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Chapter 4 Operation

This chapter presents methods for analyzing the operation of an existing or planned roundabout. The methods allow a transportation analyst to assess the operational performance of a facility, given information about the usage of the facility and its geometric design elements. An operational analysis produces two kinds of estimates: (1) the capacity of a facility, i.e., the ability of the facility to accommodate various streams of users, and (2) the level of performance, often measured in terms of one or more measures of effectiveness, such as delay and queues.

The Highway Capacity Manual (1) (HCM) defines the capacity of a facility as “the maximum hourly rate at which persons or vehicles can reasonably be expected to traverse a point or uniform section of a lane or roadway during a given time period under prevailing roadway, traffic, and control conditions.” While capacity is a specific measure that can be defined and estimated, level of service (LOS) is a qualitative measure that “characterizes operational conditions within a traffic stream and their perception by motorists and passengers.” To quantify level of service, the HCM defines specific measures of effectiveness for each highway facility type. Control delay is the measure of effectiveness that is used to define level of service at intersections, as perceived by users. In addition to control delay, all intersections cause some drivers to also incur geometric delays when making turns. A systems analysis of a roadway network may include geometric delay because of the slower vehicle paths required for turning through intersections. An example speed profile is shown in Chapter 6 to demonstrate the speed reduction that results from geometric delay at a roundabout.

While an operational analysis can be used to evaluate the performance of an existing roundabout during a base or future year, its more common function in the U.S. may be to evaluate new roundabout designs.

This chapter:
• Describes traffic operations at roundabouts;
• Lists the data required to evaluate the performance of a roundabout;
• Presents a method to estimate the capacity of five of the six basic roundabout configurations presented in this guide;
• Describes the measures of effectiveness used to determine the performance of a roundabout and a method to estimate these measures; and
• Briefly describes the computer software packages available to implement the capacity and performance analysis procedures.

Appendix A provides background information on the various capacity relationships.
4.1 Traffic Operation at Roundabouts

4.1.1 Driver behavior and geometric elements

A roundabout brings together conflicting traffic streams, allows the streams to safely merge and traverse the roundabout, and exit the streams to their desired directions. The geometric elements of the roundabout provide guidance to drivers approaching, entering, and traveling through a roundabout.

Drivers approaching a roundabout must slow to a speed that will allow them to safely interact with other users of the roundabout, and to negotiate the roundabout. The width of the approach roadway, the curvature of the roadway, and the volume of traffic present on the approach govern this speed. As drivers approach the yield line, they must check for conflicting vehicles already on the circulating roadway and determine when it is safe and prudent to enter the circulating stream. The widths of the approach roadway and entry determine the number of vehicle streams that may form side by side at the yield line and govern the rate at which vehicles may enter the circulating roadway. The size of the inscribed circle affects the radius of the driver’s path, which in turn determines the speed at which drivers travel on the roundabout. The width of the circulatory roadway determines the number of vehicles that may travel side by side on the roundabout.

The British (2), French (3), and German (4) analytical procedures are based on empirical relationships that directly relate capacity to both traffic characteristics and roundabout geometry. The British empirical relationships reveal that small sublane changes in the geometric parameters produce significant changes in capacity.

For instance, if some approaches are flared or have additional short lanes, these provide considerably more capacity for two reasons. First, wider entries require wider circulatory roadway widths. This provides for more opportunities for the circulatory traffic to bunch together, thus increasing the number of acceptable opportunities to enter, thereby increasing capacity. Second, the typical size of groups of drivers entering into acceptable opportunities in the circulatory traffic is quite small, so short lanes can be very effective in increasing group sizes, because the short lane is frequently able to be filled.

The British (2) use the inscribed circle diameter, the entry width, the approach (road) half width, the entry radius, and the sharpness of the flare to define the performance of a roundabout. The sharpness of the flare, S, is a measure of the rate at which the extra width is developed in the entry flare. Large values of S correspond to short, severe flares, and small values of S correspond to long, gradual flares (5).

The results of the extensive empirical British research indicate that approach half width, entry width, average effective flare length and entry angle have the most significant effect on entry capacity. Roundabouts fit into two general classes: those with a small inscribed circle diameter of less than 50 m (165 ft.) and those with a diameter above 50 m. The British relationships provide a means of including both of these roundabout types. The inscribed circle diameter has a relatively small effect for inscribed diameters of 50 m (165 ft) or less. The entry radius has little effect on capacity provided that it is 20 m (65 ft) or more. The use of perpendicular entries (70
degrees or more) and small entry radii (less than 15 m \([50 \text{ ft}]\)) will reduce capacity. The presence of the geometric parameters in the British and French models allow designers to manipulate elements of their design to determine both their operational and safety effects. German research has not been able to find the same influence of geometry, although this may be due to the relatively narrow range of geometries in Germany (4).

Thus, the geometric elements of a roundabout, together with the volume of traffic desiring to use a roundabout at a given time, may determine the efficiency with which a roundabout operates.

4.1.2 Concept of roundabout capacity

The capacity of each entry to a roundabout is the maximum rate at which vehicles can reasonably be expected to enter the roundabout from an approach during a given time period under prevailing traffic and roadway (geometric) conditions. An operational analysis considers a precise set of geometric conditions and traffic flow rates defined for a 15-minute analysis period for each roundabout entry. While consideration of Average Annual Daily Traffic volumes (AADT) across all approaches is useful for planning purposes as provided in Exhibit 1-13 and Chapter 3, analysis of this shorter time period is critical to assessing the level of performance of the roundabout and its individual components.

The capacity of the entire roundabout is not considered, as it depends on many terms. However, Exhibit 1-13 provides threshold average daily traffic volumes for the various categories of roundabouts, assuming four legs. Below these thresholds, a four-legged roundabout with roadways intersecting perpendicularly should have adequate capacity (provided the traffic volumes are reasonably balanced and the geometry does not deviate substantially from those shown on the design templates in Exhibits 1-7 through 1-12). The focus in this chapter on the roundabout entry is similar to the operational analysis methods used for other forms of unsignalized intersections and for signalized intersections. In each case, the capacity of the entry or approach is computed as a function of traffic on the other (conflicting) approaches, the interaction of these traffic streams, and the intersection geometry.

For a properly designed roundabout, the yield line is the relevant point for capacity analysis. The approach capacity is the capacity provided at the yield line. This is determined by a number of geometric parameters in addition to the entry width. On multilane roundabouts it is important to balance the use of each lane, because otherwise some lanes may be overloaded while others are underused. Poorly designed exits may influence driver behavior and cause lane imbalance and congestion at the opposite leg.

4.2 Data Requirements

The analysis method described in this chapter requires the specification of traffic volumes for each approach to the roundabout, including the flow rate for each directional movement. Volumes are typically expressed in passenger car vehicles per hour (vph), for a specified 15-minute analysis period. To convert other vehicle types to passenger car equivalents (pce), use the conversion factors given in Exhibit 4-1.
Entry flow and circulating flow for each approach are the volumes of interest for roundabout capacity analysis, rather than turning movement volumes.

Traffic volume data for an urban roundabout should be collected for each directional movement for at least the morning and evening peak periods, since the various movements, and thus approach and circulating volumes, may peak at different times. At rural roundabouts, the analyst should check the requirements of the agency with the jurisdiction of the site. The reader is referred to the Manual of Transportation Engineering Studies (8) for a complete discussion of traffic volume data collection methods. Typically, intersection volume counts are made at the intersection stop bar, with an observer noting the number of cars that pass that point over a specified time period. However, particularly with respect to cases in which demand exceeds capacity (when queues do not dissipate within the analysis period), it is important to note that the stop bar counts reflect only the volume that is served, not the demand volume. In this case, care must be taken to collect data upstream of the end of a queue so that true demand volumes are available for analysis.

The relationship between the standard origin-to-destination turning movements at an intersection and the circulating and entry flows at a roundabout is important, yet is often complicated to compute, particularly if an intersection has more than four approaches. For conventional intersections, traffic flow data are accumulated by directional turning movement, such as for the northbound left turn. For roundabouts, however, the data of interest for each approach are the entry flow and the circulating flow. Entry flow is simply the sum of the through, left, and right turn movements on an approach. Circulating flow is the sum of the vehicles from different movements passing in front of the adjacent upstream splitter island. At existing roundabouts, these flows can simply be measured in the field. Right turns are included in approach volumes and require capacity, but are not included in the circulating volumes downstream because they exit before the next entrance.

For proposed or planned four-legged roundabouts, Equations 4-1 through 4-4 can be applied to determine conflicting (circulating) flow rates, as shown graphically in Exhibit 4-2.

\[
\begin{align*}
V_{EB_{circ}} &= V_{EB_{LT}} + V_{SR_{LT}} + V_{SR_{TH}} + V_{NR_{LT}} + V_{NR_{TH}} + V_{EB_{U-turn}} + V_{SR_{U-turn}} + V_{EB_{U-turn}} \\
V_{WR_{circ}} &= V_{EB_{LT}} + V_{EB_{LT}} + V_{EB_{TH}} + V_{SR_{LT}} + V_{SR_{TH}} + V_{EB_{U-turn}} + V_{EB_{U-turn}} + V_{EB_{U-turn}} \\
V_{NB_{circ}} &= V_{EB_{LT}} + V_{EB_{LT}} + V_{EB_{TH}} + V_{SR_{LT}} + V_{EB_{U-turn}} + V_{SR_{U-turn}} + V_{EB_{U-turn}} + V_{EB_{U-turn}} \\
V_{SB_{circ}} &= V_{EB_{LT}} + V_{EB_{LT}} + V_{EB_{TH}} + V_{SR_{LT}} + V_{SR_{TH}} + V_{EB_{U-turn}} + V_{SR_{U-turn}} + V_{EB_{U-turn}}
\end{align*}
\]
While this method is mathematically correct, it is somewhat sensitive to errors and inconsistencies in the input data. It is important that the counts at all of the locations in the roundabout be made simultaneously. Inconsistencies in the data from counts taken on different days can produce meaningless results, including negative volumes. At a minimum, the sum of the entering and exiting volumes should be checked and adjustments should be made if necessary to ensure that the same amount of traffic enters and leaves the roundabout.

For existing roundabouts, when approach, right-turn, circulating, and exit flows are counted, directional turning movements can be computed as shown in the following example. Equation 4-5 shows the through movement flow rate for the eastbound approach as a function of the entry flow rate for that approach, the exit flow rate for the opposing approach, the right turn flow rate for the subject approach, the right turn flow rate for the approach on the right, and the circulating flow rate for the approach on the right. Other through movement flow rates can be estimated using a similar relation.

\[
V_{E,B,TH} = V_{E,B,entry} + V_{W,B,exit} - V_{E,B,RT} - V_{N,B,RT} - V_{N,B,circ} \tag{4-5}
\]

The left turn flow rate for an approach is a function of the entry flow rate, the through flow rate, and the right turn flow rate for that same approach, as shown in Equation 4-6. Again, other movements’ flows are estimated using similar equations.

\[
V_{E,B,LT} = V_{E,B,entry} - V_{E,B,TH} - V_{E,B,RT} \tag{4-6}
\]
4.3 Capacity

The maximum flow rate that can be accommodated at a roundabout entry depends on two factors: the circulating flow on the roundabout that conflicts with the entry flow, and the geometric elements of the roundabout.

When the circulating flow is low, drivers at the entry are able to enter the roundabout without significant delay. The larger gaps in the circulating flow are more useful to the entering drivers and more than one vehicle may enter each gap. As the circulating flow increases, the size of the gaps in the circulating flow decrease, and the rate at which vehicles can enter also decreases. Note that when computing the capacity of a particular leg, the actual circulating flow to use may be less than demand flows, if the entry capacity of one leg contributing to the circulating flow is less than demand on that leg.

The geometric elements of the roundabout also affect the rate of entry flow. The most important geometric element is the width of the entry and circulatory roadways, or the number of lanes at the entry and on the roundabout. Two entry lanes permit nearly twice the rate of entry flow as does one lane. Wider circulatory roadways allow vehicles to travel alongside, or follow, each other in tighter bunches and so provide longer gaps between bunches of vehicles. The flare length also affects the capacity. The inscribed circle diameter and the entry angle have minor effects on capacity.

As at other forms of unsignalized intersection, when traffic flows on an approach exceed approximately 85 percent of capacity, delays and queue lengths vary significantly about their mean values (with standard deviations of similar magnitude as the means). For this reason, the analysis procedures in some countries (Australia, Germany, and the United Kingdom), and this guide, recommend that roundabouts be designed to operate at no more than 85 percent of their estimated capacity.

As performance data become available for roundabouts designed according to the procedures in this guide in the United States, they will provide a basis for development of operational performance procedures specifically calibrated for U.S. conditions. Therefore, analysts should consult future editions of the Highway Capacity Manual.

4.3.1 Single-lane roundabout capacity

Exhibit 4-3 shows the expected capacity for a single-lane roundabout for both the urban compact and urban/rural single-lane designs. The exhibit shows the variation of maximum entry flow as a function of the circulating flow on the roundabout. The calculation of the circulating flow was described previously. The capacity forecast shown in the chart is valid for single-lane roundabouts with inscribed circle diameters of 25 m to 55 m (80 ft to 180 ft). The capacity forecast is based on simplified British regression relationships in Appendix A, which may also be derived with a gap-acceptance model by incorporating limited priority behavior.
Note that in any case, the flow rate downstream of the merge point (between the entry and the next exit) should not be allowed to exceed 1,800 veh/h. Exceeding this threshold may indicate the need for a double-lane entry.

The urban compact design is expected to have a reduced capacity, but has significant benefits of reduced vehicle speeds through the roundabout (per the German equations in Appendix A). This increases safety for pedestrians and bicyclists compared with the larger single lane roundabouts. Mini-roundabout capacities may be approximated using the daily maximum service volumes provided for them in Chapter 3, but in any case should not exceed the capacity of the urban compact design.

Circulating flow should not exceed 1,800 veh/h at any point in a single-lane roundabout. Exit flows exceeding 1,200 veh/h may indicate the need for a double-lane exit.

Exhibit 4-3. Approach capacity of a single-lane roundabout.

The slope of the upper line changes because circulating flow downstream from a roundabout entry should not exceed 1,800 veh/h.

Exhibit 4-3. Approaching capacity of a single-lane roundabout.

Entering and circulating flow = 1,800 veh/h.
4.3.2 Double-lane roundabout capacity

Exhibit 4-4 shows the expected capacity of a double-lane roundabout that is based on the design templates for the urban/rural double-lane roundabouts. The capacity forecast shown in the chart is valid for double-lane roundabouts with inscribed circle diameters of 40 m to 60 m (130 ft to 200 ft). The capacity forecast is based on simplified British regression relationships in Appendix A, which may also be derived with a gap-acceptance model by incorporating limited priority behavior. Larger inscribed diameter roundabouts are expected to have slightly higher capacities at moderate to high circulating flows.

4.3.3 Capacity effect of short lanes at flared entries

By flaring an approach, short lanes may be added at the entry to improve the performance. If an additional short lane is used, it is assumed that the circulatory road width is also increased accordingly. The capacity of the entry is based on the assumption that all entry lanes will be effectively used. The capacity is given by the product of the appropriate factor in Exhibit 4-5 and the capacity of a two-lane roundabout in Exhibit 4-4. Refer to Appendix A for a derivation of these factors (9).
### Exhibit 4-5. Capacity reduction factors for short lanes.

The use of short lanes can nearly double approach capacity, without requiring a two-lane roadway prior to the roundabout.

### Exhibit 4-6. Capacity comparison of single-lane and double-lane roundabouts.

Exhibit 4-6 shows a comparison of the expected capacity for both the single-lane and double-lane roundabouts. Again, it is evident that the number of lanes, or the size of the entry and circulating roadways, has a significant effect on the entry capacity.

#### 4.3.4 Comparison of single-lane and double-lane roundabouts

Exhibit 4-6 shows a comparison of the expected capacity for both the single-lane and double-lane roundabouts. Again, it is evident that the number of lanes, or the size of the entry and circulating roadways, has a significant effect on the entry capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of vehicle spaces in the short lane, ( n_f )</th>
<th>Factor (applied to double-lane approach capacity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 *</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Used for the case of a single lane entry to a double-lane roundabout.
4.3.5 Pedestrian effects on entry capacity

Pedestrians crossing at a marked crosswalk that gives them priority over entering motor vehicles can have a significant effect on the entry capacity. In such cases, if the pedestrian crossing volume and circulating volume are known, the vehicular capacity should be factored (multiply by $M$) according to the relationship shown in Exhibit 4-7 or Exhibit 4-8 for single-lane and double-lane roundabouts, respectively.

Note that the pedestrian impedance decreases as the conflicting vehicle flow increases. The *Highway Capacity Manual* (1) provides additional guidance on the capacity of pedestrian crossings and should be consulted if the capacity of the crosswalk itself is an issue.

Exhibit 4-7. Capacity reduction factor $M$ for a single-lane roundabout assuming pedestrian priority.

The effects of conflicting pedestrians on approach capacity decrease as conflicting vehicular volumes increase, as entering vehicles become more likely to have to stop regardless of whether pedestrians are present.

Source: (10)
4.3.6 Exit capacity

An exit flow on a single lane of more than 1,400 veh/h, even under good operating conditions for vehicles (i.e., tangential alignment, and no pedestrians and bicyclists) is difficult to achieve. Under normal urban conditions, the exit lane capacity is in the range of 1,200 to 1,300 veh/h. Therefore, exit flows exceeding 1,200 veh/h may indicate the need for a double-lane exit (11).

4.4 Performance Analysis

Three performance measures are typically used to estimate the performance of a given roundabout design: degree of saturation, delay, and queue length. Each measure provides a unique perspective on the quality of service at which a roundabout will perform under a given set of traffic and geometric conditions. Whenever possible, the analyst should estimate as many of these parameters as possible to obtain the broadest possible evaluation of the performance of a given roundabout design. In all cases, a capacity estimate must be obtained for an entry to the roundabout before a specific performance measure can be computed.

**Exhibit 4-8.** Capacity reduction factor $M$ for a double-lane roundabout assuming pedestrian priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduction factor $M$ [-]</th>
<th>0.70</th>
<th>0.80</th>
<th>0.85</th>
<th>0.90</th>
<th>0.95</th>
<th>1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$q_k$ [pcu/h]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (10)
4.4.1 Degree of saturation

Degree of saturation is the ratio of the demand at the roundabout entry to the capacity of the entry. It provides a direct assessment of the sufficiency of a given design. While there are no absolute standards for degree of saturation, the Australian design procedure suggests that the degree of saturation for an entry lane should be less than 0.85 for satisfactory operation. When the degree of saturation exceeds this range, the operation of the roundabout will likely deteriorate rapidly, particularly over short periods of time. Queues may form and delay begins to increase exponentially.

4.4.2 Delay

Delay is a standard parameter used to measure the performance of an intersection. The Highway Capacity Manual (1) identifies delay as the primary measure of effectiveness for both signalized and unsignalized intersections, with level of service determined from the delay estimate. Currently, however, the Highway Capacity Manual only includes control delay, the delay attributable to the control device. Control delay is the time that a driver spends queuing and then waiting for an acceptable gap in the circulating flow while at the front of the queue. The formula for computing this delay is given in Equation 4-7 (12, based on 13; see also 14). Exhibit 4-9 shows how control delay at an entry varies with entry capacity and circulating flow. Each curve for control delay ends at a volume-to-capacity ratio of 1.0, with the curve projected beyond that point as a dashed line.

\[ d = \frac{3600}{c_{m,x}} + 900T \times \left[ \frac{V_x}{c_{m,x}} - 1 + \left( \frac{V_x}{c_{m,x}} - 1 \right)^2 + \frac{3600}{c_{m,x}} \left( \frac{V_x}{c_{m,x}} \right) \right] \] (4-7)

where:
- \( d \) = average control delay, sec/veh;
- \( V_x \) = flow rate for movement \( x \), veh/h;
- \( c_{m,x} \) = capacity of movement \( x \), veh/h; and
- \( T \) = analysis time period, h (\( T = 0.25 \) for a 15-minute period).
Note that as volumes approach capacity, control delay increases exponentially, with small changes in volume having large effects on delay. An accurate analysis of delay under conditions near or over saturation requires consideration of the following factors:

- **The effect of residual queues.** Roundabout entries operating near or over capacity can generate significant residual queues that must be accounted for between consecutive time periods. The method presented above does not account for these residual queues. These factors are accounted for in the delay formulae developed by Kimber and Hollis (15); however, these formulae are difficult to use manually.

- **The metering effect of upstream oversaturated entries.** When an upstream entry is operating over capacity, the circulating volume in front of a downstream entry is less than the true demand. As a result, the capacity of the downstream entry is higher than what would be predicted from analyzing actual demand.

For most design applications where target degrees of saturation are no more than 0.85, the procedures presented in this section are sufficient. In cases where it is desired to more accurately estimate performance in conditions near or over capacity, the use of software that accounts for the above factors is recommended.

Geometric delay is the additional time that a single vehicle with no conflicting flows spends slowing down to the negotiation speed, proceeding through the intersection, and accelerating back to normal operating speed. Geometric delay may
be an important consideration in network planning (possibly affecting route travel times and choices) or when comparing operations of alternative intersection types. While geometric delay is often negligible for through movements at a signalized or stop-controlled intersection, it can be more significant for turning movements such as those through a roundabout. Calculation of geometric delay requires an estimate of the proportion of vehicles that must stop at the yield line, as well as knowledge of the roundabout geometry as it affects vehicle speeds during entry, negotiation, and exit. Procedures for calculating the number of stops and geometric delay are given in the Australian design guide (16).

### 4.4.3 Queue length

Queue length is important when assessing the adequacy of the geometric design of the roundabout approaches.

The average queue length (L vehicles) can be calculated by Little's rule, as shown in Equation 4-8 (17):

$$ L = \frac{v \cdot d}{3600} \quad (4-8) $$

where:
- $v$ = entry flow, veh/h
- $d$ = average delay, seconds/veh

Average queue length is equivalent to the vehicle-hours of delay per hour on an approach. It is useful for comparing roundabout performance with other intersection forms, and other planning procedures that use intersection delay as an input.

For design purposes, Exhibit 4-10 shows how the 95th-percentile queue length varies with the degree of saturation of an approach (18, 19). The x-axis of the graph is the degree of saturation, or the ratio of the entry flow to the entry capacity. Individual lines are shown for the product of $T$ and entry capacity. To determine the 95th-percentile queue length during time $T$, enter the graph at the computed degree of saturation. Move vertically until the computed curve line is reached. Then move horizontally to the left to determine the 95th-percentile queue length. Alternatively, Equation 4-8 can be used to approximate the 95th-percentile queue. Note that the graph and equation are only valid where the volume-to-capacity ratio immediately before and immediately after the study period is no greater than 0.85 (in other words, the residual queues are negligible).
\[ Q_{95} = 900T \left[ \frac{V_x}{C_{m,x}} - 1 + \sqrt{\left( 1 - \frac{V_x}{C_{m,x}} \right)^2 + \frac{3600}{150T} \left( \frac{V_x}{C_{m,x}} \right)} \right] \] (4-9)

where:
- \( Q_{95} \) = 95th percentile queue, veh,
- \( V_x \) = flow rate for movement \( x \), veh/h,
- \( C_{m,x} \) = capacity of movement \( x \), veh/h, and
- \( T \) = analysis time period, h (0.25 for 15-minute period).

Source: (19)

Exhibit 4-10. 95th-percentile queue length estimation.
4.4.4 Field observations

The analyst may evaluate an existing roundabout to determine its performance and whether changes to its design are needed. Measurements of vehicle delay and queuing can be made using standard traffic engineering techniques. In addition, the analyst can perform a qualitative assessment of the roundabout performance. The following list indicates conditions for which corrective design measures should be taken (20). If the answers to these questions are negative, no corrective actions need be taken.

- Do drivers stop unnecessarily at the yield point?
- Do drivers stop unnecessarily within the circulating roadway?
- Do any vehicles pass on the wrong side of the central island?
- Do queues from an external bottleneck back up into the roundabout from an exit road?
- Does the actual number of entry lanes differ from those intended by the design?
- Do smaller vehicles encroach on the truck apron?
- Is there evidence of damage to any of the signs in the roundabout?
- Is there any pedestrian activity on the central island?
- Do pedestrians and cyclists fail to use the roundabout as intended?
- Are there tire marks on any of the curb surfaces to indicate vehicle contact?
- Is there any evidence of minor accidents, such as broken glass, pieces of rim, etc., on the approaches or the circulating roadway?
- Is there any gravel or other debris collected in nontraveled areas that could be a hazard to bicycles or motorcyclists?
- Are the vehicle speeds appropriate?

4.5 Computer Software for Roundabouts

While the analytical procedures of different countries are not very complex, they are repetitive and time consuming, so most of these procedures have been implemented in software. A summary of current (as of 1999) software products and the analytical procedures that they implement is presented in Exhibit 4-11. The reader is also advised to consult the latest version of the U.S. Highway Capacity Manual. While the procedures provided in this chapter are recommended for most applications covered by this guide, models such as ARCADY, RODEL, SIDRA, KREISEL, or GIRABASE may be consulted to determine the effects of geometric parameters, particularly for multilane roundabouts outside the realm of this guide, or for fine-tuning designs to improve performance. Note that many of these models represent different underlying data or theories and will thus produce different results. Chapter 8 provides some information on microscopic simulation modeling which may be useful alternatives analysis in systems context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Application and Qualities (1999 versions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCADY</td>
<td>All configurations</td>
<td>British method (50 percent confidence limits). Capacity, delay, and queuing. Includes projected number of crashes per year. Data were collected at extensive field studies and from experiments involving drivers at temporary roundabouts. Empirical relationships were developed from the data and incorporated into ARCADY. This model reflects British driving behavior and British roundabout designs. A prime attribute is that the capacities it predicts have been measured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RODEL</td>
<td>All configurations including multiple roundabout interactions</td>
<td>British method (user-specified confidence limits). Capacity, delay, and queuing. Includes both an evaluation mode (geometric parameters specified) and a design mode (performance targets specified). Includes a crash prediction model. RODEL uses the British empirical equations. It also assists the user in developing an appropriate roundabout for the traffic conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDRA</td>
<td>All configurations and other control types</td>
<td>Australian method, with analytical extensions. Capacity, delay, queue, fuel, and environmental measures. Also evaluates two-way stop-controlled, all-way stop controlled, and signalized intersections. It also gives roundabout capacities from U.S. HCM 1997 and German procedures. SIDRA is based on gap acceptance processes. It uses field data for the gap acceptance parameters to calibrate the model. There has been limited field evaluation of the results although experience has shown that the results fit Australian and U.S. single-lane (21) roundabout conditions satisfactorily. An important attribute is that the user can alter parameters to easily reflect local driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCS-3</td>
<td>Single-lane roundabouts with a limited range of volumes</td>
<td>U.S. HCM 1997 method. Limited to capacity estimation based on entering and circulating volume. Optional gap acceptance parameter values provide both a liberal and conservative estimate of capacity. The data used to calibrate the models were recorded in the U.S. The two curves given reflect the uncertainty from the results. The upper-bound average capacities are anticipated at most roundabouts. The lower bound results reflect the operation that might be expected until roundabouts become more common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KREISEL</td>
<td>All configurations</td>
<td>Developed in Germany. Offers many user-specified options to implement the full range of procedures found in the literature from U.S. (including this chapter), Europe, Britain, and Australia. KREISEL gives the average capacity from a number of different procedures. It provides a means to compare these procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIRABASE</td>
<td>All configurations</td>
<td>French method. Capacity, delay, and queuing projections based on regression. Sensitive to geometric parameters. Gives average values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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