CETRA\textsuperscript{2018} 
5\textsuperscript{th} International Conference on Road and Rail Infrastructure 
17–19 May 2018, Zadar, Croatia 

TITLE 
Road and Rail Infrastructure V, Proceedings of the Conference CETRA 2018 

EDITED BY 
Stjepan Lakušić 

ISSN 
1848-9850 

ISBN 
978-953-8168-25-3 

DOI 
10.5592/CO/CETRA.2018 

PUBLISHED BY 
Department of Transportation 
Faculty of Civil Engineering 
University of Zagreb 
Kačićeva 26, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia 

DESIGN, LAYOUT & COVER PAGE 
minimum d.o.o. 
Marko Uremović · Matej Korlaet 

PRINTED IN ZAGREB, CROATIA BY 
“Tiskara Zelina”, May 2018 

COPIES 
500 

Zagreb, May 2018. 

Although all care was taken to ensure the integrity and quality of the publication and the information herein, 
no responsibility is assumed by the publisher, the editor and authors for any damages to property or persons 
as a result of operation or use of this publication or use the information's, instructions or ideas contained in 
the material herein. 
The papers published in the Proceedings express the opinion of the authors, who also are responsible for their 
content. Reproduction or transmission of full papers is allowed only with written permission of the Publisher. 
Short parts may be reproduced only with proper quotation of the source.
CETRA 2018
5th International Conference on Road and Rail Infrastructure
17–19 May 2018, Zadar, Croatia

ORGANISATION

CHAIRMEN

Prof. Stjepan Lakušić, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Civil Engineering
Prof. emer. Željko Korlaet, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Civil Engineering

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

Prof. Stjepan Lakušić
Prof. emer. Željko Korlaet
Prof. Vesna Dragčević
Prof. Tatjana Rukavina
Assist. Prof. Ivica Stančerić
Assist. Prof. Maja Ahac
Assist. Prof. Saša Ahac
Assist. Prof. Ivo Haladin
Assist. Prof. Josipa Domitrović
Tamara Džambas
Viktorija Grgić
Šime Bezina
Katarina Vranešić
Željko Stepan

PROFESSORS

Prof. Rudolf Eger
Prof. Kenneth Gavin
Prof. Janusz Madejski
Prof. Nencho Nenov
Prof. Andrei Petriaev
Prof. Otto Plašek
Assist. Prof. Andreas Schoebel
Prof. Adam Szeląg
Brendan Halleman

INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Stjepan Lakušić, University of Zagreb, president
Borna Abramović, University of Zagreb
Maja Ahac, University of Zagreb
Saša Ahac, University of Zagreb
Darko Babić, University of Zagreb
Danijela Barić, University of Zagreb
Davor Brčić, University of Zagreb
Domagoj Damjanović, University of Zagreb
Sanja Dimter, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek
Aleksandra Deluka Tibljaš, University of Rijeka
Josipa Domitrović, University of Zagreb
Vesna Dragčević, University of Zagreb
Rudolf Eger, RheinMain Univ. of App. Sciences, Wiesbaden
Adelino Ferreira, University of Coimbra
Makoto Fujii, Kanazawa University
Laszlo Gaspar, Széchenyi István University in Győr
Kenneth Gavin, Delft University of Technology
Nenad Gucunski, Rutgers University
Ivo Haladin, University of Zagreb
Staša Jovanović, University of Novi Sad
Lajos Kisgyörgy, Budapest Univ. of Tech. and Economics
Anastasia Konon, St. Petersburg State Transport Univ.
Željko Korlaet, University of Zagreb
Meho Saša Kovačević, University of Zagreb
Zoran Krakutovski, Ss. Cyril and Methodius Univ. in Skopje
Dirk Lauwers, Ghent University
Janusz Madejski, Silesian University of Technology
Goran Mladenović, University of Belgrade
Tomislav Josip Mlinarić, University of Zagreb
Nencho Nenov, University of Transport in Sofia
Mladen Nikšić, University of Zagreb
Andrei Petriaev, St. Petersburg State Transport University
Otto Plašek, Brno University of Technology
Mauricio Pradena, University of Concepcion
Carmen Racanel, Tech. Univ. of Civil Eng. Bucharest
Tatjana Rukavina, University of Zagreb
Andreas Schoebel, Vienna University of Technology
Ivica Stančerić, University of Zagreb
Adam Szeląg, Warsaw University of Technology
Marjan Tušar, National Institute of Chemistry, Ljubljana
Audrius Vačkus, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University
Andrei Zaitsev, Russian University of transport, Moscow
FEASIBILITY OF INTERCHANGE CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS ALONG MOTORWAYS

Anastasios Mouratidis, Fotini Kehagia
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Highway Laboratory of Civil Engineering Department, Greece

Abstract

Existing guidelines and regulations define the conditions to interpose an additional interchange along a motorway. These regulations mainly deal with traffic operations and safety on the transportation system involved and the motorway in question. In the present analysis, cost and land use criteria are also considered as parts of a feasibility investigation meant to grant access to a motorway. However, what is most important is the research on the “inverse” question, that is, the concern of a too long spacing which may be an impediment to sustainability. The basic concept of establishing specific criteria in view of the construction of an additional interchange reflects the need to provide reachable social assets and to permit quick access in case of emergency. The constitutive pattern presented herewith introduces conditions in favor of the potential project. Their expected beneficial effect may turn a controversial construction project to a positive asset for travellers and local society.
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1 Introduction

Design of interchange density along a motorway constitutes a basic issue to be addressed, at first place, during the project planning stage. Later on, the engineering design study is meant to provide the overall layout including the position and the type of each interchange along the route.

In this regard, a global policy for the distribution and the design of interchanges, applicable indiscriminately to every new motorway or to every upgrading project, may prove inadequate, due to the variety of the contributing factors: traffic volume, neighboring built environment, type of terrain, land use, environmental features, budget constraints. All these factors, associated with the motorway and its surroundings, may be so different from one case to another, that it is impossible to conceive how a global policy would result in a suitable design all by applying simple rules of geometric considerations. Low-volume motorways must be handled in a quite different way from congested freeways. Expressways traversing underdeveloped regions play a significant role and should be appraised by a broad look beyond the rules concerning an ordinary transportation link.

Accordingly, the scope of planning the number and the position of interchanges along a motorway becomes wider. A sustainable design needs to combine environmental friendliness, engineering capacity, economic efficiency and societal needs, to transform the transportation infrastructure into a substantial means of development and welfare. Traditional and innovative literature on the subject (Baker,1975), (AASHTO,2004), (Institute of Transportation Engineers,2005) primarily deals with the geometric conditions of interchange design, including terms of interposing new interchanges on existing motorways. The main concern throughout
the said literature is to conserve road safety and serviceability at high level. Issues related with traffic operations on ring roads, urban and suburban freeways are thoroughly examined. Traffic deceleration, safety in weaving areas and ramp spacing are common subjects of detailed study and analysis. Operational aspects of the overall transportation system are also investigated and introduced into combined briefs of rules and guidelines. The contribution of the existing methods of interchange design to preserve high serviceability standards is beneficial in cases of congested freeways or urban ring roads (TRB, 2010). By contrast, in cases of non-congested freeways and common motorways in rural environment, B/C models designed for transportation infrastructure projects can be applied (Caltrans, 2012). They usually consider four categories of benefits resulting from highway construction projects: travel time savings, vehicle operation cost savings, accident cost savings, emission reduction. However, a gap still exists: are the aforesaid rules and guidelines sufficient to ensure economic, environmental and societal sustainability? Should other factors, such as local economy or societal needs, be taken into consideration? The analysis presented hereafter aims at extending the research to a wider area so as to cover all aspects of an effective and sustainable planning of additional interchanges on motorways.

2 Prerequisites for a new interchange

Addressing mainly the case of congested freeways in urban and peri-urban areas, the FHWA proposes the checking process consisting of eight points/criteria in view to granting access to an interstate freeway (Federal Register, 2009). The FHWA analysis focuses on traffic operation and a detailed assessment of the deceleration impact by an interposed interchange (TRB, 2011). Safety issues in weaving areas are also dealt with (Table 1). In an attempt to extend the scope of the subject, it is worth widening the research introducing quantifiable and non-quantifiable factors in the decision producing algorithm. This constitutive algorithm should explore both cases: “Is the distribution of interchanges too dense?” and “Is it too sparse?” A rational planning should avoid both non-sustainable situations.

Table 1 Prerequisites to permit access to a freeway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A/A</th>
<th>FHWA POINTS</th>
<th>Transport Infrastructure affected</th>
<th>Operational criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The existing system is incapable of accommodating desired access or traffic demands</td>
<td>TS(*)</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>All reasonable alternatives to a new interchange have been considered, including transportation system management</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The proposal does not have an adverse safety or operational impact on the freeway</td>
<td>Freeway</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A full interchange at a public road is provided</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The proposal is consistent with transportation and land use plans</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>LOS(**)/Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>A comprehensive interstate network study is prepared</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>There is coordination with transportation system improvements</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The request is considered as an alternative in environmental evaluations</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*)TS=Transport System, (**)LOS=Level of Service
3 Comparative analysis

A motorway is an expressway with separate carriageways and full access control. Local access along rural motorways is usually provided by frontage roads. Potential interchanges aiming to give access to regional roads, villages or historic settlements (Fig.1) are unlikely to be granted and planned in the frame of an ordinary motorway construction project. Conversely, interchanges must be foreseen to link the motorway to major cities, crossing expressways and principal national roads (Fig.2). These informal, all but, fundamental principles can be effectively applied to motorway construction projects in developed countries, where an extended and highly operational transportation infrastructure exists. However, an eventual application of this policy to every motorway construction project or to every project upgrading an existing facility may prove totally ineffective. Through the existing guidelines, the conditions and the criteria to interpose an interchange on an existing or a planned motorway seem well established. These criteria reflect the concern to raise limitations in the density of interchanges so as to preserve serviceability and safety. Sustainability is considered at risk if the spacing is too short and, as a result, traffic operations and safety criteria are not satisfied. Nevertheless, a relevant question arises: is the opposite concern reasonable and justified? What if the distribution is too sparse? What about sustainability in this case? A meticulous investigation of the subject unveiled several adverse effects of a too sparse distribution of interchanges on motorways. Furthermore, through this research a full overview of the generated impact of a too dense interchange distribution has been recorded. In Table 2, these effects, mainly negative, in both situations, are presented.

![Figure 1](image)

**Figure 1** a) Potential access denied b) Potential access granted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Classification</th>
<th>Distribution of Interchanges</th>
<th>Too dense</th>
<th>Too sparse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk of congestion</td>
<td>Limited traffic volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excessive information/traffic signs</td>
<td>Inability to manage incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion on local network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional construction cost</td>
<td>Cost-ineffective investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impediment to regional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societal</strong></td>
<td>Reachable social services</td>
<td>Inaccessible societal assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td>Negative impact (land use, air pollution)</td>
<td>Limited impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 International experience

Generally, interchanges are not placed in an orderly arrangement along a motorway. Minimum interchange spacing is provided by national or state regulations. In the USA, minimum spacing of interchanges along rural freeways is defined to 3 or 6 miles by different states. In Europe, common practice (Grecu, 2011) reflects a tendency to respect the lower limit of spacing at 8 km (Table 3). The international experience on main expressways records interchanges, placed close enough one to another, the spacing seldom exceeding 15 km. Therefore, the need for establishing an upper limit of spacing seems rather useless.

Table 3 Average distance between exits on European motorway segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Motorway</th>
<th>Length [km]</th>
<th>Number of exits</th>
<th>Average distance between exits [km]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>A1 West Autobahn</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>M1 Budapest towards Vienna</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>A1 Zagreb-Split</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>A1 Autoestrada do Norte</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>A7 North-south</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>A6 Autoroute du Soleil</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>A2 (E90) Egnatia Motorway</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>A6 Attiki Odos (Peri-urban)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Traffic demand

While facing the feasibility of an additional interchange along a motorway, major traffic concerns are safety and congestion (TRB, 2011). Especially, in urban and peri-urban expressways, it is basically the criterion of congestion that dictates the outcome of the respective analysis. The point raised by the FHWA statement (2009) is relevant: “The existing system is incapable of accommodating desired access or traffic demands”. This criterion applies in case of congested national and local networks. Likewise, when the traffic safety level is low on the local network, diverting a part of traffic volume to the adjacent motorway may prove an effective solution. On congested interurban and rural motorways, exhibiting a low level of service (C or lower), interposing a new interchange should not deteriorate the operational traffic condition. Point 3 of FHWA is relevant “the proposal does not have an adverse safety or operational impact on the freeway”. Similar questions about adding a new interchange to an existing motorway, at high serviceability condition (LOS A), may arise. Congestion is the least of concerns, in this case. Feasibility should mainly be addressed in terms of enhancement of accessibility of social assets and cost-effectiveness of the total investment. Nevertheless, screening levels of traffic volume are also useful. A very low volume of expected traffic at the interchange indicates cost/benefit inadequacy or uselessness. By contrast, significant traffic expected may reinforce the feasibility of the planned facility, especially if the traffic on the motorway is low (i.e, ADT < 10,000).

6 Economic appraisal

Deployment of interchanges, in the frame of a new motorway planning or interposing a new interchange on an existing facility, must go through a comprehensive economic appraisal. On this matter, various methods of assessment, in the frame of a cost-benefit analysis, are available, namely, the “net present value”, the “internal rate of return” and other, each one presenting advantages and drawbacks related to the case in question. The “cost-benefit”
analysis is a comprehensive method and produces, in most cases, reliable and exploitable results (FHWA, 2003). The “investment cost” should include all cost components of the project: design, construction, management, supervision, expropriations, frontage roads, crossroads, maintenance, taxes and insurance. Cost-benefit analysis needs to be carried out incorporating quantifiable and non-quantifiable factors. Reasonably, initial investment, maintenance and operation costs are quantifiable and so are economic development benefits. Travel time savings may also be estimated. On the other hand, safety issues and access to social services may be quantified but not in monetary terms. Any attempt to measure accurately environmental effects due to a new interchange construction project may prove a quite different task. With regard to “benefits”, special attention must be paid to the risk of overlapping. Benefits considered elsewhere in the overall evaluation, especially improvement of societal assets, should not re-state to avoid double counting. The economic feasibility of a project aiming at planting a new interchange along a motorway lies on two different and distinct conditions:
• Is the interchange construction project feasible by itself?
• Is the impact of this prospective construction to the motorway in question positive and measurable?

This latter condition is indispensable while considering motorways bearing low traffic volume and widely spaced interchanges. The “cost-benefit” analysis normally results in defining the “benefit-cost ratio” (BCR), a quotient juxtaposing benefits to costs. Commonly, in order to calculate the present value of benefits, a realistic rate of discount is taken into account to sum up expected measurable benefits throughout the life-time of the facility. A feasible project is identified by a BCR value greater than 1. Usually, the BCR value is estimated to select a prospective project among different alternatives. While examining a well-defined solution, BCR > 1 is a prerequisite, but depending on the available financing means, a higher threshold value may be adopted to designate the cost effectiveness and affordability of the project. For example, if the additional incoming traffic of a prospective interchange is estimated too low, the alternative choice of upgrading the existing national network must also be considered.

7 Social assets and societal aspects

In developing countries, innovative motorways may be beneficial to the neighboring communities. Remote and low-income regions, deprived from modern transportation infrastructure, may turn to rapid development following the construction of new high-capacity road links. Economic growth, by industrial and commercial expansion, is expected, in this case, as a result of respective investment to re-vive the lethargic power of productive development. Moreover, direct and quick access to social services is highly appreciated by regional communities. A new motorway crossing a remote region offers the possibility of rapid movement to and from the adjacent major city. Services may include health institutions, public offices, educational establishments, finance and credit agencies, commercial centers and other. Thus, services getting closer, the remote region becomes less isolated and more inviting. Would this be a decisive criterion to plan or to interpose an interchange along a motorway? Probably, it depends, in any case, on other factors as well, such as expected traffic and economic feasibility. However, this is a substantial component of the overall question, not to be neglected. In an attempt to measure the beneficial effect of a prospective interchange on a motorway to support an isolated inhabited area, the gain in travel time must be estimated. The population to acquire indirect profit from this additional infrastructure element is also an important factor to be considered while quantifying the beneficial effect expected.
8 Environmental consideration

In an interchange design study allowing for sustainability, the impact to the environment must be suit-ably estimated. This impact varies with regard to the topography and the location of the project and the complexity of the layout of the link (cloverleaf, diamond, etc.). Constraints related to the surrounding terrain predominate and therefore the design of the inter-change must be closely fitted to it to elude increase in construction cost and land acquisition. The main environmental issues associated with the existing condition of landscape and the proposed interchange are:

• Land use: The extent of right-of-way needed to develop the interchange combined with the commercial or residential character of the surrounding area may influence the final design and geometry. Design features should respect the intrinsic character of the area. Especially, areas in which rare agriculture products are cultivated or areas of nature conservation interest should have taken into consideration.

• Water resources: The appropriate measures have to be taken in order no impaired waters locate in the study area.

• Nature conservation issues: Interchanges can be wildlife traps or islands for the species. Well sited and designed constructions must avoid fragmentation. Connectivity between the segments of an interchange with culverts or tunnels may be important for the movement of fauna. Moreover, densely planted land contained in the interchange, minimizes the degree of fragmentation. The correct fencing helps to avoid confusing the fauna and unintentionally leading them onto the road.

• Cultural issues: A flexibility of design standards can be used to by-pass a cultural site without comproming the operational or safety issues.

• Air quality-Noise: Research of the potential of environmental burden in the area of new access.

9 A pattern for sustainability

In a frame of planning new motorways or upgrading existing ones, the justification of the number and the position of interchanges, along the transportation infrastructure, is required. In this regard, sustain-ability is provided by an effective arrangement among traffic operations, social welfare and environmental protection. The methodology elaborated and presented herewith consists of two distinct and different entities. The first entity replies to the common question: Is the proposed project feasible? Is this project worth financing and carrying it out? Relevant preconditions to identify feasibility are given in Table 4.

Table 4  Conditions to permit a new interchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Condition/Restriction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>In congested motorways (LOS = C or lower) not to reduce LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>&quot;Benefit-Cost&quot; ratio &gt; 1 or greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use / Environment</td>
<td>Preserve rare agricultural products; Preserve areas of nature conservation interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacing</td>
<td>Respect lower limit: S ≥ 10 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second entity goes further: the main concern is a too sparse distribution of interchanges. The criteria to formulate a proposal for a new interchange, not only feasible but substantial prerequisite to develop-ment, growth and welfare of the region are presented in Table 5.
Table 5 Criteria recommending a new interchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Criterion/Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>In remote and low-income regions: if quick access is provided to facilities, public services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>In non-congested motorways (LOS = A) to supply additional traffic and improve sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In case of low serviceability and safety level in the adjacent local network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Management</td>
<td>Provide additional entrance to emergency vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacing</td>
<td>Respect upper limit: $S \leq 20$ km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a case of planning a new motorway, it would be useful to estimate the consequences of inter-change density options by applying the present methodology. In fact, this analysis consists of two steps: a) determine presumptive traffic flow in the motorway and the local roads and b) evaluate benefits and adverse effects following the proposed pattern. While using the proposed methodology, it must be absolutely clear that this is a pattern mainly based on qualitative effects which cannot be fully converted in monetary terms. The use of the cost-benefit analysis is restrained to the benefits and disbenefits which can, indeed, be adequately appraised as capital, income and expenses.

10 Conclusions

The common question about the need for an additional interchange along a motorway reflects the concern of generating traffic congestion and safety problems. The overall subject, however, is quite wider; land use and environmental considerations must also be taken into account to preserve sustainability. Moreover, in non-congested motorways, a project providing further access to social services may be not only feasible but much more, beneficial and mandatory. In this respect, the afore-presented methodology is supposed to enhance the societal impact and the traffic serviceability of the transportation infrastructure. Consequently, the cost-effectiveness and the overall sustainability of the entire transportation facility get reinforced and presumed negative effects are eliminated.
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