

## Implications of Distracted Driving on Startup Lost Time for Dual Left Turn Lanes

David S. Hurwitz, A.M.ASCE<sup>1</sup>, Kevin P. Heaslip, A.M.ASCE<sup>2</sup>,

Steven D. Schrock, A.M.ASCE<sup>3</sup>, Joshua Swake, S.M.ASCE<sup>4</sup>,

Patrick Marnell, S.M.ASCE<sup>5</sup>, Halston Tuss, S.M.ASCE<sup>6</sup>, Eric Fitzsimmons, A.M.ASCE<sup>7</sup>

### ABSTRACT:

Previous research has found that distracted driving measurably increases driver response times to unanticipated roadway hazards. These instances are of particular consequence as they tend to be highly correlated with vehicle crashes resulting in property damage and/or injury. However, comparatively little attention has been allocated to quantifying the negative impacts of distracted driving on driver reaction to anticipated stimuli. This study empirically determined the impact of distracted driving on queue discharge rates at signalized intersections with protected left turn phases for dual left turn lanes. Observational studies were conducted at 11 intersection approaches at six signalized intersections in three states resulting in the observation of 844 distracted and 3,726 undistracted left turning drivers. A statistical model was developed for the startup lost time resulting from the average headways of the samples in each state. The difference in startup lost times between queues comprised entirely of distracted or undistracted drivers

---

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Oregon State University, 220 Owen Hall, Corvallis, OR, 97331.

Phone: (541) 737-9242; Fax: (541) 737-3052; Email: david.hurwitz@oregonstate.edu

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Utah State University, 233 Engineering, Logan, UT, 84322.

Phone : (435) 797-8289 ; Email : [kevin.heaslip@usu.edu](mailto:kevin.heaslip@usu.edu)

<sup>3</sup> Associate Professor, University of Kansas, 2159B Learned Hall, Lawrence, KS, 66045.

Phone : (785) 864-3418 ; Fax : (785) 864-5631 ; Email : [schrock@ku.edu](mailto:schrock@ku.edu)

<sup>4</sup> Graduate Research Assistant, Oregon State University, 220 Owen Hall, Corvallis, OR 97331.

Email : [swakej@onid.orst.edu](mailto:swakej@onid.orst.edu)

<sup>5</sup> Graduate Research Assistant, Oregon State University, 220 Owen Hall, Corvallis, OR 97331.

Email : [marnellp@onid.orst.edu](mailto:marnellp@onid.orst.edu)

<sup>6</sup> Graduate Research Assistant, Oregon State University, 220 Owen Hall, Corvallis, OR 97331.

Email : [halston.tuss@gmail.com](mailto:halston.tuss@gmail.com)

<sup>7</sup> Lecturer / Post Doctoral Researcher, University of Kansas, 2159A Learned Hall, Lawrence, KS, 66045. Phone : (785) 864-1921 ; Fax : (785) 864-5631 ; Email : [fitsimmons@ku.edu](mailto:fitsimmons@ku.edu)

ranged from 3.36 seconds to 4.06 seconds in Kansas, 2.97 seconds to 4.41 seconds in Oregon and 2.25 seconds to 5.14 seconds in Utah.

**KEYWORDS:** Intersection Performance, Distracted Driving, Traffic Safety, Dual Left Turn Lanes

## **INTRODUCTION**

The implications of distracted driving have become a priority in transportation safety and driver behavior research. Evidence that an increase in driver response times to unanticipated roadway hazards can result from the practice of distracted driving has clearly motivated these efforts. Instances of unanticipated hazards are of particular consequence as they tend to be highly correlated with vehicle crashes. However, comparatively limited research has been conducted to quantifying the negative impacts of distracted driving on driver reaction to anticipated stimuli, such as those presented by traffic control devices. A collaborative research effort between Oregon State University, the University of Kansas, and Utah State University addresses the overarching research goal of determining the impact of distracted driving on driver response to anticipated stimuli. This research addresses this goal by empirically determining queue discharge behavior at signalized intersections with protected left turn phases for dual left turn lanes. A series of research hypotheses are developed in the next section to address the overall research goal.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Theory and Calculation**

To build the argument for the aforementioned research questions and to set the stage for the experimental design, a brief review of the literature relevant to distracted driving and driver

performance is provided. The findings are presented in three focus areas: driver distraction types and impacts, start-up lost time and saturation headway, and left turn capacity at signalized intersections.

### **Driver Distraction**

Driving a vehicle is a complicated multitasking activity. When dealing with multiple tasks that require continuous and careful attention, a human brain cannot perform as it does when involved in individual tasks performed separately. The brain can only contribute to a limited number of tasks simultaneously and once drivers attempt to multitask, their ability to do either task is degraded (Regan, et al., 2008). The National Safety Council describes inattention as the state when "cognitive distraction contributes to a withdrawal of attention from the visual scene, where all the information the driver sees is not processed" (National Safety Council, 2010). More simply, distracted driving is any type of activity, commonly classified as manual, visual, or cognitive, that diverts the drivers' attention away from the driving task. Drivers that attempt to multitask are more prone to miss visual cues critical to safety and navigation (National Safety Council, 2010). However, Klauer, et al. extended this definition further and explained that drivers attending to secondary tasks, driver drowsiness, or a non-specific glance away from the roadway could also be sources of distraction. They found that the risk of a crash or a near crash increases every time the driver's eyes stay off the roadway for longer than two seconds (Klauer, et al. 2006). Therefore, in-vehicle activities such as dialing a cell phone, adjusting the radio and reaching for objects, negatively impact the driver's ability to drive safely. Furthermore, even scanning the driving environment through the side and rear mirrors, which is a "safety enhancing activity," could increase the risk of a crash if it takes over two seconds (Klauer, et al., 2006).

Different sources of distraction and the way they affect driver performance have been the focus of previous research studies. The sources of driver distraction discussed in the literature are commonly in-vehicle distractions which break into two categories of non-technology based distractions such as eating/drinking, smoking/smoking related, and passengers; and technology based distractions such as cell phones, navigation systems, and other similar dashboard related distractions (Regan, et al., 2008).

Eating and drinking can be highly demanding activities involving several steps, diverting the drivers' attention away from the forward roadway to the vehicle interior for a significant portion of time. Similarly, smoking results in driver inattention and increases the risk of crash/near-crash (Regan, et al., 2008). A pilot study investigating 2,919 vehicle crashes that involved distracted drivers in Virginia indicated that 6.3 percent of such crashes were attributable to eating, drinking, or smoking (Glaze & Ellis, 2003).

The presence of passengers in the vehicle can also be a source of distraction resulting from either the passengers' distracting behavior or the conversation between the driver and the passengers. The extent to which the presence of passengers effects driving behavior, is a function of multiple parameters such as passengers' and driver age and gender, driver experience, the number of passengers, and their relationship with the driver (Regan, et al., 2001; Regan, et al., 2008). Various research studies have shown that the risk of being involved in a crash is considerably higher for young drivers, especially when accompanied by two or more young passengers (Regan, et al., 2001). Several studies have found that conversing with the passengers may result in increased perception-reaction times and reduced speeds. However, the impacts of such conversation are not comparable to cell phone conversations, where the other person is not aware of the driving environment and the roadway situation (Regan, et al., 2008). Drews et al.

conducted research which found that using a cell phone while driving was more risky than many other distracting activities drivers currently engage in; however, drivers perceived conversing on a cell phone to be an acceptable risk (Drews, et al., 2009).

Cell phones have become a part of everyday life for millions of Americans. Newer “smart” phones allow users to check email, send text messages and access the Internet. Smart phones allow for multitasking and this has resulted in cell phone use as one of the main distractions that affect drivers (Edwards, 2001). Drews concluded that there was no doubt that text messaging while driving is a dual-task combination with inherently high risk for the driver and other traffic participants (Drews, et al., 2009). The estimated risk of a crash while using a phone is four times higher than when phones are not used (McEvoy, et al., 2005). Some states have attempted to counter in-vehicle cell phone use by enacting state-level laws prohibiting use of a cell phone or only allowing hands-free usage while driving. These steps toward cell phone awareness are positive ones, but the National Safety Council says “these laws give the false impression that using a hands-free phone is safe” (National Safety Council, 2010) when using a hands free device is almost as bad as using a hand-held device (Consiglio, et al., 2003). A University of Utah study compared the use of cell phones with drunk driving. They compared the results of cell phone drivers and drunk drivers to “baseline” or normal drivers and concluded that cell phone drivers may exhibit greater impairments than legally intoxicated drivers (Strayer, et al., 2003).

Dashboard activities performed by the driver such as adjusting the vehicle stereo, adjusting the climate control, or reading a map or GPS unit can also cause a driver to be distracted and take their full attention off the road. According to Horrey and Lesch, not all drivers would allow distraction to interfere with the driving task. However, the amount of

concurrent activities the driver was trying to accomplish would provide a higher likelihood of the driver being distracted (Horrey and Lesch, 2009).

### **Perception Reaction Time**

In the context of traffic engineering, perception reaction time (PRT) can be defined as the time needed for a driver to detect a target or event, process the information, make a decision as to how to respond, and, lastly, to initiate that reaction. Higher values (i.e. 1.5 or 2.5 seconds) are commonly used as estimations for PRT as these values cover most individuals in most situations. However, it is important to remember that PRTs are not fixed; they are a product of different human factors (HSM 2010).

According to Mannering, Washburn, and Kilaeski's *Principles of Highway Engineering and Traffic Analysis*, start-up lost times occur due to an initial lag in the driver's response to the changing of a signal indication. This start-up lost time has a typical value of around 2 seconds. Furthermore, saturation headway is typically seen after the fourth vehicle in the queue (Mannering 2009).

### **Start-Up Lost Time and Saturation Headway**

Depending on the vehicle's position in a queue, different measures are used to determine the headway. For the first queued vehicle, headway refers to the time lapse between the activation of the green light and the time the front axle of the vehicle passes the stop line. For consecutive queued vehicles, headway refers to the time lapse between the vehicle's front axle, and the axle of the proceeding vehicle crossing the stop line. Since the first driver proceeds through a full perception-reaction process, the first headway is typically longer and tends to reduce for the subsequent vehicles until it reaches a constant value after the fourth or fifth vehicle, which is referred to as the *saturation headway* ( $h$ ).

The initial headways for the first 4 to 5 vehicles are usually above “ $h$ ” seconds, by a value of  $\Delta_i$  (for headway  $i$ ). What is known as the *start-up lost time* ( $l_1$ ) is achieved, when these additional values are added:

$$l_1 = \sum \Delta_i \quad (1)$$

Research efforts focused mainly on the effects of driver distraction on start-up delay and headway because these factors directly influence the capacity of a signalized intersection.

### **Dual Left Turn Lane Capacity**

Dual left turn lanes allow a higher volume of left turning vehicles to traverse through the intersection than just one turn lane. The use of dual turn lanes allows for a maximum capacity increase because nearly twice as many vehicles can utilize the intersection per cycle and the requirement of green time to meet the demand is less.

There have been differing opinions whether the use of left turn lanes is the most effective approach to adding left turn capacity. Maze, et al. stated “the presence of a left-turn lane at a signalized intersection improves intersection safety and efficiency of operation” (Maze, et al., 2004). However, Chang, et al. found that “the presence of left-turning vehicles at signalized intersections tends to increase crash potential, causing excessive delay and reduction of intersection capacity” (Chang, et al., 1996). The results of these studies could be valid because it is difficult to evaluate the effects of traffic measurements in terms of the change in the number of traffic crashes at intersections, because traffic crashes are unpredictable and rare events (Oh, et al., 2010).

### **RESEARCH HYPOTHESES**

The following hypotheses were established to address the research goal of determining what, if any, impact does distracted driving have on queue discharge characteristics and left turn capacity at signalized intersections.

- $H_{O \text{ distraction}}$ : There is no difference between the proportions of driver distraction types in different regions of the country.
- $H_{O \text{ headway}}$ : There is no difference between the headway of each individual vehicle position (first, second, third, fourth, and fifth) of a distracted driver and an undistracted driver.
- $H_{O \text{ startup lost time}}$ : There is no difference between the startup lost time of a queue composed of distracted drivers or undistracted drivers.

In this research study, the first headway is defined as the difference in time between the activation of the green left turn arrow and the moment the front axle of the first vehicle in the queue crosses the stop line, while the subsequent vehicle headways are the difference in time between the front axles of two adjacent vehicles crossing the stop line. The vehicle startup lost time is defined as the sum of the differences in time between each of the first five vehicle headways and the saturation headway.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The methodology for this research study involved observations of six field locations in three states, which yielded a robust dataset of observations of visibly distracted and undistracted drivers. The following sections will detail the steps of the research methodology.

### **Site Selection**



The experimental sites in each state were chosen by the research team due to their operational characteristics of the intersections matching the stated goals of the study. The requirements for the selection of an intersection were at least one dual left turn lane and demand that resulted in queuing (queues of four to five vehicles could accumulate before the left turn arrow was activated). Another requirement was that video data could be collected in an inconspicuous manner, so that the presence of the researcher would not adversely impact the behavior of approaching drivers. An equal number of sites were selected from each state to increase the potential diversity of driver behavior as well as intersection configuration. The following signalized intersections and approaches were selected for inclusion in the study:

- Lawrence, Kansas (655 observations)
  - Iowa Street at 31st Street (SB and EB)
  - Iowa Street at West 23rd Street / Clinton Parkway (SB)
- Corvallis, Oregon (1320 observations)
  - NW Harrison Boulevard at Hwy 34 (WB)
  - NW Circle Boulevard at Hwy 99W (NB)
- Logan, Utah (1751 observations)
  - 1400 N at Main Street (NB, SB, EB, and WB)
  - 400 N at Main Street (NB, and SB)

Figure 1 provides design drawings of the geometric configurations for the six study intersections. For several instances multiple approaches were observed at the same intersection. While the study intersections span 11 approaches at six intersections in three states, all of the study sites were located in relatively smaller communities in close proximity to large public

universities. As such, it is recommended that for future studies the results of this study should be calibrated to local conditions before broad generalizations of driver behavior are proposed.

### **Video Data Collection**

Data collection occurred on prevalingly good weather days, during daylight and under dry pavement conditions. Data were collected on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays to replicate typical weekday travel conditions and driver behavior. Effort by the research team was made to observe the locations during periods of time where queuing was more likely to occur as a means of increasing the sample per unit of observed time.

All field data were recorded by high definition video cameras to aid in clearly determining: distracted driver behaviors inside the vehicle compartment, to identify exactly when the left arrows were activated and when the front axle of vehicles crossed the approach stop line. Researchers in the field carefully positioned the camera equipment such that it would not be detected by the left turning vehicles that were being observed.

While the video data collection provided a mechanism to observe drivers directly without influencing their behavior, it also posed a limitation for identifying certain types of distractions. Distractions could only be identified if they could be detected through visual inspection (e.g. talking on a hand held cell phone). It was likely that some distractions were present but could not be detected through visual inspection of the video data (e.g. from listening to music).

### **Video Data Reduction**

Video data were reduced by researchers on large high-definition LCD monitors at Oregon State University. To ensure consistency among researchers reducing the data, a single transcription template was developed with detailed instructions as to how the data was to be extracted and organized from the video. Observer reliability was maintained by requiring at least

two research assistants transcribing an identical five minutes from every 60 minutes of transcribed video. If inconsistencies were detected, the entire hour was cross-checked until the observations of both researchers were in agreement.

Data were collected on every left turning vehicle and driver in the inside and outside left turn lane of the intersection approach during the observation period. Time stamp data for the activation of the green arrow and the time the front axle crossed the stop line were recorded at a rate of 60 frames per second. The recorded data for individual vehicles and drivers including the travel lane (inside or outside), position in the queue (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, etc.), vehicle classification (heavy vehicle, bus, truck, passenger car, motorcycle or bicycle), driver gender (male or female), and type of distraction (cell phone, eating/smoking, talking to passengers, other, undistracted, or could not determine). The distraction type was recorded if it transpired within 5 seconds of the onset of the green indication.

An important aspect of the transcription methodology was the process by which vehicle headways were determined. To accurately determine this value (time difference between the front axle of two successive vehicles to cross the same point), it was required that times be rounded to the nearest 0.01 second (by video time stamp). Figure 2 displays two images of a vehicle observed in Oregon as it was reduced. As shown in Figure 2, the left panel shows a light pickup in the outside left turn lane, in the first position of a queue at the instant the left turn green arrow was activated. The right panel shows the same pick-up at the moment the front axle crossed the stop line. The headway for the first vehicle was calculated as the difference between the activation of the green arrow and the time its front axle crossed the stop line. The headway for each subsequent vehicle was defined as the difference in time between the front axles of two sequential vehicles crossing the stop line.

Table 1 shows the breakdown of video hours collected at each observed intersection approach and the resulting numbers of distracted and undistracted drivers. As shown in Table 1, a total of 33 hours of video, representing 704 cycles were collected in the field. No less than 10 hours were collected in each state resulting in a total sample of 4,935 drivers. Additional analyses of this data set are described in the following section.

## **RESULTS AND ANALYSIS**

A further analysis was performed on the data to test the aforementioned hypotheses. The process began by aggregating the data from the three states together, and verifying observer reliability was maintained during the data reduction process. Due to the described video reduction technique, driver distraction could not be adequately classified by the research team for 365 observations. Therefore, the usable sample of vehicles was reduced to 4,570 which included 844 distracted drivers and 3,726 undistracted drivers. It was critical to initially examine the types of distracted driving behaviors captured in this study before the impacts of those behaviors on traffic stream parameters such as headway and start-up lost time could be illustrated.

### **Driver Distractions**

Proportions of distracted driving were captured and categorized. Figure 3 shows information regarding the overall proportion of distracted driving as well as the breakdown of distracted driving types on a per state basis. The distracted driving types identified in this effort were eating/smoking, talking to passengers, cell phones use, dashboard activities, and other.

As shown in Figure 3, the distracted driving proportions were determined to be 23.7 percent, 11.8 percent and 20.9 percent in Kansas, Oregon and Utah respectively. The proportion of distracted driving in Oregon was approximately half the proportion observed in Kansas and

Utah. It should be noted that Oregon requires hands-free usage of cell phones while Kansas and Utah only have laws banning drivers from texting while driving. The result of a test for equality of proportions, utilizing Pearson's chi-squared test statistic, showed that there were statistically significant differences between the proportions of distracted drivers between Oregon and Utah, and between Kansas and Oregon ( $P < 0.05$ ), but no significant differences were found between the proportions of distracted drivers in Kansas and Utah ( $P = 0.30$ ). The most common occurrence of distracted driving observed in this study was related to talking with a passenger in the vehicle, while the least prevalent distraction was associated with dashboard distractions. A series of Chi-squared tests determined that all three distributions of distracted driving types were statistically different from one another ( $P < 0.05$ ).

### Headways

The second research question asked if there was a statistically significant difference between the mean headways of distracted and undistracted drivers for each of the first five vehicles in a standing queue entering an intersection at the onset of a protected green left turn arrow. To address this research question, linear regression methods were used. Each state was assigned a dummy variable, “distracted” or “not distracted,” and the position in the queue. These variables were used in regression models as predictors for the headway, the dependent variable. An undistracted driver, in Oregon, in the 1<sup>st</sup> queue position was used as the reference level resulting in the following full model:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mean } h = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \text{Utah Dummy} + \beta_2 * \text{Kansas Dummy} + \beta_3 * \text{Distracted Dummy} \\ & + \beta_4 * \text{Pos2 Dummy} + \beta_5 * \text{Pos3 Dummy} + \beta_6 * \text{Pos4 Dummy} + \beta_7 * \text{Pos5 Dummy} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

This model was compared to a reduced model with no terms for queue position:

$$\text{mean } h = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \text{Utah Dummy} + \beta_2 * \text{Kansas Dummy} + \beta_3 * \text{Distracted Dummy} \quad (3)$$

The comparison was performed using an F-test, where null hypothesis is that  $\beta_4 = \beta_5 = \beta_6 = \beta_7 = 0$ . This test showed overwhelming evidence to reject this hypothesis (P-value < 0.05) meaning that the full model described in Equation 2 better explains the variance in mean headway. Table 2 shows the values of the regression coefficients from the preferred full model. In all cases the lane position is significant (P-value < 0.05) effecting the expected mean value of headway (when compared to the headway of a vehicle in position 1) by 0.11 seconds to -0.57 seconds.

The decision to include the impact of location (Kansas, Oregon, and Utah) in the previous models (2) & (3) was made based on the fact that the proportion test showed a difference in the proportions of distracted drivers in the different states. To confirm this assumption a reduced model was created with no terms for state:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mean } h = & \beta_0 + \beta_3 * \text{Distracted Dummy} + \beta_4 * \text{Pos2 Dummy} + \beta_5 * \text{Pos3 Dummy} \\ & + \beta_6 * \text{Pos4 Dummy} + \beta_7 * \text{Pos5 Dummy} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

This model was compared to the full model using an F-test, (null hypothesis is that  $\beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$ ). This test showed strong evidence to reject this hypothesis (P-value < 0.05) showing that the full model (2) with state better explains the variance in mean headway.

To examine the effect of individual distraction types, the full model (2) was expanded to include dummies for each of the distraction types:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mean } h = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \text{Utah Dummy} + \beta_2 * \text{Kansas Dummy} + \beta_3 * \text{Pos2 Dummy} \\ & + \beta_4 * \text{Pos3 Dummy} + \beta_5 * \text{Pos4 Dummy} + \beta_6 * \text{Pos5 Dummy} \\ & + \beta_7 * \text{Cell Phone Dummy} + \beta_8 * \text{Eating or Smoking Dummy} + \beta_9 * \text{Talking Dummy} \\ & + \beta_{10} * \text{Dashboard Dummy} + \beta_{11} * \text{Other Dummy} + \beta_{12} * \text{Combination Dummy} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Table 3 shows the values of the regression coefficients from this model. Every distraction in this model had a significant increase on mean headway except the eating or smoking variable. The value of this increase varied from 0.16 seconds to 0.65 seconds.

### **Start-Up Lost Time**

The startup lost times were examined on a per state basis so that geographic differences might be more readily examined. Equation 1 provides the standard practice for calculating a start-up lost time ( $l_1$ ). The application of Equation 1 requires the determination of saturation headway ( $h$ ). For this study,  $h$  was determined by calculating descriptive statistics for headways 6 through 12, factoring out any headway outside of a single standard deviation from the mean headway and then calculating the new average headway. The saturation headways were calculated per approach, however the values were so similar within a single state that only a single value was used. The resulting value for the saturation headway was 1.92 seconds in Kansas, 2.09 seconds in Oregon, and 2.12 seconds in Utah. These values were used in the calculation of the actual startup lost times presented in Figure 4.

Figure 4 shows a box plot of empirical data for the start-up lost times determined from standing, five vehicle queues containing anywhere from one to four distracted drivers. The condition of zero percent distracted driving represents a measure for the startup lost time without any distracted drivers in the queue at the onset of the green arrow. The condition of 80 percent distracted driving represents the startup lost time if four of the five vehicles in the standing queue were distracted. Table 4 supplements the start-up lost time data in Figure 4 with sample sizes, means and standard deviations. The mean start-up lost times for queues with zero, one, or two distracted drivers are based upon reasonable sample sizes. It is important to note that only actual

queues with these levels of distraction were used, significantly reducing the number of observations, but providing confidence in the measures reported.

Increases in the percentage of distracted driving for vehicles in a standing queue in a dual left turn lane resulted in varying increases in the corresponding start-up lost time. Through a visual inspection of the data, it appears that as the percentage of distracted drivers in the queue increases, so does the mean of the corresponding start-up lost times; however the spread of the data is less consistent.

To verify this observation, a family-wise comparison from an ANOVA analysis with the Tukey Kramer honest significant difference was conducted between each level of distraction (*zero, one, two, three, or four distracted drivers*). No queues with five distracted vehicle were observed during this study. The results of these statistical tests are located in Table 5, which gives the P-values for each test.

The statistical tests provided partial evidence to support the notion that increased proportions of distracted driving result in an increased mean and variance of the observed start-up lost times. Statistically significant increases were observed at 95% confidence in the mean startup lost times of *zero distracted drivers* and *two distracted drivers* ( $P = 0.001$ ). Also, a suggestive result was indicated between *two distracted drivers* and *one distracted driver* ( $P = 0.0616$ ). Additionally, statistically significant increases in variance were observed between *zero distracted drivers* and *two distracted driver* ( $P < 0.001$ ), *one distracted driver* and *two distracted driver* ( $P < 0.001$ ), *two distracted drivers* and *three distracted driver* ( $P = 0.031$ ), and *two distracted drivers* and *four distracted driver* ( $P = 0.018$ ).

### **Study Limitations**



The results of this research study should be considered with the following four caveats in mind: 1) while the sample size of drivers observed is large enough to draw statistical significance, all of the observations took place in three relatively small towns near large public universities, 2) while the data were collected such that drivers were unaware they were being observed, the research team could only detect distractions with a strong visual component (e.g. a person holding and talking on a cell phone), 3) In some instances distractions could not be adequately classified due to the presence of window glare or the occasional occlusion of vehicles in the outside lane by vehicles in the inside lane, and 4) the conclusions should not be extrapolated to other movements (e.g. single exclusive left turn bays or left turns from a shared lane). As such, results should not be directly extrapolated to the entire population of drivers without an additional calibration process to local conditions since it is likely that all forms of distracted driving were identified in the study sample.

## **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

This research effort sought to determine if the presence of distracted driving in the standing queue of left turning vehicles at the onset of the green arrow in dual left turn lanes negatively impacts the headways and associated start-up lost times. Through careful data collection and reduction a sample of 844 distracted drivers and 3,726 undistracted drivers were observed in Kansas, Oregon, and Utah. Meaningful differences were identified, relating to the types and amounts of distracted driving observed in each state, as well as differences between the headways and start-up lost times of distracted and undistracted drivers. Several findings were produced, and are described here:

### **Driver Distraction**

The proportion of observed distracted drivers differed between the three states in which data were collected. Drivers in Kansas and Utah were nearly twice as likely to be distracted compared to drivers in Oregon. The proportion of drivers observed in each of the five distraction categories differed between the three states in which data were collected. In particular, cell phone distractions were observed more frequently in Utah than Kansas or Oregon. Specifically, cell phone use in Utah was observed approximately eight times more frequently than in Oregon and two times more frequently than in Kansas. The most commonly observed driver distraction type across all three states was talking to a passenger.

### **Headways:**

- Regression analysis found that distraction and queue position were both significant variables in predicting mean headway.
- It was estimated that a distracted driver's headway was 0.385 seconds greater than an undistracted driver's.

### **Start-up Lost Time:**

- The saturation headway for vehicles in a dual left turn lane was determined to be 1.92 seconds in Kansas, 2.09 seconds in Oregon, and 2.12 seconds in Utah.
- Increases in the number of distracted drivers in the first five vehicles of a standing queue in a dual left turn lane result in an increase in the mean (up to 1.06 seconds) and standard deviation (up to 1.01 seconds) of empirically observed start-up lost times for 5 vehicle queues.

These data and the associated analysis should help to inform the current debate revolving around the exclusion of in-vehicle distractions. Current research supports the notion that the minimization or elimination of distractions will lead to fewer crashes. The potential

improvement in the operational capacity at signalized intersections has been largely ignored. These data also contribute to the notion that we may need to consider regional calibration factors for the modeling of intersection capacity dependent on proportions of distracted driving.

## REFERENCES

- Chang, G.L, Chen, C.Y. & Perez, C. (1996). Hybrid model for estimating permitted left-turn saturation flow rate. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 1556 54-63.
- Consiglio, W., Driscoll, P., Witte, M. & Berg, W.P. (2003). Effect of cellular telephone conversations and other potential interference on reaction time in a braking response. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 35(4) 495- 500.
- Dewar, R., and Olson, P. (2007). *Human Factors in Traffic Safety*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., Lawyers & Judges Publishing Company Inc., Tucson, AZ.
- Drews, F.A., Yazdani, H., Godfrey, C.N., Cooper, J.M., & Strayer, D.L. (2009). Text messaging during simulated driving. *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 51, 762-770.
- Edwards, M. AAA. (2001). Driver distraction and safety: Implications for telematic devices [White paper].
- Glaze, A.L. & Ellis, J.M. (2003). Pilot study of distracted drivers. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University Centre for Public Policy.
- Highway Safety Manual, 1<sup>st</sup> Ed., Vol. 1, (2010). AASHTO, Washington D.C.
- Horrey, W.J., & Lesch, M.F. (2009). Driver-initiated distractions: Examining strategic adaptation for in-vehicle task initiation. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 41(1), 115-122.
- Klauer S.G., Dingus T.A., Neale V.L., Sudweeks, J.D., and Ramsey, D.J. Washington: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2006). The impact of driver inattention on near-crash/crash risk: An analysis using the 100 car naturalistic driving study data. DOT HS 810 594.
- Mannering, F., Washburn, S., Kilareski, W. (2009). *Principles of Highway Engineering and Traffic Analysis*, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed., Wiley, New York.
- Maze, T.H., Henderson, J.L. & Sankar, R. (2004). Impacts of safety on left-turn treatment at high speed signalized intersections. Project HR-347, Iowa Highway Research Board.
- McEvoy, S., Stevenson, M.R., McCartt, A.T., Woodward, M., Haworth, C., Palamara, P., & Cercarelli, R. (2005). Role of mobile phones in motor vehicle crashes resulting in hospital attendance: A case-crossover study.
- National Safety Council. (2010). Understanding the distracted brain: Why driving while using hands-free cell phones is risky behavior [White paper].

Oh, J., Kim E., Kim, M., & Choo, S. (2010). Development of conflict techniques for left-turn and cross-traffic at protected left-turn signalized intersections. *Safety Science*, 48(4), 460-468.

Regan, M.A., Lee, J.D., and Young, K.L. (2008). *Driver distraction: theory, effects and mitigation*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Regan, M. A. & Mitsopoulos, E. (2001) Understanding passenger influences on driver behavior: Implications for road safety and recommendations for countermeasure development. Report No. 180. Melbourne, Australia: Monash University Accident Research Centre.

Strayer, D.L., Drews, F.A., & Johnston, W.A. (2003). Cell phone-induced failures of visual attention during simulated driving. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 9(1), 23-32.

## **FIGURE CAPTION LIST**

**Fig. 1.** Geometric configurations of observed intersections

**Fig. 2.** Vehicle in outside left turn lane at onset of the left turn green arrow (left panel), and as vehicle entered the intersection (right panel)

**Fig. 3.** Proportions of distracted driving types in Kansas, Oregon, and Utah

**Fig. 4.** Start-up lost time for five-vehicle queues in all states

## **TABLE CAPTION LIST**

**Table 1.** Observed Left Turn Vehicle Sample

**Table 2.** Driver Headway Regression

**Table 3.** Driver Headways Analysis Regression by Distraction Type

**Table 4.** Descriptive Statistics for Figure 4

**Table 5.** Family-wise Comparisons of the Mean Value of Startup Lost Time by Number of Distracted Drivers in the Queue

**Table 1.** Observed Left Turn Vehicle Sample

<b>City, State</b>	<b>Intersection</b>	<b>Approach</b>	<b>Video (Hrs)</b>	<b>Distracted Drivers</b>	<b>Undistracted Drivers</b>	<b>Unable to Determine</b>
Corvallis, Oregon	Circle Blvd at 99W	(WB)	5	84	519	112
	Harrison Blvd at 34	(NB)	7	93	801	43
Logan, Utah	400 N at Main	(NB)	1.5	24	110	16
		(SB)	1.5	159	361	0
	1400 N at Main	(NB)	2	48	312	106
		(SB)	2	96	512	0
		(EB)	2	63	264	2
		(WB)	2	74	192	0
Lawrence, Kansas	Iowa at W 23rd St	(SB)	5	87	279	20
	Iowa at 31st St	(SB)	2	51	249	51
		(EB)	3	65	127	15
<b>TOTAL:</b>			<b>33</b>	<b>844</b>	<b>3726</b>	<b>365</b>

**Table 2. Driver Headway Regression**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Coefficient Estimate</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>t Value</b>	<b>P-Value</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Intercept	2.863	0.039	73.319	<<0.001	<b>Yes</b>
Kansas	-0.157	0.049	-3.200	0.001	<b>Yes</b>
Utah	-0.038	0.041	-0.942	0.346	No
Distracted	0.385	0.045	8.474	<<0.001	<b>Yes</b>
Position 2	0.110	0.045	2.444	0.015	<b>Yes</b>
Position 3	-0.177	0.051	-3.450	<<0.001	<b>Yes</b>
Position 4	-0.440	0.060	-7.398	<<0.001	<b>Yes</b>
Position 5	-0.577	0.071	-8.156	<<0.001	<b>Yes</b>

\* Significance was defined as a confidence of 95 percent or greater (P-value < 0.05)



**Table 3. Driver Headways Regression by Distraction Type**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Coefficient Estimate</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>t Value</b>	<b>P-Value</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Intercept	2.858	0.039	73.319	<<0.001	<b>Yes</b>
Kansas	-0.159	0.049	-3.231	0.001	<b>Yes</b>
Utah	-0.035	0.041	-0.857	0.391	No
Cell Phone	0.163	0.078	2.086	0.037	<b>Yes</b>
Eating/Smoking	0.165	0.142	1.158	0.246	No
Talking	0.527	0.066	7.924	<<0.001	<b>Yes</b>
Dashboard	0.378	0.163	2.315	0.021	<b>Yes</b>
Other	0.533	0.109	4.889	<<0.001	<b>Yes</b>
Combination	0.655	0.333	1.969	0.048	<b>Yes</b>
Position 2	0.112	0.045	2.491	0.013	<b>Yes</b>
Position 3	-0.170	0.051	-3.315	<0.001	<b>Yes</b>
Position 4	-0.431	0.059	-7.243	<<0.001	<b>Yes</b>
Position 5	-0.570	0.071	-8.069	<<0.001	<b>Yes</b>

\*Significance was defined as a confidence of 95 percent or greater (P-value < 0.05)

**Table 4.** Descriptive Statistics for Figure 4

<b>Number of Vehicles</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Sample Size</b>	110	101	45	15	4
<b>Mean (sec.)</b>	2.16	2.48	3.22	2.58	2.86
<b>Standard Deviation (sec.)</b>	1.39	1.27	2.40	1.39	0.45

**Table 5.** Family-wise Comparisons of the Mean Value of Startup Lost Time by Number of  
 Distracted Drivers in the Queue

Comparison of Distracted Driving	Family Wise Comparisons using Tukey Kramer Honest Significant Difference		
	Estimated Difference	Adj. P-Value	Sig* Diff
<b>0 distracted vs. 1 distracted</b>	-0.317	0.576	No
<b>0 distracted vs. 2 distracted</b>	1.061	0.001	<b>Yes</b>
<b>0 distracted vs. 3 distracted</b>	-0.418	0.866	No
<b>0 distracted vs. 4 distracted</b>	-0.702	0.902	No
<b>1 distracted vs. 2 distracted</b>	0.744	0.062	<b>No/Suggestive</b>
<b>1 distracted vs. 3 distracted</b>	-0.100	0.999	No
<b>1 distracted vs. 4 distracted</b>	-0.385	0.989	No
<b>2 distracted vs. 3 distracted</b>	0.644	0.636	No
<b>2 distracted vs. 4 distracted</b>	0.359	0.992	No
<b>3 distracted vs. 4 distracted</b>	-0.285	0.998	No

\*Significance was defined as a confidence of 95 percent or greater (P-value < 0.05)







Fig. 1. Geometric Configurations of Observed Intersections



**Fig. 2.** Vehicle in outside left-turn lane at onset of the left-turn green arrow (left panel), and as vehicle entered the intersection (right panel)



**Fig. 3.** Proportions of distracted driving types in Kansas, Oregon, and Utah



**Fig. 4.** Start-up lost time for 5 vehicle queues in all states