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## 0. Summary

### 0.1 Purpose and Outline of the Work

JICA Expert Team (the Team) conducted to develop the proposal for mitigation of traffic accident in aspect of road geometric structure and traffic safety facility through the following works.
$\checkmark$ Site investigation to identify issues on the national highways and the expressway.
$\checkmark$ Analysis of the issues.
$\checkmark$ Developing proposal for the solution.

### 0.2 Classification of the Identified Issues

The Team classified the issues according to major causes as listed below. After then the Team analyzed the each cause to consider its solution.
(1) Inappropriate arrangement and/or absence of road furniture
(2) Unnecessary object is continued to exist
(3) Inappropriate road geometric structure
(4) Inappropriate work manner
(5) Inappropriate traffic manner
(6) Defect due to inappropriate construction quality

### 0.3 Proposal for the Solution

The Team developed the proposal for the solution against the above stated issues by examining practicability level of the solution from A to C in accordance with the following criteria.

## > Level-A: High practicability

Implementation will be enabled by internal approval in MOC. Cost is low and period is short.

## > Level-B: Moderate practicability

Implementation will be enabled by the government's approval and/or co-working with other Ministries. Cost is low - medium and/or period is medium - long.

## > Level-C: Low practicability

Implementation will be enabled by the government's approval and/or co-working with other Ministries. Cost is high and/or period is long.

Summary of the proposal is as shown in the following table.

Summary of the Proposal for the Solution

| No. | Issue | Approach (desirable) | Practicability | Approach (secondary) | Practicability |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) | Inappropriate arrangement <br> and/or absence of road <br> furniture | - Rearrangement, <br> relocation and/or newly <br> installation | A |  |  |
| (2) | Unnecessary object is <br> continued to exist | - Removal | A |  |  |
| (3) | Inappropriate road geometric <br> structure | - Large scale realignment <br> \& reconstruction <br> - Slope cutting \& road <br> widening | C | - Install traffic safety <br> facility | A-B |
| (4) | Inappropriate work manner |  <br> training program | B | - Establish work cycle | A |
| (5) | Inappropriate traffic manner | - Reinforce penal <br> regulation <br> - Access control to <br> expressway | C | - Public awareness <br> campaign of traffic <br> safety | B |
| (6) | Defect due to inappropriate <br> construction quality | - Repair work based on <br> investigation \& design in <br> appropriate manner | C | - Install traffic safety <br> facility <br> - Temporary repair work | A - B |

### 0.4 Action Taken by the Government of Myanmar

The counterpart (CP) of the Government of Myanmar took swift action to solve the issues in response to the discussion with the Team as shown in the following figure.

Location : 2mile-5furlong in Yangon - Mandalay Expressway
Action : Removal of unnesessary concrete posts


Action Outcome of the CP

### 0.5 Effort by the Road Agencies in Japan

The Team introduces the effort by the Japanese road agencies in both road classifications namely expressway and national highway. Sample photos are as shown below.


Arrangement View of Traffic safety Facilities in the Expressway


Work View and Road Facility in the National Highway

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Work Purpose

JICA Expert Team (the Team) conducted the work to mitigate risk of traffic accident on the road infrastructure in aspect of road geometric structure and traffic safety facility. The Team implemented site investigation works on both of road categories namely national highway and expressway to identify the issues those threatening traffic safety. Subsequently, the Team analyzed the issues and considered to develop the mitigation approaches.

The work output is compiled in this "TECHNICAL NOTE ON NTIONAL HIGHWAY \& EXPRESSWAY (Geometric Structure \& Traffic Safety Facility)".

### 1.2 Work Outline

The Team implemented a total of 8 times site investigation works on the following routes. The work schedule is as shown in Table 1.2.1. Furthermore, the route map is as illustrated in Figure 1.2.1.
(i) Yangon-Mandalay Expressway
(ii) National Highway No. 1 (Nay Pyi Taw, Bago Region \& Yangon Region)
(iii) National Highway No. 4 (Shan State)

Table 1.2.1 Investigation Schedule

| No. | Period | Route | Investigation Section |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | $3-4$, Oct, 2013 | Yangon-Mandalay Expressway | Yangon - Nay Pyi Taw - Mandalay |
| 2 | $28-31$, Jan, 2014 | Yangon-Mandalay Expressway | Yangon - Nay Pyi Taw - Mandalay |
| 3 | $7-8$, Jul, 2014 | Yangon-Mandalay Expressway | Yangon - Nay Pyi Taw |
| 4 | 20, Aug, 2014 | National Highway No.1 | Nay Pyi Taw - Yangon |
| 5 | $21 \& 23$, Aug, 2014 | Yangon-Mandalay Expressway | Yangon - Nay Pyi Taw |
| 6 | 27, Oct, 2014 | Yangon-Mandalay Expressway | $185 / 0-185 / 1$ <br> (Pilot work section for installation of <br> various delineators) |
| 7 | $28-29$, Oct, 2014 | Yangon-Mandalay Expressway | Yangon - Nay Pyi Taw |
| 8 | $17-20$, Dec, 2014 | National Highway No.4 (Shan <br> State) | Heho - Taunggyi - Loilem - Takaw |



Figure 1.2.1 Route Map of Site Investigation Work

### 1.3 Work Approach

The work is composed of;-
$\checkmark$ site investigation to identify issues,
$\checkmark$ analysis of the issues, and
$\checkmark$ developing proposal for the solution.

Each work component is summarized as follows. Furthermore, Details of the works are described in Chapter 2.

## (1) Site Investigation Work

The Team executed visual investigation on vehicle basis to identify extraordinary situation occurred on road geometric structure and traffic safety facility on the investigated route. After then, the Team got off from the vehicle for taking photo and note in case of the identifying. Working photos during the investigation are as shown in Figure 1.3.1.


Figure 1.3.1 Working Photos in the Site Investigation

## (2) Analysis of the Identified Issues

The Team discussed and analyzed the identified issues to clarify its cause and find clue for the solution. Note example in Japan was often referred for comparative analysis work as shown in Figure 1.3.2.


Figure 1.3.2 Comparison of Roads between Myanmar and Japan

## (3) Developing Proposal for solution

The Team finalized and compiled proposal for solution on the basis of the above works. Examples of the proposal are as shown in Figure 1.3.3.


Figure 1.3.3 Examples of Proposals for the Solution

## 2. Work Contents

### 2.1 Classification of the Issues

At first, the Team classified the issues according to major causes as listed below. After then the Team worked for analysis of the each cause to consider its solution. The work detail is described in the following clauses.
(1) Inappropriate arrangement and/or absence of road furniture
(2) Unnecessary object is continued to exist
(3) Inappropriate road geometric structure
(4) Inappropriate work manner
(5) Inappropriate traffic manner
(6) Defect due to inappropriate construction quality

### 2.2 Analysis of the Issues

The Team listed up frequent observations of the each issue in Table 2.2.1-2.2.6 respectively. Furthermore, negative effect if the situation remains neglected is also stated in the tables.

Table 2.2.1 Observation of the Issues: (1) Inappropriate Arrangement and/or Absence of Road Furniture

| No. | Observation \& Effect (If Neglect) | Photo |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (Observation) <br> - The furniture is not located in a straight line each other. <br> (Effect) <br> - Damage will be severer if vehicle hits gap between the objects. |  |  |
|  |  | Parapet wall is located ahead of the curb stone. | Foundation of post is located ahead of the parapet walls. |
| 2 | (Observation) <br> - The furniture is located ahead of protective facility (e.g. guardrail). <br> (Effect) <br> - Damage will be severer if vehicle hits the object. |  |  |
|  |  | Traffic sign is located ahead of guardrail. | Milestone post is located ahead of guardrail. |


| No. | Observation \& Effect (If Neglect) | Photo |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | (Observation) <br> - Inappropriate alignment/location of guardrail. <br> (Effect) <br> - Damage will be severer due to inappropriate alignment/location as stated in right columns. |  |  |
|  |  | Gap between guardrail and handrail on bridge. Overrun vehicle may hit concrete block. | Guardrail is installed inside of the curve instead of outside. Over speeded vehicle may overrun from carriageway. |
| 4 | (Observation) <br> - Absence of the furniture. <br> (Effect) <br> - Risk of accident will increase due to the absence as stated in right columns. |  |  |
|  |  | No lane mark on road surface. Risk of a head-on collision will increase. | No guardrail and mirror on mountainous road. Risk of fall accident and/or head-on collision will increase. |



Table 2.2.2 Observation of the Issues: (2) Unnecessary Object is Continued to Exist

| No. | Observation \& Effect (If Neglect) | Photo |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (Observation) <br> - Concrete objects remain existed. <br> (Effect) <br> - Risk of accident (collision) will increase due to the existence. |  |  |
|  |  | Concrete posts at beginning of ramp section. | Concrete blocks at end of widening section. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Concrete walls in front of widened bridge. | Former parking area (?) |

Table 2.2.3 Observation of the Issues: (3) Inappropriate Road Geometric Structure



Table 2.2.4 Observation of the Issues: (4) Inappropriate Work Manner


Table 2.2.5 Observation of the Issues: (5) Inappropriate Traffic Manner


Table 2.2.6 Observation of the Issues: (6) Defect due to Inappropriate Construction Quality

| No. | Observation \& Effect (If Neglect) | Photo |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (Observation) <br> - Defects on pavement. <br> (Effect) <br> - Driving comfortableness will be impaired. <br> - Traffic safety will be threatened if it becomes severer. <br> - Cost of repair/rehabilitation will significantly increase if defect achieves deeper layers (i.e. base/subbase course). |  |  |
|  |  | De-lamination. Possible cause is inadequate cleaning and/or failure of tack coating work before placement of upper layers. | Defect area gradually has been spread. |
| 2 | (Observation) <br> - Gap occurred between each structure (e.g. bridge and approach road). <br> (Effect) <br> - Traffic safety will be threatened if it becomes severer. |  |  |
|  |  | Overlaying for filling gap between bridge and approach road. Possible cause is settlement occurred on foundation ground on approach section. | Depth of gap reached 20 cm . |


| No. | Observation \& Effect (If Neglect) | Photo |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | (Continued) | 10.3 .2013 |  |
|  |  | Gap between carriageway and shoulder. Possible cause is failure of dimension control during construction period (?) | Water remains in the gap area. |
| 3 | (Observation) <br> - Destruction of the structure. <br> (Effect) <br> - Traffic safety will be threatened if it becomes severer. <br> - Risk of road closure if destructed completely. <br> - Cost of repair/rehabilitation will significantly increase. | 10.3 .2013 |  |
|  |  | Large cavity under concrete slab. Possible cause is erosion due to inadequate treatment of groundwater. | Collapse of slope protection (concrete block). Possible cause is circular slip on the slope or settlement on foundation ground. |

### 2.3 Proposal for the Solution

The Team discussed development of the proposal for the solution against the above stated issues. Table 2.3.1 indicates 1 or 2 approaches namely desirable case and secondary case by the issue. Note the Team examined practicability level of the approaches from A to C in accordance with the following criteria.

## Level-A: High practicability

Implementation will be enabled by internal approval in MOC. Cost is low and period is short.

## > Level-B: Moderate practicability

Implementation will be enabled by the government's approval and/or co-working with other Ministries. Cost is low - medium and/or period is medium - long.

## > Level-C: Low practicability

Implementation will be enabled by the government's approval and/or co-working with other Ministries. Cost is high and/or period is long.

Summary of the proposal is as shown in Table 2.3.1.

Table 2.3.1 Summary of the Proposal for the Solution

| No. | Issue | Approach (desirable) | Practicability | Approach (secondary) | Practicability |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| (1) | Inappropriate arrangement <br> and/or absence of road <br> furniture | - Rearrangement, <br> relocation and/or newly <br> installation | A |  |  |
| (2) | Unnecessary object is <br> continued to exist | - Removal | A |  |  |
| (3) | Inappropriate road geometric <br> structure | - Large scale realignment <br> \& reconstruction <br> - Slope cutting \& road <br> widening | C | - Install traffic safety <br> facility | A - B |
| (4) | Inappropriate work manner |  <br> training program | B | - Establish work cycle | A |
| (5) | Inappropriate traffic manner | - Reinforce penal <br> regulation <br> - Access control to <br> expressway | C | - Public awareness <br> campaign of traffic <br> safety | B |
| (6) | Defect due to inappropriate <br> construction quality | - Repair work based on <br> investigation \& design in <br> appropriate manner | C | - Install traffic safety <br> facility <br> - Temporary repair work | A - B |

Table 2.3.2 Proposal for the Solution: (1) Inappropriate Arrangement and/or Absence of Road Furniture




Table 2.3.2 Proposal for the Solution: (2) Unnecessary Object is Continued to Exist


Table 2.3.3 Proposal for the Solution: (3) Inappropriate Road Geometric Structure


| No. | Proposal | Photo |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | (Observation) |  |
|  | - Small horizontal curve in expressway. |  |
|  | (Proposal) |  |
|  | - Reconstruction to improve vertical alignment. (Desirable case) |  |
|  | - Install traffic sign for warning. (Secondary case) |  |
|  | - Replace concrete wall with guardrail for overrun vehicle. (Secondary case) |  |
|  | Practicability: C for desirable and A for secondary | Install guardrail and traffic sign. |

Table 2.3.4 Proposal for the Solution: (4) Inappropriate Work Manner


Table 2.3.5 Proposal for the Solution: (5) Inappropriate Traffic Manner


Table 2.3.6 Proposal for the Solution: (6) Defect due to Inappropriate Construction Quality



### 2.4 Action Taken by the Government of Myanmar

The Team had fruitful discussion with the counterpart (CP) appointed by the Government of Myanmar to deal with the issues identified through the site investigation. Subsequently, CP took swift action to solve the issues such as mainly for issue (1) and (2). Photos of the action outcome are illustrated in Figure 2.4.1. Furthermore, checklist of the action taken by CP (latest version: Jun/2015) is as shown in Table 2.4.1. The Team expects sustainable implementation of the action a lot in a future.


Figure 2.4.1 Action Outcome of the CP

Table 2.4.1 Checklist of the Action taken by the CP (1 of 4)

| Direc | tion: | YGN | N => MDL | M: Mile, F: Furlong |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | M | F | Observation | Action |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | Unnecessary post should be removed. |  |
| 2 | 2 | 5 | Unnecessary post should be removed. | Removed |
| 3 | 3 | 5 | Concrete wall should be replaced with temporary barrier. | Removed |
| 4 | 3 | 6 | Unnecessary post should be removed. | Removed |
| 5 | 4 | 7 | Concrete wall should be replaced with temporary barrier. | Removed |
| 6 | 6 | 1 | Concrete wall should be replaced with temporary barrier. | Removed |
| 7 | 9 | 5 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 8 | 12 | 0 | Unnecessary post should be removed. | Removed |
| 9 | 13 | 3 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 10 | 16 | 7 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 11 | 17 | 0 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 12 | 25 | 3 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 13 | 29 | 3 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 14 | 42 | 3 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 15 | 42 | 6 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 16 | 43 | 1 | Erosion on embankment. |  |
| 17 | 49 | 4 | Mileage post \& signboard are too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 18 | 49 | 5 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 19 | 50 | 3 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 20 | 50 | 4 | Road lighting pole is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 21 | 51 | 2 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 22 | 52 | 0 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 23 | 54 | 1 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 24 | 54 | 6 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 25 | 56 | 4 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 26 | 57 | 1 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 27 | 63 | 2 | Guardrail should connect bridge wall smoothly. |  |
| 28 | 63 | 5 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 29 | 65 | 2 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 30 | 65 | 3 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 31 | 66 | 0 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 32 | 70 | 2 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 33 | 72 | 5 | Arrow board and cushion should be removed |  |
| 34 | 73 | 3 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 35 | 75 | 7 | Unnecessary post should be removed. |  |
| 36 | 79 | 5 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 37 | 80 | 5 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 38 | 81 | 0 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 39 | 81 | 6 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 40 | 81 | 7 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 41 | 84 | 1 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 42 | 84 | 5 | Signboard is located in front of guardrail. |  |
| 43 | 84 | 7 | Arrow signboard should be removed |  |
| 44 | 85 | 7 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 45 | 87 | 0 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 46 | 92 | 6 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 47 | 92 | 7 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 48 | 94 | 7 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 49 | 95 | 2 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 50 | 98 |  | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |

Table 2.4.1 Checklist of the Action taken by the CP (2 of 4)

| Direction: YGN => MDL |  |  |  | M: Mile, F: Furlong |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | M | F | Observation | Action |
| 51 | 100 | 0 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 52 | 101 | 7 | Partially broken guardrail. | Repaired |
| 53 | 107 | 6 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 54 | 108 | 1 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 55 | 108 | 2 | Mileage post and signboard are too close to carriageway. |  |
| 56 | 108 | 3 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 57 | 108 | 4 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 58 | 108 | 5 | Mileage post and signboard are too close to carriageway. |  |
| 59 | 108 | 6 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 60 | 109 | 0 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 61 | 109 | 1 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 62 | 109 | 2 | Mileage post and signboard are too close to carriageway. |  |
| 63 | 114 | 4 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 64 | 117 | 4 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 65 | 120 | 6 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 66 | 120 | 6 | Partially broken guardrail. |  |
| 67 | 125 | 4 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 68 | 126 | 6 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 69 | 129 | 4 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 70 | 132 | 5 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 71 | 137 | 6 | Unnecessary post should be removed. |  |
| 72 | 138 | 0 | Unnecessary post should be removed. |  |
| 73 | 138 | 4 | Reflection board should be removed. |  |
| 74 | 140 | 2 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 75 | 140 | 3 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 76 | 144 | 5 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 77 | 146 | 4 | Unnecessary post should be removed. |  |
| 78 | 147 | 4 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 79 | 148 | 6 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 80 | 154 | 3 | Unnecessary concrete wall \& post should be removed. |  |
| 81 | 163 | 0 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 82 | 171 | 1 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 83 | 173 | 3 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 84 | 176 | 6 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 85 | 178 | 7 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 86 | 302 | 2 | Gap between curb stone and foundation concrete of handrail on box culvert. |  |
| 87 | 305 | 1 | Gap between curb stone and foundation concrete of handrail on box culvert. |  |
| 88 | 338 | 6 | Erosion around abutment. |  |
| 89 | 339 | 0 | Inappropriate material (concrete) filled in cushion barrel. |  |
| 90 | 339 | 0 | Erosion around abutment. |  |

Table 2.4.1 Checklist of the Action taken by the CP (3 of 4)


Table 2.4.1 Checklist of the Action taken by the CP (4 of 4)

| Direction: MDL => YGN |  |  |  | M: Mile, F: Furlong |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | M | F | Observation | Action |
| 141 | 100 | 6 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 142 | 94 | 7 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 143 | 94 |  | Arrow board should be removed |  |
| 144 | 91 | 7 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 145 | 90 | 2 | Partially broken guardrail. |  |
| 146 | 89 | 2 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 147 | 89 | 1 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 148 | 86 | 2 | Signboard is in front of guardrail. |  |
| 149 | 86 | 1 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 150 | 86 | 0 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 151 | 84 | 4 | Arrow board is in front of guardrail. |  |
| 152 | 83 | 1 | Concrete wall \& cushion barrel should be removed. |  |
| 153 | 81 | 7 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. | Removed |
| 154 | 81 | 0 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 155 | 80 | 5 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 156 | 79 | 3 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 157 | 79 | 2 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 158 | 79 | 1 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 159 | 73 | 6 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 160 | 72 | 2 | Cushion should be removed. |  |
| 161 | 70 | 1 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 162 | 68 | 4 | Cushion should be placed in front of wing wall of abutment. |  |
| 163 | 68 | 3 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 164 | 66 | 2 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 165 | 66 | 1 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 166 | 65 | 7 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 167 | 63 | 2 | Cushion should be placed in front of wing wall of abutment. |  |
| 168 | 56 | 0 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 169 | 53 | 2 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 170 | 52 | 7 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 171 | 52 | 6 | Signboard is in front of guardrail. |  |
| 172 | 52 | 3 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 173 | 51 | 0 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 174 | 49 | 5 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 175 | 49 | 2 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 176 | 48 | 0 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. | Relocated |
| 177 | 46 | 3 | Arrow board is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 178 | 42 | 4 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. |  |
| 179 | 42 | 4 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 180 | 22 | 5 | Mileage post is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 181 | 21 | 6 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 182 | 21 | 5 | Signboard is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 183 | 21 | 3 | Arrow board is too close to carriageway. |  |
| 184 | 12 | 1 | Unnecessary post should be removed. |  |
| 185 | 8 | 1 | Unnecessary post should be removed. |  |
| 186 | 6 | 2 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. | Removed |
| 187 | 4 | 7 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. | Removed |
| 188 | 3 | 5 | Unnecessary concrete wall should be removed. | Removed |
| 189 | 2 |  | Unnecessary post should be removed. |  |

## 3. Effort to Secure Traffic Safety in Japan

### 3.1 General

The Team introduces the effort taken by the road agencies in Japan to secure traffic safety in both road classifications namely expressway and national highway in this chapter.

### 3.2 Expressway

Network of expressway in Japan has been operated by 3 companies namely East Nippon Expressway Co., Ltd. (E-NEXCO), Central Nippon Expressway Co., Ltd. (C-NEXCO) and West Nippon Expressway Co., Ltd. (W-NEXCO). These companies apply the integrated regulations including geometric structure and traffic safety for their operation.

Regulation of the traffic safety facility in the expressway is severely determined in order to ensure high speed vehicle in safe condition. Image of various dimensions of the traffic signboards are illustrated in Figure 3.2.1 - 3.2.4. Furthermore, photos of actual arrangement of the facilities on the sites are as shown in Figure 3.2.5 and 3.2.6.


Figure 3.2.1 Dimension of Signboard Installation (1)


Figure 3.2.2 Dimension of Signboard Installation (2)


Figure 3.2.3 Dimension of Signboard Installation (3)


Figure 3.2.4 Dimension of Signboard Installation (4)


Figure 3.2.5 Arrangement View of Traffic safety Facilities (1)


Figure 3.2.6 Arrangement View of Traffic safety Facilities (2)

### 3.3 National Highway

National highway network in Japan has been managed by the Road management offices under the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (MLIT). The each office is required to secure traffic safety and enhance service level for road users. On the other hand, characteristics of the network are varied by comparing with the expressway as follows.
$\checkmark$ Very long and complicated network
$\checkmark$ Various road geometric dimensions by their classification
$\checkmark$ Various surroundings along the roads (e.g. topography, climate, land use, etc)
$\checkmark$ Various types of road users (e.g. pedestrian, bicycle, motorcycle, vehicle, etc)
$\checkmark$ Free access from the roadside in almost of the network sections

Therefore, the offices have been dealing with the given missions in the above stated circumstances. Photos of the road facilities are illustrated in Figure 3.3.1.



Figure 3.3.1 Photos of the Road Facilities in National Highway

## 4. Photos Taken during the Site Investigation Work

Photos taken during the site investigation work (8times in total) and observation comments are attached in this chapter.

| No. | Period | Route | Investigation Section |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $3-4$, Oct, 2013 | Yangon-Mandalay Expressway | Yangon - Nay Pyi Taw - Mandalay |
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|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Ph. 35 Car could not return to the carriageway by itself due to big gap with the shoulder. | Ph. 36 Injection of cement mortal into joint parts between each concrete slabs to prevent water penetration (good example). |
|  |  |
| Ph. 37 Workers took a rest within carriageway (prohibited work manner). | Ph. 38 Continuous concrete wall on median strip side instead of concrete block (good example). Overrun will be prevented. |
|  |  |
| Ph. 39 Speed meter | Ph. 40 Workers took a rest within carriageway (prohibited work manner). |
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| No. | Period | Route | Investigation Section |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | $28-31$, Jan, 2014 | Yangon-Mandalay Expressway | Yangon - Nay Pyi Taw - Mandalay |
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| No. | Period | Route | Investigation Section |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | $7-8$, Jul, 2014 | Yangon-Mandalay Expressway | Yangon - Nay Pyi Taw |
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| No. | Period | Route | Investigation Section |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 4 | 20, Aug, 2014 | National Highway No.1 | Nay Pyi Taw - Yangon |
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| No. | Period | Route | Investigation Section |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | $21 \& 23$, Aug, 2014 | Yangon-Mandalay Expressway | Yangon - Nay Pyi Taw |
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| No. | Period | Route | Investigation Section |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 27, Oct, 2014 | Yangon-Mandalay Expressway | $185 / 0-185 / 1$ <br> (Pilot work section for installation of <br> various delineators) |
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| No. | Period | Route | Investigation Section |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | $28-29$, Oct, 2014 | Yangon-Mandalay Expressway | Yangon - Nay Pyi Taw |
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| No. | Period | Route | Investigation Section |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 8 | $17-20$, Dec, 2014 | National Highway No.4 (Shan <br> State) | Heho - Taunggyi - Loilem - Takaw |
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