

COMPARISON OF DRIVER YIELDING FOR RECTANGULAR RAPID-FLASHING BEACONS USED ABOVE AND BELOW PEDESTRIAN CROSSING SIGNS

By Kay Fitzpatrick, Raul Avelar, Tomas Lindheimer, and Marcus Brewer

INTRODUCTION

Traffic control devices, such as rectangular rapid-flashing beacon (RRFB), have been shown to increase the number of drivers yielding to crossing pedestrians. Evaluations of field installations of these devices have been conducted in several locations, including Florida, Texas, Oregon, Michigan, Arizona, Wisconsin, and Calgary, AB. (See references 1 through 10.) Before-after studies have shown a large increase in driver yielding between the before period (range of 1 to 83 percent) to the after period (range of 38 to 98 percent). Although the RRFB is allowed under interim approval from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), there is growing interest in adding it to the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD).^(11,12) The Signals Technical Committee (STC) of the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD), which assists in developing language for Chapter 4 of the MUTCD, is interested in research and/or assistance in developing materials on the design, application, and effectiveness of the RRFB. One of the areas on which the STC is seeking advice is the position of the beacon relative to the crossing sign. For example, does positioning the beacon above the sign improve the driver's ability to see a pedestrian crossing or waiting to cross, and thus yield to crossing pedestrians?

This TechBrief describes the methodology and results from an open-road study sponsored by FHWA that examined driver yielding behavior at crosswalks with RRFBs positioned above the pedestrian crossing sign and at crosswalks with RRFBs positioned below the sign.

FHWA Interim Approval of RRFB

On July 16, 2008, FHWA issued Interim Approval 11 (IA-11) for the optional use of the RRFB at uncontrolled pedestrian and school crosswalks.⁽¹¹⁾ As defined in IA-11, the RRFB shall consist of two rapidly and alternately flashing rectangular yellow indications having LED-array based pulsing light sources.⁽¹¹⁾ When IA-11 was issued, the only position for the beacon in the pedestrian sign assembly was between the crossing warning sign and the supplemental plaque. The text in IA-11 describes the position as a specific exception to the then-current 2003 MUTCD Section 4K.01 guidance, stating that the RRFB shall be located between the bottom of the crossing warning sign and the top of the supplemental downward diagonal arrow plaque (or, in the case of a supplemental advance sign, the AHEAD plaque), rather than 12 inches above or below the sign assembly.

Study Objective

The objective of this study was to determine benefits of different positions for the rectangular rapid-flashing beacon being used with pedestrian or school crossing signs. The study included both a closed-course and an open-road portion. Details on the closed-course study are available elsewhere;⁽¹³⁾ this article is focused on the open-road study. Because the closed-course study

indicated that benefits may exist for placing the beacon above the sign, the open-road study investigated if drivers yield differently to RRFBs placed above the pedestrian crossing sign instead of below the pedestrian crossing sign. This study measured the percentage of drivers yielding to crossing pedestrians at the same pedestrian crosswalk when the beacon was located above the crossing warning signs and when the beacon was located below the crossing warning signs.

STUDY SITES

Near the conclusion of the closed-course study,⁽¹³⁾ the researchers talked to agency representatives and made requests during professional society meetings, seeking agencies that would be willing to participate in the open-road research. Four agencies volunteered: Aurora, Illinois; Douglas County, Colorado; Marshall, Texas; and Phoenix, Arizona. As a minimum, the agencies were asked to identify at least two locations that either (a) had existing RRFBs below the pedestrian crossing sign that could be moved to a position above the sign or (b) that they would allow the beacon to be installed in one position and then moved to the other position after the initial data collection. Table 1 lists the 13 sites included in the study.

Examples of study assemblies at the crosswalk are shown in Figure 1 (above position) and Figure 2 (below position). The beacon was mounted on a roadside pole to supplement either a pedestrian (W11-2) or trail (W11-15) crossing warning sign with a diagonal downward arrow (W16-7p) plaque, and located at or immediately adjacent to the marked crosswalk.



Figure 1. Photo. Example of beacon placed above sign.



Figure 2. Photo. Example of beacon placed below sign.

Table 1. Open-road study site characteristics^a.

Site	PSL (mph)	Tot CD (ft)	CD to R (ft)	ADT	CW	Ad Lines?	# Ln	Median	Geom	Ped/Hr
AZ-PH-04	35	61	20	23,700	Ladder	Yes	5	Raised	MO(50)	25
AZ-PH-05	35	49	NR	8,700	Ladder	Yes	3	TWLTL	3L	288
CO-DC-02	45/50 ^{b,c}	63	25	7,900	Ladder	No	4	Raised	3L	20
CO-DC-03	30	35	NR	2,600	Ladder	No	2	None	4L	15
CO-DC-04	30	35	NR	4,900	Ladder	No	2	None	3L	19
CO-DC-05	45 ^c	78	32	16,100	Ladder	Yes	4	Raised	3L	16
CO-DC-06	35/45 ^b	63	28	19,800	Ladder	Yes	4	Raised	MB(50)	36
CO-DC-07	45 ^c	78	34	18,800	Ladder	Yes	4	Raised	MB(50)	18
IL-AU-02	35	56	NR	30,800	Diagonal	No	4	TWLTL	MB(30)	17
IL-AU-03	35	30	NR	8,900	Diagonal	No	2	None	MB(360)	19
IL-AU-04	35	94	50	9,400	Transverse	Yes	5	Raised	4L	18
TX-MA-01	30	40	NR	1,400	Diagonal	No	2	None	MB(300)	137
TX-MA-02	30	30	NR	4,900	Diagonal	No	2	None	3L	17

^a Column Headings:

Site = site label (XX-YY-##) where XX=two letter code for state, YY=two letter code for city, and ##=site number within the city.

PSL = posted speed limit.

Tot CD = total crossing distance.

CD to R = crossing distance to refuge, where NR = no refuge present.

ADT = average daily traffic (ADT) values were either provided by the agencies (Arizona, Colorado, and Texas) or estimated based on one-hour counts made from video recordings (Illinois)..

CW = crosswalk marking pattern.

Ad Lines? = are advance stop or yield lines present at the site?

Ln = number of through or left-turn lanes crossed by the pedestrians.

Median = type of median present where TWLTL = two-way left-turn lane.

Geom = intersection geometry at crossing where 3L = 3-leg intersection, 4L = 4-leg intersection, MO = midblock with median job, and MB = midblock with the distance to nearest intersection or major driveway shown in parentheses (measured from center of crossing to center of nearest driveway/intersection)

Ped/Hr = number of pedestrian crossings per hour during the daytime data collection period when the beacon was located below the crossing sign.

^b Speed limit varied by approach.

^c Site also includes the following two advance traffic control assemblies: (a) Pedestrian Crossing (W11-2) warning sign with AHEAD (W16-9P) plaque and (b) SPEED LIMIT 25 (R2-1) regulatory sign with WHEN FLASHING (S4-4P) plaque and a 12-inch circular beacon that is activated when the pedestrian pushes the pedestrian push button at the crossing.

Three of the Colorado sites had a unique series of signs in advance of the crossing. The series started with a Pedestrian Crossing (W11-2) warning sign with AHEAD (W16-9P) plaque. Next was a SPEED LIMIT 25 (R2-1) regulatory sign with WHEN FLASHING (S4-4P) plaque and a 12-inch circular beacon. This beacon flashes when the RRFBs at the crossing are activated (see example shown in Figure 3). At the crosswalk are RRFBs with the Pedestrian Crossing (W11-2) warning sign and diagonal downward pointing arrow (W16-7P) plaque. Also at the crossing and

in the median are the STATE LAW YIELD TO (pedestrian symbol) WITHIN CROSSWALK (R1-6) sign and RRFB.



Figure 3. Photo. Example of speed limit sign assembly used at three sites in Colorado.

DATA COLLECTION

The data were collected at the 13 sites between October 2014 and May 2015. Following installation of the device in its initial position, the research team collected the initial data. Once the initial data were obtained, the research team requested the agency to move each beacon at a site to the second position (i.e., RRFBs above the sign were moved to below the sign and vice versa). After receiving confirmation that the beacons had been moved, the research team collected data for the second position. The time difference between the initial data collection and the second data collection trip for a site was between one and eight weeks. The goal was to have similar weather conditions for both data collection trips. Data were collected primarily during the daytime; however, because few studies have collected data at night, the research team also obtained nighttime data collected at one site within each city.

The research team used a staged pedestrian protocol to collect driver-yielding data to present oncoming drivers with a consistent presentation of the approaching pedestrian. Under this protocol, a member of the research team acted as a pedestrian using the crosswalk. Each staged pedestrian wore similar clothing (gray T-shirt, blue jeans, and gray tennis shoes) and followed specific instructions in crossing the roadway. A second researcher accompanied the staged pedestrian and was responsible for observing and recording the yielding data on datasheets. Additional details regarding the protocol are available elsewhere.⁽⁶⁾

The protocol specified the completion of a minimum of 40 (and a desired 60) staged pedestrian crossings at each site within each time period. The same time period was used for the below and above data collection; for example, data were collected in the afternoon (or the morning) for both the below and above conditions at a site.

RESULTS

During the daytime, driver yielding to staged pedestrians averaged 64 percent for above position and 61 percent for the below position. The range of driver yielding to staged pedestrians at these 13 sites did show a large range from a low of 19 percent to a high of 98 percent. Similar results were found for yielding during nighttime crossings. For most sites, neither position (i.e., above or below) showed a large increase in driver yielding as compared to the other. Therefore, the site characteristics appear to have greater influence on driver yielding decisions rather than the beacon placement above or below the sign.

The statistical analyses were conducted using individual crossing data and found that there are no significant differences between the tested beacon positions. A similar driver yielding was observed when the beacon was above the sign as compared to below the sign.

CONCLUSIONS

This study investigated whether the position of an RRFB in relation to the pedestrian crossing sign is associated with different driver yielding rates. For the two positions tested, no statistically significant differences were found; therefore, the position of the yellow rapid-flashing beacon does not have an impact on whether a driver decides to yield to pedestrians. Variables that did have an impact on driver yielding for this set of sites include natural light (day or night), intersection configuration (i.e., the number of approaches), and city.

The open-road study found that the position of the RRFB (either above or below the sign) does not affect a driver's decision to yield. With the apparent benefits identified from the closed-course study (i.e., lower discomfort and improved ability to detect the pedestrian as measured by identifying the direction a cutout photo of a pedestrian is traveling)⁽¹³⁾ and the lack of difference in driver yielding due to beacon position, locating the beacon above the warning sign could improve the overall effectiveness of this treatment.

Based on the findings from this study, the FHWA is planning to issue an official interpretation, to permit agencies to place the beacon either above or below the warning sign for RRFB installations. Other official interpretations on the RRFB, including the recent interpretation regarding flash pattern, is available on the MUTCD website (<http://www.mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/resources/interpretations/index.htm>)

REFERENCES

1. Shurbutt, J., and Van Houten, R. (2010), *Effects of Yellow Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacons on Yielding at Multilane Uncontrolled Crosswalks*, FHWA-HRT-10-043, FHWA, Washington, DC.
2. Pécheux, K., Bauer, J., and McLeod, P. (2009), *Pedestrian Safety Engineering and ITS-Based Countermeasures Program for Reducing Pedestrian Fatalities, Injury Conflicts,*

- and Other Surrogate Measures Final System Impact Report*, FHWA, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, DC.
3. Hunter, W.W., Srinivasan, R., and Martell, C.A. (2009), *Evaluation of the Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacon at a Pinellas Trail Crossing in St. Petersburg, Florida*, Florida Department of Transportation, Tallahassee, FL.
 4. Brewer, M.A., Fitzpatrick, K., Larson, G.W., and Minter, H. (2011), *Before-and-After Study of the Effectiveness of Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacons Used With School Sign in Garland, Texas*, Technical Memorandum to City of Garland Department of Transportation, TTI, College Station, TX.
 5. Fitzpatrick, K. et al. (2014), *Characteristics of Texas Pedestrian Crashes and Evaluation of Driver Yielding at Pedestrian Treatments*, FHWA/TX-14/0-6702-1, TTI, College Station, TX.
 6. Fitzpatrick, K., Brewer, M., and Avelar, R. “Driver Yielding to Traffic Control Signals, Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons, and Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons in Texas,” *Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2463, October 2013.
 7. Fitzpatrick, K. et al. (2014), *Investigating Improvements to Pedestrian Crossings with an Emphasis on the Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacon*, Draft, FHWA-HRT-15-043, FHWA, Washington, DC.
 8. Ross, J., Serpico, D., and Lewis, R. (2011), *Assessment of Driver Yielding Rates Pre- and Post-RRFB Installation, Bend, Oregon*, Oregon Department of Transportation, Salem, OR.
 9. Bennett, M.K., Manal, H., Van Houten, R., “A Comparison of Gateway In-Street Sign Configuration to Other Driver Prompts to Increase Yielding to Pedestrians at Crosswalks,” *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 47(1), Spring 2014.
 10. Domarad, J., Grisak, P., and Bolger, J. (2013), “Improving Crosswalk Safety: Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacons (RRFB) Trial in Calgary,” *Canada Institute of Transportation Compendium*,
http://www.cite7.org/conferences/compendium/2013_Pedestrian_ImprovingCrosswalkSafety.pdf.
 11. Furst, A. (2008), *MUTCD—Interim Approval for Optional Use of Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (IA-11)*, U.S. Department of Transportation, FHWA Memorandum, July 16, Washington, DC.
http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/resources/interim_approval/ia11/fhwamemo.htm
 12. Federal Highway Administration (2009), *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*, last accessed January 5, 2011, http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/kno_2009.htm.
 13. Fitzpatrick, K., R. Avelar, and J. Robertson (2015), “Impacts of LED Brightness, Flash Pattern, and Location for Illuminated Pedestrian Traffic Control Device” FHWA TechBrief HRT-15-042.