

## Passing Sight Distance Regulations Vs Reality

Konstantinos Apostoleris, Phd Candidate, Civil Engineer Stergios Mavromatis, Associate Professor
Vassilios Matragos, Phd Candidate, Civil Engineer
Basil Psarianos, Professor
Fotis Mertzanis, Phd, Civil Engineer
Kiriakos Amiridis, Phd, Rural and Surveing Engineer

National Technical Univercity of Athens (NTUA)

## Objective of the Study

The objective of the present study is to investigate the length required for a complete and safe overtaking procedure at various speeds and for different types of vehicles, taking also into account the influence of the road longitudinal slope.
At the same time, measurements were carried out with appropriate equipment to determine the relationship between speed and acceleration of a newer technology vehicle in order to compare the results with the currently used regulations. The purpose of this analysis is to set the basis for the better determination of
 limiting PSD values in order to harmonize theory with practice.

## Proposed Methodology

The overtaking process involves three vehicles with different characteristics:

1. The passed vehicle 1 , which may be considered moving at a constant speed, slightly below the speed limit of the road (e.g. $10 \sim 20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ below the posted speed limit).
2. The passing vehicle 2 , which may be considered moving at a constant speed until it decides to overtake. From the moment starting the overtaking process and until its completion, a smoothly accelerated motion is assumed; and
3. The vehicle 3 that is moving in the opposite direction, which may be considered in favor of safety as being driven at a constant speed equal to the $\mathrm{V}_{85}$ operating speed.


## Proposed Methodology

The required overtaking length Su depends on the following factors:

1. The decision time for the driver of vehicle 2 to proceed with the overtaking process. For this period of time, vehicle 2 is driven at a constant speed same with vehicle 1 speed.
2. The length Lu where the passing Vehicle 2 has travelled from the beginning of the overtaking process until completion. In this case, vehicle 2 achieves constant acceleration, which depends on the vehicle's technical characteristics and the longitudinal slope of the road.
3. The safety distance $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}$ between vehicles 2 and 3 when the overtaking process is completed.
4. The distance $L_{3}$ traveled by vehicle 3 during the overtaking process. At this time vehicle 3 is moving at a constant speed equal to $\mathrm{V}_{85}$ operating speed.


## Assumptions

For the present research, the following assumptions were made:

1. Decision time $t_{\text {dec. }}$ was applied equal to 2 seconds.
2. Length Ls was set to 20 meters.
3. Speed $\mathrm{V}_{1}$ of vehicle 1 was considered $20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ lower than the design speed.
4. Operational speed $\mathrm{V}_{85}$ was considered $20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ higher than the design speed.
5. Safety margin $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}$ applied as 50 meters.
6. Speed of the passing vehicle shall never exceed the operational speed $\mathrm{V}_{85}$ while the overtaking procedure is active $(20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ higher than the design speed).


## Analysis and Relationship with current regulations

General analysis for many longitudinal slopes and several acceleration values has been completed and the results were primarily correlated with the limits proposed in the Greek Regulations OMOE-X and US Regulations (AASHTO), versions 2004 and 2018.

TABLE 3: Required PSD in Respect to the Longitudinal Slope, for Acceleration values equal to $2.0 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$

| Constant vehicle acceleration during overtaking procedure equal to $\alpha=2.0 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ve} \\ (\mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}) \end{gathered}$ | Road Longitudinal Slope / (+) Upgrade, (-) Downgrade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | OMOE | AASHTO |  |
|  | 10\% | 8\% | 6\% | 4\% | 2\% | 0\% | -2\% | -4\% | -6\% | -8\% | -10\% |  | 2004 | 2018 |
| 40 | 362 | 346 | 334 | 325 | 318 | 312 | 307 | 304 | 300 | 297 | 295 | 425 | 270 | 140 |
| 50 | 423 | 403 | 388 | 377 | 368 | 361 | 356 | 351 | 347 | 343 | 340 | 475 | 345 | 160 |
| 60 | 483 | 459 | 442 | 429 | 419 | 411 | 404 | 398 | 394 | 390 | 386 | 500 | 410 | 180 |
| 70 | 544 | 516 | 496 | 481 | 470 | 460 | 452 | 446 | 440 | 436 | 432 | 525 | 485 | 210 |
| 80 | 604 | 573 | 551 | 534 | 520 | 509 | 501 | 493 | 487 | 482 | 477 | 575 | 540 | 245 |
| 90 | 665 | 630 | 605 | 586 | 571 | 559 | 549 | 541 | 534 | 528 | 523 | 625 | 615 | 280 |
| 300 | Required length less than the one provided for Greek and AASHTO (2004) regulations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 400 |  | Required length less than the one provided for Greek and greater than AASHTO (2004) regulations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 500 |  | Required length greater than the one provided for in Greek and AASHTO (2004) regulations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 600 |  | Grades allowed by exception for the specific design speed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis and Relationship with current regulations

From the general analysis some conclusions were exported:

- A realistic conservative acceleration value of $\alpha=1.5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$ can be achieved with a vehicle of 100 hp , while for this acceleration value the required passing sight distance is significantly shorter in many cases than the minimum value presented in Greek regulations.
- AASHTO regulations (2018) has lower limits, and the required PSD in all cases is significantly higher from the calculated values.
- Previous version of AASHTO Regulations (2004) has more realistic thresholds, especially on lower design speed roads (lower than 60km/h).
- For higher design speed roads, AASHTO limit values (2004) converge to Greek regulation limits.
- Vehicles with higher horsepower, which are presently widely used on the National and Rural Road network, achieve a safe overtaking procedure much shorter than required by the Greek and previous AASHTO regulations (2004), but are not sufficient according to the recent AASHTO limits (2018).
- In the German RAL-2012 design guidelines, the required PSD is set to 600 m , which is adequate for almost all vehicles to complete a safe overtaking procedure for any speed less than $90 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.


## Investigation for different types of vehicles

As a second step, alternative scenarios for vehicles weighting $1000 \sim 1500 \mathrm{~kg}$, with a horsepower of 80 to 300 HP were considered in relation to the value of the acceleration $(\alpha)$ that vehicle 2 may achieve.

TABLE 1: Acceleration Values ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$ ), for Vehicles Weighing 1000kg in Respect to the Horsepower.

| Range of <br> Velocity | Box Gear | Horsepower (HP) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 0}$ |  |
| $\mathbf{4 0 - 8 0}$ | 2nd | 1,70 | 2,00 | 2,20 | 2,50 | 3,20 | 3,60 |  |
| $\mathbf{6 0 - 1 0 0}$ | 3rd | 1,20 | 1,40 | 1,60 | 1,80 | 2,20 | 2,50 |  |
| $\mathbf{8 0 - 1 2 0}$ | 4th | 0,90 | 1,05 | 1,20 | 1,40 | 1,70 | 1,90 |  |

TABLE 2: Acceleration Values ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$ ), for Vehicles Weighing 1500 kg in Respect to the Horsepower.

| Range of <br> Velocity | Box Gear | Horsepower (HP) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ |  |
| $\mathbf{4 0 - 8 0}$ | 2nd | 1,30 | 1,50 | 1,70 | 1,90 | $\mathbf{2 , 4 0}$ | 2,80 | 4,50 |  |
| $\mathbf{6 0 - 1 0 0}$ | 3rd | 0,90 | 1,05 | 1,20 | 1,40 | 1,70 | 2,00 | 3,20 |  |
| $\mathbf{8 0 - 1 2 0}$ | 4th | 0,70 | 0,80 | 0,90 | 1,05 | 1,30 | 1,50 | $\mathbf{2 , 5 0}$ |  |

## Investigation for different types of vehicles

The technical characteristics of the vehicles, and therefore the acceleration they can develop at the time of the overtaking procedure, is greatly influence the required PSD. In the present study, an analysis was performed by considering the average acceleration values presented above.

TABLE 4: Required PSD for 0\% Grade and Acceleration Values Depending on Horsepower and Vehicle Weight

| Vehicle Weight 1500kgr |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ve} \\ (\mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}) \end{gathered}$ | Vehicle Horsepower (HP) |  |  |  |  |  |  | OMOE | AASHTO |  |
|  | 80 | 100 | 120 | 140 | 180 | 210 | 300 |  | 2004 | 2018 |
| 40 | 336 | 323 | 311 | 302 | 284 | 274 | 245 | 425 | 270 | 140 |
| 50 | 391 | 374 | 361 | 349 | 328 | 314 | 280 | 475 | 345 | 160 |
| 60 | 446 | 426 | 410 | 397 | 371 | 355 | 314 | 500 | 410 | 180 |
| 70 | 566 | 537 | 514 | 488 | 459 | 437 | 382 | 525 | 485 | 210 |
| 80 | 630 | 597 | 570 | 541 | 508 | 483 | 421 | 575 | 540 | 245 |
| 90 | 760 | 723 | 693 | 656 | 610 | 581 | 494 | 625 | 615 | 280 |
| 100 | 830 | 790 | 757 | 716 | 664 | 633 | 537 | 675 | 670 | 320 |

300 Required length less than the one provided for Greek and AASHTO (2004) regulations
Required length less than the one provided for Greek and greater than AASHTO (2004) regulations
500
Required length greater than the one provided for in Greek and AASHTO (2004) regulations

## Investigation for different types of vehicles



From the above analysis some more conclusions were exported:

- For an average vehicle with a power of 140 hp , the length required for overtaking is usually shorter in respect to the Greek Regulations OMOE-X and German Regulations RAL-2012, especially on roads where the design speed is less than $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.
- On the other hand, for the same vehicle, the values provided in the previous AASHTO Regulations (2004) appear to approach the values derived from the present analysis for an average vehicle.
- The required PSD is always higher than the one suggested in the new AASHTO guidelines (2018).

Figure 3 - Required PSD as related to vehicle horsepower (1500kg weight) and design speed for longitudinal slope equal to $0 \%$
(1800cc, 122HP - Year 2019)
In order to further investigate literature results, measurements were made in


Figure 4 - VERICOM VC4000DAQ accelerometer the field with appropriate equipment and actual speed and acceleration data were recorded with a modern standard vehicle.

- A common large vehicle TOYOTA-CHR Hybrid 1800cc with 122 hp and manufacture year 2019 was used.
- Measurements were made using the VERICOM VC4000 accelerometer, which accurately records vehicle speed every 0.1 sec , as well as the longitudinal acceleration of the vehicle with a step of 0.01 sec .
- The measurements were carried out on a freeway road section with a very low curvature rate, without traffic in order to allow the vehicle to make the acceleration process unobstructed up to the vehicle speed limit.
- The average longitudinal slope of the motorway was approximately $1 \%$, which was taken into account in the final results.
- The measurements were made on a dry, clean pavement and with high tire grip between tires and pavement.
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Application for specific vehicle Toyota CHR Hybrid
(1800cc, 122HP - Year 2019)


Figure 5 - For Toyota CHR (122hp)
Measurements of vehicle speed and acceleration in respect to the distance covered were completed.

Based on the measurements, a mathematical relationship for the acceleration of the CHR Hybrid vehicle in respect to the instant vehicle speed was developed.

$$
\alpha=-0.0695 * \mathrm{~V}+3.32-\mathrm{s} * \mathrm{~g}
$$

$\mathrm{V}(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec})=$ the instant vehicle speed of CHR Hybrid (122HP)

## Application for specific vehicle Toyota CHR Hybrid

## (1800cc, 122HP - Year 2019)

According to Equation 3 and the mathematical equations of accelerating movement ( $\alpha=\mathrm{dV} / \mathrm{dt}$ and $\mathrm{V}=\mathrm{dS} / \mathrm{dt}$ ), the following equations were determined for the instant vehicle speed for CHR Hybrid and the distance travelled in respect to vehicle's running time.

$$
\begin{equation*}
V=\frac{V_{o}-\frac{3.32-s * g}{0.0695}}{1+0.0695 * t}+\frac{3.32-s * g}{0.0695} \quad \text { (4) } \quad S=\frac{V_{o}-\frac{3.32-s * g}{0.0695}}{0.0695} * \ln (1+0.0695 * t)+\frac{3.32-s * g}{0.0695} * t \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where: $\quad \mathrm{V}(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec})=\quad$ the instant vehicle speed of CHR Hybrid (122HP)
$\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{m})=\quad$ the travelled distance by CHR Hybrid (122HP)
$\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{o}}(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec})=\quad$ the initial vehicle speed of CHR Hybrid (122HP)
$\mathrm{S}(-)=\quad$ the longitudinal grade of the road $(+)$ for uphill and (-) for downhill.
$\mathrm{g}\left(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}^{2}\right)=\quad$ the gravity acceleration, equal to $9,81 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}^{2}$.
$\mathrm{t}(\mathrm{sec})=\quad$ the travel time of the vehicle CHR Hybrid (122HP)
Above equations refers only to TOYOTA-CHR Hybrid (1800cc, 122HP, 2019) that were used in the present study.

## Application for specific vehicle Toyota CHR Hybrid <br> (1800cc, 122HP - Year 2019)

| Required PSD for vehicle TOYOTA CHR-Hybrid (122HP, 1800cc, 2019) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ve (km/h) | Road Longitudinal Slope / (+) Upgrade, (-) Downgrade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | OMOE | AASHTO |  |
|  | 10\% | 8\% | 6\% | 4\% | 2\% | 0\% | -2\% | -4\% | -6\% | -8\% | -10\% |  | 2004 | 2018 |
| 40 | 299 | 290 | 282 | 276 | 270 | 266 | 262 | 259 | 256 | 253 | 251 | 425 | 270 | 140 |
| 50 | 363 | 350 | 340 | 330 | 322 | 315 | 310 | 305 | 301 | 297 | 294 | 475 | 345 | 160 |
| 60 | 436 | 418 | 402 | 389 | 378 | 368 | 360 | 353 | 348 | 343 | 338 | 500 | 410 | 180 |
| 70 | 519 | 493 | 472 | 454 | 439 | 426 | 415 | 405 | 397 | 390 | 385 | 525 | 485 | 210 |
| 80 | 618 | 580 | 550 | Less PSD needed $(\mathbf{2 5 m} \mathbf{\sim} \mathbf{6 3 m})$ for the overtaking procedure of Toyota CHR in respect to the constant acceleration of $2,0 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 433 | 575 | 540 | 245 |
| 90 | 738 | 683 | 641 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 485 | 625 | 615 | 280 |
| C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . $0 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| Ve (km/h) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | OMOE | AASHTO |  |
| Ve (km/h) | 10\% | 8\% | 6\% | 4\% | 2\% | 0\% | -2\% | -4\% | -6\% | -8\% | -10\% |  | 2004 | 2018 |
| 40 | 362 | 346 | 334 | 325 | 318 | 312 | 307 | 304 | 300 | 297 | 295 | 425 | 270 | 140 |
| 50 | 423 | 403 | 388 | 377 | 368 | 361 | 356 | 351 | 347 | 343 | 340 | 475 | 345 | 160 |
| 60 | 483 | 459 | 442 | 429 | 419 | 411 | 404 | 398 | 394 | 390 | 386 | 500 | 410 | 180 |
| 70 | 544 | 516 | 496 | 481 | 470 | 460 | 452 | 446 | 440 | 436 | 432 | 525 | 485 | 210 |
| 80 | 604 | 573 | 551 | 534 | 520 | 509 | 501 | 493 | 487 | 482 | 477 | 575 | 540 | 245 |
| 90 | 665 | 630 | 605 | 586 | 571 | 559 | 549 | 541 | 534 | 528 | 523 | 625 | 615 | 280 |

## Application for specific vehicle Toyota CHR Hybrid <br> (1800cc, 122HP - Year 2019)

| Required PSD for vehicle TOYOTA CHR-Hybrid (122HP, 1800cc, 2019) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ve (km/h) | Road Longitudinal Slope / (+) Upgrade, (-) Downgrade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | OMOE | AASHTO |  |
|  | 10\% | 8\% | 6\% | 4\% | 2\% | 0\% | -2\% | -4\% | -6\% | -8\% | -10\% |  | 2004 | 2018 |
| 40 | 299 | 290 | 282 | 276 | 270 | 266 | 262 | 259 | 256 | 253 | 251 | 425 | 270 | 140 |
| 50 | 363 | 350 | 340 | 330 | 322 | 315 | 310 | 305 | 301 | 297 | 294 | 475 | 345 | 160 |
| 60 | 436 | 418 | 402 | 389 | 378 | 368 | 360 | 353 | 348 | 343 | 338 | 500 | 410 | 180 |
| 70 | 510 | 403 | 472 | 454 | 439 | 426 | 415 | 405 | 397 | 390 | 385 | 525 | 485 | 210 |
| 80 | 618 | 580 | 550 | 526 | 506 | 489 | 474 | 461 | 450 | 441 | 433 | 575 | 540 | 245 |
| Constant vehicle acceleration during overtaking procedure equal to $\alpha=2.0 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Required length for the overtaking procedure is higher only in higher speed cases ( $80 \sim 90 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ) with higher longitudinal slope ( $\mathbf{+ 6 \%} \sim \mathbf{+ 1 0 \%}$ ). |  |  |  |  | al Slope / (+) Upgrade, (-) Downgrade |  |  |  |  |  |  | OMOE | AASHTO |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \% | 0\% | -2\% | -4\% | -6\% | -8\% | -10\% |  | 2004 | 2018 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 18 | 312 | 307 | 304 | 300 | 297 | 295 | 425 | 270 | 140 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 68 | 361 | 356 | 351 | 347 | 343 | 340 | 475 | 345 | 160 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 19 | 411 | 404 | 398 | 394 | 390 | 386 | 500 | 410 | 180 |
| 70 | 544 | 516 | 496 | 481 | 470 | 460 | 452 | 446 | 440 | 436 | 432 | 525 | 485 | 210 |
| 80 | 604 | 573 | 551 | 534 | 520 | 509 | 501 | 493 | 487 | 482 | 477 | 575 | 540 | 245 |
| 90 | 665 | 630 | 605 | 586 | 571 | 559 | 549 | 541 | 534 | 528 | 523 | 625 | 615 | 280 |

## (1800cc, 122HP - Year 2019)

| Required PSD for vehicle TOYOTA CHR-Hybrid (122HP, 1800cc, 2019) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ve (km/h) | Road Longitudinal Slope / (+) Upgrade, (-) Downgrade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | OMOE | AASHTO |  |
|  | 10\% | 8\% | 6\% | 4\% | 2\% | 0\% | -2\% | -4\% | -6\% | -8\% | -10\% |  | 2004 | 2018 |
| 40 | 299 | 290 | 282 | 276 | 270 | 266 | 262 | 259 | 256 | 253 | 251 | 425 | 270 | 140 |
| 50 | 363 | 350 | 340 | 330 | 322 | 315 | 310 | 305 | 301 | 297 | 294 | 475 | 345 | 160 |
| 60 | 436 | 418 | 402 | 389 | 378 | 368 | 360 | 353 | 348 | 343 | 338 | 500 | 410 | 180 |
| 70 | 519 | 493 | 472 | 454 | 439 | 426 | 415 | 405 | 397 | 390 | 385 | 525 | 485 | 210 |
| 80 | 618 | 580 | 550 | 526 | 506 | 489 | 474 | 461 | 450 | 441 | 433 | 575 | 540 | 245 |
| 90 | 738 | 683 | 641 | 607 | 580 | 557 | 538 | 522 | 507 | 495 | 485 | 625 | 615 | 280 |
| Overall time for the overtaking procedure (sec) - Driver decision time, taken as 2.0sec, is not included |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ve (km/h) | Road Longitudinal Slope / (+) Upgrade, (-) Downgrade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |  |  |
|  | 10\% | 8\% | 6\% | 4\% | 2\% | 0\% | -2\% | -4\% | -6\% | -8\% | -10\% |  |  |  |
| 40 | 7.38 | 6.99 | 6.66 | 6.36 | 6.12 | 5.91 | 5.73 | 5.58 | 5.45 | 5.34 | 5.24 | The influence of the longitudinal slope is particularly important and should be taken into account in determining the required PSD. |  |  |
| 50 | 7.83 | 7.38 | 6.99 | Additional 1,2 sec $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ 2,7sec needed for the overtaking procedure in case of $+6 \%$ Vs $-6 \%$ slope |  |  |  |  | 5.58 | 5.45 | 5.34 |  |  |  |
| 60 | 8.37 | 7.83 | 7.37 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.73 | 5.58 | 5.45 |  |  |  |
| 70 | 9.04 | 8.36 | 7.82 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.90 | 5.73 | 5.58 |  |  |  |
| 80 | 9.87 | 9.02 | 8.36 | 7.81 | 7.36 | 6.97 | 6.64 | 6.35 | 6.10 | 5.90 | 5.72 |  |  |  |
| 90 | 10.97 | 9.86 | 001 | 8.35 | 7.80 | 7.35 | 6.96 | 6.63 | 631 | 6.10 | 5.89 |  |  |  |
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## Application for specific vehicle Toyota CHR Hybrid

## (1800cc, 122HP - Year 2019)

| Speed range achieved from the passing vehicle ( $\mathbf{k m / h}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{Ve}(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h})$ | Road Longitudinal Slope / (+) Upgrade, (-) Downgrade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |
|  | 10\% | 8\% | 6\% | 4\% | 2\% | 0\% | -2\% | -4\% | -6\% | -8\% | -10\% |  |
| 40 | 20~54 | 20~56 | 20-58 | 20~60 | $20-60$ | 20~60 | 20~60 | 20~60 | $20 \cdot 60$ | 20~60 | 20~60 | The passing vehicle starts the overtaking procedure with a speed $20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ lower than the design speed, while the maximum speed does not exceed the design speed plus $20 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| 50 | 30~62 | 30~64 | $30 \cdot 66$ | 30~68 | $30 \cdot 70$ | $30 \sim 70$ | $30 \sim 70$ | $30 \sim 70$ | $30 \cdot 70$ | $30 \sim 70$ | $30 \sim 70$ |  |
| 60 | $40 \sim 70$ | $40 \sim 72$ | $40 \cdot 74$ | 40~76 | 40-78 | $40 \sim 80$ | $40 \sim 80$ | $40 \sim 80$ | $40-80$ | 40~80 | 40~80 |  |
| 70 | 50~77 | 50~80 | $50 \cdot 82$ | 50~84 | $50-87$ | 50~89 | 50~90 | $50 \sim 90$ | $50-90$ | $50 \sim 90$ | 50~90 |  |
| 80 | 60~85 | $60 \sim 87$ | $60 \cdot 90$ | 60~92 | 60-94 | 60~97 | 60~99 | $60 \sim 100$ | $60 \sim 100$ | $60 \sim 100$ | $60 \sim 100$ |  |
| 90 | $70 \sim 92$ | $70 \sim 95$ | $70 \cdot 98$ | $70 \sim 100$ | 70-102 | $70 \sim 104$ | $70 \sim 107$ | $70 \sim 109$ | $70 \sim 110$ | $70 \sim 110$ | $70 \sim 110$ |  |
| Acceleration range achieved from the passing vehicle ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathbf{s}^{2}$ ) - The influence of the longitudinal slope is included |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{Ve}(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h})$ | Road Longitudinal Slope / (+) Upgrade, (-) Downgrade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |
|  | 10\% | 8\% | 6\% | 4\% | 2\% | 0\% | -2\% | -4\% | -6\% | -8\% | -10\% |  |
| 40 | $1.95 \sim 1.29$ | $2.15 \sim 1.45$ | $2.35 \sim 1.60$ | $2.54 \sim 1.77$ | 2.74~1.97 | $2.93 \sim 2.16$ | $3.13 \sim 2.36$ | $3.33 \sim 2.55$ | $3.52 \sim 2.75$ | $3.72 \sim 2.95$ | $3.91 \sim 3.14$ | The acceleration that can be achieved during the overtaking procedure varies significantly depending on the speed and the longitudinal slope of the road section, affecting the required PSD |
| 50 | $1.76 \sim 1.14$ | $1.96 \sim 1.29$ | $2.15 \sim 1.45$ | $50 \% ~ \sim ~ 105 \%$ higher acceleration on $-6 \%$ in respect to $+6 \%$ |  |  |  |  | 3.33 ~ 2.56 | $3.53 \sim 2.75$ | $3.72 \sim 2.95$ |  |
| 60 | $1.57 \sim 0.99$ | 1.76~1.14 | $1.96 \sim 1.30$ |  |  |  |  |  | $3.14 \sim 2.36$ | $3.33 \sim 2.56$ | $3.53 \sim 2.76$ |  |
| 70 | $1.37 \sim 0.84$ | $1.57 \sim 0.99$ | 1.77 ~ 1.14 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.94 ~ 2.17 | $3.14 \sim 2.37$ | $3.34 \sim 2.56$ |  |
| 80 | $1.18 \sim 0.70$ | $1.38 \sim 0.85$ | $1.57 \sim 1.00$ | 1.77 ~ 1.15 | 1.97 ~ 1.30 | $2.16 \sim 1.46$ | 2.36 ~ 1.61 | 2.55 ~ 1.78 | 2.75 ~ 1.98 | 2.95 ~ 2.17 | $3.14 \sim 2.37$ |  |
| 90 | $0.99 \sim 0.56$ | 1.18 ~ 0.70 | $1.38 \sim 0.85$ | $1.58 \sim 1.00$ | 1.77 ~ 1.15 | 1.97 ~ 1.30 | $2.16 \sim 1.46$ | 2.36 ~ 1.62 | $2.56 \sim 1.78$ | $2.75 \sim 1.98$ | $2.95 \sim 2.18$ |  |

## Conclusions

- PSD provided by the Greek Regulations is significantly higher than the required. On the other hand, the AASHTO regulations, as they apply today (7th edition 2018), seem to provide very low values for the required overtaking length. Values in the 5th Edition (2004) of AASHTO appear to be more realistic, while 600 m proposed by the German RAL-2012 guidelines seems to meet the requirements of a typical passenger car for the recommended speed of $90 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ applied in design class EKL3.
- The longitudinal slope of the road has a significant influence on the desired visibility threshold for overtaking and should be considered in determining the acceptable PSD limits in regulations.
- Increased acceleration even for small vehicles should lead to reconsider the conservative assumptions made in regulations currently used in several countries. From the preceding analysis it becomes apparent that even for a vehicle with 100 hp horsepower, the required overtaking length is significantly lower in many cases than the minimum value provided by the Greek, US and German Regulations.
- Vehicles with higher horsepower can safely complete the overtaking procedure of a slow-moving vehicle in a shorter length. Nevertheless, the present analysis shows that the reduction is relatively small, especially on roads with a low design speed (less than $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ).



## Thank You for your attention!



