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## Introduction

Orth-Rodgers \& Associates, Inc. (ORA) was selected by the South Jersey Transportation Planning Organization (SJTPO) to conduct their 2007 Road Safety Audit (RSA) program. The sections of roadway to be studied were selected by SJTPO based on a number of factors considered important to the safety and future development of the roadways. Among the factors considered were crash data, traffic volume growth, recent and planned future development along the roadway, and local cooperation and control. Except at the intersection of a state highway with the study roadway, state highways were excluded from the process. County and local officials cooperated with the SJTPO in identifying roads that meet these parameters.

Four roadway sections were chosen for the 2007 audits. Two of the roadways are located in Cape May County, one is in Salem County, and one in Atlantic County. The four roadway sections are:

1. Fire Road (CR 651), between Tilton Avenue (CR 563) and Delilah Road (MP 7.91-9.97) in the Township of Egg Harbor, Atlantic County. Additionally, a section from Mill Road to Tilton Road (MP 6.67-7.91) is to be scanned.
2. Shunpike Road (CR 620), entire length between Indian Trail Road (CR 618 ) and Dias Creek Road (CR 612 ) in the Township of Middle, Cape May County.
3. Dennisville-Petersburg Road (CR 610), entire length between Route 47 and Tuckahoe Road (CR 631) (MP 0.00-7.77), in the Townships of Dennis and Upper, and the Borough of Woodbine, Cape May County.
4. Buck-Centerton Road (CR 553) between the Cumberland County border and the Gloucester County border (MP 26.97-34.78) in the Townships of Pittsgrove and Upper Pittsgrove. This includes a very short section of CR 540 (MP 25.90-25.98). Approximately two miles of the road will be audited and the remainder scanned.

Each studied roadway will have a separate report, but will share basically the same introduction, background section, format and some text.

Safety audits serve to address the safe operation of the roadways and to ensure a high level of safety for all road users. The process of a safety audit is two-fold: 1) to conduct a formal examination of highway features and the surrounding environment that increases the potential for crashes; and, 2) to identify countermeasures that will reduce or eliminate the probability of such crashes. According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the formal definition of a road safety audit is as follows:
> "A Road Safety Audit is the formal examination of an existing or future roadway or traffic project by an independent team of trained specialists."

To accomplish these goals, the audit team assesses the safety performance history, as well as the future crash potential of a roadway and prepares a report that documents the safety deficiencies and appropriate countermeasures. The purpose of the 2007 audit is to identify potential safety deficiencies along the selected sections of the four roadways.

There are three primary parts of the audit: 1) the data collection and analysis phase; 2) the field view (conducted by the team); and, 3) the preparation of the report and findings.

The data collection phase is performed prior to the audit team conducting a field view of the entire roadway. The data is intended to assist the team in identifying potential safety issues, as well as to provide a factual and historic component of the study. Traffic count and crash data are collected, and a capacity analysis of major intersections is performed. The traffic counts are used to assist in analyzing solutions for the intersections, as well as aid in identifying the most congested sections of the roads. The crash data assists the team in identifying specific areas and/or conditions that warrant close scrutiny that might have otherwise been overlooked. The capacity analysis of intersections identifies how well the intersections are operating and when
and where improvements may be needed. Based on an analysis of all the data, the audit team can conduct a productive and comprehensive evaluation of the roads being studied. A multidisciplinary team conducts the field view. In this case, the team walked the entire length of the study area being audited (Delilah Road to Tilton Road) and drove the section being scanned several times (Tilton Road to Mill Road), discussing observations and taking notes for inclusion in the report. The team leader then prepared a draft report that documented the audits findings and recommended actions. The draft report was distributed to the team members for their review and comments. A final report was then prepared by the team leader incorporating the agreed upon draft report comments.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Prior to the audit, ORA e-mailed John Masi of the Atlantic County Engineer's office a list of questions seeking background information on the selected of Fire Road. The questions included.

- Why was the road chosen for the audit?
- What problems exist on the road?
- What areas should be given special attention?
- Has the roadway changed in the last three years?
- Are there any projects pending or anticipated for the roadway and their status?
- Have any of the traffic control devices or regulations been changed in the last three years (i.e., signals, speed limits, etc.)?
- Was there any development on the road in the last three years, or any proposed development on the road or in the area that has or will impact traffic in the future?
- Are any recent traffic counts available?
- Have any recent traffic studies been conducted on the road?
- What plans, if any, are available for the road?
- At what locations should new traffic counts, either turning movement or ATR's be conducted?

Mr. Masi responded in a letter dated September 6, 2006, providing answers to the questions asked. The same questions were again asked at the workshop on the day of the audit to ensure
that no available data was missing and Mr. Masi's letter was shared with the team. Since Atlantic County had already participated in the 2005 and 2006 audits, ORA did not schedule a general kick-off meeting. Additionally, a pre-audit information package was prepared and distributed in advance of the workshop and field view. The package included a brief explanation of what a safety audit is, why safety audits are conducted, and the process involved. It also included charts of three-year crash trends, crash occurrence by month, by day of the week, by time of day, by surface condition, by light condition, by crash severity, by crash type, and by closest intersection. All team members were asked to review the information package prior to attending the workshop and audit. Also, prior to the audit, ORA had contacted the Egg Harbor Township Police Department to explain the purposes and process involved in the audit. Since most of the scheduled team members had already participated in the FY 2005 or FY 2006 audit, and all stakeholders received the information package, the workshop and field views were scheduled to take place on the same day.

## FIRE ROAD (CR 651)

Fire Road (CR 651) is under the jurisdictional control of Atlantic County. It is designated as a south-north road. The section being audited extends between Tilton Road (CR 634) on the southern end of the study area and Delilah Road (CR 646) at the northern end of the study area. The section being scanned extends from Mill Road on the southern end to Tilton Road on the northern end. The total length of the study area is 3.3 miles. The road is classified as an urban minor arterial.

Fire Road cross section varies along its length.

- Approaching Delilah Road from the north and proceeding southbound, it is one lane in each direction flared to three lanes at the intersection of Delilah Road with an exclusive left-turn lane and shared through and right-turn lanes in each direction.
- Between Delilah Road and Doughty Road, it is basically a three-lane road with one lane of traffic in each direction and a two-way center left-turn lane.
- Approaching Doughty Road, it again transitions to an exclusive single direction leftturn lane and a shared through and right-turn lane in each direction.
- Between Doughty Road and Washington Avenue, it is basically one lane in each direction. At Washington Avenue, southbound traffic is restricted to a single lane of traffic, but northbound traffic has an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through and right-turn lane.
- Between Washington Avenue to north of Route $40 / 322$, it is basically a three-lane road with one lane of traffic in each direction and a two-way center left-turn lane.
- From north of Route $40 / 322$ to Tilton Road, it is basically a five-lane road with a twoway left turn or single direction left-turn lane, an exclusive through lane and a shared through and right-turn lane.
- Northbound at Tilton Road there are two exclusive left-turn lanes, an exclusive through lane and a shared through and right-turn lane.
- From Tilton Road to north of Hingston Road, it is basically a five-lane road with a twoway left turn or single direction left-turn lane, an exclusive through lane and a shared through and right-turn lane. The exceptions are southbound right-turn lanes at the driveways to Canal's Liquors and Fire Plaza.
- From that point south to Mill Road, it is basically a three-lane road with either a twoway or single direction left-turn lane and one shared through and right-turn lane in each direction.

The curb line development between Delilah Road to south of Washington Avenue is best described as mixed rural residential-business; the section from south of Washington Avenue to south of the Hingston Avenue is more densely developed and mostly business in nature, becoming very densely developed from north of Tilton Road to the GSP traffic signal. From the GSP traffic signal to Mill Road the curb line development is less densely developed and remains mostly business orientated.

The Fire Road Plaza is the only major traffic generator along the study section of road. The proposed Wal-Mart development, if constructed, would be another significant generator.

There are seven signalized intersections in the study area, at Delilah Road, at Doughty Road, at Washington Avenue, at Tilton Road, at Fire Road Plaza, at GSP, and at Mill Road. Because the intersections of Tilton Road and Delilah Road were evaluated in prior audits of crossing routes, these intersections were excluded from this audit.

It was ascertained from local members of the audit team that:

- The roadway was chosen to be audited due to the volume of traffic utilizing the road, lack of pedestrian facilities, and the frequency of crashes along the road.
- There have been no geometric changes along the road in the last three years.
- The Mill Road intersection is scheduled for both short term and long term improvements. The Mill Road eastbound approach was recently reconstructed (December 2006) as a short term improvement and signal phasing changes implemented. A major re-design of the intersection is planned as a long term improvement.
- A Wal-Mart is proposed along the northbound side of Fire Road between Old Egg Harbor Road and Route 40/322. In conjunction with the Wal-Mart development, a traffic signal would be installed at the intersection of Old Egg Harbor Road.
- The same Wal-Mart development may require the developer to make improvements at the Route $40 / 322$ signalized intersection.
- The NJDOT's Safe Corridor Team is evaluating the intersection of Route 40/322 and Fire Road.
- A Renaissance Inn is also proposed on the southeast quadrant of Fire Road with Old Egg Harbor Road.

The following sections describe the various tasks undertaken by ORA in partnership with the Safety Audit Team and summarize the findings from the audit process in a manner that will allow the responsible agencies and personnel to prioritize implementation of safety enhancements.

## Pre-Audit Data Collection and Analysis

Prior to the audit activities on site, ORA collected and reviewed traffic data and other related materials in order to assist the team in conducting the audit. A description of the materials that were reviewed is provided below.

## 1. Straight Line Plan

Straight line plans, $1^{\prime \prime}=200$ ', were developed of the study section of the road. The crash data was shown on these plans for use at the audit and for the final report.

## 2. Traffic Volume Data

The County requested that an eight-hour traffic count be conducted at the Hingston Avenue and Old Egg Harbor Road intersections. A-Tech Engineering conducted the counts on October 12, 2006 and October 25, 2006.

## 3. Traffic Signal

The County submitted traffic signal plans for all of the signals along the section of road being audited. The plans were reviewed for conformance with the current MUTCD.

## 4. Crash Data

SJTPO forwarded to ORA the crash reports from the Egg Harbor Township Police Department for the years 2003, 2004, and 2005. A summary sheet was prepared for the three-year period. For the three-year period, a total of 74 crashes were plotted on the straight-line plan for the study section of road. Sixteen (16) crashes occurred in 2003, 37 in 2004, and 21 in 2005.

The types of crashes are characterized as follows:

0 - fatal crashes

14 - injury crashes
60 - non-injury crashes
13 - right-angle type crashes - five (5) at Old Egg Harbor Road, two (2) at Washington Avenue, and two (2) at the driveway to Motion Enterprise. There were no other concentrations.

38 - same-direction type crashes - fourteen (14) at Washington Avenue, 12 at Route US $40 / 322$, five (5) at Doughty Road, and two (2) at Roosevelt Avenue. There were no other concentrations.

7 - left-turn type crashes - Three (3) at Old Egg Harbor Road and two (2) at Doughty Road. There were no other concentrations.

5 - side-swipe type crashes - There were no concentrations.

2 - fixed-object type crashes - There were no concentrations.

8 - other type crashes
1 - Pedestrian crash - highway worker in work zone.

A review of the crashes established the following:

- The critical months for crashes were April and October.
- The highest frequency of crashes occurred on Fridays.
- The highest frequency of crashes occurred between 5:00 PM and 6:00 PM.
- The percentage of crashes during hours of darkness ( $13 \%$ ) is much less than the statewide average for county roads (approximately $30 \%$ ).
- The percentage of crashes for wet surface conditions ( $26 \%$ ) is consistent with the statewide average for county roads (approximately $24 \%$ ). The percentage of crashes
with snowy or icy surface conditions (5\%) is consistent with the statewide average for county roads (approximately 5\%).
- The percentage of crashes with injuries (19\%) is lower than the statewide average for county roads (approximately $30 \%$ ).
- The percentage of right-angle type crashes ( $17 \%$ ) is consistent with the statewide average for county roads (approximately $21 \%$ ).
- The percentage of same directional crashes $(51 \%)$ is higher than the statewide average for county roads (approximately $29 \%$ ).
- The percentage of left-turn crashes $(9 \%)$ is higher, than the statewide average for county roads (approximately 6\%).
- The percentage of side- swipe type crashes (7\%) is less than the statewide average for county roads (approximately $12 \%$ ).
- The percentage of fixed-object type crashes (3\%) is less than the statewide average for county roads (approximately $12 \%$ ).
- The percentage of bicycle type crashes $(0 \%)$ is less than the statewide average for county roads (approximately 1\%).


## 5. Other Information

Additional materials reviewed by ORA prior to the formal audit process included videotapes taken by A-TECH Engineering, Inc. of both directions of travel for the entire study area.

Materials listed above are included in the Appendix.

## Audit

On October 12, 2006, the Safety Audit Team met in the Atlantic County's Engineer's Office to formally conduct the audit. The meeting commenced at 9:00 AM with brief statements by ORA representatives who reiterated the importance of RSAs and outlined the objectives of the safety audit. There were brief introductions by team members followed by an extensive review and discussion of materials described in the previous section. The team then drove to the Delilah Road intersection to begin the audit. Atlantic County provided a van for the team. Team members are listed below.

SAFETY AUDIT TEAM FOR JIMMIE LEEDS ROAD

| Name | Agency |
| :--- | :--- |
| Raymond Reeve | Office of Highway Safety |
| Edward Newman | Atlantic County Engineering |
| John Masi | Atlantic County Engineering |
| Albert N. Maiorano | Egg Harbor Township Police Department |
| Timothy Chelius | SJTPO |
| Karen Yunk | FHWA |
| Norman Deitch | Orth-Rodgers \& Associates, Inc. |
| George Strathern | Orth-Rodgers \& Associates, Inc. |

The team began at Delilah Road and walked south to Tilton Avenue before breaking for lunch. After lunch, the team scanned the section of road between Mill Road and Tilton Road.

During the field views, team members identified features on the roadway and its surrounding environment that could contribute to the occurrence or relative severity of roadway crashes. At the intersections and mid-block locations, the Audit Team identified safety deficiencies and inappropriate traffic signs, as well as other items that were felt to be inconsistent with effective road function and use. A variety of safety improvement measures were discussed with field notes and digital photographs being taken by team members.

At the completion of the audit, the team leader recapped the findings of the audit with the team.

The team leader informed the team members on the next step in the audit process; ORA will prepare a draft report summarizing the findings from the audit process and forward the report to all team members for their review and comments.

Approximately two weeks after the daytime audit, John Masi, Norm Deitch and George Strathern conducted a night audit. The goal was to check the retroflectivity of the street signs, pavement marking, and condition of the raised pavement markers (RPMs). In addition, the need for street lighting was checked and lights adjacent to the roadway on private property were checked to ensure that they did not create bright areas that could distract drivers. The team also looked for issues that would only be apparent during hours of darkness, such as clearly defined roadway alignment, signal indication visibility conflicts, ineffective street lighting, etc.

The next section of the report summarizes the findings from the daytime and nighttime audits of Fire Road (CR651), as well as the scanned section between Tilton Avenue and Mill Road.

## Findings

The findings from the Fire Road (CR 651) safety audit are presented on the following pages in the approximate order of their location along the roadway beginning at Delilah Road and traveling south to Mill Road.

| SAFETY ISSUE |  | REMEDIAL ACTION | LEVEL OF EFFORT REQUIRED |  |  | POTENTIAL SAFETY BENEFIT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH |
| 1 | General comment - Sign installation. Many of the signs along the road are installed as "bendaway" rather than "breakaway." Many installed as "breakaway" are installed incorrectly with the stub too far out of the ground or on the wrong side of the post. |  | Consideration should be given to inventorying the method of sign installation along the entire road and taking steps to properly install all signs as "breakaway" in accordance with the most current NJDOT standards and the MUTCD. |  | X |  |  | X |  |
| 2 | Southbound side approximately 300 feet south of RT US 40-322 - Speed limit 40 MPH sign worn. | Replace with new sign. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 3 | Northbound side approximately 300 feet south of Rt 40-322 - Truck route sign assembly worn. | Replace with new sign assembly. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 4 | Southbound side opposite Adams Road guide rail on both sides of driveway. Need for guide rail is questionable and the end treatments are not to current standards. | The need for the guide rail should be evaluated and, if retained, end treatments should be upgraded to current standards. |  | X |  |  | X |  |
| 5 | Northbound side approximately 300 feet north of Doughty Road - driveway to industrial complex has center median. Needs "KEEP RIGHT" sign on end of the median. | Install "KEEP RIGHT" sign. | X |  |  | X |  |  |


| SAFETY ISSUE |  | REMEDIAL ACTION | LEVEL OF EFFORT REQUIRED |  |  | POTENTLAL SAFETY BENEFIT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH |
| 6 | Traffic signal at Doughty Road intersection: <br> - northeast corner - no handicapped ramps <br> - southeast corner - triangular island forms right turn slot that is yield controlled. Suggested by team member that "YIELD BAR" be painted across the ramp. Also, there are no handicapped ramps on either the island or the corner radius. <br> - Northwest corner - triangular island forms right turn slot that is yield controlled. Suggested by team member that "YIELD BAR" be painted across the ramp. There are no handicapped ramps on the island. |  | - Consideration should be given to installing the missing handicapped ramps at the intersection. <br> - Consideration should be given to the installation of YIELD BARS across the right turn ramps. |  | X |  | X |  |  |
| 7 | Traffic signals at Doughty Road intersection - lettering on mast arm signs appear small. | The size of the letters on the mast arm signs should be checked. If they are found to be smaller than $8 " \mathrm{C}$ consideration should be given to replacing the signs. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 8 | Both sides of roadway at Atlantic Avenue and at ACE - guide rail appears too low and end treatments are not to current standards. | Consideration should be given to upgrading guide rail to current standards. |  |  | X |  |  | X |
| 9 | Southbound side at Atlantic Avenue inlet cover is not bicycle safe. | Consideration should be given to replacing existing inlet cover with bicycle safe cover. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 10 | Northbound side north of ACE - fire hydrant located in opening in guide rail. Team members stated that the opening could be eliminated if hydrant was raised to be higher than guide rail. | Consideration should be given to raising height of hydrant to eliminate opening. |  | X |  |  | X |  |


| SAFETY ISSUE |  | REMEDIAL ACTION | LEVEL OF EFFORT REQUIRED |  |  | POTENTIAL SAFETY BENEFIT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH |
| 11 | Both sides of road just north of ACE inlet covers that are not bicycle safe. |  | Consideration should be given to replacing existing inlet covers with bicycle safe covers. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 12 | Both sides of road just south of ACE inlet covers that are not bicycle safe. | Consideration should be given to replacing existing inlet covers with bicycle safe covers. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 13 | Both sides of road approximately 200 south of ACE - inlet covers that are not bicycle safe. | Consideration should be given to replacing existing inlet covers with bicycle safe covers. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 14 | Both sides of roadway south of ACE guide rail appear too low and end treatments not to current standards. | Consideration should be given to upgrading guide rail to current standards. |  |  | X |  |  | X |
| 15 | Columbus Avenue northeast corner vehicles parked on grass area on comer within the sight triangular. | Contact property owner to terminate this practice. | X |  |  |  | X |  |
| 16 | Washington Avenue - At pre-audit meeting, it was noted that signal operated on fixed time with an electricalmechanical controller. Installation has no junction boxes and only 1.5 -inch conduit. Therefore, existing signal not easily upgraded. There are plans for major improvements to intersection. Consultant preparing plans. Construction over a year away. | Consideration should be given to making those improvements eligible to be funded through this program. |  |  | X |  |  | X |
| 17 | Washington Avenue intersection - It was noted by local team members that at certain times of the day the intersection suffers excessive delays. And that eliminating some of the right turn on red restrictions at the intersection may improve its operation. Of particular note was the eastbound right turn on red prohibition. | The right turn on red restrictions at the intersection should be evaluated and those judged to be overly restricted be removed. | X |  |  |  | X |  |
| 18 | Washington Avenue northeast corner pilings and metal poles paralleling the radius on the corner. | If these obstacles are within the ROW, they should be removed. | X |  |  |  | X |  |


| SAFETY ISSUE |  | REMEDIAL ACTION | LEVEL OF EFFORT REQUIRED |  |  | POTENTIAL SAFETY BENEFIT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH |
| 19 | Northwest and southwest corners - signal base covers are missing exposing wiring. |  | Install missing signal base covers. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 20 | Southbound side approximately 200 feet south of Washington Avenue - Speed limit 40 MPH sign is worn. | Replace with new sign | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 21 | Two-way left-turn lane between Washington Avenue and railroad grade crossing lacks painted left turn arrows in the lane. | Install painted left turn arrows in this section of the two-way leftturn lane. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 22 | Railroad Grade Crossing just south of Roosevelt Avenue - Grade crossing just re-done. NJDOT's Bureau of Railroad and Safety to return to evaluate traffic protection at the crossing. Cross bucks installed on right side of road only, cross bucks are worn and one on southbound side of road obstructed by utility pole. | Pass these observations along to NJDOT's Bureau of Railroad and Safety. | X |  |  |  | X |  |
| 23 | Two-way left-turn lane between railroad grade crossing and RT 40/322 lacks painted left turn arrows in the lane. | Install painted left turn arrows in this section of the two-way left turn lane. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 24 | Southbound side north of RT 40/322-two-way left-turn lane becomes southbound left-turn lane - no signs indicating change. | Install appropriate additional signing indicating southbound left-turn lane. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 25 | Southbound side approximately 600 feet north of Rt US 40/322 - route marker assembly "JCT 40/322" is worn. | Replace sign assembly. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 26 | Intersection of RT US 40/322-Safe corridor team is evaluating this intersection. Therefore, intersection not evaluated. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | Cape Savings Bank on southwest corner of RT 40/322 - guide rail parallel to curb between curb and bank's parking lot. | If guide rail is within ROW, consideration should be given to its removal. |  | X |  |  | X |  |
| 28 | Southbound side south of RT US 40/322 - confirming route marker assembly "SOUTH 65I"- south plate is worn. | Replace worn plate. | X |  |  | X |  |  |


| SAFETY ISSUE |  | REMEDIAL ACTION | LEVEL OF EFFORT REQUIRED |  |  | POTENTIAL SAFETY BENEFIT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH |
| 29 | Southbound side north of Old Egg Harbor Road - there is on the right side of the road "CENTER LANE FOR LEFT TURN ONLY" with a 45 degree arrow. This sign is intended for use on center median of roads not on right side of road. |  | Replace sign with standard lane use control sign. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 30 | Two-way, left-turn lane between RT 40/322 and Old Egg Harbor Road lacks painted left turn arrows in the lane. | Install painted left turn arrows in this section of the two-way leftturn lane. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 31 | Southbound side approximately 150 feet north of Old Egg Harbor Road - Speed limit 40 MPH sign is worn. | Replace with new sign. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 32 | Southbound side just north of CR 687 route marker assembly " 687 " with a horizontal arrow to the left is worn. | Replace sign assembly. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 33 | Southwest corner of Old Egg Harbor Road - inlet cover not bicycle safe. | Consideration should be given to replacing existing inlet cover with bicycle safe cover. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 34 | Northbound side north of Old Egg Harbor Road - Speed limit 40 MPH sign is worn. | Replace with new sign. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 35 | Northbound side south of Old Egg Harbor Road - "JCT 40/322" route marker assembly is worn. | Replace with new sign assembly. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 36 | Both sides of road between Tilton Road and Rt 40/322 - paths worn indicating pedestrian traffic, some pedestrians observed during field view. No sidewalks along this section of road. | Consideration should be given to upgrading pedestrian facilities. |  |  | X |  |  | X |
| 37 | Southbound north of the GSP intersection - existing lane ends symbol sign. Right lane does not end until well after the GSP intersection. | Remove sign. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 38 | Along both directions of travel at the GSP intersection, there are guide signs for the GSP with arrows at 45 degrees. Should be horizontal arrows. | Consideration should be given to replacing signs with signs that have horizontal arrows. |  |  |  |  | X |  |


| SAFETY ISSUE |  | REMEDIAL ACTION | LEVEL OF EFFORT REQUIRED |  |  | POTENTIAL SAFETY BENEFIT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH |
| 39 | Hingston Road - quite a bit of time was spent at the intersection. Traffic count was ordered but not yet received at the time of the audit. Crash data was ordered as a result of field observations made during the Scan portion of this study. Because the crash data was ordered and received after the audit, it was not included in the crash summary for the road but was plotted separately and is described here. For the three-year period including 2004, 2005 through October of 2006, there was a total of nine crashes at the intersection. Four right-angle type crashes, one same direction type crash, one fixed-object type crash and three crashes involving vehicles turning left from Fire Road striking vehicles waiting at the stop line on Hingston Road. The traffic count taken at the intersection showed that the Hingston Road approach experienced a peak hour volume of 286 vehicles with an average hourly volume of 249 vehicles. Two-way traffic on Fire Road averaged 1432 vehicles/hour for the same 8 -hour period. The intersection easily exceeds Warrant 1 of the MUTCD for signalization. While meeting a warrant alone is not a reason to signalize an intersection, the operational conditions observed at the intersection during the audit also suggest that the intersection should be considered for signalization. |  | Consideration should be given to installing a traffic signal at the intersection and re-aligning the driveway to the Bon-Ton Plaza opposite Hingston Road to be included in the signalization. An alternative would be to re-align the road opposite the driveway or some combination of realigning both the driveway and the road. |  |  | X |  |  | X |
| 40 | Northbound approaching Mill Road "SIGNAL AHEAD" sign is worn and too close to the intersection. | Install new sign farther from the intersection. | X |  |  | X |  |  |


| SAFETY ISSUE |  | REMEDIAL ACTION | LEVEL OF EFFORT REQUIRED |  |  | POTENTIAL SAFETY BENEFIT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH |
| 41 | Mill Road - signal head installed on mast arm on far left facing northbound traffic. |  | Consideration should be given to relocating signal to pole on near left corner of the intersection. |  | X |  |  | X |  |
| NIGHTTJME FIELD VIEW IDENTIFIED THE FOLLOWING SAFETY ISSUES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42 | Intersection of GSP - Traffic signal display is not in conformance with current MUTCD. GSP ramp and driveway opposite GSP ramp have exclusive phases, but lack left turn green arrows now required for this type of signal phasing. | Consideration should be given to revising signal to meet current standards. |  | X |  | X |  |  |
| 43 | Mill Road intersection - near left signal facing the Mill Road eastbound is visible to northbound Fire Road traffic. | Attempt should be made to minimize side glow so that indication is not as visible to Fire Road traffic. | X |  |  |  | X |  |
| 44 | RPM on road are in very poor condition. | Consideration should be given to replacing RPM's along entire road. |  |  | X |  |  | X |
| 45 | Northbound north of Tilton Road confirming route marker assembly "NORTH 651 "- north plate is worn. | Replace "NORTH" plate. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 46 | Washington Ave northwest corner street luminaire burned out. | Contact responsible party regarding replacement of light bulb. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 47 | Southbound at ACE "BRIDGE <br> FREEZES BEFORE ROAD SURFACE" warning sign is worn. | Install new sign. | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| 48 | Washington Avenue southbound signals at intersection appear duller than normal. | Consideration should be given to examining lenses and bulbs to determine why lenses appear dull. | $\mathrm{X}$ |  |  |  | X |  |
| 49 | Southbound side at Old Egg Harbor Road - luminaire burned out. | Contact responsible party regarding replacement of light bulb. | X |  |  | X |  |  |


| SAFETY ISSUE |  | REMEDIAL ACTION | LEVEL OF EFFORT REQUIRED |  |  | POTENTIAL SAFETY BENEFIT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH |
| 50 | Southbound approaching Tilton Road YIELD sign on left side of $U$ and leftturn ramp is twisted so that it is clearly visible to Fire Road traffic. |  | Reinstall sign. | X |  |  |  | X |  |

## Recommendations

As stated earlier, the intent of the road safety audit process is to conduct a formal examination of highway features and the surrounding environment that increase the potential for crashes and identify countermeasures that will reduce (or eliminate) the probability of such crashes. The safety issues identified during the conduct of this audit and included in this report have been organized to provide the convenience and flexibility necessary to allow the implementation of the safety improvements as time and budget limitations allow. To the extent possible, the findings have been separated into line items so that the improvements can be implemented independently as appropriate. Clearly, consolidating a number of the safety recommendations will reduce the overall cost of improvements. We recommend that the appropriate management staff review the findings and decide which items can be completed in the immediate future (within one year). Many of the deficiencies can be corrected in the short term if the roadway owners dedicate both the time and financial resources to the task. The Level of Effort (an estimate of expenditures and man hours) indicated on the finding sheets of the report represent the team's best effort at categorizing each item.

The findings of the report with the greatest potential for reducing the crash experience along the road and the potential for future crashes are item \#39 the installation of a traffic signal at Hingston Road, \#36 the installation of missing section of sidewalk between Tilton Road and Rt $40 / 322$, and item \#45 the installation of new RPMs along the road. We acknowledge that these recommendations do not readily correlate with the crash experience along the road, but recall that one of the purposes of the audit is to identify potential safety problems; and that the crash experience, while a very important tool of the team, is not the only tool to be used by the team in identifying potential problems. The team members experience in the traffic safety arena, whether it be enforcement, design, maintenance or operation, are often equally important in identifying potential safety problems.

Those improvements discussed in the body of the report, which are scheduled and planned by the County, will also contribute to the safety of the road and those which may qualify for short term, quick fix funding should also be considered. Unfortunately, it is doubtful that the improvements to the Washington Avenue intersection will fit the criteria of a quick fix, low cost improvement.

As evidenced by the over representation of same directional type crashes, much of the crash experience on the road is probably congestion related. The crash experience at five of the seven traffic signals (end points Tilton and Delilah Roads excluded) along the audited portion of the road is included in the summary. As expected the signalized intersections are points of concentration for same directional type crashes.

Unfortunately, with many roads and many of the audits we have conducted, there is no easy quick fix solution to many of the crash patterns.

While the safety audit focuses on roadway features, enforcement is still a crucial component of safety on a road. Enforcement discourages the motorist from becoming lax in obeying or observing the traffic regulations along the road. Just as resources must be allocated to the physical improvements of the road, they must also be allocated to enforcement to maintain the safe operation of the road.

The opinions found in the findings of this Safety Audit report are those of the Safety Audit Team, as a whole, and not necessarily the opinions of the SJTPO or the individual team members.

## Appendix

- Straight line diagram of Fire Road
- Straight-line plan on which are plotted crashes
- 8.5 " X 11 " crash diagram of the Hingston Road intersection.
- Traffic counts
- Crash Summary Sheet
- Crash Data Charts
- Photographs



2003-2006 CRASH DIAGRAM
FIRE ROAD (CR 651) AND HINGSTQN ROAD EGG HARBOR TOWSHIP
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## FIRE ROAD (CR 651)

## EGG HARBOR TOWNSHIP

CRASH SUMMARY 2003-2005

## TOTAL-74 CRASHES

## Month

| Jan. | Feb. | Mar. | Apr. | May | June | July | Aug. | Sept. | Oct. | Nov. | Dec. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{9}$ | $\underline{1}$ | $\underline{5}$ | $\underline{10}$ | $\underline{6}$ | $\underline{8}$ | $\underline{7}$ | $\underline{6}$ | $\underline{3}$ | $\underline{11}$ | $\underline{7}$ | $\underline{1}$ |


| AM <br> Midnight - Noon | Time of Day <br> Number of <br> PM |  | Number of Crashes | Day | Week <br> Number of Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Midnight - 1:00 |  | 12:00-1300 | 5 | Monday | 10 |
| 1:00-2:00 |  | 1300-1400 | 5 | Tuesday | 14 |
| 2:00-3:00 | 1 | 1400-1500 | 4 | Wednesday | 12 |
| 3:00-4:00 | 2 | 1500-1600 | 9 | Thursday | 8 |
| 4:00-5:00 |  | 1600-1700 | 7 | Friday | 20 |
| 5:00-6:00 |  | 1700-1800 | 10 | Saturday | 7 |
| 6:00-7:00 |  | 1800-1900 | 2 | Sunday | 3 |
| 7:00-8:00 | 3 | 1900-2000 | 3 |  |  |
| 8:00-9:00 | 6 | 2000-2100 | 1 |  |  |
| 9:00-10:00 | 4 | 2100-2200 |  |  |  |
| 10:00-11:00 | 5 | 2200-2300 | 1 |  |  |
| 11:00-12 Noon | 5 | 2300-2400 |  |  |  |

DAY $\underline{63}$

NIGHT $\quad \underline{10}$
UNKNOWN 1

| DRY 51 | WET $\underline{19}$ | SNOWY $\underline{3}$ | ICY $\underline{1}$ | OTHERS |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CLEAR 51 | RAIN $\underline{18}$ | SNOW | $\underline{4}$ | FOG $\underline{1}$ |  |
| INJURY $\underline{14}$ | NON-INJURY | $\underline{60}$ | FATAL $\underline{0}$ |  |  |


| Right Angle | Same Direction | Left Turn | Right Turn | Side Swipe |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{13}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\underline{7}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{5}$ |
| Fixed Object | Head On | Other | Pedestrian | Bike |
| $\mathbf{2}$ |  | $\underline{8}$ | $\underline{1}$ |  |

Parking Related $\qquad$


Fire Road ( CR 651)
Crash Occurrence by Time of Day


Fire Road (CR 651 )
Crash Occurrence by Surface Conditions



Fire Road (CR 651) Crash Occurrence by Light Condition


Fire Road (CR 651)

## Crash Severity
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