## Intersection Road Safety Audit

## Williamstown Road \& Erial Road



Created in 1965, the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) is an interstate, intercounty and intercity agency that provides continuing, comprehensive and coordinated planning to shape a vision for the future growth of the Delaware Valley region. The region includes Bucks, Chester, Delaware, and Montgomery counties, as well as the City of Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania; and Burlington, Camden, Gloucester and Mercer counties in New Jersey. DVRPC provides technical assistance and services; conducts high priority studies that respond to the requests and demands of member state and local governments; fosters cooperation among various constituents to forge a consensus on diverse regional issues; determines and meets the needs of the private sector; and practices public outreach efforts to promote two-way communication and public awareness of regional issues and the Commission.


Our logo is adapted from the official DVRPC seal, and is designed as a stylized image of the Delaware Valley. The outer ring symbolizes the region as a whole, while the diagonal bar signifies the Delaware River. The two adjoining crescents represent the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

DVRPC is funded by a variety of funding sources including federal grants from the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Pennsylvania and New Jersey departments of transportation, as well as by DVRPC's state and local member governments. The authors, however, are solely responsible for its findings and conclusions, which may not represent the official views or policies of the funding agencies.

> DVRPC fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. DVRPC's website may be translated into Spanish, Russian, and Traditional Chinese online by visiting www.dvrpc.org. Publications and other public documents can be made available in alternative languages or formats, if requested. For more information, please call (215) 238-2871.
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## ERIAL ROAD and WILLIAMSTOWN ROAD INTERSECTION ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

### 1.0 BACKGROUND

This document represents the final report for the Erial Road and Williamstown Road Intersection Road Safety Audit. This project represents a step towards the implementation of the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) Regional Safety Action Plan. Improving the design and operation of intersections is a priority area for both engineering and enforcement disciplines, as documented in the Plan. DVRPC has been coordinating with Pennsylvania Department of Transportation to address corridors on the District 6 Safety Plan since fiscal year 2007. In fiscal year 2008, intersection road safety audits are being conducted in New Jersey under Transportation Safety Planning in DVRPC's planning work program. The New Jersey road safety audits concentrate on intersections located on county and/or local roads. Implementation of improvement strategies identified through this process may be eligible for Local Federal Safety funds.

Since the goal of this project is to improve and promote transportation safety on the region's roadways while maintaining mobility, the main objective is to address the safe operation of the roadway and ensure a high level of safety for all road users. The road safety audit program is conducted to generate improvement recommendations and countermeasures for roadway segments demonstrating a history of or potential for a high incidence of motor vehicle crashes. The emphasis is placed on identifying low cost, quick turnaround safety projects to address the issues where possible, but it will not exclude the more complex projects.

### 1.1 The Audit

A road safety audit (RSA) is a formal safety performance examination of an existing or future road or intersection by an audit team. Road safety audits can be used on any size project, from minor maintenance to megaprojects. There are eight major steps involved in conducting a road safety audit, but these can be simplified into a three-step process identify the corridor/intersection and the audit team; conduct the RSA and report on the findings; and follow-up on RSA findings where feasible. There are major benefits to the road safety audit: it is a proactive tool, not solely dependent on crash data; it is a planning tool, identifying safety issues to be considered in improvement projects; it can determine whether or not the needs of all road users are adequately met; it is adaptable to local needs and conditions; and its recommendations can be implemented in small stages as time and resources permit.

Prior to the road safety audit activities on site, DVRPC collected, reviewed, and analyzed relevant data (video of roadway under different conditions, traffic volume data, turning movement counts, maps, aerial photographs, and crash data). Using the crash data, collision diagrams were produced that showed the crashes and types for the locations where they occurred.

The Road Safety Audit was conducted on April 23, 2008. The day began with a PreAudit meeting that involved the definition of a road safety audit and how it differs from
the corridor study process, the required steps of an audit, the presentation of the site issues, and an exchange of ideas and knowledge of the roadway. A video showing the site under nighttime conditions was also shown. The field view followed, during which the audit team, made up of state and local officials and other stakeholders, walked the site and identified transportation safety issues. See Appendix A for the list of audit team members. The postaudit meeting followed and was spent discussing the findings from the field view, identifying strategies to address issues, and determining priorities.

### 1.2 Overview of the Study Area

The study area consists of the signalized intersection of CR 536 Spur (Williamstown Road) and CR 706 (Erial Road) in Winslow Township, New Jersey, see Appendix B the study area map.

Williamstown Road, which is functionally classified as an urban minor arterial at the study location, runs north to south. CR 536 Spur runs from US 322/NJ 42 in Monroe Township to US 30 in Winslow Township, for a distance of approximately 7.5 miles. Williamstown Road connects with several major roads. West of the study intersection, Williamstown Road connects with the intersection of US 322/NJ 42, CR 704 (Chews Landing Road), and CR 705 (Sicklerville Road). North of the study intersection, Williamstown Road connects with CR 720 (New Freedom Road), CR 710 (Factory Road), CR 561 (Cedarbrook Road/ Transboro Road), NJ 73 and US 30.

At the study intersection, Williamstown Road has one lane at the eastern approach and one through/left turn lane and a channelized right-turn lane at the western approach. The dedicated right-turn lane is separated by a raised triangular median. Shoulder width is minimal at the study intersection and the speed limit is 45 MPH .

Erial Road, which is functionally classified as an urban collector, generally runs in a north-south direction. Erial Road runs south from CR 705 (Sicklerville Road) in Winslow Township northward to CR 534 in Deptford Township, for a distance of 13 miles. It connects with several major roads, which include CR 705 south of the study area, while to the north Erial Road connects with CR 689 (Cross Keys Road), CR 687 (Jarvis Road), CR 703 (Garwood Road/Erial Clementon Road), CR 688 (Hickstown Road), CR 673 (College Drive), CR 759 (Little Gloucester Road/Peter Cheeseman Road), CR 534 (Blackwood Clementon Road), NJ 168 (Black Horse Pike), CR 681 (Good Intent Road), NJ 41 and CR 534 (Cooper Street).

At the study intersection, Erial Road is one lane in each direction, accommodating all traffic movements.

The land use in the area immediately surrounding the study intersection is mixed, minor commercial, low-density residential and public uses. On the northwest and southwest corners of the intersection the land use is low-density residential, with land adjacent to the intersection approach mainly wooded and undeveloped. On the northeast corner of the intersection the land use is public use. On the southeast corner of the intersection the land use is minor commercial. There is a gas and automobile service station located
at the southeast corner of the intersection with multiple access points along the southeast and northeast legs.

The NJ Transit bus route 400 serves the study intersection. The Route 400, from Philadelphia to Sicklerville, serves Williamstown Road south of the study intersection, and turns onto Erial Road at the study intersection and serves Erial Road east of the intersection. This bus provides access to Center City Philadelphia, Walter Rand Transportation Center, Audubon Crossing Shopping Center, the Deptford Mall, Camden County Community Services Center, Camden County Community College, Pennco Technical Institute, and it connects with other transit routes. There are 15 AM and 11 PM weekday trips to Philadelphia and 9 AM and 17 PM weekday trips to Sicklerville which serves the study intersection. The daily weekday ridership for this route in 2007 was 5,119.

Average annual daily traffic (AADT) volumes on Erial Road were 10,981 vehicles in 2008. Compared with 1996 volumes of 7,138 just south of this location; the current volumes show an increase in traffic volumes of 54 percent. In 2005, an AADT of 19,495 vehicles was recorded on Williamstown Road south of the Atlantic City Expressway; while the Expressway recorded 30,337 vehicles the same year (see Appendix B for Traffic Volume Map). Turning movement counts were taken in January 2008 for the study intersection. These showed that the morning peak hour is between 6:15AM and 7:15AM, and the afternoon peak hour is between 5:00PM and 6:00PM (see Appendix C). There were 1,339 and 1,574 vehicles moving through the intersection during the morning and afternoon peak period, respectively. From Williamstown Road there are heavy left-turn movements onto Erial Road during the afternoon peak hour, along with heavy right-turn movements for northwest Erial Road. Erial Road experiences heavy movement from both approaches in the morning peak in the northeast direction on Williamstown Road.

### 1.3 Crash Data

According to Winslow Township Police crash records, there were 39 reportable and 11 non-reportable crashes for the study area for the three-year period 2005 to 2007. Reportable crashes are crashes that may result in a fatality, injury, and/or property damage of $\$ 500$ or more. A comprehensive analysis of the crash data is shown in Appendix C.

Rear-end (20), hit fixed object (13) and left turn (6) crashes represented approximately 77 percent of the intersection crashes. Rear-end (39.2\%), hit fixed object (25.5\%), leftturn (11.76\%), and head-on (5.9\%) crashes were higher than 2006 New Jersey Statewide County Road Averages of 30.32, 11.89, 7.89, 3.73 percent, respectively. There were two fatal crashes during the study period, one in 2005 and one in 2007. There were 28 (54.9\%) property- damage-only crashes and 20 (39.2\%) injury crashes of varying levels of severity. The fatality average (3.93\%) and the injury average (39.2\%) are above the 2006 statewide average of $0.27 \%$ and $29.16 \%$ for the county road system. Crashes occurring during dusk/dawn were higher than the 2006 statewide averages. In an analysis of roadway surface conditions during the occurrence of
crashes, approximately $65 \%$ occurred on dry road surface while $11.76 \%$ occurred on road surface condition of ice or snow. The 2006 statewide averages for the county road system showed a $2.13 \%$ average of crashes occurring on icy and snowy road surface condition.

### 2.0 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following represents the findings and recommendations of the Erial Road/Williamstown Road Intersection Road Safety Audit. Shaded areas represent recommended strategies requiring a low level of effort for implementation with high potential safety benefits.


## Issue

- High intersection volumes, with relatively high left turning volumes from Williamstown Road onto Erial Road.
- Left-turning traffic blocking through movements at Williamstown Road approaches Aggressive Driving.
- High number of left-turn and angle crashes.


## Possible Improvement Strategies

- Consider adding dedicated left-turn lanes for both approaches on Williamstown Road
- Upgrade traffic signal and timing to accommodate protected left-turn movements.
- Consider reconfiguring the channelized island to accommodate additional lane.
- Upgrade all pavement markings at the intersection (lane lines, shoulders, edgelines, and stop bars).

Level of Effort Potential Safety Benefit
Medium High
or
High
(If ROW acquisition is required)
The Road Safety Audit team considered this a HIGH priority.

* All photographs in this document were taken by DVRPC staff, 2008.

| Striping |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| Issue |  |
| - Stop bar on the southeast approach of Erial Road is too close to the intersection. This results in difficult turning movements from Williamstown Road onto northbound Erial Road. |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies <br> - Move stop bar back from intersection to accommodate safer turning movements. |  |
| Level of Effort Low | Potential Safety Benefit High |
| Issue |  |
| - Stop bars are missing/faded at all approaches of the intersection. |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies |  |
| Level of Effort Low | Potential Safety Benefit High |
| Issue |  |
| - The intersection has no crosswalks. |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies <br> - Install crosswalks at the intersection at the northwest approach of Erial Road and the southwest approach of Williamstown Road. <br> (Crosswalks will provide quidance for pedestrians who are crossing the roadways and alert |  |
| motorists) |  |
| Level of Effort Low | Potential Safety Benefit High |



| Issue |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Several guide signs (church and hospital) are in poor condition and are mounted too low. |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies <br> - Remove or replace signs as appropriate. |  |
| Level of Effort Potential Safety Benefit |  |
| Issue |  |
| - Camden County Park guide sign at the intersection is faded. |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies <br> - Replace sign and mount according to MUTCD guidance. |  |
| Level of Effort Potential Safety Benefit |  |
|  |  |
| Issue |  |
| - "Traffic signal ahead" signs are redundant. At the sign motorists are able to see the traffic signal. |  |
| - Replace these signs with "Junction" signs with county route designation for the intersection. |  |
| Level of Effort | Potential Safety Benefit |
| Low | Medium |
| Issue |  |
| - Reflective signs in the right-turn channelized island are leaning and oriented in the wrong direction. |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies |  |
| - Upgrade signs according to MUTCD guidance and supplement with raised pavement markers on the edgeline of the northeast Williamstown Road approach lane and the southeast Erial Road receiving lane. |  |
| Level of Effort | Potential Safety Benefit |
| Low | High |




| Pavement |
| :--- | :--- |
| Issue |
| • Pavement on Erial Road on the south side of the intersection is in disrepair. |
| Possible Improvement Strategies |
| - Repave the roadway. |
| Level of Effort Potential Safety Benefit |
| Medium |
| (County paving project is scheduled for Erial Road from the intersection south) |


| Guide Rail |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| Issue |  |
| - Guide rails are damaged. |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies <br> - Replace existing guide rail with end treatments consistent with AASHTO guidelines. |  |
| Level of Effort Medium | Potential Safety Benefit High |


| Vegetation |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| Issue |  |
| - Shrubs at the intersection are overgrown and interfere with motorist sight distance. |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies <br> - Trim shrubs at the intersection. |  |
| Level of Effort Low | Potential Safety Benefit High |
| Issue |  |
| - Channelized island is overgrown and presents a hazard for pedestrians. |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies <br> - Hardscape the island (low maintenance). |  |
| Level of Effort Low | Potential Safety Benefit High |


| Drop Off |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| Issue |  |
| - Egde drop off on the north side of the intersection on Erial Road. |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies <br> - Pave the shoulder with a tapered transition to make traversable. |  |
| Level of Effort Medium | Potential Safety Benefit High |
| Issue <br> - Crash history of 'hit fixed object' crashes in the vicinity. |  |
|  |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies <br> - Consider installing edge line rumble strips, especially for the Erial Road approach, where there is a history of 'hit fixed object' crashes. |  |
| Level of Effort Medium | Potential Safety Benefit <br> High |

## Access Management



## Issue

- Trucks exiting the Mongan's Service station block both lanes of traffic on Williamstown Road.
- The service station has no defined access/egress points on both roadways at the intersection.
- Motorists make unsafe turns from service station driveways.


## Possible Improvement Strategies

- Coordinate with business owner to define driveway access according to current county access management policy.
- Consider restricting left turns from service station.

Level of Effort Potential Safety Benefit<br>Medium High

|  | Traffic Signal |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| Issue <br> - High number of angle and left-turn crashes. |  |
|  |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies <br> - Revisit the signal timing and possibly increase the all-red phase. |  |
|  | Level of Effort Potential Safety Benefit <br> High |
| Issue <br> - Sun glare makes it difficult to see the signal at specific times of the day. |  |
|  |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies <br> - Add backplates to signal heads to enhance visibility. |  |
|  | Level of Effort Potential Safety Benefit <br> Low |
| Issue <br> - There are no pedestrian signal heads. |  |
|  |  |
| Possible Improvement Strategies <br> - Add pedestrian signal heads and push button. |  |
|  | Level of Effort Potential Safety Benefit <br> Medium <br> High  |




### 3.0 CONCLUSION

As discussed earlier, the road safety audit program is conducted to generate improvement recommendations and countermeasures for roadway segments or intersections demonstrating a history of or potential for a high incidence of motor vehicle crashes. The safety issues identified during the audit and documented in this report, along with the recommended strategies, should improve the overall safety of the study area. Many of the strategies identified can be implemented through routine maintenance. The full impact of the improvement strategies will be realized when they are combined, but time and budget constraints may dictate when remedial strategies are implemented.

Engineering strategies alone will not eliminate the traffic safety issues identified at the study area. Therefore, enforcement and education are necessary components to address the human behavioral aspects to effectively reduce the number of crashes occurring. Policy or legislative issues may be involved in addressing safety concerns, so engaging the appropriate stakeholders is important. Coordination and collaboration is the key to making the roadway safer for all users.

## APPENDIX A Audit Team

# DELAWARE VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION ERIAL ROAD \& WILLIAMSTOWN ROAD INTERSECTION ROAD SAFETY AUDIT 

AUDIT TEAM

| Name | Organization |
| :--- | :--- |
| Rosemarie Anderson | Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission |
| Sophia Azam | New Jersey Department of Transportation |
| Joe Gallagher | Winslow Township Administrator |
| Ed McGlinchey | Winslow Township Public Works Department |
| Regina Moore | Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission |
| Kevin Murphy | Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission |
| Ed O'Connor | New Jersey Division of Highway Traffic Safety |
| Joe Radday | ABR Consultants (Winslow Township Engineer) |
| Mark Passanella | Winslow Township Police Department |
| Caroline Trueman | Federal Highway Administration |

## APPENDIX B Maps




## APPENDIX C Traffic Data

## Erial Road and Williamstown Road Intersection. Peak Hour Turning Movement Counts

## Peak Hours

AM : 6:15-7:15
[PM]: 5:00-6:00
sCHEMATIC NOT TO SCALE





Crash Summary

| CR 706 \& CR 536 Spur | 2005 |  | 2006 |  | 2007 |  | Total |  | 2006 NJ Statewide County Road Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crash Summary | Crash | \% | Crash | \% | Crash | \% | Crash | \% |  |
| *Reportable | 8 | 66.67\% | 14 | 77.78\% | 17 | 85.00\% | 39 | 76.47\% | ~ |
| Non-Reportable | 4 | 33.33\% | 4 | 22.22\% | 3 | 15.00\% | 11 | 21.57\% | ~ |
| Collision Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rear-End | 4 | 33.33\% | 8 | 44.44\% | 8 | 40.00\% | 20 | 39.22\% | 30.32\% |
| Angle | 1 | 8.33\% | 4 | 22.22\% | $\sim$ | $\sim$ | 5 | 9.80\% | 18.09\% |
| Left Turns | 1 | 8.33\% | 3 | 16.67\% | 2 | 10.00\% | 6 | 11.76\% | 7.89\% |
| Hit Fixed Object | 3 | 25.00\% | 2 | 11.11\% | 8 | 40.00\% | 13 | 25.49\% | 11.89\% |
| Hit Animal | 2 | 16.67\% | ~ | ~ | $\sim$ | ~ | 2 | 3.92\% | 3.80\% |
| Head On | 1 | 8.33\% | 1 | 5.56\% | 1 | 5.00\% | 3 | 5.88\% | 3.73\% |
| Same Direction Side Swipe | $\sim$ | $\sim$ | $\sim$ | ~ | 1 | 5.00\% | 1 | 1.96\% | 11.45\% |
| Intersection Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| At Intersection | 4 | 33.33\% | 8 | 44.44\% | 5 | 25.00\% | 17 | 33.33\% | 39.52\% |
| Not at Intersection | 8 | 66.67\% | 10 | 55.56\% | 15 | 75.00\% | 33 | 64.71\% | 60.45\% |
| Severity Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fatality | 1 | 8.33\% | $\sim$ | $\sim$ | 1 | 5.00\% | 2 | 3.92\% | 0.27\% |
| Injured | 5 | 41.67\% | 8 | 44.44\% | 7 | 35.00\% | 20 | 39.22\% | 29.16\% |
| Property Damage Only | 6 | 50.00\% | 10 | 55.56\% | 12 | 60.00\% | 28 | 54.90\% | 70.57\% |
| Lighting Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Day | 7 | 58.33\% | 14 | 77.78\% | 13 | 65.00\% | 34 | 66.67\% | 70.25\% |
| Dusk/Dawn | 1 | 8.33\% | 1 | 5.56\% | 2 | 10.00\% | 4 | 7.84\% | 3.84\% |
| Night | 4 | 33.33\% | 3 | 16.67\% | 5 | 25.00\% | 12 | 23.53\% | 25.49\% |
| Road Surface Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry | 10 | 83.33\% | 13 | 72.22\% | 10 | 50.00\% | 33 | 64.71\% | 77.54\% |
| Wet | 1 | 8.33\% | 4 | 22.22\% | 5 | 25.00\% | 10 | 19.61\% | 19.67\% |
| Ice/Snow | 1 | 8.33\% | 1 | 5.56\% | 4 | 20.00\% | 6 | 11.76\% | 2.13\% |
| Fog/Smog/Smoke | $\sim$ | ~ | $\sim$ | ~ | 1 | 5.00\% | 1 | 1.96\% | $\sim$ |

## APPENDIX D <br> Checklist

## DELAWARE VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION ERIAL ROAD \& WILLIAMSTOWN ROAD INTERSECTION ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

## CHECKLIST

Audit Team Member $\qquad$

## GENERAL ISSUES

| Item \# | Description | Check | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ <br> Drainage | Do drainage items seem to be <br> adequate? |  |  |
|  | Are drainage items clear of debris? |  |  |
| 2 <br> Landscaping | Is landscaping in accordance with <br> guidelines (sight distance, clearances, <br> etc.) |  |  |
| 3 <br> Public <br> Utilities | Are boxes, poles, and/or posts located <br> in a safe position? |  |  |
|  | Do the above items interfere with sight <br> distance? |  |  |
| 4 <br> Access <br> Management | Are there locations at and near the <br> intersection where access management <br> is problematic? |  |  |
| $\mathbf{5}$ <br> Lighting | Is lighting needed in the vicinity of the <br> intersection? |  |  |

## ALIGNMENT AND CROSS SECTION

| Item \# | Description | Check | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 <br> Visibility | Are sight distances adequate for the <br> speed of traffic approaching the <br> intersection? |  |  |
|  | Is adequate sight distance provided at <br> the intersection? |  |  |
| 2 <br> Driver <br> Expectation | Are there any sections of the <br> intersection that may cause driver <br> confusion, such as: |  |  |
|  | a. Is alignment of roadway clearly <br> defined? |  |  |
|  | b. Are crossroads or hidden driveways <br> properly signed along corridor? |  |  |


|  | c.Do streetlights and tree lines <br> conform to the road alignment? <br> $\mathbf{3}$ <br> WidthsAre all the traffic lanes and roadway <br> widths adequate? |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## INTERSECTION

| Item \# | Description | Check | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & \text { Location } \end{aligned}$ | Are there any roadside objects nearby that would intrude on the driver's line of sight? |  |  |
|  | Is the intersection adequate for all vehicular movements? |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \\ & \text { Controls } \end{aligned}$ | Are pavement markings and intersection control signing satisfactory? |  |  |
|  | Are there any pedestrian signals? |  |  |
| 3 <br> Signage | Is the intersection appropriately signed? |  |  |
|  | Are there advance warning signs indicating the intersection? |  |  |
|  | Are signs appropriately located and of the appropriate size? |  |  |
| 4 Layout | Is the intersection layout obvious to all users? |  |  |
|  | Is the alignment of curbs satisfactory? |  |  |
|  | Are turning radii and tapers appropriate? |  |  |
|  | Are there driveways located at or near the intersections? |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5 \\ & \text { Transit } \end{aligned}$ | Are there bus stops located near the intersections? |  |  |
|  | a. If so, are the bus stops near side or far side? |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \text { Turn Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | Does the channelized right-turn lane onto CR 536 Spur cause any problems with merging traffic on CR 706? |  |  |
|  | Are there any approaches of the intersection where a left-turn lane is needed? |  |  |

## TRAFFIC SIGNALS

| Item \# | Description | Check | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ <br> Signal <br> Operation | Are traffic signals operating correctly <br> (e.g., clearance time)? |  |  |
|  | Should there be left-turn signal <br> protection for the approaches? |  |  |
| 2 <br> Signal Heads <br> and Visibility | Are traffic signals clearly visible to <br> approaching motorists? |  |  |
|  | Are signal heads adequately placed so <br> as not to cause driver confusion? |  |  |
|  | Are the signals post mounted, wire <br> mounted, or mast arm mounted? |  |  |
|  | Are "signal ahead warning" signs <br> needed? |  |  |
|  | Is the number of signal heads <br> adequate? |  |  |
|  | Are the signal heads too small for <br> motorists to notice? |  |  |
|  | Are the signals hard to see due to sun <br> glare? |  |  |

## PEDESTRIANS

| Item \# | Description | Check | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 <br> Land Use <br> Factors | Are there schools or other pedestrian <br> generators nearby? |  |  |
| 2 <br> Facilities at <br> CR 706 and <br> CR 536 Spur <br> Intersection | Are crosswalks provided at the <br> intersection? | C. If so, are the crosswalks clearly <br> marked? |  |
|  | Are the pedestrian ramps adequate? |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Are there pedestrian signals located at <br> intersection? |  |  |
|  | Is the intersection clearly delineated for <br> the visually impaired? |  |  |
|  | Is there adequate drainage at the <br> intersection? |  |  |


| 3 <br> Area Near <br> the CR 706 <br> and CR 536 <br> Spur <br> intersection | Is the speed limit appropriate for all road <br> users? | Are there safety concerns for <br> pedestrians walking near the corner gas <br> station? |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 |  |  |  |
|  | Is the sidewalk in the vicinity near the <br> intersection adequately lit for <br> pedestrians to see and feel safe? |  |  |
|  | Are there dark places or hiding places <br> that represent a personal security issue? |  |  |
|  | Are the pedestrian crosswalks <br> adequately lit for pedestrians and <br> motorists? |  |  |
|  | Are pedestrians waiting to cross visible <br> to motorists? |  |  |
|  | Can pedestrians see approaching <br> vehicles? |  |  |
|  | Are there temporary or permanent <br> obstructions near the crosswalks (i.e., <br> vegetation, fences, etc.) |  |  |

## SIGNAGE, PAVEMENT MARKINGS, DELINEATION AND LIGHTING

| Item \# | Description | Check | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S <br> Signage | Are there signs missing from key <br> locations? |  |  |
|  | Are the signs easy to understand? |  |  |
|  | Are the correct signs used for each <br> situation? And is each sign necessary? |  |  |
|  | Are signs effective for all likely <br> conditions (i.e., day, night, oncoming <br> headlights, ect.)? |  |  |
|  | Is there sign clutter at the intersection? |  |  |
|  | Are all necessary regulatory, warning, <br> and direction signs in place? Are they <br> conspicuous? |  |  |
|  | Are they redundant? |  |  |
|  | Are traffic signs in their correct locations <br> and properly positioned with respect to <br> lateral clearance and height? |  |  |
|  | Are signs placed so as to restrict sight <br> distance, particularly for vehicles? |  |  |


|  | Do sign supports conform to guidelines? |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2}$ <br> Pavement <br> Markings <br> and <br> Delineation | Does existing pavement markings need <br> to be repainted? | Do raised pavement markers need to be <br> installed at the approach of the <br> intersection? |  |
|  | Are pavement markings easily visible <br> and effective for all likely conditions (i.e., <br> at night, day, inclement weather, etc.)? |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## PAVEMENT

| Item \# | Description | Check | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ <br> Pavement <br> defects | Is the pavement free of defects (i.e., <br> excessive roughness, potholes) that <br> could result in safety problems? |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ |  |  |  |
| Ponding | Is the pavement free of areas where <br> ponding may occur, resulting in a safety <br> problem? |  |  |

## BICYCLISTS

| Item \# | Description | Check | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Are there share-the-road signs posted? |  |  |
|  | Is the road surface of suitable quality for <br> bicyclists? |  |  |

## TRANSIT

| Item \# | Description | Check | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ <br> Buses | Are bus stops located at or near the <br> intersection of CR 706 and CR 536 <br> Spur? |  |  |

## APPENDIX E Response Sheet

DELAWARE VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

| ISSUES | IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES | $\begin{gathered} \text { Decision } \\ \text { Agree/Reject } \end{gathered}$ | Planned Completion Date | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Geometry Improvement |  |  |  |  |
| - High intersection volumes, with relatively high leftturning volumes from Williamstown Road onto Erial Road. <br> - Left-turning traffic blocking through movements at Williamstown Road approaches - Aggressive Driving. <br> - High number of left-turn and angle crashes. | - Consider adding dedicated leftturn lanes for both approaches on Williamstown Road. <br> - Upgrade traffic signal and timing to accommodate protected left-turn movements. <br> - Consider reconfiguring the channelized island to accommodate additional lane. <br> - Upgrade all pavement markings at the intersection (lane lines, shoulders, edgelines, and stop bars). |  |  |  |
| Striping |  |  |  |  |
| - Stop bar on the southeast approach of Erial Road is too close to the intersection. This results in difficult turning movements from Williamstown Road onto northbound Erial Road. | - Move stop bar back from intersection to accommodate safer turning movements. |  |  |  |
| - Stop bars are missing/faded at all approaches of the intersection. | - Add or repaint stop bars as appropriate. |  |  |  |


| ISSUES | IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES | $\begin{gathered} \text { Decision } \\ \text { Agree/Reject } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Planned <br> Completion Date | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Striping cont'd |  |  |  |  |
| - The intersection has no crosswalks. | - Install crosswalks at the intersection at the northwest approach of Erial Road and the southwest approach of Williamstown Road. <br> (Crosswalks will provide quidance for pedestrians who are crossing the roadways and alert motorists) |  |  |  |
| Signs |  |  |  |  |
| - "No Standing Anytime" signs have faded, they are mounted too low, and they are on nonbreakaway posts. | - Replace signs and mount according to MUTCD guidance. |  |  |  |
| - "Reduce Speed Ahead" sign is mounted too low on nonbreakaway posts. | - Remount sign according to MUTCD guidance. |  |  |  |
| - Existing county route designation signs are not up to current standards. | - Replace signs according to current standards and mount according to MUTCD guidance. |  |  |  |
| - Several guide signs (church and hospital) are in poor condition and are mounted too low. | - Remove or replace signs as appropriate. |  |  |  |
| - Camden County Park guide sign at the intersection is faded. | - Replace sign and mount according to MUTCD guidance. |  |  |  |


| ISSUES | IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES | $\begin{gathered} \text { Decision } \\ \text { Agree/Reject } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Planned <br> Completion Date | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signs cont'd |  |  |  |  |
| - "Traffic signal ahead" signs are redundant. At the sign motorists are able to see the traffic signal. | - Replace these signs with "Junction" signs with county route designation for the intersection. |  |  |  |
| - Reflective signs in the rightturn channelized island are leaning and oriented in the wrong direction. | - Upgrade signs according to MUTCD guidance and supplement with raised pavement markers on the edgeline of the northeast Williamstown Road approach lane and the southeast Erial Road receiving lane. |  |  |  |
| Channelized Island |  |  |  |  |
| - No striping for northeast Williamstown Road approach channelized rightturn lane. | - On the Erial Road side of the island add solid line for southeast Erial Road receiving lane edgeline and extend this line approximately 50 feet further from the island and continue with dashed striping for the merge. |  |  |  |
| - There are no "yield" or "stop" signs or pavement markings for the channelized right turn lane | - Install a "yield" sign and/or saw tooth yield pavement markings. |  |  |  |


| ISSUES | IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES | $\begin{gathered} \text { Decision } \\ \text { Agree/Reject } \end{gathered}$ | Planned Completion Date | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Passing Zone |  |  |  |  |
| - Passing Zone begins too close to the active driveways of the Mongan's Service Station and the Winslow Court intersection. | - Extend No Passing Zone north of the storage facility driveway located north of Winslow Court. |  |  |  |
| - There are no warning signs to advise motorists traveling southwest on Williamstown Road of the end of the passing zone. | - Install "No Passing Zone" signage for motorists traveling southwest on Williamstown Road. |  |  |  |
| Pavement |  |  |  |  |
| - Pavement on Erial Road on the south side of the intersection is in disrepair. | - Repave the roadway. <br> (County paving project is schedule for Erial Road from the intersection south) |  |  |  |
| Vegetation |  |  |  |  |
| - Shrubs at the intersection are overgrown and interfere with motorist sight distance. | - Trim shrubs at the intersection. |  |  |  |
| - Channelized island is overgrown and presents a hazard for pedestrians. | - Hardscape the island (low maintenance). |  |  |  |
| Drop Off |  |  |  |  |
| - Egde drop off on the north side of the intersection on Erial Road. | - Pave the shoulder with a tapered transition to make traversable. |  |  |  |


| ISSUES | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { IMPROVEMENT } \\ \text { STRATEGIES } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Decision } \\ \text { Agree/Reject } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Planned Completion Date | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drop Off cont'd |  |  |  |  |
| - Crash history of 'hit fixed object' crashes in the vicinity. | - Consider installing edge line rumble strips, especially for the Erial Road approach, where there is a history of 'hit fixed object' crashes. |  |  |  |
| Guide Rail |  |  |  |  |
| - Guide rails are damaged. | - Replace existing guide rail with end treatments consistent with AASHTO guidelines. |  |  |  |
| Access Management |  |  |  |  |
| - Trucks exiting the Mongan’s Service station block both lanes of traffic on Williamstown Road. <br> - The service station has no defined access/egress points on both roadways at the intersection. <br> - Motorists make unsafe turns from service station driveways. | - Coordinate with business owner to define driveway access according to current county access management policy. <br> - Consider restricting left turns from service station. |  |  |  |
| Traffic Signal |  |  |  |  |
| - High number of angle and left-turn crashes. | - Revisit the signal timing and possibly increase the all-red phase. |  |  |  |
| - Sun glare makes it difficult to see the signal at specific times of the day. | - Add backplates to signal heads to enhance visibility. |  |  |  |


| ISSUES | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { IMPROVEMENT } \\ \text { STRATEGIES } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Decision } \\ \text { Agree/Reject } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Planned <br> Completion Date | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Traffic Signal cont'd |  |  |  |  |
| - There are no pedestrian signal heads. | - Add pedestrian signal heads and push button. |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |
| - Sidewalk is in poor condition. | - Upgrade/maintain sidewalks. |  |  |  |
| - Curb ramps are not ADA compliant. | - Install ADA-compliant curb ramps. |  |  |  |
| Delineation |  |  |  |  |
| - Raised pavement markers are too far apart. | - Install additional raised pavement markers to enhance their safety effect. |  |  |  |
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The study area consists of the signalized intersection of Erial Road (CR 706) and Williamstown Road (CR 536 Spur) and vicinity in Winslow Township, New Jersey.
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ABSTRACT: This is a documentation of the process and findings of the Erial Road (CR 706) and Williamstown Road (CR 536 Spur) Intersection Road Safety Audit (RSA) undertaken by Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC). The goal of the audit is to generate improvement recommendations and countermeasures for intersections demonstrating a history of, or potential for a high incidence of motor vehicle crashes. The emphasis is placed on identifying low cost, quick turnaround safety projects to address the issues where possible. This project represents a step towards implementation of the DVRPC Regional Safety Action Plan. Improving the design and operation of intersections is a priority area for both engineering and enforcement discipline, as documented in the Plan. Improvement strategies may be eligible for Local Federal Safety Funds for implementation. The report details safety issues identified by the audit team at the study location and remedial strategies to address them.
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