissertation | 1 2 4 |
| 2 | LITERAT | TURE REVIEW | 7 |
| 2.1 2.2 | What is k 2.2.1 2.2.2 2.2.3 | tionknown about rural curve crashes? | 8 8 9 13 |
| 2.3 | Design o 2.3.1 2.3.2 2.3.3 | of rural curves | .16 16 17 19 |
| 2.4 | The role 2.4.1 2.4.2 2.4.3 | of speed in safety | .21 21 27 30 |
| 2.5 | Factors i 2.5.1 2.5.2 2.5.3 | nfluencing driver choice of speed | .32 .32 .39 .45 |
| 2.6 | Role of la 2.6.1 2.6.2 2.6.3 | ane position in crashes at curves | .46 46 47 53 |
| 2.7 | | ses to the curve crash problem | |
| 2.8 | 2.8.1 2.8.2 | y and gaps in knowledgeSummaryGaps in knowledge | 55 56 |
| 2.9 | Key rese 2.9.1 | earch questions and hypotheses | .57 (|
| | | Research question 2: Differences between inexperienced and experienced drivers | 58 |
| | | experienced drivers through high and low risk curves | |
| 3 | METHO | D | 61 |

i

| 3.1 | | ıction | |
|-----|----------------|--|-----|
| 3.2 | Experir | mental design | |
| | 3.2.1 | Different methods for assessing behaviour at curves | 62 |
| | 3.2.2 | Factors influencing route choice | 67 |
| | 3.2.3 | Sample design | 68 |
| | 3.2.4 | Planned statistical analysis | 69 |
| 3.3 | Descrip | otion of route | 70 |
| 3.4 | Curve | selection | 74 |
| 3.5 | Subjec | ts | 76 |
| 3.6 | Equipn | nent | 78 |
| | 3.6.1 | | |
| | 3.6.2 | Mobileye C2-270 device | |
| 3.7 | Proced | lure | |
| 3.8 | | xtraction and processing | |
| 4 | | LTS | |
| 4.1 | | iction | |
| 4.2 | | sk versus low risk curves | |
| 4.2 | 4.2.1 | Speed | |
| | 4.2.1 4.2.2 | Acceleration/deceleration | |
| | 4.2.2 4.2.3 | | |
| | 4.2.3 4.2.4 | Side forceLane position | |
| | | • | |
| 4.0 | 4.2.5 | Summary for high risk versus low risk curves | |
| 4.3 | • | rienced versus experienced drivers | |
| | 4.3.1 | Speed | |
| | 4.3.2 | Acceleration / deceleration | |
| | 4.3.3 | Side force | |
| | 4.3.4 | Lane position | 100 |
| | 4.3.5 | Summary for inexperienced compared with experienced drivers | 102 |
| 4.4 | Inevne | rienced versus experienced drivers for high and low risk curve | |
| 7.7 | 4.4.1 | Speed | |
| | 4.4.2 | Acceleration/deceleration | |
| | 4.4.3 | Side force | |
| | 4.4.4 | Lane position | |
| | 4.4.4 4.4.5 | | |
| | 4.4.5 | Summary for inexperienced compared with experienced drive through high and low risk curves | 111 |
| 4.5 | Individ | ual differences and design assumptions | 111 |
| | 4.5.1 | Speed | 112 |
| | 4.5.2 | Acceleration/deceleration | 114 |
| | 4.5.3 | Side force | |
| | 4.5.4 | Lane position | |
| | 4.5.5 | Summary for individual differences | |
| 4.6 | | ary of results in relation to hypotheses | |
| 4.0 | 4.6.1 | Research question 1: Differences between high risk and low | |
| | 4.0.1 | curves | |
| | 4.6.2 | Research question 2: Differences between inexperienced ar | |
| | 4.0.2 | • | |
| | 400 | experienced drivers | |
| | 4.6.3 | Research question 3: Differences between inexperienced ar | |
| | 101 | experienced drivers through high and low risk curves | |
| _ | 4.6.4 | Research question 4: Design assumptions | |
| 5 | DISCU | SSION | 125 |
| 5.1 | Discus | sion of results | |
| | 5.1.1 | Research question 1: Differences between high risk and low | |
| | | curves | 125 |

| | 5.1.2 | Research question 2: Differences between inexperienced and | |
|------------|-----------|--|-----|
| | | experienced drivers | 127 |
| | 5.1.3 | Research question 3: Difference between inexperienced and | 400 |
| | E 1 1 | experienced drivers through high and low risk curves | |
| - 0 | 5.1.4 | Research question 4: Design assumptions | |
| 5.2 | | ons and recommendations from findings | |
| 5.3 | | ological strengths and limitations | |
| 5.4 | | nendations for further research | 135 |
| 6 | | UDING COMMENTS AND SUMMARY OF RESEARCH | 137 |
| 7 | REFERE | ENCES | 140 |
| APPI | ENDIX A | REVIEW ON EFFECTIVE TREATMENTS FOR RURA | ۱L |
| | CURVE | S | 153 |
| A.1 | Treatme | nt of Rural Curve Speed through Road Engineering Measures | |
| | A.1.1 | Advanced Warning Signs | |
| | A.1.2 | Chevron Alignment Markers | 154 |
| | A.1.3 | Speed Advisory Signs | |
| | A.1.4 | Vehicle Activated Signs | |
| | A.1.5 | Other Delineation Devices | 157 |
| | A.1.6 | Transverse Rumble Strips | |
| | A.1.7 | Perceptual Countermeasures | |
| | A.1.8 | Route Based Curve Treatments | |
| A.2 | | and driver-based interventions to address speed | |
| | A.2.1 | Intelligent Speed Assist | |
| | A.2.2 | In-vehicle curve warning systems | |
| | Enforcer | ment | 164 |
| A.4 | Education | on, training and publicity | 166 |
| A.5 | Summar | у | 167 |
| APPI | ENDIX B | PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSE | |
| | FORM | | |
| | ENDIX C | DRIVER DETAILS FORM | _ |
| APPI | ENDIX D | DRIVING INSTRUCTIONS | 174 |
| APPI | ENDIX E | RESULTS FOR CURVES AND SUBJECTS | 179 |
| E.1 | Speed a | t curve minimum point | 179 |
| | Ė.1.1 | High risk curves (km/h) | |
| | E.1.2 | Low risk curves (km/h) | |
| E.2 | Accelera | ation at minimum point | 181 |
| | E.2.1 | High risk curves (m/s/s) | 181 |
| | E.2.2 | Low risk curves (m/s/s) | 182 |
| E.3 | Side for | ce: maximum in curve | 183 |
| | E.3.1 | High risk curves (g) | |
| | E.3.2 | Low risk curves (g) | |
| E.4 | | e to edgeline: maximum in curve | |
| | E.4.1 | High risk curves (m) | 185 |
| | E.4.2 | Low risk curves (m) | 186 |
| ΔΡΡΙ | ENDIX E | EXAMPLE PEER REVIEWED PURI ICATION | 187 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 1.1: | Typical rural curve | |
|--------------|--|------|
| Figure 1.2: | Structure of research thesis | |
| Figure 2.1: | Structure of literature review | 7 |
| Figure 2.2: | Relative frequency of crash types by driver experience (from Catchpole & Edgar, 1999) | 14 |
| Figure 2.3: | Relationship between mean speed change and crash rate (from E et al., 2004) | lvik |
| Figure 2.4: | Speed and crash risk (from Kloeden et al., 2001) | 25 |
| Figure 2.5: | Relationship between accident frequency, speed and road quality | 20 |
| rigure 2.5. | (from Taylor et al., 2002) | |
| Figure 2.6: | Segments of curve driving task (from Campbell et al., 2008) | |
| Figure 2.7: | Relationship between speed, radius and side force at curves | |
| Figure 2.8: | Four categories of lane position (from Jamieson, 2012) | |
| Figure 2.9: | Six categories of driving style (from Spacek, 2005) | |
| Figure 3.1: | Route location relative to CBD (from Google Maps) | |
| Figure 3.2: | Map of route (data recorded in both directions; from Google Maps | |
| Figure 3.3: | Experimental section of route (data collected in both directions; from | • |
| Ü | Google Maps) | |
| Figure 3.4: | Typical environment from experimental route | |
| Figure 3.5: | Data acquisition unit | |
| Figure 3.6: | GPS unit fitted to vehicle | |
| Figure 3.7: | Rotopulser device fitted to vehicle | 80 |
| Figure 3.8: | Gipsi-Trac device fitted to vehicle | 80 |
| Figure 3.9: | Video camera fitted to front windscreen | 81 |
| Figure 3.10: | Mobileye device fitted to front windscreen | 82 |
| Figure 3.11: | Curve 84 (NBD) showing faded centreline and edgeline | 82 |
| Figure 4.1: | Speed at different points through high and low risk curves | 91 |
| Figure 4.2: | Acceleration at different points through high and low risk curves | 93 |
| Figure 4.3: | Lateral acceleration at different points through high and low risk curves | 94 |
| Figure 4.4: | Distance to edgeline at different points through left and right and hand low risk curves | |
| Figure 4.5: | Incidence of lane crossing for left curves | |
| Figure 4.6: | Incidence of lane crossing for right curves | |
| Figure 4.7: | Speed at different points through curves for experienced and inexperienced drivers | |
| Figure 4.8: | Acceleration at different points through curves for experienced and | |
| rigaro i.o. | inexperienced drivers | |
| Figure 4.9: | Lateral acceleration for inexperienced and experienced drivers | |
| Figure 4.10: | • | |
| Figure 4.11: | | |
| Figure 4.12: | | |
| Figure 4.13: | | |
| Figure 4.14: | | |
| Figure 4.15: | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| Figure 4.16: | | 106 |

| Acceleration for right curves for inexperienced and experienced drivers | 107 |
|---|---------|
| Lateral acceleration through left curves for inexperienced and | 108 |
| Lateral acceleration through right curves for inexperienced and | 108 |
| • | |
| | 110 |
| Curve 23R – Speed for experienced and inexperienced drivers | 113 |
| Curve 23R | 114 |
| Curve 23R – Deceleration/acceleration for experienced and | |
| inexperienced drivers | 116 |
| Curve 23R – Side force for experienced and inexperienced | |
| drivers | 118 |
| Lane position for left curves – inexperienced and experienced | |
| drivers | 129 |
| Lane position for right curves – inexperienced and experienced | |
| drivers | 129 |
| | drivers |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 2.1: | Relationship between mean speed change and crash rate (from Elvik et al., 2004)23 |
|-------------|--|
| Table 2.2: | Road elements and typical speeds (adapted from Charlton & Baas, 2006) |
| Table 3.1: | Details for high risk curves |
| Table 3.2: | Details for low risk curves76 |
| Table 4.1: | Mean and Standard Deviation in speed for high and low risk curves 92 |
| Table 4.2: | Mean and standard deviation in acceleration/deceleration for high and low risk curves |
| Table 4.3: | Mean and Standard Deviation in lateral acceleration for high and low risk curves |
| Table 4.4: | Mean and standard deviation in distance to edgeline96 |
| Table 4.5: | Incidence of lane crossing behaviour for inexperienced and experienced drivers |
| Table 4.6: | Incidence of lane crossing behaviour for inexperienced and experienced drivers for left and right curves |
| Table 4.7: | Incidence of lane crossing behaviour for inexperienced and experienced drivers110 |
| Table 4.8: | Speed results for individual curves at curve minimum – high and low risk (km/h) |
| Table 4.9: | Acceleration/deceleration for high and low risk curves (m/s/s) 115 |
| Table 4.10: | Lateral acceleration for high risk and low risk curves (g)117 |
| Table 4.11: | Distance to edgeline for left curves (m) |
| Table 4.12: | Distance to edgeline for right curves (m)119 |

ABSTRACT

Road crashes at rural curves result in a high number of deaths and serious injuries. Speed has been identified as a significant contributor to such crashes, but some researchers have suggested that an understanding of other elements is also required. This study was designed to broaden the understanding of the mechanisms that lead to elevated crash risk at curves. A better understanding of these issues might provide insight into methods for improving safety at curves. This study included an assessment of the elements of curve design that are linked to side force and crash risk, including speed, curve radius and driver lane position. These issues were assessed for high risk and low risk curves. Differences between inexperienced and experienced drivers were also compared.

40 male drivers (20 inexperienced and 20 experienced) drove a set rural route in a test vehicle which was instrumented to collect data. Measures of speed, side force and lane position were taken on a continuous basis for each curve on the route. Information regarding the design elements for each curve was also collected, including curve radius, curve direction (left or right) and curve risk (calculated based on the difference between curve approach speed and minimum curve speed). Based on the calculation of curve risk 20 high risk curves, and 20 low risk curves were identified and data for each included in the study.

Differences in speed, side force and lane position through high and low risk curves were assessed, as were the differences between inexperienced and experienced groups of drivers on these same measures. This information was collected at key points on approach and through curves.

Results indicated that when comparing high risk curves with low risk curves speeds were lower for high risk curves; acceleration and deceleration levels were greater; side force was greater; and variance between drivers was greater. Deceleration continued through and beyond the curve mid-point for high risk curves. Given this is a high risk point within a curve (i.e. where the side force is greatest, and the chance to lose control highest) it is highly desirable that drivers will have already fully decelerated by this point.

There were substantial differences in lane position on approach and through high risk compared to low risk curves. Lane position was also statistically and substantively different for inexperienced compared with experienced drivers. For high risk curves, experienced drivers 'cut the corner', reducing side force to a greater degree than inexperienced drivers.

These results relating to speed (particularly the need to reduce speed at or before the curve mid-point) and lane position provide useful information on possible sources of risk to drivers through curves. The findings support the hypothesis that in order to understand risk at curves, factors such as speed and lane position should be considered in combination. The results presented provide additional opportunities to help improve safety. Earlier deceleration coupled with more appropriate lane position would act to reduce side force through curves, and therefore lead to improved safety outcomes.

THESIS DECLARATION

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name, in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

I acknowledge the support I have received for my research through the provision of an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship.

Signed

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisors, Jeremy Woolley, Mary Lydon, Peter Cairney and Chris Stokes. Each brings an incredible amount of knowledge and common sense that has helped me bring this work to completion. I appreciate the help that they have provided, and count myself as fortunate that each has played a part. Similarly, I would like to thank other staff at CASR for their help, including feedback during presentations. Particular acknowledgement goes to Paul Hutchinson for his input at critical stages.

I have been lucky to have had strong support from my employer and colleagues at the Australian Road Research Board (ARRB). This included provision of the data collection vehicle and collection equipment and for vouchers to help compensate subjects for their time. Particular thanks to Mike Shackleton for support in providing encouragement and resources; the Systems staff for installing equipment and software plus providing advice; and other PhD students for sharing experiences and providing support. Thank you to Bill Young for useful comments on the early draft. Thanks also to my direct colleagues for their help and support, including Michael Tziotis, for allowing time to complete the study; John Catchpole for discussions of ideas during many lunchtime walks, and other teammates for advice and help carrying the load for my 'day job' when I was busy at critical stages of study. Thanks also to Peter Milne who proof read the final draft and helped whittle out the typos.

I was very fortunate to have the help of a talented vacation student, Thomas Keating, who assisted with the installation of equipment for data collection, programing for data extractions, and in administration of the subjects. This assistance was greatly appreciated.

I would like to thank all of the subjects who gave up their time to be involved in the trial. This included ARRB staff, friends and complete strangers. Thank you also to those who helped promote the trial, including VicRoads and RACV for advertising for subjects.

Thanks to other friends and family who have provided support and encouragement. I was lucky to select a topic that many people could relate to, and enjoyed thoughts and comments from all who provided them. Particular thanks to my dad, Brian, who always seemed genuinely interested to hear what was happening with the study.

Lastly, and most importantly, I would like to thank my wife Kate, and children Alice and Lucy. A part time PhD takes a very long time, and intrudes on family time to a large

