### Portland State University

# **PDXScholar**

Civil and Environmental Engineering Faculty Publications and Presentations

**Civil and Environmental Engineering** 

2020

# An Empirical Study of the Impacts of Bicycles on Passenger Car Speeds on Urban Roads without Bicycle Lanes

Jaclyn S. Schaefer Portland State University, jsschae@pdx.edu

Miguel Figliozzi Portland State University, figliozzi@pdx.edu

Avinash Unnikrishnan Portland State University, uavinash@pdx.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cengin\_fac

Part of the Transportation Engineering Commons Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

#### **Citation Details**

Schaefer, Jaclyn S.; Figliozzi, Miguel; and Unnikrishnan, Avinash, "An Empirical Study of the Impacts of Bicycles on Passenger Car Speeds on Urban Roads without Bicycle Lanes" (2020). *Civil and Environmental Engineering Faculty Publications and Presentations*. 575. https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cengin\_fac/575

This Pre-Print is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Civil and Environmental Engineering Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

1	An Empirical Study of the Impacts of Bicycles on Passenger Car Speeds on Urban Roads								
2	without Bicycle Lanes								
3	·								
4	Jaclyn S. Schaefer								
5	Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering								
6	Portland State University, Portland, OR, 97201								
7	Email: jsschae@pdx.edu								
8									
9	Miguel A. Figliozzi (corresponding author)								
10	Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering								
11	Portland State University, Portland, OR, 97201								
12	Email: figliozzi@pdx.edu								
13									
14	Avinash Unnikrishnan, Ph.D.								
15	Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering								
17 17	Portland State University, Portland, OR 97201								
17 18	Eman: uavinasn@pux.edu								
19									
20	Word Count: 7,041 words + 1 table (250 words per table) = 7,291 words								
21									
22 22	Manuscript Number: TPRAM 21 01820								
25 24	Munuscript Number. IRDAM-21-01850								
24 25	Original Submission: 31 July 2020								
25	Priginal Submission: 31 Suly 2020 Revision Submission: 30 November 2020								
20 27	Revision Submission. 50 Wovember 2020								
27 28									
20	Panar acconted for presentation at the 2021 TPR Annual Meeting (January 2021								
29	Washington DC) and notantial publication in Transportation Descarab Decord								
20 21	washington DC) and potential publication in Transportation Research Record.								
27 21									
52									

### 1 ABSTRACT

- 2 Higher bicycle mode share has been suggested as part of a solution to reduce the burden of congestion in
- 3 urban areas. As strategies to promote bicycling are implemented, concerns have been raised by some road
- 4 users and stakeholders citing simulation based traffic studies that indicate that an increase in the bicycle
- 5 mode share generates major travel time delays via reduced vehicle speeds unless bicycle lanes are
- 6 provided. The current research investigates the effects bicycles may have on motorized vehicle speeds on
- 7 a variety of lower speed and volume urban roads without bicycle lanes. A detailed comparative analysis
- 8 of passenger car speeds was performed using two vehicle scenarios: (i) a passenger car that was preceded
- 9 by a bicycle, and (ii) a passenger car that was preceded by another passenger car. The mean and 85<sup>th</sup>
- 10 percentile speeds of scenarios (i) and (ii) were analyzed using *t*-tests. Relationships between speed and
- 11 gap times with oncoming (opposite direction) traffic were also investigated. The results indicate that at
- 12 most sites (92%), bicycles do not reduce passenger car mean speeds by more than 1 mph. Speed
- 13 reductions are not generally observed in local streets or facilities with adequate number of gaps in
- 14 oncoming traffic for overtaking.

15

16 Keywords: Urban, shared, local, collector, vehicle speed, bicycle speed, mixed-traffic, overtaking

### 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Over 76% of workers in the U.S. commute by single-occupancy vehicles [1]. Combined with 3 rising populations and increasing urbanization, traffic congestion and travel time delay are perpetually 4 growing problems in many cities. In response, solutions, such as encouraging cycling, are being sought to help reduce the use of single-occupancy vehicles. Cycling is typically regarded as a healthy and 5 environmentally friendly form of transportation. Proponents tout its potential role in reducing greenhouse 6 7 gas emissions, in addition to mitigating traffic congestion. As such, initiatives to promote cycling for transportation have been pushed by cities and cycling advocates in recent years to increase the bicycle 8 9 mode share.

Across the U.S., bicycling is a highly underutilized mode of transportation, with less than 1% of the commute mode share, on average [1]. Even in cities such as Portland, Oregon, where 6.3% of workers commuted by bicycle in 2017 [2], there is a huge opportunity to increase bicycle ridership. Portland is renowned throughout the U.S. for its cycling culture. The City continues to push forward projects to build a safe and well-connected network of bicycle facilities in hopes of reaching a 25% bicycle mode share by the year 2030 [3]. As of 2019, there were 385 miles of bikeways in Portland. Shared roads are an integral component of this network, constituting 27% of the bikeway miles [2].

While it is generally preferred to segregate motor vehicles and bicycles by providing designated
lanes, creating a separate infrastructure on every road is infeasible and often unnecessary. For example,
roadways with speed limits less than approximately 35 km/h (22 mph) and ADT less than approximately
2,500 vehicles are candidates for mixed-traffic conditions according to Danish bikeway design guidance
[4].

22 Implementing shared-use facilities can be an economical solution to a growing need for bikeways. The differing performance capabilities of motor vehicles and bicycles, and the vulnerable 23 nature of cyclists, creates challenges regarding safety and mobility when roadway space is shared, 24 25 however. There is a growing body of research related to vehicle-bicycle interactions. Many of these 26 studies focus on lateral positioning and passing behavior, but there has been little empirical research 27 concerning the effects bicycles might have on motor vehicle speed or travel time. As cities like Portland 28 experience a mode shift toward bicycling, it is necessary to study the impacts these changes may have on 29 the existing transportation network and motorized vehicles.

One particular concern of some motorists is that unless bicycle lanes are implemented, bicycles
 will slow down motor vehicles. Motorists may interpret such speed reductions as confining their
 movement, leading to feelings of stress and the perception of congestion. Although a complex

relationship exists between travel time and travel speed in urban areas [5-6], research involving a

34 simulated traffic study has prompted discussions that warn of travel time delays as the bicycle mode share

35 increases if bicycle lanes are not installed [7-8]. Empirical evidence of this claim is lacking, however.

Previous work by Schaefer et al. [9] has suggested that the presence of bicycles on low volume, low speed

urban roads without bicycle lanes does not meaningfully reduce passenger car speeds at most sites that
meet bikeway design guidelines for mixed-traffic roadways. However, this study [9] was limited to six

25-mph, rather homogeneous sites. Statistically significant differences in mean speed of more than 1 mph
were only found at one site where speeds and traffic volumes exceeded those in the bikeway guidance for
shared roads, and at another site with a significant grade. These results provided the motivation for a more
extensive study utilizing a more diverse set of data collection locations.

This study significantly extends the previous study [9] by incorporating a large number of study sites (40 locations and 75 directional speed datasets) and presenting more diversity with respect to traffic volumes, posted speed limit (PSL), roadway markings, functional classification, and grade. In addition, this study considers the potential effects of oncoming (opposite direction) traffic on motorists'

47 opportunities to overtake a cyclist. The results of this research are more widely applicable and may help 48 mide decisions regarding the implementation of shared bikeways

48 guide decisions regarding the implementation of shared bikeways.

#### **1 LITERATURE REVIEW**

2 Shared roads or roads without bicycle lanes may contribute to a substantial portion of an urban 3 bikeway network in some cities. World leaders in bicycling culture, the Danish have developed guidelines 4 for when shared or mixed-traffic roads may be appropriate. The Cycling Embassy of Denmark suggests 5 motor vehicle speeds should be less than 35 km/h (22 mph), and traffic volumes should be low (less than approximately 2,500 ADT) for mixed-traffic roadways [4]. Similar guidelines are set forth by the FHWA, 6 7 indicating shared facilities may be acceptable for urban roads with speeds less than 25 mph and volumes less than 3,000 ADT [10]. The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) advises a 8 9 somewhat lower maximum motor vehicle volume of only 1,500 vehicles per day [11], but agrees with the 10 Danish and FHWA range of maximum speeds for shared roads.

As cities continue to encourage bicycling as a primary mode of transportation, the need for additional research regarding the impact of bicycles on traffic operations is highlighted, especially in mixed-traffic contexts. In particular, there appear to be relatively few studies in the traffic literature on the impact of vehicle-bicycle interactions on travel speed or delay.

Most existent studies on vehicle-bicycle interactions have focused on rider position in the roadway, lateral clearance when overtaking, or how these factors may influence safety. For example, research has been conducted on the effects of a cyclist's helmet usage, clothing, and apparent gender on overtaking proximity [12-13]. Other studies have concluded that the presence of shared lane markings (also known as sharrows) encourages cyclists to ride in a more central lane position, which may improve their visibility [14-15].

Lane position also affects the type of interference bicycles may impose on motor vehicles. A cyclist riding to the right of a wide lane may impose little friction interference to a passing motor vehicle, which may not need to reduce travel speed significantly if there is room to overtake safely. When a cyclist occupies a more substantial portion of the lane, at the center or left, block interference is more likely to occur, forcing the motorist to reduce their speed and wait for an opportunity to overtake [16].

When block interference occurs on a two-lane road, and a motorist desires to overtake, they must find an appropriate gap in oncoming (opposite direction) traffic. The decision to initiate a passing maneuver is guided by the required passing sight distance (PSD), which is a function of the speeds and lengths of the bicycle and motor vehicle, the headways between the bicycle and the motor vehicle before and after overtaking, a minimum clearance interval with oncoming traffic, and the overtaking motorist's perception-reaction time [17].

32 The effects of block interference were demonstrated in a study using empirical data from three 33 urban road sections in Beijing, China [16]. Researchers found that as bicycle lane widths decreased or bicycle volumes increased, block interference was more likely to occur due to bicycles spilling into the 34 35 motor vehicle lane, offering insufficient width for motor vehicles to pass. When no interference occurred, 36 mean motor vehicle speeds ranged from 35.15 km/h to 41.56 km/h (21.84 mph to 25.82 mph). Mean speeds were reduced by 17-21% under friction interference conditions. Under block interference, mean 37 speeds were reduced by 29-37%. The lane widths were stated to be 3.7 m (12 ft.), but the PSL or the 38 roadway volume was not indicated. 39

40 When empirical data is unavailable, simulations have been used to model vehicle-bicycle 41 interactions. Oketch [18] designed a model to simulate heterogeneous traffic behavior on a two-lane road with three-meter (10 ft.) lane widths. Model parameters included an average desired speed of 80 km/h (50 42 mph) and a flow of 1,000 vehicles per hour to simulate a typical urban arterial road. Compared to a 43 homogeneous traffic stream of private cars, a simulation including 25% bicycles and 75% private cars 44 showed a 36% decrease in capacity. A reduction in the mean free-flow speed was cited as the cause of the 45 decreased capacity. Note, however, that the model parameter values set for speed and traffic volume in 46 47 this simulation are well outside of the mentioned bicycle design recommendations for mixed-traffic 48 roadwavs.

Gosse and Clarens [8] also used simulations to quantify the effects of bicycles on travel time for a
 two-lane urban road. The simulations were based on a motor vehicle speed of 37.4 mph and used different
 combinations of values for motor vehicle lane widths, grades, and bicycle mode share percentages. The

1 researchers concluded travel time delay costs were incurred when the bicycle mode share reached 10% as

a result of a 'stuck vehicle condition,' whereby shared travel lanes did not offer sufficient width for heavy
vehicles to pass safely. A positive 4% grade magnified the effect of the stuck vehicle condition.

4 Alternatively, when adequate space was provided for larger vehicles to pass, travel time delay costs were

5 reduced with a 10% bicycle mode share. These simulation studies can be useful, but the parameters used

to model the roadway or driver-cyclist interactions do not capture the full spectrum of real-world
 situations.

8 9

## DATA COLLECTION

10 Traffic speed data collected from 2015 through 2019, obtained from the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT), was used to study the effects of bicycles may have on passenger car speeds on 11 roads without bicycle lanes. PBOT regularly performs traffic data collection throughout the city using 12 pneumatic tubes configured to measure speed and classify vehicles according to a modified FHWA 13 Scheme F [18]. Under the modified classification scheme, bicycles are considered class one vehicles, and 14 15 passenger cars are considered class two. Pneumatic tubes are commonly used to perform short-term 16 traffic counts. The accuracy of pneumatic tubes to count and record speeds of bicycles was investigated 17 by Nordback et al. [20]. The researchers found that the JAMAR brand tubes performed better than two other brands of classification counters tested and that manually computed bicycle speeds were in 18 agreeance with those reported by the JAMAR model. PBOT has been using these JAMAR brand tube 19 20 counters for many years, and crews are skilled in the set-up and placement of these tubes to collect data for both motorized vehicles and bicycles. The data collection equipment records individual vehicles with 21 an associated timestamp, accurate to the second, and speed in 1-mph increments. Bidirectional speed data 22 23 were collected at 40 locations for a minimum of one full day. In some cases, only one direction of traffic was analyzed due to the number of observations required. This resulted in 75 datasets available for 24 25 analysis.

All sites were located along two-way, two-lane urban roads without bicycle lanes in Portland. Sites were chosen to represent a variety of roadway characteristics. Considerations were made for roadway functional class, centerline marking, ADT, PSL, and grade. Local and urban collector roads were represented (with 39 and 36 datasets, respectively), and class two ADT ranged from fewer than 200 up to approximately 4,700 vehicles per day. Parallel parking was permitted at all locations. Road widths ranged from 34 ft. to 40 ft.

32 Dashed yellow center lines were present in 12 datasets, and double yellow center lines were 33 present in two datasets. The remaining 61 datasets did not have a continuous center lane marking, but double yellow lines were present within approximately 40 ft. of traffic control devices. Sharrows (shared 34 lane markings) were also present along these streets. These datasets were collected from roadways 35 36 designated as neighborhood greenways – roads with relatively low motorized traffic volumes and speeds, typically meeting the recommendations for mixed-traffic roads. Traffic calming, such as speed humps and 37 38 mini traffic circles, are usually present along neighborhood greenways to deter speeding and cut-through traffic. Bicycles often comprise a significantly greater portion of the total traffic than the citywide average 39 40 on these roads. The mean class one percentage for the 61 neighborhood greenway datasets was 43%, 41 compared to an average of 3% for the remaining datasets.

Grades were estimated from a ten-foot interval contour map [21] and ranged between -5% and 5%. Two of the datasets had a speed limit of 30 mph, 39 datasets had a 25-mph speed limit, and 34 datasets had a 20-mph speed limit. **Figures 1** – **3** provide representative street views of a neighborhood greenway local road, an urban collector with a dotted yellow centerline, and an urban collector with a double yellow centerline, respectively.



Figure 1 Neighborhood greenway local street without a centerline. SE Lincoln east of 48<sup>th</sup>, eastbound (left) and westbound (right) [22].



Figure 2 Urban collector with dotted yellow centerline. NE Fremont east of 46<sup>th</sup>, eastbound (left)

and westbound (right) [23].



# Figure 3 Urban collector with double yellow centerline. SE Division east of 33<sup>rd</sup>, eastbound (left) and westbound (right) [24].

Pneumatic tubes for data collection count axles and cannot directly differentiate between motorized class one vehicles such as motorcycles or e-bikes and pedal bicycles. Motorcycles make up a small percentage of traffic and account for less than 1% of vehicle miles traveled [25-26], and e-bikes still comprise a small fraction of bicycle sales in the U.S. [27-28]. Nonetheless, to prevent artificial inflation of bicycle speeds, histograms were utilized to filter out class one observations with speeds higher than would typically be expected of a pedal cyclist. Studies in the U.S. have reported average bicycle speeds ranging between 11 mph and 15.5 mph. Faster speeds were observed when traveling in bicycle lanes than on off-street paths [29-30]. It is also possible for more advanced cyclists and those riding on a downhill

1 grade to reach speeds up to 30 mph [31]. The class one speed histograms were examined in conjunction

2 with the estimated road grade to ensure only observations with speeds reasonable of pedal cyclists were

included. A typical example of a class one speed distribution presenting two modes, corresponding to
 lower speed bicycles and higher speed motorized class one vehicles is shown on the left of Figure 4. Note

that the mode on the right side of this histogram coincides with this location's PSL of 30 mph. After the

6 data cleaning, the mean class one speed was approximately equal to 15 mph. The histogram on the right

7 in **Figure 4** is from a location with a 25-mph PSL, at which class one traffic is dominated by bicycles.

8 The mean class one speed for this dataset was approximately 16 mph – slightly higher than the typical
9 range due to a 1% downhill grade.

10



11

Figure 4 Bimodal class one speed distribution indicating the presence of bicycles and motorized class one vehicles (left), and class one speed histogram from a location where bicycles are the

14 dominant class one vehicle type (right).

15

### 16 ANALYSIS

17 Upon encountering a slower-moving bicycle from the rear, a motorist may be forced to reduce their speed until an opportunity to overtake presents itself. If roadway or traffic conditions do not provide 18 sufficient opportunities for overtaking, delay may occur, and additional motor vehicles may begin to 19 queue behind the cyclist. Based on this premise, observations of passenger cars (class two vehicles) 20 belonging to one of two scenarios were selected from the data. The two scenarios are described as 21 22 follows: in scenario (i), a passenger car was preceded by a bicycle (class one vehicle), and in scenario (ii), 23 a passenger car was preceded by another passenger car. These data selections enable testing of the 24 hypothesis that bicycles cause reduced passenger car speeds on roads without bicycle lanes due to friction 25 or block interference.

The mean speeds of scenario (i) and scenario (ii) vehicles were compared using a two-sample t-26 27 test. The null hypothesis states that the difference between the mean speeds of scenario (ii) and scenario (i) is equal to 1 mph,  $H_0$ :  $\mu_{ii} - \mu_i = 1$ . The alternative hypothesis states that the mean speed of scenario (i) 28 29 is less than the mean speed of scenario (ii) by more than 1 mph,  $H_A$ :  $\mu_{ij} - \mu_j > 1$ . Note that a difference of 30 1 mph was chosen to match the sensitivity of the data collection equipment, which records speeds in integer values, and also to use a metric that provide results that are "practically significant" instead of just 31 32 "statistically significant" because a 1-mph difference is unlikely to be noticed by drivers. For p < 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. If  $p \ge 0.05$ , the sample data fail to reject the null hypothesis. 33

The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is frequently used as a performance metric and a baseline for determining appropriate speed limits [32]. For this reason, a modified *t*-test was performed with the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds of scenario (i) and scenario (ii) vehicles. Details of the test can be found in Hou et al. [33]. Similar to the hypothesis test of mean speeds, this null hypothesis states that the difference between the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds of scenario (ii) and scenario (i) is equal to 1 mph, H<sub>0</sub>:  $\zeta_{85, ii} - \zeta_{85, i} = 1$ . The 1 alternative hypothesis states that the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of scenario (i) is less than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile 2 speed of scenario (ii) by more than 1 mph, H<sub>A</sub>:  $\zeta_{85, ii} - \zeta_{85, i} > 1$ . Again, for p < 0.05, the null hypothesis is 3 rejected.

The availability of bidirectional data allowed for an investigation of how gaps in oncoming traffic may impact scenario (i) speeds. Henceforward, an "oncoming" vehicle travels in a direction that opposes the direction of travel of the bicycle. Under the assumption that a scenario (i) vehicle must occupy a portion of the oncoming lane to overtake a bicycle, opportunities for passing are dependent on the required passing sight distance (PSD), and subsequently, gaps with oncoming traffic. PSD can be calculated as the sum of four distances, described as follows:

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

- the distance the passing vehicle travels during a one-second perception-reaction time,
  - the distance traveled by the passing vehicle while occupying the oncoming (opposite direction of travel) lane,
    - the clearance distance between the passing and oncoming vehicle that creates a one-second gap, and,
- the distance traveled by the oncoming vehicle during two-thirds of the time the passing vehicle occupies the oncoming lane [17].

The required PSD can be used to calculate the gap time with an oncoming vehicle that is necessary to overtake safely – the safe passing gap. In this analysis, the safe passing gap was calculated assuming an overtaking vehicle length of 19 ft., a bicycle length of 6 ft., a one second gap between the overtaking vehicle and the bicycle before and after the maneuver, and an oncoming vehicle speed equal to the PSL. If the existent gap time between a scenario (i) vehicle that wishes to overtake and an oncoming vehicle is less than the safe passing gap, it is expected that a lower scenario (i) vehicle speed would result.

23 To determine if the presence of an oncoming vehicle may have suppressed a scenario (i) vehicle 24 from initiating an overtaking maneuver, observations of oncoming vehicles arriving at the pneumatic 25 tubes directly before and directly after a scenario (i) vehicle were extracted from the data. This data selection follows from the possibility of an oncoming vehicle that was suppressing a scenario (i) vehicle 26 from overtaking to arrive at the tubes just before or after the scenario (i) vehicle. Bicycle observations 27 were excluded from the oncoming data since they may not occupy the full width of the lane, thereby 28 29 enabling an overtaking maneuver despite the presence of the oncoming vehicle. The observed gap times 30 between the selected oncoming vehicles and the scenario (i) vehicle were calculated from the timestamps 31 of the observations and compared to the safe passing gap.

The *t*-tests described above were first performed on all scenario (i) and scenario (ii) observations 32 to provide an average baseline of expected speed changes throughout all hours of the day. The *t*-tests were 33 34 then performed on three subsets of the data, and results were compared to the baseline conditions. The 35 first subset of data included all scenario (ii) observations and retained only scenario (i) observations in 36 which the existent gap times with the selected oncoming vehicles were greater than or equal to the safe 37 passing gap. An existent gap with the selected oncoming vehicles greater than or equal to the safe passing gap would indicate that the scenario (i) vehicle was able to overtake the bicycle if so desired. The second 38 39 subset of data included all scenario (ii) observations and only scenario (i) observations in which the existent gap times with the selected oncoming vehicles were less than the safe passing gap – suggesting 40 41 the suppression of overtaking maneuvers. The third subset of data was limited to scenario (i) and scenario 42 (ii) observations in which the gap times between the leading and following vehicles of the respective 43 scenario (the bicycle and passenger car for scenario (i), e.g.) was less than ten seconds, representing 44 conditions of more constrained flow. Scenario (i) and (ii) data subsets were excluded from the hypothesis 45 testing if they contained fewer than 20 observations.

46

### 47 **RESULTS**

48 Of the 75 datasets analyzed using all observations, only six (8%) were found to reject the null
49 hypothesis stating that the mean speeds of scenarios (i) and (ii) were equal. Rejection of the null indicates
50 that the mean speed of scenario (i) was more than 1 mph slower than the mean speed of scenario (ii) in

1 these datasets. All six datasets were collected from urban collector roads. Table 1 provides details of the

2 hypothesis test results for the six datasets that presented significant differences in mean speeds of more

3 than 1 mph. The PSL, class one and class two ADT, class one mean speed, grade, and type of road

4 marking at these sites are also given in **Table 1**. Scenario (ii) mean speeds ranged from 1.6 to 3.3 mph 5

higher than scenario (i) mean speeds.

When including all observations, only one of the 75 datasets, collected at eastbound Fremont west 6 7 of 43rd in July 2019, was found to have a significant decrease in 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds of more than 1 mph for scenario (i) when compared to scenario (ii) (p = 0.01). Note that the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds for 8 9 scenario (i) and scenario (ii) were higher than the 20 mph PSL, at 23 mph and 26 mph, respectively. This 10 dataset also displayed mean speeds for scenario (i) that were approximately three miles per hour slower

- 11 than for scenario (ii) (p = 0.0).
- 12

13	TABLE 1 Hypothesis test results for the six datasets using all observations that reject the null
14	hypothesis of equal mean speeds.

		ADT		Mean					
		Class	Class	Class			р-	Grade	Road
Dataset	PSL	1	2	1	(i)	(ii)	value	%	Marking
Alberta E of 11th Sep	25	132	2949	14.54	22.89	25.01	0.039	-0.4	Dotted
2016 WB									Yellow
Clinton W of 14th Sep	20	933	428	14.52	20.04	21.62	0.027	-0.7	Sharrow
2019 WB									
Division E of 23rd Jul	25	124	4462	18.13	23.95	26.26	0.017	-4.1	Double
2015 WB									Yellow
Fremont W of 43rd	20	187	4689	9.42	17.65	20.97	0.000	0.0	Dotted
Jul 2019 EB*									Yellow
Willamette E of	30	88	2958	14.93	27.50	30.12	0.030	0.8	Dotted
Mohawk Jul 2019 EB									Yellow
Willamette E of	30	115	2937	16.26	27.22	29.77	0.005	-0.8	Dotted
Mohawk Jul 2019 WB									Yellow

15

\*A significant decrease of more than 1 mph in the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed was also observed in this dataset.

16

The results of *t*-test for the mean speed on the first subset of data, in which the scenario (i) vehicle 17 had an opportunity to overtake the bicycle (when observed time gaps between the scenario (i) and the 18 19 selected oncoming vehicles were greater than or equal to the safe passing gap), indicate that significant speed reductions of more than 1 mph (p < 0.05) were present in only four of the 75 datasets tested (5.3%). 20 The *t*-test results on this data subset for the  $85^{th}$  percentile speeds revealed one dataset in which a 21 22 significant speed reduction occurred.

23 Within the second subset of data, in which the scenario (i) vehicle did not have a sufficient gap 24 time with the selected oncoming vehicles to safely pass the bicycle, significant reductions in the mean speed of more than 1 mph were observed in six of the 60 datasets tested (10%). Six of the datasets also 25 displayed significantly reduced 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds. 26

27 The third subset of data, including observations with gap times of less than ten seconds between 28 the lead and following vehicle in the respective vehicle scenarios, showed a higher proportion of the 29 datasets tested had significantly reduced mean speeds of more than 1 mph as compared to the full datasets 30 and the previous two subsets. A total of 24 out of 63 datasets tested (38%) rejected the null hypothesis for 31 the mean speed t-test. Meanwhile, seven of these 63 datasets (11%) indicated a significant reduction of 32 the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds occurred.

The percentages of datasets suggesting significant speed reductions in the mean or 85<sup>th</sup> percentile 33 speeds for all observations and the three subsets can be visualized in Figure 5 and Figure 6. The results 34 35 in these figures have been further categorized to show the percentages according to the functional class

(Figure 5) and the neighborhood greenway status (Figure 6). Recall that the neighborhood greenways did 1 2 not have continuous centerlines, but dashed or double yellow centerlines were present on the nonneighborhood greenways. Thus, the neighborhood greenway categories also represent the presence of 3 4 centerline categories. It should also be noted that all local roads in this study were also neighborhood greenways, but not all neighborhood greenways were local roads.











# Figure 6 Percentage of datasets tested indicating significant speed reductions for all observations and three subsets, according to neighborhood greenway status (G = neighborhood greenway, NN = non-neighborhood greenway).

5 The results shown in **Figure 5** and **Figure 6** suggest that for most categories, mean and 85<sup>th</sup> percetile speeds were less likely to be reduced by more than 1 mph when the observed gap times between 6 7 the scenario (i) and selected oncoming vehicles were sufficient for passing the bicycle (i.e., greater than or equal to the safe passing gap) compared to when the gap times with the oncoming vehicles were 8 9 insufficient for passing (less than the safe passing gap). The non-neighborhood category (where 10 centerlines are present) displays an exception to this pattern when considering mean speeds (Figure 6). A higher percentage of datasets indicated significantly reduced mean speeds occurred when gaps with 11 oncoming vehicles were greater than or equal to the safe passing gap (29%) compared to when the gaps 12 with oncoming vehicles were less than the safe passing gap (21%). Smaller gap times between the leading 13 and following vehicles of the respective scenarios, representing more constrained flow conditions, also 14 appear to increase the likelihood of significantly reduced mean or 85<sup>th</sup> percentile scenario (i) speeds. 15

In addition to these observations regarding the three data subsets, differences were found within
 the functional class and neighborhood greenway status categories. A higher percentage of non neighborhood or urban collector datasets displayed significantly reduced speeds, compared to
 neighborhood greenways or local roads for all subsets of data.

## 21 DISCUSSION

4

20

Based on the results of the *t*-tests comparing the speeds of passenger cars following bicycles (scenario (i)) and passenger cars following other passenger cars (scenario (ii)), there is little evidence to suggest that bicycles lead to a practical reduction (> 1 mph) in passenger car speeds on low volume, low speed urban roads without bicycle lanes under general operating conditions.

26 In traffic literature, free-flow speeds are defined as those occurring when a vehicle is traveling 27 uninhibited by the preceding vehicle. A gap time between vehicles greater than four to six seconds is 28 typically used as a threshold to identify vehicles in free-flow conditions. When motorized vehicles are 29 forced to follow a slower-moving bicycle under inhibited flow conditions, it is expected that mean and 30 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds will be reduced. This is demonstrated by the results of the *t*-tests on datasets limited 31 to observations with gap times of less than ten seconds between the leading and following vehicles of the respective scenarios. Within this data subset, a somewhat higher percentage of significantly reduced mean 32 33 or 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds were observed than when all observations were tested.

When overtaking opportunities are sufficiently abundant, a passenger car approaching a bicycle 34 35 from behind may not need to significantly reduce their speed for a meaningful amount of time. Thus, the 36 overall speed of traffic would be largely unaffected. This outcome is evidenced by the results of the *t*-tests performed when scenario (i) data were subset according to the potential for an opportunity to overtake the 37 38 bicycle. When the gap times between the scenario (i) and the selected oncoming vehicles were greater than or equal to the safe passing gap, a lower percentage of datasets showed evidence that scenario (i) 39 40 mean or 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds were reduced by more than 1 mph, compared to when the gap times with oncoming vehicles were less than the safe passing gap. 41

42 Overall, the *t*-test results produced limited evidence that passenger car speeds are reduced on 43 these lower volume, low speed, urban roads without bike lanes. Mean or 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed reductions 44 of more than 1 mph appear to occur less frequently on local functionally classed roads and neighborhood 45 greenways, which prioritize active travelers and typically have high bicycle volumes. The unique 46 characteristics of the neighborhood greenways may play an additional role in speed behavior by

communicating to motorists and setting the expectation of encountering a cyclist, leading to lower overall
 motorized speeds.

When all observations were considered, only six of the 75 datasets analyzed (8%) indicated that
scenario (i) mean speeds were significantly lower than scenario (ii) by more than 1 mph. Differences in
mean speeds for scenario (i) and scenario (ii) in these datasets ranged from 1.6 to 3.3 mph. Only one of

these datasets demonstrated a significant difference in 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds when all observations were 1 2 analyzed. A few common characteristics were present in these datasets that may have contributed to the difference in speeds. All six datasets were collected from urban collector roads, and the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile 3 speeds for both vehicle scenarios were all in excess of the PSL. Additionally, a high percentage (38% to 4 5 58%) of class two vehicles exceeding the PSL was observed within these datasets. Grade did not appear 6 to be a significant factor, however. At five of the sites, the presence of centerlines and class two ADT 7 greater than is recommended by Danish bikeway design guidance for shared roads may have influenced 8 motorists' decision to overtake. Larger speed differentials were observed between bicycles and passenger 9 cars in two datasets, likely causing motorists to decrease speed when overtaking on account of safety. The 10 PSL at these two sites also exceeded the recommendations of the bikeway design guidance, and the decreased scenario (i) speeds provide additional evidence of the design guidance applicability. One site, 11 westbound Clinton west of 14<sup>th</sup>, differed somewhat from the other five sites. At this location, a centerline 12 is absent, and priority is given to bicycles, which comprise nearly 63% of the total traffic. The class two 13 14 ADT and PSL for this dataset were within the acceptable range for shared roads. Speed humps are present 15 throughout this segment of the roadway at roughly 400-500 ft. intervals to calm traffic. Motorists may choose to delay overtaking a bicycle due to the presence of a downstream speed hump and the nature of 16 17 braking and accelerating associated with it. A traffic signal is also present at a T-intersection approximately 425 ft. downstream of the data collection location. This distance was insufficient for 18 overtaking according to the calculated PSD for 67% of the scenario (i) observations, likely forcing 19 20 motorists to delay overtaking until the intersection was cleared. 21 The hypothesis tests were not conducted separately for peak hours due to the typically low

22 volumes throughout all hours of the day at most sites. However, peak hours had previously been 23 calculated as the eight consecutive 15-minute intervals (two hours in total) with the highest passenger car 24 counts. Peak hours for same-direction and opposing-direction traffic were found to overlap in just 16 of 25 the 75 datasets. Due to the directionality that was generally present with the peak-hour traffic, likely 26 allowing larger oncoming gaps and more opportunities for overtaking, it is possible that little to no 27 additional impact on speeds would be observed during a peak-hour analysis. This conjecture, as well as 28 the possible effects of vehicle platooning or traffic signal progression, could be further investigated in 29 future research.

# 31 CONCLUSIONS

30

32 This research has provided a detailed comparative analysis of passenger car speeds using two 33 vehicle scenarios: (i) a passenger car that was preceded by a bicycle, and (ii) a passenger car that was preceded by another passenger car. This research addressed the limitations of a previous study [9] by 34 incorporating a significant number of study sites displaying a wide variety of characteristics with respect 35 36 to functional class, grade, traffic volume and composition, and PSL. As the bicycle mode share continues to grow, it will be increasingly important to design and maintain robust networks of bicycle facilities, and 37 38 these results indicate that shared roads can contribute substantially to those networks while preserving the 39 travel speed of motorized vehicles.

The mean and 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds of the two vehicle following scenarios were compared using *t*-tests. These *t*-tests were performed on all observations and three subsets of the data to investigate the effects of overtaking opportuities within oncoming traffic and inhibited flow conditions. The results of the analyses presented within this paper predominantly indicate that bicycles are unlikely to lead to reduced passenger car speeds on urban roads without bicycle lanes that meet the design guidelines for shared roadways.

When all observations were considered, a small percentage of datasets did show evidence of significantly different mean speeds, but a significant difference in 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds was only observed in one of the 75 datasets. Overall, the results of the hypothesis testing suggest that scenario (i) speeds are less likely to be reduced by more than 1 mph on streets that are designated as neighborhood greenways or those that carry a local functional classification.

- 1 Even if speed reductions are statistically significant, this does not necessarily imply that these
- 2 reduced speeds have a meaningful impact in terms of travel time. The relationship between travel time
- and speed is relatively complex, and road users in urban areas generally overestimate the actual time
- 4 savings associated with higher travel speeds [5-6]. Traffic signals and stop signs are more likely to
  5 increase motorists' travel time in streets that meet the guidelines for mixed-traffic roadways. Future
- studies, like [34], that account for each vehicle's travel time between successive data collection locations,
- real studies, fike [54], that account for each vehicle's traver time between successive data concerton locations,
   can provide additional information about the main sources of delay in low speed, low volume urban roads
- 8 with a high percentage of active travelers.
- 9 10 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
- 11 The authors would like to acknowledge Tom Jensen and Scott Batson of PBOT for providing the data
- 12 used in this analysis.
- 13

## 14 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

- 15 The authors confirm contribution to the paper as follows: study conception and design: MAF; data
- 16 collection: PBOT; analysis and interpretation of results: JSS, MAF, AU; draft manuscript preparation:
- 17 JSS, MAF, AU. All authors reviewed the results and approved the final version of the manuscript.

### REFERENCES

- United States Census Bureau. American FactFinder COMMUTING CHARACTERISTICS BY SEX, 2018 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates [Internet]. Washington DC: US Census Bureau; 2018 [cited 2020 Jun 21]. Available from: https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=S08&d=ACS%201-Year%20Estimates%20Subject%20Tables&tid=ACSST1Y2018.S0801&vintage=2018
- City of Portland Oregon. Bicycles in Portland Fact Sheet [Internet]. Portland, OR: City of Portland; 2019 [updated 2019 Apr; cited 2020 Jun 21]. Available from: https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/407660
- City of Portland Oregon. Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030 [pdf] [Internet]. Portland, OR: City of Portland; 2010 Feb 11 [cited 2020 Jun 25]. Available from: https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/289122
- 4. Andersen T, Bredal F, Weinreich M, Jensen N, Riisgaard-Dam M, Nielsen MK. Collection of cycle concepts 2012. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Denmark: Cycling Embassy of Denmark; 2012. Planning the cycling infrastructure; p. 53-54.
- 5. European Conference of Ministers of Transport, OECD/ECMT Transport Research Centre. Speed management. OECD Publishing; 2006.
- 6. Archer J, Fotheringham N, Symmons M, Corben B. The impact of lowered speed limits in urban/metropolitan areas. (Report No. 276). Clayton, Australia: Monash University Accident Research Centre. 2008 Jan.
- Andersen, M. Real Talk: Bikes don't reduce congestion without bike lanes [Internet]. Boulder, CO: PeopleForBikes; 2015 Apr 22 [cited 2020 Jun 25]. Available from: https://peopleforbikes.org/blog/real-talk-bikes-cant-reduce-congestion-without-bike-lanes/
- Gosse C, Clarens A. Quantifying the total cost of infrastructure to enable environmentally preferable decisions: the case of urban roadway design. Environmental Research Letters. 2013 Mar; 8(1):1-9.
- 9. Schaefer JS, Figliozzi MA, Unnikrishnan A. Evidence from Urban Roads without Bicycle Lanes on the Impact of Bicycle Traffic on Passenger Car Travel Speeds. Transportation Research Record. 2020 Jun 12:0361198120920880.
- Schultheiss B, Goodman D, Blackburn L, Wood A, Reed D, Elbech M. Bikeway selection guide. United States: Federal Highway Administration Office of Safety; 2019 Feb 1. Report No.: FHWA-SA-18-077. Washington DC: FHWA, p. 23.
- National Association of City Transportation Officials. Urban bikeway design guide. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Washington DC: Island Press; 2014 Mar 24.
- Walker I. Drivers overtaking bicyclists: Objective data on the effects of riding position, helmet use, vehicle type and apparent gender. Accident Analysis & Prevention. 2007 Mar 1;39(2):417-25.

- 13. Walker I, Garrard I, Jowitt F. The influence of a bicycle commuter's appearance on drivers' overtaking proximities: an on-road test of bicyclist stereotypes, high-visibility clothing and safety aids in the United Kingdom. Accident Analysis & Prevention. 2014 Mar 1;64:69-77.
- 14. Brady J, Loskorn J, Mills A, Duthie J, Machemehl R, Beaudet A, Barrea N, Wilkes N, Fialkoff J. Effects of Shared Lane Markings on Bicyclist and Motorist Behavior along Multi-Lane Facilities. Center for Transportation Research, U. of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX. 2010.
- 15. LaMondia J, Duthie J. Analysis of factors influencing bicycle–vehicle interactions on urban roadways by ordered probit regression. Transportation Research Record. 2012;2314(1):81-88.
- Jia S, Peng H, Guo J, Chen H. Quantitative analysis of impact of bicycles on vehicles in urban mixed traffic. Journal of Transportation Systems Engineering and Information Technology. 2008 Apr 1;8(2):58-63.
- 17. Harwood DW, Sun C. Passing sight distance criteria. Transportation Research Board; 2008.
- 18. Oketch TC. Modeled performance characteristics of heterogeneous traffic streams containing non-motorized vehicles. Transportation Research Board 82nd Annual Meeting [CD-ROM]. 2003.
- 19. Federal Highway Administration. Traffic monitoring guide. Washington DC: US Department of Transportation; 2016. p. C-1.
- 20. Nordback K, Kothuri S, Phillips T, Gorecki C, Figliozzi M. Accuracy of bicycle counting with pneumatic tubes in Oregon. Transportation Research Record. 2016;2593(1):8-17.
- United States Geological Survey. 10 foot contours of the Portland, OR metro area [Internet]. 2011 Jan 24 [modified 2011 May 15; cited 2020 Jun 25]. Available from: https://databasin.org/datasets/e5f48e27860046c6b4bc14d64adf1ceb
- Google Maps. Google Street View, 4749 SE Lincoln St. [Image on internet]. United States: Google; 2016 Apr [cited 2020 Jul 18]. Available from: https://goo.gl/maps/NxH3nCjBT3C4uwEG7
- Google Maps. Google Street View, 4624 NE Fremont St. [Image on internet]. United States: Google; 2019 May [cited 2020 Jul 18]. Available from: https://goo.gl/maps/gmsZy5xw6i2WT6426
- 24. Google Maps. Google Street View, 3302 SE Division St. [Image on internet]. United States: Google; 2018 Aug [cited 2020 Jul 18]. Available from: https://goo.gl/maps/4Qfv7VLfMo5L9t3T7
- 25. Hallenbeck M, Rice M, Smith BL, Cornell-Martinez C, Wilkinson J. Vehicle volume distributions by classification; FHWA-PL-97-025 Technical Report.1997 Jul. p. 29.
- 26. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Traffic Safety Facts [pdf] [Internet]. Washington DC: US Department of Transportation; 2013 [cited 2020 Jun 25]. Available from: https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/812148#:~:text=Motorcycles%20ma ma%20up%203%20percent,of%20all%20vehicle%20miles%20traveled.

- 27. McFarland M. Electric bicycles emerge as a hot trend in the U.S. [Internet]. CNNMoney. 2018 [cited 2020 Jun 27]. Available from: https://money.cnn.com/2018/01/17/technology/ebikeselectric-bikes/index.html
- 28. Wagner I. U.S. Bicycle Industry Statistics & Facts [Internet]. Statista. 2019 [cited 2020 June 27]. Available from: https://www.statista.com/topics/1448/bicycle-industry-in-the-us/
- 29. Miller RE. Width requirements for bikeways: A level of service approach. University of California, Davis; 1976.
- 30. Opiela KS, Khasnabis S, Datta TK. Determination of the characteristics of bicycle traffic at urban intersections. Transportation Research Record. 1980;743:30-8.
- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. Guide for Development of Bicycle Facilities. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Washington, DC: American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials; 2012
- 32. Federal Highway Administration. Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways. 2009 Ed. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Transportation; 2009.
- 33. Hou Y, Sun C, Edara P. Statistical test for 85th and 15th percentile speeds with asymptotic distribution of sample quantiles. Transportation Research Record. 2012 Jan; 2279(1):47-53.
- 34. Figliozzi MA, Glick TB. Evaluation of Roadway Reallocation Projects: Analysis of Before-and-After Travel Speeds and Congestion Utilizing High-Resolution Bus Transit Data. NITC-RR-887. Portland, OR: Transportation Research and Education Center (TREC); 2017.