JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY (JICA)

# THE PROJECT FOR COMPREHENSIVE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR METRO MANILA

# TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 2 QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY TO MMDA AND LGUS

November 2022

ALMEC CORPORATION ORIENTAL CONSULTANTS GLOBAL CO., LTD. TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH INSTITUTE CO., LTD.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# 1 TRAFFIC BOTTLENECKS IDENTIFIED BY MMDA

	1.1	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA 1-1
	1.2	Physical Characteristic of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA 1-4
	1.3	Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA 1-18
	1.4	Existence of Planned Measures 1-20
	1.5	Evaluation of Implemented Measures1-22
	1.6	Analysis on Distribution of Road Congestion Over Time 1-24
	1.7	Summary of and Comment on Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA 1-25
2	TRA	AFFIC BOTTLENECKS IDENTIFIED BY LGUS IN METRO MANILA
	2.1	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by LGUs in Metro Manila 2-1
	2.2	Physical Characteristic of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Metro Manila LGUs . 2-4
	2.3	Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Metro Manila LGUs 2-15
	2.4	Existence of Planned Measures 2-17
	2.5	Evaluation of Implemented Measures
	2.6	Human Resources Related Traffic and Transportation 2-22
	2.7	Understanding LGUs Responsibility by Metro Manila LGUs 2-24
	2.8	Summary and Comments on Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Metro Manila
		LGUs

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA on EDSA
	and Rest of C41-4
Table 1.2:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA along C51-6
Table 1.3:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA
	along Marcos Highway/ Aurora Blvd. and Magsaysay Blvd1-9
Table 1.4:	Physical Characteristic of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA
	along Commonwealth Avenue1-11
Table 1.5:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA
	along Quezon Avenue1-12
Table 1.6:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA
	along Taft Avenue1-14
Table 1.7:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA
	along Mindanao Avenue1-15
Table 1.8:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA
	along Mindanao Avenue1-16
Table 2.1:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Caloocan City2-4
Table 2.2:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Las Piñas City2-5
Table 2.3:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Makati City2-5
Table 2.4:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Malabon City2-6
Table 2.5:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Mandaluyong City 2-6
Table 2.6:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by City of Manila2-7
Table 2.7:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Marikina City2-7
Table 2.8:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Muntinlupa City2-7
Table 2.9:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Navotas City2-8
Table 2.10:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Parañaque City2-9
Table 2.11:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Pasay City2-9
Table 2.12:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Pasig City2-10
Table 2.13:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Pateros2-11
Table 2.14:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Quezon City2-11
Table 2.15:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by San Juan City2-12
Table 2.16:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Taguig City2-13
Table 2.17:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Valenzuela City2-13
Table 2.18:	Human Resources Related Traffic and Transportation2-22
Table 2.19:	Understanding LGUs Responsibility by Metro Manila LGUs2-25

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1:	Location of the Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA	1-1
Figure 1.2:	Direction of Traffic Flow along Major Corridors	1-2
Figure 1.3:	Number of the Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA by Corridor	1-3
Figure 1.4:	Severity of the Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA by Corridor	1-3
Figure 1.5:	Examples of U-turn Slot by Blocks	1-6
Figure 1.6:	Examples of No Pedestrian Crossing	1-8
Figure 1.7:	Examples of Traffic Conflict	1-10
Figure 1.8:	Images of Lanes Occupied by Construction Work	1-12
Figure 1.9:	Examples of Mixed Traffic with Pedestrians	1-15
Figure 1.10:	Examples of No-pedestrian Facilities	1-16
Figure 1.11:	Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA	1-18
Figure 1.12:	Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks by Corridor	1-19
Figure 1.13:	Severity by Evaluated Measurements along Major and Minor Roads	1-19
Figure 1.14:	Existing Rate of Planned Improvement Measures along Major Roads	1-20
Figure 1.15:	Existing Rate of Planned Improvement Measures along Minor Road	1-21
Figure 1.16:	Evaluation Rate of Implemented Measures along Major Roads	1-22
Figure 1.17:	Evaluation Rate of Implemented Measures along Minor Roads	1-23
Figure 1.18:	Degree of Congestion Over Time	1-24
Figure 2.1:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Metro Manila	2-2
Figure 2.2:	Number of Traffic Bottlenecks in Each LGU	2-3
Figure 2.3:	Severity of Traffic Bottlenecks in Each LGU	2-3
Figure 2.4:	Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks in Metro Manila	2-15
Figure 2.5:	Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks in Each LGU	2-16
Figure 2.6:	Existence Rate of Planned Improvement Measures at Identified	
	Traffic Bottlenecks	2-17
Figure 2.7:	Share of Causes Decreased by Enforcements	2-18
Figure 2.8:	Evaluation Rate of Traffic Management Measures Implemented	
	by 17 LGUs	2-19
Figure 2.9:	Share of Saturated Demand among Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks	
	by LGU	2-20
Figure 2.10:	Share of Lack of Safety Facilities among Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks	
	by LGU	2-21
Figure 2.11:	Traffic Bottlenecks in the Southern Part of Caloocan City	2-30
Figure 2.12:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Caloocan City (North)	2-31
Figure 2.13:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Caloocan City (South)	2-32
Figure 2.14:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Caloocan City (1)	2-33
Figure 2.15:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Caloocan City (2)	2-34
Figure 2.16:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Caloocan City (3)	2-35
Figure 2.17:	Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Las Piñas City along	
	Alabang-Zapote Road	2-36

Figure 2.18:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Las Piñas City	2-37
Figure 2.19:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Las Piñas City (1)	2-38
Figure 2.20:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Las Piñas City (2)	2-39
Figure 2.21:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Las Piñas City (3)	2-40
Figure 2.22:	Road Classification in Makati City	2-40
Figure 2.23:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Makati City	2-42
Figure 2.24:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Makati City	2-44
Figure 2.25:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Malabon City	2-45
Figure 2.26:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Malabon City	2-47
Figure 2.27:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Mandaluyong City	2-48
Figure 2.28:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Mandaluyong City (1)	2-49
Figure 2.29:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Mandaluyong City (2)	2-50
Figure 2.30:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Manila	2-51
Figure 2.31:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Manila (1)	2-52
Figure 2.32:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Manila (2)	2-53
Figure 2.33:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Marikina City	2-54
Figure 2.34:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Marikina City	2-55
Figure 2.35:	Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Muntinlupa City along	
	Alabang-Zapote Road and Manila South Road	2-56
Figure 2.36:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Muntinlupa City	2-57
Figure 2.37:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Muntinlupa City (1)	2-58
Figure 2.38:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Muntinlupa City (2)	2-59
Figure 2.39:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Muntinlupa City (3)	2-60
Figure 2.40:	Ongoing NLEX R-10 Exit Ramp Construction (Part of NLEX	
	Harbor Link Project)	2-61
Figure 2.41:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Navotas City	2-62
Figure 2.42:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Navotas City	2-63
Figure 2.43:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Parañaque City	2-64
Figure 2.44:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Parañaque City	2-65
Figure 2.45:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasay City	2-66
Figure 2.46:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasay City	2-67
Figure 2.47:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City	2-69
Figure 2.48:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City (1)	2-70
Figure 2.49:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City (2)	2-71
Figure 2.50:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City (3)	2-72
Figure 2.51:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City (4)	2-73
Figure 2.52:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City (5)	2-74
Figure 2.53:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City (6)	2-75
Figure 2.54:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pateros	2-77
Figure 2.55:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pateros (1)	2-78
Figure 2.56:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pateros (2)	2-79
Figure 2.57:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Quezon City	2-81
Figure 2.58:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Quezon City (1)	2-82

Figure 2.59:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Quezon City (2)	2-83
Figure 2.60:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Quezon City (3)	2-84
Figure 2.61:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Quezon City (4)	2-85
Figure 2.62:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in San Juan City	2-87
Figure 2.63:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in San Juan City (1)	2-88
Figure 2.64:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in San Juan City (2)	2-89
Figure 2.65:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in San Juan City (3)	2-90
Figure 2.66:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Taguig City	2-92
Figure 2.67:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Taguig City (1)	2-93
Figure 2.68:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Taguig City (2)	2-94
Figure 2.69:	Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City	2-96
Figure 2.70:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City (1)	2-97
Figure 2.71:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City (2)	2-98
Figure 2.72:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City (3)	2-99
Figure 2.73:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City (4)	2-100
Figure 2.74:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City (5)	2-101
Figure 2.75:	Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City (6)	2-102

# **ABBREVIATIONS**

CTMP	Comprehensive Traffic Management Plan
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
JPT	JICA Project Team
LGU	local government unit
MMDA	Metropolitan Manila Development Authority
PUJ	public utility jeepney
EDSA	Epifanio de los Santos Avenue
C-road	circumferential road
R-road	radial road
NLEX	North Luzon Expressway

# 1 TRAFFIC BOTTLENECKS IDENTIFIED BY MMDA

Currently, traffic congestion is a serious problem on national roads managed by the Metropolitan Manila Development Authority (MMDA). MMDA does not have a clear definition of traffic bottleneck, and it is not clear where is the origin of traffic congestion, i.e., traffic bottleneck. Therefore, as first activity of understanding the situation, a questionnaire survey was conducted for MMDA to clarify the actual situation of MMDA traffic management. The questionnaire survey on traffic bottlenecks on roads under the management of MMDA was conducted by the JPT from 6 June 2019 to the end of October 2019. For the next section, the questionnaire survey responses will be summarized.

#### 1.1 Location of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA

Figure 1.1 shows the location of the traffic bottleneck identified by MMDA. There is a total of 102 traffic bottlenecks and these are concentrated on large-scale national roads. They are categorized as 91 points and 11 lines.



Figure 1.1: Location of the Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA

### 1) Definition of Direction of Traffic Flow

The traffic bottlenecks mentioned above have a different situation for every direction. The traffic flow was defined along major roads directionally as shown in Figure 1.2 for the following analysis.



Figure 1.2: Direction of Traffic Flow along Major Corridors

#### 2) Number of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA

Figure 1.3shows the distribution of the traffic bottlenecks by roads. One out of three traffic bottlenecks is concentrated along Epifanio de los Santos Avenue (EDSA).



Source: JPT

Figure 1.3: Number of the Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA by Corridor

#### 3) Severity of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA along Major Roads

The severity here is defined as the congestion level divided into 5 from level 1: slight severity to level 5: high severity. Along EDSA, over 50% of the traffic bottlenecks are indicated as traffic bottlenecks with high severity. C5, Marcos Highway/ Aurora Blvd. & Magsaysay Blvd. and Taft Avenue also have a considerable number of intersections with high severity as shown in Figure 1.4.



1) Severity of each direction at the traffic bottlenecks is merged. 2) The upper figure is for major roads, and the lower figure is for minor roads. Source: JPT

Figure 1.4: Severity of the Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA by Corridor

#### 1.2 Physical Characteristic of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA

#### 1) Epifanio de los Santos Avenue (EDSA, C4)

In order to understand the physical characteristics of the traffic bottleneck identified by MMDA, multiple items were shown in the survey form which MMDA filled in. The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA along EDSA, C4 are shown in Table 1.1.

				Structure				Major	Road			Minor Road 1								
	Main		Minor				Facilitie	s			Pedestri	an Safety			Facilities	6			Pedestria	an Safety
ID	Road Name	Minor Road Name	Name 2	Segregate d/ At-grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Traffi c Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Marki ng	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
01	EDSA	Taft Avenue	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	1-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
02	EDSA	Tramo Service Road (Tramo Road)	N/A	Segregated	No	No	1-2	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	1-2	Yes	No	No	No	No
03	EDSA	Magallanes Off Ramp (Magallanes Interchange)	N/A	Segregated	No	No	0	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
04	EDSA	Magallanes U-turn at Fly over	N/A	Segregated	No	No	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
05	EDSA	Magallanes after MRT Station	N/A	Segregated	No	No	1	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
06	EDSA	Ayala Avenue	N/A	Segregated	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
07	EDSA	Buendia Avenue	N/A	Segregated	No	Yes	0	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
08	EDSA	Kalayaan Avenue	N/A	Segregated	No	No	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
09	EDSA	Estrella Rockwell	N/A	Segregated	No	No	1	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	1	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
10	EDSA	Guadalupe Tulay (JP Rizal - Cloverleaf)	N/A	Segregated	No	No	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	1-3	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
11	EDSA	Pioneer MRT Station	N/A	Segregated	No	Yes	1.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
12	EDSA	Shaw Boulevard	N/A	Segregated	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
13	EDSA	Julia Vargas Ave	N/A	Segregated	No	No	2	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	2	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
14	EDSA	Guadix	N/A	Segregated	No	No	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	1	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
15	EDSA	Poveda / Ortigas Bus Stop	N/A	Segregated	No	No	1	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	1	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
16	EDSA	Ortigas Avenue LEFT turning ramp to Rosario	N/A	Segregated	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	No	0-1	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
17	EDSA	White plains	N/A	Segregated	No	No	1.5	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	1.5	Yes	No	No	No	No
18	Santolan C	Crame U-turn slot	N/A	At-grade	No	Yes	1	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
19	EDSA	Santolan / Boni Serrano Avenue	N/A	Segregated	Yes	Yes	0.5-1	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
20	EDSA	P. Tuazon Intersection	N/A	At-grade	No	Yes	1	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	1	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
21	EDSA	Aurora Boulevard	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	1-1.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	1-1.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
22	EDSA	GMA Kamuning / Kamias intersection/ Uturn slot	N/A	Segregated	Yes	Yes	1-1.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1-1.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
23	EDSA	Timog Avenue/ East Avenue intersection	East Ave	Segregated	Yes	Yes	0.5-1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0.5-1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
24	North Ave/ Trinoma U-turn Slot		N/A	At-grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	No	0.5/3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
25	SN North L	oading Bay (Bus Stop)	N/A	At-grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	No	2	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
26	SM North A	Annex - U-turn Slot	N/A	At-grade	No	No	1.5	Yes	No	No	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
27	Corregidor	– U-turn Slot	N/A	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
28	EDSA	Roosevelt Ave/ Congressional Avenue	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	1.5-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	1.5-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
29	EDSA	Kaingin / Royal (right turn)	N/A	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	0.5	Yes	No	No	No	No

Table 1.1: Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA on EDSA and Rest of C4

		ľ	Miner	Structure				Major	Road							Mino	r Road 1			
	Main		Road				Facilitie	s			Pedestri	an Safety			Facilitie	s			Pedestria	an Safety
ID	Road Name	Minor Road Name	Name	Segregate	Traffic Signal	Traffic Signal	Side	Lane	U-turn	Traffi	Pedestrian	Pedestrian	Traffic Signal	Traffic Signal	Side walk	Lane Marki	U-turn	Traffic	Pedestrian	Pedestrian
			2		(Vehicle)	(Pedestrian)	(m)	Marking	Slots	Signs	Bridges	Crossing	(Vehicle)	(Pedestrian)	(m)	ng	Slots	Signs	Bridges	Crossing
30	EDSA	SA Oliveros U-turn Slot		At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	0	No	No	No	No	No
31	Balintawak	Light Rail Transit (LRT 1) Station	N/A	At-grade	No	No	2	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
32	EDSA	Balintawak Cloverleaf	N/A	Segregated	No	No	0.5	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	1	Yes	No	No	No	No
33	EDSA	General Malvar - U -turn Slot	N/A	At-grade	No	No	1.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	0.5	Yes	No	No	No	No
34	EDSA	De Jesus	N/A	At-grade	No	No	2	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	Yes	No	No	No	No
35	EDSA	General Tinio U-turn Slot	N/A	At-grade	No	No	2	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	0.5	No	No	No	No	No
36	EDSA	Moumento	N/A	At-grade	No	No	1-2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	1-2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No

- (i) Two-thirds of the traffic bottlenecks identified along EDSA are segregated structures.
- (ii) At-grade structure traffic bottlenecks are mainly U-turn slot sections. According to on-site observations, the U-turn slot is formed by MMDAowned blocks, therefore the structure can be modified (Figure 1.5).
- (iii) At the identified traffic bottlenecks, there are a few places where signals are installed, however vehicles and pedestrians are separated at almost all traffic bottlenecks by pedestrian facilities. Therefore, it is considered that a low signal installation rate does not make the pedestrian environment worse.
- (iv) The sidewalks are generally wide at the identified traffic bottlenecks.
- (v) Pedestrian bridge is installed in many sections.



Source: Google Street View



#### 2) Carlos P. Garcia Avenue (C5)

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA along C5 are shown in Table 1.2.

	Main			Structure				Major	Road							Minor Ro	ad 1			
	Main						Facilit	ies			Pedestri	an Safety			Facilitie	s			Pedestria	n Safety
ID	Road Name	Minor Road Name	Minor Road Name 2	Segregate d/ At-grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle )	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestri an Crossing
01	C5	C. P. Garcia Avenue	N/A	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
02	C5	Mirriam College Gate	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	1.0	Yes	No	No	No	No
03	C5	Atteneo Gate	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	0	Yes	No	No	No	No
04	C5	Katipunan Flyover	Aurora Blvd	Segregated	Yes No (on flyover)	No	1.0- 2.0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes No (on flyover)	Yes No (on flyover)	Yes No (on flyover)	No	1.0	Yes	No	No	No	No
05	C5	Libis Tunnel	N/A	Segregated	No	No	0	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
06	C5	Libis Service Road (FVR Road - Blue Ridge subd)	N/A	Segregated	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
07	C5	Eastwood	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	2.0	Yes	No	Yes	N/A	N/A

 Table 1.2:
 Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA along C5

				Structure				Major	Road							Minor Ro	ad 1			
	Main						Facilit	ies			Pedestria	an Safety			Facilitie	s			Pedestria	n Safety
ID	Road Name	Minor Road Name	Minor Road Name 2	Segregate d/ At-grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle )	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestri an Crossing
08	C5	Green Meadows	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
09	C5	Ortigas Flyover	Ortigas Ave	Segregated	Yes No (on flyover)	Yes	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes No (on flyover)	Yes No (on flyover)	Yes	1.5- 2.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
10	C5	Lanuza	N/A	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1.0- 1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
11	C5	Bagong Ilog - Bridge	Pasig Blvd Ext	Segregated	Yes No (on flyover)	No	0.5- 1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes No (on flyover)	Yes	No	0.5- 1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
12	C5	Kalayaan	San Guillermo Ave	At-grade	No	No	0.5- 1.0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	0.5- 1.5	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
13	C5	32nd Avenue	N/A	Segregated	No	No	0.5	Yes	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	No	0.5	Yes	No	No	N/A	N/A
14	C5	Blue Bos (Blue Vos)	N/A	At-grade	No	No	1.0	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	0.5	No	No	No	No	No
15	C5	Mc Kinley Road (Mc Kinley Park Way)	N/A	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

Source: JPT

(i) About one-third of the traffic bottlenecks identified are segregated.

(ii) There is a huge number of installations of traffic signals for vehicles. On the other hand, traffic signals for pedestrians are not installed well.

(iii) The sidewalk is generally wide enough for pedestrians.

(iv) In one traffic bottleneck, both pedestrian bridges and pedestrian crossings are not installed. In addition, there are some places where it is difficult to cross the road (Figure 1.6). No. 05 is also a tunnel, so pedestrians cannot cross the road.



Source: Google Street View



#### 3) Marcos Highway/ Aurora Blvd. and Magsaysay Blvd. (Component of C6)

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA along Marcos Highway/ Aurora Blvd. and Magsaysay Blvd. are shown in Table.1.3.

				Structure				Major	Road				Minor Road 1									
	Main	Minor Poad	Minor Pood				Facilities	3			Pedestria	an Safety			Facilitie	es			Pedestri	an Safety		
ID	Road Name	Name	Name 2	Segregate d/ At-grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Markin g	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidew alk (m)	Lane Marki ng	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing		
01	R6	Felix Ave. (Imelda Ave.)	G. Fernando (A. Tuazon)	At-grade	No	No	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		
02	R6	Fernando	N/A	At-grade	No	No	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		
03	R6	Ligaya	J. P. Rizal Ave.	At-grade	No	No	2.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		
04	R6	A. Bonifacio	N/A	Segregated	No	No	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	1.0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
05	R6	Katipunan Bonifacio	N/A	Segregated	Yes No (on flyover)	No	1.0	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes No (on flyover)	No	1.0-2.0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes No (on flyover)	Yes No (on flyover)		
06	R6	Anonas	N/A	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	No		
07	R6	EDSA	N/A	Segregated	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes No(on underpass)	No	1.5	Yes	Yes No(on underpass)	Yes	Yes No(on underpass)	No		
08	R6	Gilmore	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes		
09	R6	G. Araneta Ave.	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	1.0- 2.0	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		
10	R6	V. Mapa	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes		
11	R6	Nagtahan	A. H. Lacson	Segregated	Yes	Yes	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes		
12	R6	Bustillos - Regalado	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes		
13	R6	Mendiola	C. M. Recto	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		
14	C1	P. Burgos - Roxas Blvd.	Katigbak Drive	At-grade	Yes	Yes	2.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	2.0-3.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes		

Table 1.3: Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA along Marcos Highway/ Aurora Blvd. and Magsaysay Blvd.

- (i) Traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA are mostly at-grade traffic bottlenecks.
- (ii) The sidewalk is generally wide enough for pedestrians.
- (iii) Major roads do not have both traffic signals and pedestrian bridges for vehicles and pedestrians, respectively, to maximize the traffic volume passing through this section. Therefore, the flow of vehicles and pedestrians is separated completely. However, the flow of vehicles along major and minor roads have conflicts at the junction (Figure 1.7).



Source: Google Street View



#### 4) Commonwealth Avenue (Component of R7)

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA along Commonwealth Avenue are shown in Table 1.4.

- (i) The traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA are all at-grade traffic bottlenecks except for No. 07.
- (ii) Traffic signals are mostly not installed. As mentioned above in the 3) Marcos Highway/ Aurora Blvd. and Magsaysay Blvd. (Component of C6), the flow of vehicles and pedestrians are completely separated by a pedestrian bridge without any installation of traffic signals for the maximization of traffic flow along the major road. To solve the conflict of vehicle flow along major and minor roads, the installation of traffic signals or priority lanes must be considered.
- (iii) Additionally, the congestion at the junction is remarkable because the road width and the number of lanes had been reduced due to the ongoing construction of Metro Rail Transit (MRT7) (Figure 1.8).
- (iv) The sidewalk is generally wide enough for pedestrians.

			Minor	Structure				Major I	Road							Minor I	Road 1			
	Main Road	Minor Road	Minor				Facilities	;			Pedestria	an Safety			Faciliti	es			Pedestri	an Safety
ID	Name	Name	Road Name 2	Segregate d/ At-grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Marking	U- turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
01	Commonwealt h Avenue	Mindanao Avenue	Mindanao Ave East	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1.0- 1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
02	Commonwealt h Avenue	Regalado Avenue	N/A	At-grade	No	No	1.0- 1.5	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
03	Commonwealt h Avenue	Fairview Mall	N/A	At-grade	No	No	1.0	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	N/A	Yes	No	No	No	N/A
04	Commonwealt h Avenue	Dona Carmen	N/A	At-grade	Rotunda	No	1.5	Yes	No (Rotu nda)	Yes	No	No	Rotunda	No	0.5	No	No	No	No	No
05	Commonwealt h Avenue	Litex road	Batasan Rd	At-grade	No	No	1.0	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	1.0	No	No	No	Yes	No
06	Commonwealt h Avenue	Don Antonio (Drive)	N/A	At-grade	No	No	1.0- 1.5	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	1.0- 1.5	No	No	No	Yes	No
07	Commonwealt h Avenue	Tandang Sora	N/A	Segregated	Yes No (on flyover)	No	1.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes No (on flyover)	Yes No (on flyover)	Yes	No	1.0- 1.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
08	Commonwealt h Avenue	Philcoa	N/A	At-grade	No	No	1.0- 2.0	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	1.0	Yes	No	No	Yes	No

#### Table 1.4: Physical Characteristic of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA along Commonwealth Avenue



Source: Google Street View



#### 5) Quezon Avenue (Component of C7)

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA along Quezon Avenue are shown in Table 1.5.

		Minor Road Name		Structure				Major F	Road							Minor	Road 1			
	Main Road		Minor Road Name 2			F	acilities				Pedestria	an Safety			Faciliti	es			Pedestri	an Safety
ID	Name			Segregate d/ At-grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Markin g	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
01	Quezon Avenue	Agham St.	BIR Road	Segregated	Yes No (on Underpass)	Yes	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
02	Quezon Avenue	EDSA (Q. Ave)	N/A	Segregated	Yes No (on underpass)	No	3.0	Yes	No	Yes	Yes No (on underpass)	No	Yes	No	2.0- 3.0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
03	Quezon Avenue	BIR Uturn Slot	N/A	At-grade	No	N/A	2.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### Table 1.5: Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA along Quezon Avenue

	Main Road Name			Structure				Major R	load							Minor	Road 1	d 1				
		Minor Road Name	Minor			F	acilities				Pedestria	an Safety			Faciliti	es			Pedestria	an Safety		
ID			Road Name 2	Segregate d/ At-grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Markin g	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing		
04	Quezon Avenue	TIMOG / WEST Avenue (Q.Ave)	Timog Ave.	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	1.0- 3.0	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		
05	Quezon Avenue	Roosevelt Avenue (Q. Ave)	N/A	At-grade	No	Yes (Not Working)	2.0	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	No		
06	Quezon Avenue	Araneta Avenue (Q. Ave)	N/A	Segregated	Yes No (on underpass)	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		
07	Quezon Avenue	D. Tuazon U-turn Slot (Q. Ave)	N/A	At-grade	No	No	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

Source: JPT

- (i) Half of the traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA are segregated traffic bottlenecks.
- (ii) Traffic signals are installed well compared to other major corridors.
- (iii) The sidewalk is generally wide enough for pedestrians.

#### 6) Taft Avenue (Component of R2)

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA along TAFT Avenue are shown in Table 1.6.

- (i) All traffic bottlenecks are at-grade traffic bottlenecks.
- (ii) The installation rate of traffic signal is high.
- (iii) The sidewalk is generally wide enough for pedestrians.
- (iv) As for traffic bottlenecks that do not have both traffic signals for vehicles and pedestrians such as No. 8 and No. 11, mixed traffic with pedestrians happens. This is the case of No. 11 especially where there is a large-scale market nearby. Many pedestrians enter and exit the market then cross this section (Figure 1.9).

			Minor Road Name 2	Structur e				Major R	oad						Minor Roa	d 1				
	Main Road	Minor Road Name					Faciliti	es			Pedestri	an Safety			Facilities				Pedestri	ian Safety
ID	Name			Segrega ted/ At- grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedest rian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Traffi c Signs	Pedestria n Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
01	Taft Avenue	EDSA	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	1.0-1.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	0.5-1.5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
02	Taft Avenue	Libertad	Antonio S. Arnaiz Ave.	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.0-1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
03	Taft Avenue	Buendia Avenue	N/A	At-grade	No	No	2.0	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	0.5-1.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
04	Taft Avenue	Vito Cruz (Ocampo St.)	N/A	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1.0-1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.0-1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
05	Taft Avenue	Quirino Avenue	N/A	At-grade	Yes	Yes	2.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	2.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
06	TAFT Avenue	Pedro Gil	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	2.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
07	Taft Avenue (Ma Lawton)	anila City Hall/	N/A	Segregat ed	No	No	2.0	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
08	Taft Avenue	Rizal Avenue - Carriedo	N/A	At-grade	No	No	1.0	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	1.0	Yes	No	No	No	No
09	Taft Avenue	Tayuman	N/A	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1.0-1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
10	Taft Avenue	Bambang	N/A	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
11	Taft Avenue	Blumentritt	N/A	At-grade	No	No	1.0	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
12	Taft Avenue	Abad Santos	N/A	At-grade	Yes	No	2.0	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes(Not working)	2.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
13	Taft Avenue	R. Papa	N/A	At-grade	Yes	Yes(Not working)	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
14	Taft Avenue	C3 - 5th Avenue	N/A	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.0	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
15	Taft Avenue	EDSA (Monumento)	N/A	At-grade	No (Rotunda)	No	1.0-3.0	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No (Rotunda)	No	1.0-3.0	Yes	No (Rotund a)	Yes	Yes	No

#### Table 1.6: Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA along Taft Avenue



Source: Google Street View



#### 7) Mindanao Avenue (Connection Road of North Luzon Expressway (NLEX) and C5)

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA along Mindanao Avenue are shown in Table 1.7.

Table 1.7:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified b	y MMDA along Mindanao Avenue
------------	--	------------------------------

		Minor Road Name	Minor	Structure				Majo	r Road						Minor Roa	ad 1				
	Main Road		Pood				Facilities	5			Pedestria	an Safety			Facilities				Pedestri	an Safety
ID	Name		Name 2	Segregate d/ At-grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Markin g	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U- turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
01	Mindanao Avenue	Quirino Highway		Segregated	Yes	No	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
02	Mindanao Avenue	All U-turn Slots (Tandang Sora)	Sauyo UTS	At-grade	No	No	1.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
03	Mindanao Avenue	Congressional Ave.		At-grade	Yes	Yes	1.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
04	Mindanao Avenue	NLEX - SB		At-grade	Yes	No	0.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	0.5	Yes	No	Yes	No	No

- (i) All traffic bottlenecks are at-grade traffic bottlenecks except for No. 1. The traffic signals are also installed well.
- (ii) The pedestrian facilities are completely not installed at No. 4 (see Figure 1.10).



Source: Google Street View



#### 8) Roxas Boulevard (R1)

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA along Mindanao Avenue are shown in Table 1.8.

Table 1.8:	Physical	Characteristics	of Bottlenecks	<b>Identified</b> by	MMDA along	y Mindanao Avenue
------------	----------	-----------------	----------------	----------------------	------------	-------------------

		Minor Road Name		Structure				Major F	Road							Minor R	oad 1			
	Main Road Name		Minor				Faciliti	es			Pedestri	an Safety			Facilit	ies			Pedestri	an Safety
ID			Road Name 2	Segregate d/ At-grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side walk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Traffic Signs	Pedestria n Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
01	Roxas Boulevard	NAIA/MIA Road - Coastal intersection	N/A	Segregated	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	1.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
02	Roxas Boulevard	Baclaran Area	N/A	At-grade	Yes	Yes	0.5-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	0.5-2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
03	Roxas Boulevard	President Quirino Avenue	N/A	At-grade	Yes	Yes	10	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes

- (i) Pedestrian facilities and traffic signals are installed well.
- (ii) No. 1 is the intersection selected for the first round of the Case study. It is the only segregated intersection of traffic bottlenecks along Roxas Boulevard. The Ninoy Aquino International Airport (NAIA) Expressway flyover passes over the intersection, and the pillars of the flyover affect the structure of the intersection.

## 1.3 Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA

#### 1) Overall Causes

Figure 1.11 shows the causes of the traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA. The three major causes add up to over 75%. Although the biggest cause is the lack of road capacity as compared to the saturated demand, other major causes, such as mixed traffic with pedestrians, boarding/alighting practice of Public Utility Jeepneys (PUJs) at intersections, unruly driving behavior, and illegal roadside parking, also make the road capacity decrease.

Therefore, there might be a huge possibility that we can ease the traffic congestion without constructing large-scale roads and bridges. In other words, traffic management can be an effective way in Metro Manila.



1) Causes of major roads and minor roads are merged. Source: JPT



#### 2) Causes by Corridor

Figure 1.12 shows the causes of the Traffic Bottlenecks by road. Along almost all roads, the three major causes are the Saturated Demand, Mixed Traffic with Pedestrians, and Boarding/ Alighting Practice of PUJs at Intersections. Along C5, Mindanao Avenue and Roxas Boulevard, Saturated Demand occupies over 50% of all the causes.

As mentioned earlier, traffic management is an effective means of reducing traffic congestion in Metro Manila. However, the construction and widening of new roads, and the addition of new lanes night be more important along C5, Mindanao Avenue and Roxas Boulevard than the other major corridors.



1) Causes of major roads and minor roa Source: JPT



#### 3) Relationship between Causes and Severity

Figure 2.13 shows the severity of measures along major and minor roads. For either road, Saturated Demand, Boarding/ Alighting Practice of PUJs, Mixed Traffic with Pedestrians and Unruly Driving Behavior are considered as the serious causes. In particular, along major roads, they may reach up to the most serious level: Level 5. In addition, malls/schools/hospitals, and bus terminals, which are the specific causes of traffic bottlenecks in major roads, also affect the severity. On the other hand, tricycles, illegal vendors, window hours of truck ban, and markets may cause a relatively light level of severity.



2) 2 directions are av Source: JPT

Figure 1.13: Severity by Evaluated Measurements along Major and Minor Roads

### 1.4 Existence of Planned Measures

JPT studied whether MMDA is planning traffic management measures for traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA in this questionnaire survey. The planned traffic management measures are divided into three categories: infrastructure, safety facilities, and enforcement, and each traffic bottleneck are divided into major road and minor road to clarify the formulation status of measure planning.





- (a) **Infrastructure:** MMDA planned traffic management measures for approximately 90% of the intersections along Commonwealth Avenue. On the other hand, no other measures are planned along the other corridors.
- (b) **Safety Facilities:** MMDA was not planning any traffic management measures at Marcos Highway, Aurora Blvd., and Magsaysay Blvd. However, most of the other corridors have plans with high rates. Therefore, one can see that MMDA is developing traffic management plans in consideration of the walking environment of pedestrians.

(c) **Enforcement:** As shown in Chapter 1, the LGUs planned the traffic management measures with a high rate for traffic bottlenecks in their own city. On the other hand, the planning rate of traffic improvement measures by MMDA in terms of enforcement was low except for some corridors. The reason for this might be that roads under the management of MMDA are vast, unlike LGUs, and there might also be a limit to the number of personnel.

For minor roads, the planning rate of traffic control measures was lower than that of major roads at almost all corridors. This condition is very different from Metro Manila LGUs. As shown in Chapter 1, the planning rate of each method was almost the same in the LGU questionnaire survey, regardless if it is a major road or a minor road. On the other hand, the planning of traffic management measures concentrates on major roads and the concerns of MMDA are the major roads such as radial roads and circumferential roads.



Figure 1.15: Existing Rate of Planned Improvement Measures along Minor Road

#### 1.5 Evaluation of Implemented Measures

Compared to the current planning situation of traffic management measures, the evaluation rate of implemented traffic management measures is high on average.

- (a) Infrastructure: The planning of traffic management measures only had a high formulation rate for traffic bottlenecks along Commonwealth Avenue. However, the evaluation rate of implemented traffic management measures was zero at the traffic bottlenecks along Commonwealth Avenue. No other corridor had an evaluation rate of more than 50%.
- (b) Safety Facilities: All corridors had high evaluation rates (about 90%) for traffic management measures. In the LGU questionnaire survey, there were only 8 LGUs with an evaluation rate of 80% or more, so it can be said that the evaluation rate by MMDA was particularly high.
- (c) **Enforcement:** All corridors except for EDSA had a rating of over 70%. The evaluation rate of traffic management measured by the enforcers was almost the same value as those of the LGUs.



Figure 1.16: Evaluation Rate of Implemented Measures along Major Roads

The evaluation rate for the implemented traffic management measures is significantly lower than those of the LGUs, and the evaluation of measure implementation by infrastructure is rarely executed. This situation is similar to the planning rate of traffic management measures wherein minor roads have lower evaluation rates than major roads. This result supports the possibility that the MMDA's interest is concentrated on major roads.



Source: JPT

Figure 1.17: Evaluation Rate of Implemented Measures along Minor Roads

## 1.6 Analysis on Distribution of Road Congestion Over Time

Figure 1.18 shows the distribution of road congestion over time. Based on the figure, rush hours happen from 6:00 to 9:00 in the morning and from 16:30 to 19:00 in the evening. In contrast, 14:00 to 15:00 is regarded as off-peak in which there is less traffic on the roads. By comparing the morning and the evening rush hours, Direction 1 has more traffic in the evening while Direction 2 has more in the morning. The maximum congestion in Direction 1 reaches up to 80 bottlenecks while Direction 2 only reaches up to 60 bottlenecks. This indicates that evening peak hours in Direction 1 are the most congested time of the day. Also, by comparing the traffic volume by roads, EDSA accounted a large ratio in both Directions 1 and 2 during the morning and evening rush hours. In addition, TAFT in Direction 1 and Marcos Highway/ Aurora Blvd. and Magsaysay Blvd. in direction 2 also have high traffic volume. For the other notable features of each road, there is an increase on the traffic volume in Mindanao Ave. during off-peak hours while it decreases for all the other roads. Also, Commonwealth Ave. can be regarded as a road that changes the direction of the congested traffic flow from Direction 2 to Direction 1, from morning to evening.



Source: JPT

Figure 1.18: Degree of Congestion Over Time

### 1.7 Summary of and Comment on Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by MMDA

#### 1) Location

The traffic bottlenecks identified by MMDA were all concentrated on eight (8) large roads. As a result, these traffic bottlenecks do not overlap with the traffic bottlenecks identified by the LGUs described in the next section.

This might be caused mainly by the following issues:

- (i) Different definitions of traffic bottlenecks between MMDA and LGUs;
- (ii) These organizations are only concerned with the roads they are in charge of; and
- (iii) These organizations are not concerned with the roads managed by other agencies even if the roads pass through the area under their own jurisdiction.

#### 2) Number and Severity

One out of three traffic bottlenecks is concentrated along EDSA. Along EDSA, over 50% of the traffic bottlenecks are indicated as traffic bottlenecks with high severity. C5, Marcos Highway/ Aurora Blvd. & Magsaysay Blvd. and Taft Avenue all have a considerable number of intersections with high severity.

#### 3) Physical Characteristics

As for the physical characteristics of the current traffic bottlenecks, it is necessary to consider the following for future traffic management measures.

- (i) Installation of U-turn slots based on scientific evidence (including frequent opening and closing of U-turn slots)
- (ii) Relevance of setting up pedestrian facilities such as pedestrian bridges and pedestrian crossings (a comfortable walking environment for pedestrians including persons with disabilities, children and the elderly)
- (iii) Proper traffic signal installation (signal installation for cars or pedestrians only)
- (iv) Number of traffic signals installed

#### 4) Causes

The major 3 causes amount to over 75%. Although the biggest cause is about lack of road capacity as compared to the demand, other major causes, such as mixed traffic with pedestrians, boarding/alighting practice of PUJs at intersections, unruly driving behavior, illegal roadside parking, also make the road capacity decrease.

Therefore, there might be a huge possibility that the traffic congestions can be eased without constructing large scale roads and bridges. In other words, traffic management can be an effective solution for Metro Manila.

# 2 TRAFFIC BOTTLENECKS IDENTIFIED BY LGUS IN METRO MANILA

Although traffic congestion is a major social problem in Metro Manila, the location and causes of the traffic congestion are not clear. To come up with countermeasures, it is important to identify the location of traffic bottlenecks that causes the traffic congestion. Therefore, a questionnaire survey was conducted for each LGU in Metro Manila to clarify the actual situation there. JICA Study Team (JPT) conducted the questionnaire survey on traffic bottlenecks in 17 LGUs in Metro Manila. The questionnaire survey was conducted from 26 April 2019 to 31 October 2019. The responses were obtained from all LGUs (Partial data was obtained from some of the 17 LGUs). For the next section, the questionnaire survey responses will be summarized.

### 2.1 Location of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by LGUs in Metro Manila

First, all the traffic bottlenecks identified by 17 LGUs are placed on the map. Figure 2.1 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Metro Manila. 187 traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey.



Figure 2.1: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Metro Manila
#### 1) Number of the Traffic Bottlenecks in Each LGU

Figure 2.2 shows the number of traffic bottlenecks which was proposed by each LGU. Pasig City, Valenzuela City, and Quezon City identified not less than 20 traffic bottlenecks. On the other hand, 6 LGUs identified 2 to 5 traffic bottlenecks each. There is a huge difference among LGUs and it is assumed that the definition of the LGUs' traffic bottleneck is largely different. Therefore, to clarify the unrelatedness of the city area, the correlation between the number of proposed traffic bottlenecks and city area was surveyed. The results show that the no. of traffic bottlenecks per city area (number/ km<sup>2</sup>) varies greatly among LGUs. This is especially the case for San Juan City and the Municipality of Pateros wherein they have a much higher rate of existing traffic bottlenecks compared with other LGUs.



Figure 2.2: Number of Traffic Bottlenecks in Each LGU

#### 2) Severity of the Traffic Bottlenecks along Major Roads in Each LGU

The difference in the existence of traffic bottlenecks was shown earlier. For this part, the differences in severity for each traffic bottleneck will be specified. Figure 2.3 shows the severity of the traffic bottlenecks proposed by LGUs. Muntinlupa City, Pasig City, and San Juan City indicated that almost all their traffic bottlenecks are highly congested. It may also show that the definition of severity of traffic bottlenecks is different among LGUs.



Figure 2.3: Severity of Traffic Bottlenecks in Each LGU

# 2.2 Physical Characteristic of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Metro Manila LGUs

#### 1) Caloocan City

In order to grasp the physical characteristics of the traffic bottleneck identified by each LGU in Metro Manila, multiple items were shown in the survey form that each LGU filled in. The result of the physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Caloocan City is shown in Table 2.1.

				Structure		F	acilities			Pedestria	an Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregate d/ At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestri an)	Sidewal k (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
CLN001	Teofilo Samson Ave (Brgy. 168)	Deparo Road	Llano Road	At-grade	No	Np	0	No	0	No	No
CLN 002	Camarin Road	Congressional Road (VCAS)	n/a	At-grade	No	No	0	Yes	0	No	No
CLN 003	Almar Road	Camarin Road	Zabarte Road	At-grade	No	No	0	Yes	0	Yes	No
CLN 004	Zapote Road	Camarin Road	n/a	At-grade	No	No	0	Yes	0	No	Yes
CLN 005	Quirino Hi-Way	Malaria Road	n/a	At-grade	No	No	0	Yes	0	No	No
CLS001	EDSA	McArthur Highway	Rizal Ave Extension	At-grade	No	No	3	Yes	2	Yes	No
CLS002	EDSA	B. Serrano (5th Street)	n/a	At-grade	No	No	4	Yes	2	Yes	No
CLS003	EDSA	A. de Jesus (8th Street)	n/a	At-grade	No	No	4	Yes	2	No	No
CLS004	Rizal Avenue Extension	10th Avenue (East)	10th Avenue (West)	At-grade	Yes	Yes	4	Yes	0	No	Yes
CLS005	Rizal Avenue Extension	7th Avenue (East)	7th Avenue (West)	At-grade	Yes	Yes	4	Yes	0	No	yes
CLS006	Rizal Avenue Extension	C-3 Road (East)	C-3 Road (West)	At-grade	Yes	Yes	4	Yes	0	No	Yes
CLS007	A. Mabini Street	J.P. Rizal Street	n/a	At-grade	No	No	4	Yes	0	No	No
CLS008	Rizal Avenue Extension	4th Avenue (East)	4th Avenue (West)	At-grade	Yes	Yes	4	Yes	0	No	Yes
CLS009	Santa Quiteria (Tullahan Road)	Baesa (Reparo Road)	n/a	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes

 Table 2.1: Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Caloocan City

Source: JPT

- (a) All traffic bottlenecks identified in Caloocan City are at-grade intersections.
- (b) Many of them do not have traffic signals.
- (c) The traffic bottleneck identified in Caloocan City (North) is mostly extremely narrow and pedestrians are forced to walk on the roadway. Although the answers regarding lane markings indicate that it was maintained in all intersections, pedestrian crossings were not maintained at several intersections. This means that the lane markings are most likely not appropriate.
- (d) Large traffic bottlenecks have pedestrian bridges.
- (e) There are three intersections where both the pedestrian bridge and crossing is not in place and pedestrians are at risk when crossing the road.

#### 2) Las Piñas City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Las Piñas City are shown in Table 2.2.

				Structure		F	acilities			Pedestri	an Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
LP001	Alabang-Zapote Rd	Quirino Avenue	n/a	At grade	Yes	No	2	Yes	2	No	Yes
LP002	Alabang-Zapote Rd	Dona Manuela	n/a	At grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	No	No
LP003	Alabang-Zapote Rd	CV Starr Avenue	n/a	At grade	No	No	2	Yes	2	No	Yes
LP004	Alabang-Zapote Rd	Aria Street	Manila Times	At grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	Yes	No
LP005	Alabang-Zapote Rd	BF Drive	J. Aguilar	At grade	Yes	No	2	Yes	0	Yes	Yes
LP006	Alabang-Zapote Rd	Palace Street	Rizal Ave. Extension	At grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	No	No
LP007	Alabang-Zapote Rd	Marcos Alvarez Avenue	n/a	At grade	Yes	No	2	Yes	0	No	No
LP008	Alabang-Zapote Rd	Metrocor Subdivision	Manila Doctors Subd	At grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	Yes	No
LP009	Alabang-Zapote Rd	CRM Avenue	n/a	At grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	No	Yes
LP010	Alabang-Zapote Rd	Concha Cruz	n/a	At grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	No	Yes
LP011	J. Aguilar Ave (Southville)	Tropical Avenue	n/a	At grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	No	Yes
LP012	C-5 Extension	Quirino Avenue	n/a	At grade	No	No	2	Yes	2	No	Yes
Course: II	т	•	•	•		•	•		•		

Table 2.2: Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Las Piñas City

(a) Almost all traffic bottlenecks identified by Las Piñas City are located along Alabang-Zapote Road.

(b) All traffic bottlenecks are at-grade intersections.

- (c) Traffic signals are not installed in almost all intersections.
- (d) The sidewalks have enough space in all intersections. However, there are three intersections where both the pedestrian bridge and crossing is not in place and pedestrians are at risk when crossing the road.

#### 3) Makati City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Makati City are shown in Table 2.3.

	Main Road			Structure		Facili	ties			Pedestria	an Safety
ID	Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidew alk(m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
MK001	J.P. Rizal Street	Carballo	n/a	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	No	No	No
MK002	Makati Avenue	JP Rizal Avenue	Jupiter Street	At grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	No	No	Yes
MK003	Sen. Gil Puyat Avenue	Filmore Street	Dian	At grade	Yes	Yes	3.5	Yes	No	No	Yes
MK004	Sen. Gil Puyat Avenue	Chino Roces Avenue	Ayala Avenue	At grade	Yes	Yes	3.5	Yes	No	No	Yes
MK005	J.P. Rizal Avenue	Escuela	Estrella	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	No	No	Yes

 Table 2.3:
 Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Makati City

Source: JPT

- (a) Since MK001 is not a typical intersection, no traffic signals or pedestrian facilities have been installed.
- (b) In the other intersections, traffic signals, sidewalks, lane markings, and pedestrian facilities are all well maintained.

#### 4) Malabon City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Malabon City are shown in Table 2.4.

	Main Dood			Structure		Faci	lities			Pedestri	an Safety
ID	Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
MB001	M. H. Del Pilar Street	Sanciangco Street	n/a	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	No
MB002	M. H. Del Pilar Street	Rodriguez Street	n/a	At grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	No	No
MB003	Gov. Pascual Avenue	Sisa Street	n/a	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
MB004	Gov. Pascual Avenue	M.H. Del Pilar Street	n/a	At grade	Yes	No	2	Yes	0	No	Yes
MB005	P. Quirino Avenue	Sanciangco Street	n/a	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	No
MB006	Women's Club	M. Naval Street	n/a	At grade	No	No	1	No	0	No	No

#### Table 2.4: Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Malabon City

Source: JPT

- (a) All traffic bottlenecks identified by Malabon City are at-grade intersections.
- (b) Traffic signals are almost uninstalled, and pedestrian facilities are scarce.
- (c) The walking environment of pedestrians is considerably extremely poor.

#### 5) Mandaluyong City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Mandaluyong City are shown in Table 2.5.

Table 2.5:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Mandaluyong City
------------	--

				Structure		Fa	acilities			Pedestria	an Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
MD001	Gen. Kalentong	Rev. G. Aglipay	NA	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	No
MD002	Coronado Street	Makati- Mandaluyong Bridge	San Francisco Street	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	1	No	Yes
MD003	Boni Avenue	EDSA	Barangka Drive	Segregated	No	No	1-2	Yes	5	No	Yes
MD004	Shaw Blvd	Kalentong	EDSA	Segregated	Yes	No	1-2	Yes	0	Yes	Yes
MD005	Ortigas Avenue	Connecticut	EDSA	Segregated	Yes	No	0.5-1	Yes	1	Yes	Yes
MD006	Martinez	9 De Febrero	San Rafael Street	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	Yes	Yes
MD007	Pioneer Street	Reliance	Madison	Segregated	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	No

Source: JPT

- (a) Mandaluyong City identified 7 traffic bottlenecks.
- (b) The traffic bottlenecks are identified as corridors except for MD001.
- (c) Three (3) corridors reached EDSA and have segregated section.
- (d) Traffic signals are not installed at almost all traffic bottlenecks, even if they are long sections (corridors).
- (e) Sidewalks are generally wide; however pedestrians must cross the roads carefully due to the road structure that prioritizes vehicles.

#### 6) Manila City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Manila City are shown in Table 2.6.

	Main Dood			Structure		Faci	lities			Pedestri	an Safety
ID	Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Side- walk(m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
MN001	Lubiran	Bagumbayan	Gabby's Junction	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	No
MN002	Quezon Blvd	G. Puyat (Raon)	Paterno Street	At grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	Yes	No
MN003	Tayuman Street	Rizal Aven/Juan Luna/Puregold	Abad Santos Avenue	At grade	Yes	Yes	2	Yes	0	No	Yes
MN004	Abad Santos Avenue	Mayhaligue Street	Recto Avenue	At grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
MN005	C.M. Recto Avenue	Rizal Avenue	Morayta (FEU only)	At grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
MN006	Espana & Lacson	Laong Laan Street	Lacson Street	At grade	Yes	Yes	2	Yes	0	Yes	Yes
MN007	Pedro Gil Taft	Leon Guinto	Agoncillo	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	No
MN008	V. Mapa/Mendiola/ Old Sta. Mesa	Stop & Shop	n/a	At grade	Yes	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes

#### Table 2.6: Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by City of Manila

Source: JPT

- (a) All traffic bottleneck identified by Manila City are at-grade intersections.
- (b) There are no traffic signals at small intersections.
- (c) The markings of pedestrian crossings were not appropriate.

#### 7) Marikina City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Marikina City are shown in Table 2.7.

#### Table 2.7: Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Marikina City

				Structure		Fa	cilities			Pedestri	an Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidew alk(m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
MR001	Marikina-Infanta Hi-Way	A. Bonifacio Avenue	n/a	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	Yes	Yes
MR002	J.P. Rizal Street	Nangka Bridge	n/a	At grade	Yes	No	2	Yes	0	No	Yes

Source: JPT

- (a) There are only two traffic bottlenecks identified by Marikina City.
- (b) Traffic signals are not installed properly, but pedestrian facilities are installed.

#### 8) Muntinlupa City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Muntinlupa City are shown in Table 2.8.

Table 2.8: Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Muntinlupa City

				Structure		Fa	acilities			Pedestria	an Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
ML001	Manila South Road	Rodriguez Street	n/a	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
ML002	Manila South Road	Susana Heights Access Road	n/a	At-grade	Yes	No	2	Yes	0	Yes	No
ML003	Manila South Road	Rizal-Katihan Street	n/a	At-grade	Yes	No	2	Yes	0	Yes	No
ML004	Manila South Road	Bruger Street	Estanisla o Street	At-grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	No	No
ML005	Manila South Road	Roman Cruz Dr (Soldiers' Hills Access Road)	n/a	At-grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	No	Yes
ML006	Manila South Road	Bautista Street	n/a	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes

				Structure		F	acilities			Pedestri	an Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
ML007	Manila South Road	NA	n/a	At-grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	No	No
ML008	Alabang- Zapote Road	Market Drive (Muntinlupa City Public Market)	n/a	At-grade	No	No	4	Yes	0	Yes	Yes
ML009	Alabang- Zapote Road	Theater Dr-St. Mary Street (Alabang Town Center Intersection)	n/a	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
ML010	Alabang- Zapote Road	Madrigal Avenue	n/a	At-grade	Yes	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
ML011	Alabang- Zapote Road	Don Manolo Blvd (Alabang Hills Intersection)	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	2	Yes	0	No	Yes
ML012	Alabang- Zapote Road	Acacia Avenue- Corregidor Street	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
ML013	Alabang- Zapote Road	Buencamino St- Investment Dr	n/a	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes

- (a) The traffic bottlenecks identified by Muntinlupa City are located along Manila South Road or Alabang-Zapote Road. Along the Alabang-Zapote Road, 10 traffic bottlenecks have also been identified in Las Piñas City. It is found that the Alabang-Zapote Road is crowded as a whole corridor.
- (b) All traffic bottlenecks are at-grade intersections.
- (c) There are no traffic signals for vehicles and pedestrians in more than half of the intersections.
- (d) The sidewalks are well-spaced at most intersections.
- (e) Pedestrian facilities are also maintained at most intersections, but it doesn't mean that they provide comfortable walking environments for pedestrians.

#### 9) Navotas City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Navotas City are shown in Table 2.9.

				Structure		E	acilities			Pedestri	an Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
NV001	R-10 Road	C-3	n/a	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
NV002	C-3	North Bay Blvd / H. Lopez Street	North Bay Blvd (Agora)	At grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	No	Yes
NV003	M. Naval Street	E. Pascual Street	n/a	At grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	No

 Table 2.9:
 Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Navotas City

Source: JPT

- (a) There are only three traffic bottlenecks identified by Navotas City.
- (b) All traffic bottlenecks are at-grade intersections.
- (c) There are no traffic signals at all intersections. Although there is a pedestrian crossing, the lane markings are scraped, and they are not maintained enough.

#### 10) Parañaque City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Parañaque City are shown in Table 2.10.

				Structure		Fa	acilities			Pedestria	an Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
PN001	Airport Road	Roxas Boulevard	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	2	Yes	0	No	Yes
PN002	Sucat Road	South Super Highway	n/a	Segregated	Yes	No	1	Yes	2	Yes	No
PN003	Dona Soledad Avenue	France Street	n/a	At-grade	Yes	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes

#### Table 2.10: Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Parañaque City

Source: JPT

- (a) There are only three traffic bottlenecks identified by Parañaque City.
- (b) PN002 is a segregated intersection, and it includes theSouth Luzon Expressway Southbound Exit.
- (c) The other intersections are signalized for vehicles.

#### 11) Pasay City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Pasay City are shown in Table 2.11.

Table 2.11:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by I	Pasav	/ Citv
			· · · · · ·

				Structure		Fa	acilities			Pedestria	an Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
PS001	Taft Avenue	Gil Puyat Avenue	n/a	At-grade	Yes	No	1	Yes	0	Yes	No
PS002	EDSA	Taft Avenue	n/a	At-grade	Yes	No	1	Yes	0	Yes	No
PS003	A. Arnaiz Avenue	Taft Avenue	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	Yes	Yes
PS004	Roxas Boulevard	Ocampo Street	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
PS005	Andrew Avenue	Aurora Boulevard	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	0	No	No

Source: JPT

- (a) All traffic bottlenecks identified by Pasay City are at-grade intersections.
- (b) They are mainly large-scale intersections that have multiple lanes.
- (c) However, the sidewalks are narrow and the vehicle driving speed tends to be high, which is dangerous.
- (d) The lane markings degraded over time. In PS005, it is difficult to understand where the pedestrians should walk and cross.

#### 12) Pasig City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Pasig City are shown in Table 2.12.

Table 2.12:	Physical	Characteristics of	f Bottlenecks	Identified by	Pasig City
-------------	----------	--------------------	---------------	---------------	------------

	Main David		Miner Deed	Structure		Facili	ties			Pedestri	an Safety
ID	Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
PG001	Marcos Highway	A. Rodriguez Avenue	n/a	At-grade	No	No	3	Yes	0	Yes	No
PG002	A. Rodriguez Avenue	Evangelista Avenue	Octagon Avenue	At-grade	Yes	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG003	A. Rodriguez Avenue	East Bank Road	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG004	A. Rodriguez Avenue	Ortigas Avenue	n/a	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	1	Yes	No
PG005	Ortigas Avenue	Countryside	n/a	At-grade	Yes	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG006	Ortigas Avenue	C. Raymundo Avenue	n/a	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	Yes	Yes
PG007	Ortigas Avenue	C-5 Road	n/a	Segregated	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	4	No	Yes
PG008	Ortigas Avenue	Meralco Avenue	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG009	Meralco Avenue	Julia Vargas Avenue	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	2	No	Yes
PG010	Meralco Avenue	St. Paul Road	n/a	At-grade	Yes	No	0.5	Yes	1	Yes	No
PG011	Meralco Avenue	Capt. Henry Javier	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG012	Julia Vargas Avenue	ADB Avenue	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	2	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG013	Julia Vargas Avenue	Lanuza Avenue	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	Yes	Yes
PG014	Shaw Blvd	San Miguel Avenue	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG015	Shaw Blvd	Meralco Avenue	n/a	At-grade	Yes	No	1	Yes	0	Yes	No
PG016	Lanuza Avenue	C-5 Road	n/a	At-grade	Yes	No	1	Yes	0	Yes	No
PG017	C-5 Road	Pasig Blvd Extension	n/a	Segregated	Yes	No	1	Yes	0	Yes	Yes
PG018	C-5 Road	Pasig Blvd	n/a	Segregated	Yes	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG019	Dr. Sixto Antonio Avenue	Pag-Asa Street	n/a	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG020	Dr. Sixto Antonio Avenue	Pasig Blvd Extension	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG021	C. Raymundo Avenue	F. Legaspi Street	n/a	At-grade	Yes	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG022	C. Raymundo Avenue	Mercedes Avenue	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG023	F. Legaspi Street	Jenny's Avenue	n/a	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG024	F. Legaspi Street	West Bank Road	n/a	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG025	Market Avenue	Mercedes Avenue	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG026	Sandoval Avenue	N Cruz Street	n/a	At-grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	Yes
PG027	Sandoval Avenue	Urbano Velasco Avenue	n/a	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG028	A. Mabini Street	Col. Flores Street (Plaza Rizal)	n/a	At-grade	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG029	R. Jabson Street	Elisco Road	M. Concepcion Street	At-grade	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PG030	Elisco Road	M. Jimenez Street	n/a	At-grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No

- (a) Pasig City identified 30 traffic bottlenecks.
- (b) This number is the highest among all the LGUs in Metro Manila.
- (c) These traffic bottlenecks are composed of various types of intersections in terms of structure (at-grade and segregated) and scale (large and small).
- (d) In general, the installation rate of traffic signals for vehicles is high, but it is low for pedestrians.

- (e) If there is a pedestrian bridge at an intersection, able-bodied pedestrians do not have any problems to crossing a road with no pedestrian signals. However, it would not be easy for pedestrians with disabilities and bicycle riders to cross that road. There are 6 intersections that have this kind of characteristic as mentioned above.
- (f) There are 10 intersections without pedestrian bridges and pedestrian signals. This type of situation always prioritizes cars wherein the pedestrian environment is extremely bad.
- (g) The width of the sidewalk is approximately 0.5m to 1m except for PG001. It can be dangerous for pedestrians especially during early mornings and nights when the driving speed of the car increases.

#### 13) Municipality of Pateros

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by the Municipality of Pateros are shown in Table 2.13.

				Structure		Fa	cilities			Pedestria	an Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidew alk(m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
PT001	B. Morcilla Street	P. Herrera	NA	At grade	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PT002	B. Morcilla Street	P. Tangco Street	NA	At grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	No
PT003	P. Herrera Street	C. Almeda Street	NA	At grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
PT004	M. Almeda Street	B. Morcilla Street	NA	At grade	Yes	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PT005	M. Almeda Street	Martirez Street	NA	At grade	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PT006	C. Almeda Extension	P. Tangco Street	NA	At grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
PT007	M. Almeda Street	E. Hermosa Street	NA	At grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
PT008	C. Almeda	D. Rosales Street	NA	At grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
PT009	M. Almeda Street	San Joaquin	NA	At grade	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes

 Table 2.13: Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Pateros

Source: JPT

- (a) Municipality of Pateros is the smallest LGU of Metro Manila. However, Pateros identified 9 traffic bottlenecks, the seventh most common.
- (b) The intersection is very small except for one, and there are many one-way streets. Due to its small size, the width of the sidewalk is also small and there is no road with a sidewalk exceeding 1m. While there are many intersections where signals are not installed, there are efforts for vehicle and pedestrian separation such as lane markings and pedestrian crossings. However, they are not properly implemented.
- (c) The sign "Slow down, accident-prone area" can also be observed at the road. The safety of pedestrians is not ensured in an environment where the driving speed of the car tends to increase due to the absence of a signal.

#### 14) Quezon City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Quezon City are shown in Table 2.14

 Table 2.14: Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Quezon City

				Structure		Fac	cilities			Pedestrian Safety		
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidew alk(m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing	
QZ001	Congressional Avenue	Jupiter Street	NA	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes	
QZ002	Cordillera	M. Cuenco	NA	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes	
QZ003	Visayas Avenue	Road 1	NA	At grade	No	No	2	Yes	0	No	Yes	

				Structure		Fa		Pedestrian Safety			
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidew alk(m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
QZ004	IBP Road	Filinvest Road	NA	At grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	No
QZ005	Payatas Road	Hon. B Soliven	NA	At grade	No	No	1	No	0	No	No
QZ006	Luzon Avenue	Sampaguita	NA	At grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
QZ007	Katipunan Avenue	Rosa Alvero	NA	At grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	Yes	No
QZ008	Kalayaan Road	Matalino Street	NA	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
QZ009	Mo. Ignacia	Sct. Reyes	NA	At grade	No	No	1	No	0	No	No
QZ010	Sct. Chuatoco	Sct. Reyes	NA	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
QZ011	Accountant Street	Engineer Street	NA	At grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
QZ012	Commonwealt h Avenue	Fairlane	NA	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
QZ013	Dahlia Avenue	Chestnut Street	NA	At grade	No	No	1	No	0	No	No
QZ014	Quirino Highway	Asuncion Street	NA	At grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
QZ015	Quirino Highway	Commonwealth Avenue	NA	At grade	No	No	1.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
QZ016	Regalado Avenue	Poniac Street	NA	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
QZ017	Republic Avenue	Chestnut Street	llang-llang Street	At grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
QZ018	Quirino Highway	Baesa Road	Howmart Road	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
QZ019	Tandang Sora	Banlat Road	Venus Street	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	No
QZ020	Tandang Sora	San Miguel Road	NA	At grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	No

- (a) Quezon City identified 20 traffic bottlenecks, all intersections are at-grade and do not have traffic signals at all.
- (b) About half of the identified intersections are small-scale intersections consisting of residential roads used by residents. For these kinds of roads, sidewalks are narrow and there are many spots where the lane markings are scraped.
- (c) There are a few roads that are prominently cracked due to the aging of the pavement.
- (d) There is only one intersection with a pedestrian bridge and the pedestrian crossings are not maintained for half of the intersections.

#### 15) San Juan City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by San Juan City are shown in Table 2.15.

				Structure		Fa	acilities			Pedestrian Safety		
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing	
SJ001	Ortigas Avenue	Wilson Street	NA	At-grade	Yes	Yes	2	Yes	0	No	Yes	
SJ002	Ortigas Avenue	Roosevelt Street	NA	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	Yes	
SJ003	Ortigas Avenue	Madison Street	NA	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	Yes	No	
SJ004	Santolan Road	Paterno Street	Pasadena Street	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	No	
SJ005	Santolan Road	Pinaglabanan Street	P. Guevarra Street	At-grade	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes	
SJ006	P. Guevarra Street	Mons Street	Maclang Street	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes	
SJ007	P. Guevarra Street	P. Parada Street	Ibanez Street	At-grade	Yes	Yes	0.5	No	0	No	Yes	
SJ008	P. Guevarra Street	V. Cruz Street	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	No	
SJ009	P. Guevarra Street	Wilson Street	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes	
SJ010	N. Domingo Street	Pinaglabanan Street	N. Domingo Street	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	Yes	

 Table 2.15:
 Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by San Juan City

				Structure		Fa	acilities			Pedestria	n Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
SJ011	N. Domingo Street	Paterno Street	N. Domingo Street	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
SJ012	N. Domingo Street	Blumentritt Street	N. Domingo Street	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
SJ013	N. Domingo Street	Araneta Avenue	N. Domingo Street	At-grade	Yes	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	No
SJ014	F. Blumentritt Street	F. Manalo Street	NA	At-grade	Yes	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	No
SJ015	Ortigas Avenue	Santolan Road	Boni Serrrano	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	No

- (a) All traffic bottlenecks identified by San Juan City are at-grade intersections.
- (b) Installation rate of traffic signals is comparatively higher than other LGUs in Metro Manila, however, 5 intersections do not have both pedestrian bridges and pedestrian crossings.

#### 16) Taguig City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Taguig City are shown in Table 2.16.

			Minor	Structure		Faci	lities			Pedestria	an Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
TG001	M.L. Quezon Avenue	Lower Bicutan	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
TG002	Gen. Santos Avenue	DOST Circle	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	No
TG003	Gen. Luna Street	Tuktukan	NA	At-grade	No	No	1	No	0	No	No
TG004	F. Manalo Street	F. Manalo Street	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	No
TG005	Dr. Natividad Street	Labao	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
TG006	J.P. Rizal Avenue	Bagong Calzada	NA	At-grade	No	No	1	No	0	No	No
TG007	Cayetano Blvd	Corner C5 Service Road	NA	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	No
TG008	MRT Avenue	Cuasay MRT Avenue	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	No
TG009	Lawton Avenue	Army Gym	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	No

 Table 2.16:
 Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by Taguig City

Source: JPT

- (a) Traffic signals are not installed at all the traffic bottlenecks identified by Taguig City.
- (b) Approximately half of the identified intersections have no lane markings, and the sidewalks are narrow. In addition, pedestrian facilities aren't completely developed as well.

#### 17) Valenzuela City

The physical characteristics of traffic bottlenecks identified by Valenzuela City are shown in Table 2.17.

Table 2.17:	Physical Characteristics of Bottlenecks Identified by	y Valenzuela City	y

				Structure		F	acilities			Pedestri	an Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
VL001	McArthur Highway	M.H. Del Pilar Road	NA	At-grade	Yes	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
VL002	McArthur Highway	G. Lazaro Street	T. Santiago Street	At-grade	Yes	No	0.5	Yes	0	Yes	No
VL003	McArthur Highway	Gov. I. Santiago Road	Rincon Road	At-grade	Yes	Yes	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
VL004	McArthur Highway	C.J. Santos Street	NLEX Segment 9	At-grade	Yes	Yee	1-1.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
VL005	McArthur Highway	Karuhatan Road	A. Pablo Street	At-grade	Yes	No	1.5-2	Yes	0	Yes	No
VL006	McArthur Highway	Fatima Avenue	NA	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
VL007	McArthur Highway	Tamaraw Hills Road	NA	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	Yes	No
VL008	McArthur Highway	Pio Valenzuela Street	NA	At-grade	Yes	No	0.5	Yes	0	Yes	No
VL009	McArthur Highway	A. Fernando Street	NA	At-grade	Yes	Yes	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
VL010	Gov. I. Santiago Road	NA	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No

				Structure		F	acilities			Pedestri	an Safety
ID	Main Road Name	Minor Road 1	Minor Road 2	Segregated / At grade	Traffic Signal (Vehicle)	Traffic Signal (Pedestrian)	Sidewalk (m)	Lane Marking	U-turn Slots	Pedestrian Bridges	Pedestrian Crossing
VL011	M.H. Del Pilar Road	P. Deato Street	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
VL012	Maysan Road	I. Francisco Street	A. Pablo Street	At-grade	No	No	1	No	0	No	No
VL013	Maysan Road	Tongco Street	Interior 103	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
VL014	Paso De Blas Road	T. Santiago Street	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
VL015	Paso De Blas Road	L. San Diego Street	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	Yes
VL016	Paso De Blas Road	East Service Road	West Service Road	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	Yes
VL017	Bagbaguin Road	A. Mariano Street	NA	At-grade	No	No	1	Yes	0	No	No
VL018	Gen. T. De Leon Road	Lorex Avenue	Urrutia Street	At-grade	No	No	0.5-1	Yes	0	No	No
VL019	Gen. T. De Leon Road	Santolan Road	NA	At-grade	No	No	1-1.5	No	0	No	No
VL020	Gen. T. De Leon Road	Que Grande	NA	Segregated	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
VL021	Que Grande Road	F. Bautista Street	Hillside Subdivision	At-grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
VL022	Apolonia Street	G. Angeles Street	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
VL023	Mindanao Avenue	P. Dela Cruz / Tatalon	NA	At-grade	No	No	1	No	0	No	No
VL024	T. Santiago Street	F. Dulalia Street	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
VL025	Sapang Bakaw Street	Arty Subdivision	Turn Around Slot	At-grade	No	No	0.5	No	0	No	No
VL026	Malinis Road	Mulawinan Street	NA	At-grade	No	No	0.5	Yes	0	No	No
VL018 VL019 VL020 VL021 VL022 VL023 VL024 VL025 VL026	Gen. T. De Leon Road Gen. T. De Leon Road Gen. T. De Leon Road Que Grande Road Apolonia Street Mindanao Avenue T. Santiago Street Sapang Bakaw Street Malinis Road	Lorex Avenue Santolan Road Que Grande F. Bautista Street G. Angeles Street P. Dela Cruz / Tatalon F. Dulalia Street Arty Subdivision Mulawinan Street	Urrutia Street NA NA Hillside Subdivision NA NA Turn Around Slot NA	At-grade At-grade Segregated At-grade At-grade At-grade At-grade At-grade At-grade	No No No No No No No	No No No No No No No No	0.5-1 1-1.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 1 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5	Yes No No No No No No Yes	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	No No No No No No No No	

- (a) Valenzuela City identified 26 traffic bottlenecks and they are all at-grade intersections except for VL020.
- (b) A traffic signal for vehicles was installed at 8 intersections and traffic signal for pedestrians is installed at 4 intersections. This is a very low installation rate compared with the 17 LGUs.
- (c) Almost half of the intersections do not have both pedestrian bridges and crossings. Physical facility installation must be promoted.

#### 2.3 Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Metro Manila LGUs

In order to understand the cause of the traffic bottleneck identified by each LGU in Metro Manila, the JPT conducted a questionnaire survey to the LGU showing several possible causes as choices. Figure 2.4 shows the causes of the traffic bottlenecks in Metro Manila. The five (5) major causes comprise over 75% of the causes. Among these major causes, only "Saturated Demand" with 15% is related to the demand itself. This is in accordance with the answers in the questionnaire.

Therefore, there is a high possibility to mitigate the traffic congestion without a new largescale construction to improve the road capacity. (Figure 2.5 shows the causes of the traffic bottlenecks in each LGU).

However, the major causes proposed by the LGUs are more diverse than the ones from MMDA. As mentioned earlier, only three (3) major causes account for over 75% of causes on the results of the MMDA survey. On the other hand, eight (8) causes are raised as major causes in the LGU survey.

Therefore, it's necessary to apply various countermeasures to ease the traffic congestion at the small-scale traffic bottlenecks identified by LGUs.



1) Causes of major roads and minor roads are merged. Source: JPT

#### Figure 2.4: Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks in Metro Manila

A breakdown of the causes of traffic bottlenecks identified by LGUs shows that each LGU has several unique features.

- (a) **Feature 1:** In the traffic bottlenecks listed by the LGUs, the excess of traffic demand is not a major cause. However, in the 5 LGUs below, the reduced road capacity reduced is the main cause for some reason. In these LGUs, measures by traffic management are considered to be more effective.
  - (i) Caloocan City
  - (ii) Malabon City
  - (iii) Pasay City
  - (iv) Municipality of Pateros
  - (v) Taguig City

- (b) **Feature 2:** On the other hand, for the following two LGUs, the excess of traffic demand is relatively a major cause, as in the traffic bottlenecks proposed by MMDA.
  - (i) Las Piñas City
  - (ii) Marikina City
- (c) **Other Features:** In addition, there are three other LGUs that do not fit into the above two features, each feature is described below.
  - (i) Navotas City: Poorly designed intersections account for about 20% of the causes, which is the highest percentage among 17 LGUs. In addition, since Saturated Demand accounts for about 40%, the measures by physical construction are necessary compared to other LGUs. On the other hand, some traffic bottlenecks may be eliminated or reduced as the ongoing NLEX construction is completed.
  - (ii) Parañaque City: The results of this LGU are extremely characteristic, accounting for nearly 90% of the causes due to Unruly Driving Behavior and Manual Override of Active Traffic Lights by Traffic Enforcers. As a result, the behavior of both road users and road managers was raised as the cause, and it can be said that it is highly necessary to take educational measures.
  - (iii) Taguig City: Only three causes have been identified: Mixed Traffic with Pedestrians, Unruly Driving Behavior, and Illegal Roadside Parking. However, all three are due to violation of the regulations by road users (pedestrians and drivers), so the necessity of educational measures is considered.



1) Causes of major roads and minor roads are me Source: JPT

Figure 2.5: Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks in Each LGU

#### 2.4 Existence of Planned Measures

In order to know the existence of a plan for improvement measures in the traffic bottlenecks identified by each LGU in Metro Manila, interviews were conducted with LGUs. Figure 2.6 shows the existing rate of planned improvement measures at the traffic bottlenecks identified by 17 LGUs.



Source: JPT

#### Figure 2.6: Existence Rate of Planned Improvement Measures at Identified Traffic Bottlenecks

Traffic management measures were divided into three types: infrastructures with physical improvements, safety facilities aimed at improving the pedestrian environment, and enforcement to strengthen regulatory compliance.

(a) Infrastructures: The traffic management countermeasure plan by infrastructures was hardly formulated in 5 LGUs, and the average value for 17 LGUs was as low as approximately 50%. There were no planned traffic management measures in Las Piñas City and Pasig City.

In particular, Pasig City has few plans for countermeasure by infrastructures despite the fact that Saturated Demand is one of the major causes of traffic bottlenecks. Similarly, in Las Piñas City, since Manual Override of Active Traffic Lights by Traffic Enforcers accounts for one-third of the causes of traffic bottlenecks, effective signal installation and operation are desired urgently.

(b) **Safety Facilities:** Although the traffic management countermeasure plan by safety facilities was formulated at a high rate in 6 LGUs (Caloocan City, Mandaluyong City, Muntinlupa City, Navotas City, and Municipality of Pateros), it was found that the

average of 17 LGUs was only approximately 50% on both major and minor roads.

(c) Enforcement: The traffic management countermeasure plan by enforcement was formulated for more than 80% of the traffic bottlenecks in 9 LGUs, and the average of 17 LGUs was formulated for more than 70% of traffic bottlenecks. On the other hand, Mandaluyong City and Pasig City did not make plans well, and the rate was approximately 20%.

Although Mandaluyong City and Pasig City did not plan enforcement measures well, the causes that should be decreased by enforcement measures such as Mixed Traffic with Pedestrians, Unruly Driving Behavior, Boarding / Alighting Practice of PUJs at L Intersections, and Illegal Roadside Parking, count for over 50% (see Figure 3.7). They would need to focus on planning enforcement measures.



Figure 2.7: Share of Causes Decreased by Enforcements

#### 2.5 Evaluation of Implemented Measures

In order to evaluate the status of improvement measures in the traffic bottlenecks identified by each LGU in Metro Manila, interviews with LGUs were conducted. Figure 3.8 shows the evaluation rate of traffic management measures Implemented by 17 LGUs.



Source: JPT

#### Figure 2.8: Evaluation Rate of Traffic Management Measures Implemented by 17 LGUs

Traffic management measures were divided into three types: infrastructures with physical improvements, safety facilities aimed at improving the pedestrian environment, and enforcement to strengthen regulatory compliance.

(a) Infrastructures: The evaluation of traffic management measures by infrastructures was carried out at a high rate only in 4 LGUs (Makati City, Muntinlupa City, Parañaque City, and Valenzuela City).

Evaluation of measures is important to determine whether the implementation was effective. However, Marikina City, which accounts for about 40% of the causes of traffic bottlenecks due to saturated demand and was expected to be decreased by infrastructure measures, evaluated only half of the implemented measures (see Figure 2.9).

Similarly, Las Piñas City, Navotas City, and Pasig City, where saturated demand accounts for about 30% of the causes of traffic bottlenecks, did not implement the expost evaluation.

On the other hand, Makati City, Muntinlupa City, Parañaque City, and Valenzuela City, where saturated demand accounts for about 15 to 20% of causes of traffic bottlenecks, implemented almost all measures during ex-post evaluation. The continuous improvement of measurements is expected to contribute to the reduction of the traffic bottleneck.



Source: JPT

#### Figure 2.9: Share of Saturated Demand among Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks by LGU

(b) Safety Facilities: Evaluation of traffic management measures by safety facilities was conducted at a high rate in 7 LGUs (Makati City, Marikina City, Muntinlupa City, Navotas City, Parañaque City, Municipality of Pateros and Valenzuela City). On the other hand, it was found that there was only an average of approximately 50% for both major and minor roads.

Although the 7 LGUs mentioned above have a high rate of measurement evaluation of safety facilities, Valenzuela City still has problems with the walking environment of pedestrians. Their identified intersections with traffic bottlenecks do not have a pedestrian bridge or pedestrian crossing (see Figure 2.10). They would need to reconsider their safety facilities measurements from the beginning of the plan.



Figure 2.10: Share of Lack of Safety Facilities among Causes of Traffic Bottlenecks by LGU

(c) **Enforcement:** Evaluation of traffic management measures by enforcement was carried out well in almost all LGUs and averaged over 80%. On the other hand, the evaluation on both major and minor roads were not carried out in half of the traffic bottlenecks in San Juan City.

#### 2.6 Human Resources Related Traffic and Transportation

In order to understand the current state of human resources related to traffic management in each LGU in Metro Manila, the number of staff and the status of training of staff were studied. Table 2.18 shows the human resources-related traffic and transportation in 17 LGUs. No useful data could be collected from 10 LGUs (Cities of Caloocan, Las Piñas, Manila, Marikina, Muntinlupa, Pasay, Pasig, Quezon, Taguig, and Valenzuela)and almost all LGUs had no or very few traffic management staff other than Enforcement. On the other hand, there is a considerable number of officers in the enforcement sector in each LGU.

Cities /		04	Traffic Management						
Municipality		Staming	Planning	Engineering	Enforcement	Other			
	No. of Staff	College graduate	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	NO. OF Staff	Others	n/a	n/a	n/a				
Caloocan City	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	No. of Staff	College graduate	n/a	n/a	n/a				
Las Piñas City	NO. OF Stall	Others	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	No. of Staff	College graduate	4	1	n/a				
	NO. OF Stall	Others	0	3	n/a				
Makati City	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	4	1	n/a				
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	0	3	n/a				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	Н	М	n/a				
	No. of Staff	College graduate	0	0	4				
	NO. OF Stall	Others	2	2	118	1			
Malabon City	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	0	0	36	(Traffic			
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	0	0	87	Division)			
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	Н	Н	М				
	No. of Staff	College graduate	1	2	4				
Mandaluwana	NO. OF STAT	Others	0	0	0				
City	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
Oity	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	Н	Н	Н				
	No. of Staff	College graduate	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	NO. OF Stall	Others	n/a	n/a	n/a				
Manila City	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	No. of Staff	College graduate	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	NO. OF Stall	Others	n/a	n/a	n/a				
Marikina City	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	No. of Staff	College graduate	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	NO. OF Stall	Others	n/a	n/a	n/a				
Muntinlupa City	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	No. of Staff	College graduate	0	0	23				
Navotas City	NU. UI SIAII	Others	0	0	133				
	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	0	0	107				

 Table 2.18:
 Human Resources Related Traffic and Transportation

Cities /		Stoffing	Traffic Management						
Municipality		Starting	Planning	Engineering	Enforcement	Other			
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	0	0	49				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	Н	Н	Н				
	No. of Stoff	College graduate	5	0	95	Continuing			
Navotas City	NO. OF Stall	Others	0	0	51	traffic			
	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	30	Education &			
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	116	Leadership			
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	n/a	n/a	Н	competencies			
	No. of Staff	College graduate	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	NO. OF Stall	Others	n/a	n/a	n/a				
Pasay City	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	No. of Stoff	College graduate	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	NO. OF Stall	Others	n/a	n/a	n/a				
Pasig City	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
Pasig City	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	n/a	n/a	n/a				
_	No. of Stoff	College graduate	0	0	4.4				
Municipality of	NO. OF Stall	Others	0	0	44				
Nunicipality of	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	41				
Municipality of Pateros	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	3				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	Н	Н	Н				
	No. of Stoff	College graduate	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	NO. OF Stall	Others	n/a	n/a	n/a				
Quezon City	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	No. of Staff	College graduate	n/a	n/a	5				
	NO. OF Stall	Others	n/a	n/a	65				
San Juan City	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	68				
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	2				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	n/a	n/a	М				
	No. of Staff	College graduate	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	NO. OF Stall	Others	n/a	n/a	n/a				
Taguig City	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	No. of Stoff	College graduate	n/a	n/a	n/a				
		Others	n/a	n/a	n/a				
Valenzuela City	No. of Staff by	Properly trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Assessment	Insufficiently trained	n/a	n/a	n/a				
	Training Needs:	H (high), M (medium), L (low)	n/a	n/a	n/a				

### 2.7 Understanding LGUs Responsibility by Metro Manila LGUs

Currently, the coordination of agencies related to traffic management is not working well in Metro Manila. In particular, traffic management based on unified regulations is not performed between national agencies and LGUs, and inter-LGUs as well. In this section, the results of the questionnaire survey on each LGU's role in traffic management would be described to clarify the roles and responsibilities of each LGU in Metro Manila.

Table 2.19 shows the results of understanding the LGU's responsibility by the 17 LGUs in Metro Manila. Responses from the 6 LGUs, Cities of Manila, Pasay, Pasig, Quezon, Taguig, and Valenzuela could not be collected within the survey period. However, it was found that there was a large variation in the recognition of the responsibility in traffic management among the 11 LGUs that could collect the responses.

In this survey, JPT examined the LGUs about five items: Intersection Improvement, Traffic Signal, Traffic Control, Roadside Parking, and Pedestrians Environment.

#### (1) Intersection Improvement (Channelization and Lane Marking)

Of the 11 LGUs that responded, 10 LGUs answered that intersection improvement was a means of traffic management that could be undertaken by LGUs on national roads and/or local roads. Only Malabon City answered that the intersection improvement was outside the scope of the LGU.

#### (2) Traffic Signal (Installation, Operation, and Maintenance)

According to another survey on traffic signals conducted separately from the questionnaire survey in this project, currently, many traffic signals are installed and managed by different organizations in Metro Manila. The main installers are MMDA, LGUs (Makati City and Pasig City), and Ayala Corporation, however, they do not collaborate for the signal harmonization as of this moment.

On the other hand, according to the results of the questionnaire survey, in addition to the 2 LGUs above, 4 LGUs of Navotas City, Parañaque City, Pateros City and San Juan City answered that the installation, operation, and maintenance of traffic signals were within the scope of LGUs.

If these 4 LGUs do not develop common rules for coordination before starting to install traffic signals in the future, inefficient operation of traffic signals might be further exacerbated. For this reason, it is necessary to clarify the demarcation between the institutions of signal installation, operation, and maintenance as soon as possible.

#### (3) Traffic Control (Regulation and Enforcement)

All of the 11 LGUs responded that traffic control is within the scope of the LGU. On the other hand, in many LGUs, the choice to implement traffic control changes depends on the road manager. There are also a few LGUs that did not conduct traffic control on national roads.

#### (4) Roadside Parking (Parking Ban and Pricing)

Similar to traffic control, all of the 11 LGUs answered they will do some sort of roadside parking management.

The installation possibilities of pricing would be determined depending on the location though, it is necessary to establish common rules for the parking ban among the implementing agencies in Metro Manila. Currently, the types of roads where agencies

conduct parking bans are varied among LGUs.

# (5) Pedestrians Environment (Safety Facilities, Sidewalk Improvement, and Street Signaling)

As with Traffic control, all of the 11 LGUs that answered will conduct some sort of improvement of the pedestrians' environment. Currently, due to the road manager, roads that implement the improvement of pedestrians' environment vary among LGUs. Since the permanent installation of facilities and physical improvements is a direct measure, it is also important to have common standards for structures in order to prevent pedestrian confusion.

Cities /	Task			National Road to	National R	oad to Local pad	Local Road to	Residential Subdivision	
Municipality					National Road	Naťl	Local	Local Road	Road
	Intersecti	on	Channelization	1	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
	Improvement		Lane marking		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
			Installation						
	Traffic Signal		Operation						
			Maintenance						
		PUJ	Regulation		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
			Enforcement		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
Caloocan City	Traffic	Tricycle	Regulation		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
	Control	moyolo	Enforcement		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
		Other <sup>.</sup>	Regulation		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
		Ouler.	Enforcement		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
			Parking han	Regulation	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
	Roadside	Parking	T arking bar	Enforcement	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
			Pricing						
	Dedeatrie		Safety Facilitie	S	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
	Environm	ins Iont	Sidewalk Impr	ovement	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
			Street Signaling		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
	Intersecti	on	Channelization	1	$\checkmark$				
	Improven	nent	Lane marking		$\checkmark$				
	Traffic Signal		Installation						
			Operation						
			Maintenance						
		PUL	Regulation		$\checkmark$				
	Traffic Control	100	Enforcement		$\checkmark$				
		Tricycle	Regulation		$\checkmark$				
Las Piñas Citv		Other:	Enforcement		$\checkmark$				
Luc I muc only			Regulation		$\checkmark$				
			Enforcement		$\checkmark$				
				Regulation	$\checkmark$				
	Roadside Parking		Parking ban	Enforcement	√ 				
			Pricina		1				
			Safety Facilities						
	Pedestria	ins	Sidewalk Impr	ovement	V				
	Environm	ient	Street Signalin	a	V				
	Intercepti	00	Channelization	9	V				
	Improven	nent	Lane marking		./		./	./	
	improvon		Installation		v			v	
	Traffic Si	nal	Operation				/		
	Traine Oi	gnai	Maintenance				~		
			Pequilation			1	1		
		PUJ	Enforcement			V /			
	Troffic		Degulation			∕	V (		
Makati City	Control	Tricycle	Regulation			∕	√ √		
Marali Oily	5011101		Bogulation			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
		Other:	Enforcement						
		1	Enlorcement	Regulation		./	./		
	Roadeide	Parking	Parking ban	Enforcement		V /	× /		
	Roduside	anning	Pricing	Enlorcement		~	~		
			Safety Eacilitie	c			/		
	Pedestria	ins	Sidewalk Impo	ovement			× /		
	Environm	ient	Street Signalin	a			~		
	1		Street Signalli	9			1		

 Table 2.19:
 Understanding LGUs Responsibility by Metro Manila LGUs

Cities /	Task			National Road to	National R	oad to Local	Local Road to	Residential Subdivision	
Municipality			Task		National Road	Naťl	Local	Local Road	Road
	Intersecti	ion	Channelization	1					
	Improven	nent	Lane marking						
	Traffic Si	gnal	Operation						
		1	Maintenance						
		PUJ	Regulation						
	Traffic Control		Regulation				1	1	
Malaban City		Tricycle	Enforcement					$\checkmark$	
Malabori City			Regulation				√	· √	
		Other:	Enforcement				$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
			Parking ban	Regulation					
	Roadside	e Parking		Enforcement			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
			Pricing Cofety Facilitie					,	
	Pedestria	ans	Satety Facilities				√	√	
	Environm	nent	Street Signaling				1	1	
	Intersecti	on	Channelization				√	· √	$\checkmark$
	Improven	nent	Lane marking				$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
			Installation						
	Traffic Si	gnal	Operation						
		1	Naintenance Regulation				/	/	/
		PUJ	Enforcement			/	√ /	V /	/
	Traffic		Regulation			V	V V	 √	 
Mandaluyong	Control	Tricycle	Enforcement					$\checkmark$	 √
City			Regulation				√	 √	√
		Other:	Enforcement				$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
	Roadside Parking		Dorking hon	Regulation	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
			Parking ban	Enforcement	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
			Pricing						
	Pedestrians Environment		Safety Facilitie	'S				√ ,	∕
			Sidewalk Impr				√ √	√ 	∕
	Intersecti	on	Channelization		n/a	n/a	√ n/a	√ n/a	√ n/a
	Improvement		Lane marking		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	•		Installation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Traffic Signal		Operation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Regulation		n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a
		PUJ	Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Traffic	Tricycle	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Manila City	Control	moyolo	Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Other:	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a
			Barling has	Regulation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Roadside	e Parking	Parking ban	Enforcement	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Pricing	_	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Pedestria	ans	Sidewalk Impr	s ovement	n/a	n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a
	Environm	nent	Street Signalin	ig	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Intersecti	on	Channelization	- 1					
	Improven	nent	Lane marking				$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
	T ( 0		Installation					$\checkmark$	
	I raffic Si	gnal	Operation					$\checkmark$	
	-	1	Regulation					√ /	
		PUJ	Enforcement					V /	
	Traffic		Regulation				1	√ √	
Marikina Citv	Control	Tricycle	Enforcement						
		0#	Regulation				1	$\checkmark$	
	L	Other:	Enforcement					√	
			Parking bon	Regulation				$\checkmark$	
	Roadside	e Parking	i ainiiy Dall	Enforcement				$\checkmark$	
			Pricing					√	
	Pedestria	ans	Safety Facilitie	S				$\checkmark$	
	Environm	nent	Sidewalk Impr	ovement	l			√	
			Street Signalin	iy		<u> </u>	√	√	

Cities /	Task			National Road to	National R	oad to Local	Local Road to	Residential Subdivision		
Municipality			Task		National Road	Naťl	Local	Local Road	Road	
	Intersecti	on	Channelization	1	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
	Improven	nent	Lane marking			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
			Installation						∕	
	Traffic Sig	gnal	Operation						∕	
			Maintenance						$\checkmark$	
		PUJ	Enforcement		/	/	/	/		
	Troffic		Enforcement		V	V	~	V		
Muntinluna City	Control	Tricycle	Enforcement		./			./		
Mantinupa Oity	Control		Regulation		./	v ./	./	./	v	
		Other:	Enforcement			v 		v V		
				Regulation	√	↓ √		↓ √		
	Roadside	Parking	Parking ban	Enforcement	· √	√		√		
		0	Pricing	1	 √	1	1	√ 		
			Safety Facilitie	S	· √	√		√		
	Pedestria	ins	Sidewalk Impre	ovement	√	√ 	1	 √		
	Environm	ient	Street Signalin	q		√ 	√	√ 		
	Intersecti	on	Channelization	1			1	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
	Improven	nent	Lane marking				$\checkmark$	√	$\checkmark$	
			Installation				$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
	Traffic Signal		Operation				1	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
			Maintenance				$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
		DUU	Regulation							
Navotas City	Traffic Control	PUJ	Enforcement		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
		Triovolo	Regulation		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
		Псусе	Enforcement		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
		Other	Regulation		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
		Other.	Enforcement		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
	Roadside Parking		Parking ban	Regulation	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
			T arking barr	Enforcement	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
			Pricing				$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
	Pedestrians Environment		Safety Facilities				$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
			Sidewalk Improvement				$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
			Street Signaling			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
	Intersection		Channelization		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
	Improvement		Lane marking		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
			Installation		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
	Traffic Sig	gnal	Operation		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
			Maintenance		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
		PUJ	Regulation		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
			Enforcement		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
Dere ão sua Citu	I rattic Control	Tricycle	Regulation					$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
Paranaque City	Control		Enforcement					$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
		Other:	Enforcement							
		1		Regulation	J	1	J			
	Roadside	Parking	Parking ban	Enforcement		, ,	1			
		9	Pricina		, ,	, ,	, ,			
			Safety Facilitie	s		, ,	1			
	Pedestria	ins	Sidewalk Impre	ovement	 √					
	Environm	ient	Street Signalin	a	· √	√				
	Intersecti	on	Channelization	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Improven	nent	Lane marking		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	<b>T</b> <i>m c</i>	. –	Installation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	I rattic Sig	gnal	Operation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
			Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	
		PUJ	Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Pasay City	Traffic	Triguela	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Control	Theyele	Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
		Other:	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
			Enforcement	Dogulation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Roadside	Parking	Parking ban	Enforcement	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	
	1 toutoide	, anning	Pricina	LINGIGENICII	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Pedestrians		Safety Facilities		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

Cities /			Task		National Road to	National Ro Ro	National Road to Local Road		Residential Subdivision	
Municipality					National Road	Naťl	Local	Local Road	Road	
	Environm	nent	Sidewalk Impr	ovement	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Intersecti	on	Street Signalin		n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a	
	Improven	nent	Lane marking	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
			Installation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Traffic Si	gnal	Operation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
			Maintenance		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
		PUJ	Enforcement		n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	
	Traffic	<b>T</b> · 1	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Pasig City	Control	I ricycle	Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
		Other:	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
			Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Roadside	Parking	Parking ban	Enforcement	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
		5	Pricing		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Pedestria	ans	Safety Facilitie	s	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Environm	ient	Sidewalk Impr	ovement	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Internetion		Street Signaling		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Intersecti	on nent		1	./	./	./	./		
Municipality of Pateros	improven		Installation			v 	v v	v		
	Traffic Signal		Operation		√	√	 √			
			Maintenance		 √		 √			
	-		Regulation		 √	√	√			
	Traffic Control	PUJ	Enforcement		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			
		Trievele	Regulation		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
		Tricycle	Enforcement		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
		Other	Regulation		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			
		Ouler.	Enforcement	-	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			
	Poodoida	Darking	Parking ban	Regulation	<i>√</i>	√ 	√ 	$\checkmark$	<i>✓</i>	
	Ttoausiue	a ning	Pricing	Enlorcement	V	~	V	~	V	
			Safety Facilitie	s	1	1	1	1	1	
	Pedestrians Environment Intersection Improvement Traffic Signal		Sidewalk Improvement		√	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	· √	√	
			Street Signaling		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
			Channelization		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
			Lane marking		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
			Installation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
			Operation Maintenance		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
		DUU	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
		PUJ	Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Traffic	Tricycle	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Quezon City	Control		Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
		Other:	Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
			Barline has	Regulation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Roadside	Parking	Parking ban	Enforcement	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
			Pricing		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Pedestria	ins	Safety Facilitie	es overnent	n/a	n/a	n/a n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Environm	nent	Street Signalir	a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
	Intersecti	on	Channelization	. <del>9</del> 1	170	√ √			170	
	Improven	nent	Lane marking			$\checkmark$				
			Installation		$\checkmark$					
	Traffic Si	gnal	Operation		$\checkmark$					
			Maintenance		$\checkmark$					
		DIII	Regulation				$\checkmark$			
		100	Enforcement				$\checkmark$			
San Juan Citv	Traffic	Tricycle	Regulation				$\checkmark$			
	Control		Enforcement				$\checkmark$			
		Other:	Regulation				,			
			Enforcement	Dogulation			√ ,			
	Docdoid	Dorking	Parking ban	Enforcement			√ /			
	Roadside	raiking	Pricing	Eniorcement		/	√			
	Pedestria	ine	Safety Facilitie	s		 ./				
	Environm	nent	Sidewalk Impr	ovement						
			Sidonum inipi			v				

Cities / Municipality			Task		National Road to	National Ro Ro	oad to Local oad	Local Road to	Residential Subdivision
wunicipality					National Road	Nat'l	Local	Local Road	Road
			Street Signaling			$\checkmark$			
	Intersecti	on	Channelization		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Improven	nent	Lane marking		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Installation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Traffic Sig	gnal	Operation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Maintenance		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		PUL	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		100	Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Traffic	Tricycle	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Taguig City	Control	ПСусіе	Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Other:	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Parking ban	Regulation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Roadside Parking			Enforcement	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Pricing		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Pedestrians Environment		Safety Facilities		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Sidewalk Improvement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Street Signaling		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Valenzuela City	Intersecti	on	Channelization		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Improven	nent	Lane marking		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Installation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Traffic Sig	gnal	Operation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Maintenance		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		DIII	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		100	Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Traffic	Tricycle	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Control	Поусіе	Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Other	Regulation		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Oulei.	Enforcement		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Parking ban	Regulation	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Roadside	Parking	T arking bar	Enforcement	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Pricing		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Padastria	ine	Safety Facilitie	S	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Environm	ino ient	Sidewalk Impr	ovement	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Street Signalin	g	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Source: JPT

#### 2.8 Summary and Comments on Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Metro Manila LGUs

As mentioned at the beginning of this report, JPT conducted the questionnaire survey on traffic bottlenecks in 17 LGUs in Metro Manila from 26 April 2019 to 31 October 2019.

Until this section, the response items with relatively high collect rates were described, but JPT also investigated the organization and budget related to traffic management. From here on, JPT describes the findings and considerations that are difficult to express as data, such as the positiveness of project participation and capacity.

Also, the location map of traffic bottlenecks in each LGU and list of each traffic bottleneck are shown with the congestion causes proposed by LGUs and found through the observational survey.

#### 1) Caloocan City

Caloocan City is divided into two, the north and south areas. The southern area is smaller than the northern area. However, it exceeds the northern area in the number and severity of traffic bottlenecks since the northern part is located at the northernmost end of Metro Manila, while the southern part is surrounded by 5 LGUs, and the major roads such as C3, C4, R8, and R9 mesh in the area. The identified traffic bottlenecks are concentrated on the major roads (Figure 2.11).



Figure 2.11: Traffic Bottlenecks in the Southern Part of Caloocan City

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** Traffic signals, sidewalks, and pedestrian crossing must be improved to avoid mixed traffic with pedestrians and secure pedestrian's safety.
- (b) **Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks:** Mixed traffic with pedestrians, unruly driving behavior and boarding/alighting practices of PUJs at intersections compose of approximate 70% of cause.
- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** All identified traffic bottlenecks have measure plans by safety facilities and enforcement. On the other hand, measure plan by infrastructure is limited.

- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Only evaluation of measures by enforcement was implemented well.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: No data is available on human resources. Caloocan City's traffic management covers various ways except for traffic signal installation, operation, and maintenance. Intersections composed of only local roads and residential/ subdivision roads are not included in their coverage.
- (f) **Budget and Positiveness:** No data is available on the budget. LGU's response to the questionnaire was comparatively slow, especially the response from the Southern area. Several data are still missing.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Caloocan City: Figure 2.12 and Figure 2.13 show the location of traffic bottlenecks in Caloocan City. Five (5) traffic bottlenecks in the north and nine (9) traffic bottlenecks in the south were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.14 to Figure 2.16 show the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in Caloocan City.



Figure 2.12: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Caloocan City (North)



Figure 2.13: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Caloocan City (South)



Figure 2.14: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Caloocan City (1)



Figure 2.15: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Caloocan City (2)



Source: Google and JPT

Figure 2.16: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Caloocan City (3)

#### 2) Las Piñas City

All traffic bottlenecks are located along the Alabang-Zapote Road except for two (Figure 2.17).

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** Traffic signals and pedestrian crossing must be improved to secure pedestrian safety.
- (b) **Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks:** Only three causes, mixed traffic with pedestrians, saturated demand, and manual override of active traffic lights by traffic enforcers were

identified.

- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** All identified traffic bottlenecks have measure plans by enforcement. On the other hand, the measure plans by infrastructure and safety facilities are zero.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Only evaluation of measures by enforcement was implemented well.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: No data is available on human resources. Las Piñas City's traffic management covers various ways except for traffic signal installation, operation, and maintenance along national roads only. Other roads are not included in their coverage.
- (f) Budget and Positiveness: Las Piñas City censured approximately 26.2 million PHP for personnel expenses and approximately 4.9 million PHP for facility expenses in 2019. LGU's response on the questionnaire was prompt and the missing data was also small.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Las Piñas City: Figure 2.17 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Las Piñas City. Twelve (12) traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.18 to Figure 2.21 show the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in Las Piñas City.



Figure 2.17: Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Las Piñas City along Alabang-Zapote Road



Source: JPT

Figure 2.18: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Las Piñas City



Figure 2.19: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Las Piñas City (1)


Figure 2.20: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Las Piñas City (2)



Source: Google and JP

Figure 2.21: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Las Piñas City (3)

## 3) Makati City

Makati City's roads have characteristics that are not found in other LGUs. As shown in Figure 2.22, most roads in Makati City are private roads.



Figure 2.22: Road Classification in Makati City

- (a) Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks: Physical issues are not observed much.
- (b) **Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks:** Five causes: mixed traffic with pedestrians, unruly driving behavior, boarding/ alighting practice of PUJ at intersections, saturated demand, and manual override of active traffic lights by traffic enforcers compose all the causes which occupy approximately 20% each.
- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** measure plans by infrastructure, safety facilities, and enforcement exist with almost all traffic bottlenecks that are largely above the advantage of 17 LGUs.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** measure plans by infrastructure, safety facilities, and enforcement exist with almost all traffic bottlenecks that are largely above the advantage of 17 LGUs.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: Makati City has comparatively many staff, especially in the planning sector. Makati City's traffic management covers various ways at the intersections composed of national roads and local roads.
- (f) Budget and Positiveness: According to Makati City, they secured approximately 14 million PHP for the preventive maintenance of traffic signals, approximately 18 million PHP for the traffic signal rehabilitation project, and 183 million PHP for the Makati city Intelligent Transportation and Road Administration Center Project in 2019. LGU's response to the questionnaire was prompt and the missing data was also small.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Makati City: Figure 2.23 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Makati City. Five traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.24 shows the characteristics of the traffic bottlenecks in Makati City.



Source: JPT

Figure 2.23: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Makati City





Source: Google and JPT



### 4) Malabon City

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** The walking environment of pedestrians is extremely poor due to the insufficiency of traffic signals and pedestrian facilities.
- (b) Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks: Three causes: mixed traffic with pedestrians, unruly driving behavior, boarding/ alighting practice of PUJ at intersections and illegal roadside parking accounts for approximately 90%. The percentage of illegal roadside parking is very high among 17 LGUs.
- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** All identified traffic bottlenecks have measure plans by enforcement. On the other hand, the measure plans by infrastructure and safety facilities are zero.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Only evaluation of measures by enforcement was implemented well.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: Malabon City has plenty of human resources for enforcement, however, there is no planning and engineering staff who graduated from college level. Malabon City's traffic management covers traffic control (except for PUJs), roadside parking, and pedestrian facilities on the local roads.
- (f) **Budget and Positiveness:** Malabon City secured approximately 60 million PHP budget for traffic management. LGU's response to the questionnaire was prompt and the missing data was also small.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Malabon City: Figure 2.25 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Malabon City. Six traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.26 shows the characteristics of the traffic bottlenecks in Malabon City.



Figure 2.25: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Malabon City





Source: Google and JPT



### 5) Mandaluyong City

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** Almost all roads at identified traffic bottlenecks are vehicle-prioritized road structures.
- (b) Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks: The causes are various, wherein 7 causes are over 10% of the total cause. Poorly designed intersections occupy a high percentage of causes among 17 LGUs.
- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** All identified traffic bottlenecks have measure plans except for enforcement.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Only evaluation of measures by enforcement was implemented well.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: Mandaluyong City is the only LGU that has staff who graduated from college level in all sections of planning, engineering, and enforcement among 17 LGUs. Mandaluyong City's traffic management covers various ways except for traffic signal installation, operation and maintenance, and pricing. Their responsibilities are mainly local, residential, and subdivision roads. There are limited activities on national roads.
- (f) **Budget and Positiveness:** No data on budget is available. LGU's response to the questionnaire was comparatively slow. Several data are still missing.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Mandaluyong City: Figure 2.27 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Mandaluyong City. Seven (7) traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.28 and Figure 2.29 show the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in Mandaluyong City.



Figure 2.27: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Mandaluyong City



Figure 2.28: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Mandaluyong City (1)



Source: Google and JPT

### Figure 2.29: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Mandaluyong City (2)

## 6) Manila City

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** Traffic signals, sidewalks, and pedestrian crossing must be improved to secure pedestrian safety.
- (b) Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks: Five causes: mixed traffic with pedestrians, unruly driving behavior, boarding/ alighting practice of PUJs at intersections, saturated demand, and manual override of active traffic lights by traffic enforcers compose 80% of causes.
- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** Measure plans by infrastructure and enforcement are prepared well.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Evaluation of measure plans by infrastructure and enforcement are implemented with a high percentage.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: No data is available on human resources and understanding of LGU's responsibility.
- (f) **Budget and Positiveness:** No data is available on budget. LGU's response to the questionnaire was comparatively slow. Several data are still missing.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Manila: Figure 2.30 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Manila City. Eight (8) traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.31 and Figure 2.32 show the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in the City of Manila.



Figure 2.30: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Manila



Figure 2.31: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Manila (1)



Source: Google and JPT

Figure 2.32: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Manila (2)

### 7) Marikina City

- (a) Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks: Traffic signals are not installed properly.
- (b) **Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks:** Saturated demand is the most major cause with a value of 40% of all the causes. In other words, it might be hard to improve the traffic congestion in Marikina City by only traffic management such as enforcement.
- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** Measure plans in all way is prepared at one out of two intersections.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Evaluation of measure plans by safety facilities and enforcement are implemented at all identified traffic bottlenecks.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: No data is available on human resources and understanding of LGU's responsibility.
- (f) **Budget and Positiveness:** No data is available on budget. LGU's response to the questionnaire was comparatively slow. Several data are still missing.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Marikina City: Figure 2.33 shows the

location of the traffic bottlenecks in Marikina City. Two traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.34 shows the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in Marikina City.



Source: JPT

Figure 2.33: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Marikina City



Source: Google and JPT

Figure 2.34: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Marikina City

### 8) Muntinlupa City

All traffic bottlenecks identified are located along Manila South Road and Alabang-Zapote Road (Figure 2.35).

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** Traffic signals must be installed more to improve the pedestrian's walking environment. The traffic bottlenecks in Muntinlupa might be solved better by traffic management than physical improvement.
- (b) Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks: Four causes: mixed traffic with pedestrians, unruly driving behavior, boarding/ alighting practice of PUJs at intersections, and saturated demand compose 80% of the causes. However, saturated demand only accounts for 20%. Therefore, it is important to optimize vehicle and pedestrian behavior at intersections.
- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** Measure plans by all way is prepared at almost all intersections. This is the highest rate among 17 LGUs.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Evaluation of measure plans by all way are prepared at almost all intersections. This is the highest rate among 17 LGUs.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: No data is available on human resources. Muntinlupa City's traffic management covers various ways except for traffic signal installation and operation and maintenance at national and local roads. However, they handle all tasks regarding traffic signals at residential/ subdivision roads.
- (f) Budget and Positiveness: Muntinlupa City secured approximately 52.2 million PHP for traffic management in 2019. The main areas of expenditure are personnel expenses, maintenance and other operating expenses, trainings of traffic personnel and purchase of traffic supplies and equipment. LGU's response to the questionnaire was comparatively slow, however, most data are provided properly.

(g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Muntinlupa City: Figure 2.36 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Muntinlupa City. Thirteen (13) traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.37 to Figure 2.39 show the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in Muntinlupa City.



Source: JPT

Figure 2.35: Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Muntinlupa City along Alabang-Zapote Road and Manila South Road



Source: JPT

Figure 2.36: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Muntinlupa City



Figure 2.37: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Muntinlupa City (1)



Figure 2.38: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Muntinlupa City (2)



Source: Google and JPT

Figure 2.39: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Muntinlupa City (3)

### 9) Navotas City

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** Traffic signals, pedestrian crossing and lane markings must be installed and maintained properly.
- (b) Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks: Three causes: saturated demand, poorly designed intersections and ongoing NLEX R-10 exit ramp construction compose over 60% of the total causes. Ongoing NLEX R-10 exit ramp construction is only raised as a cause in Navotas City (Figure 2.40).



Source: Inquirer.com

#### Figure 2.40: Ongoing NLEX R-10 Exit Ramp Construction (Part of NLEX Harbor Link Project)

- (a) **Improvement Measure Planning:** Measure plans by all way is prepared at almost all intersections.
- (b) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Evaluation of measure plans by safety facilities and enforcement is prepared at almost all intersections.
- (c) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: There are plenty of human resources in the enforcer section, however there are no staff in other 2 sections. Navotas City's traffic management covers various way except for PUJ regulation at local and residential/subdivision roads. At national roads, their activities are limited only to traffic control, parking ban and street lighting.
- (d) Budget and Positiveness: Navotas City secured approximate 32.2 million PHP for traffic management in 2019. Main area of expenditure is for personnel expenses. LGU's response on questionnaire was comparatively slow, but the data missing is limited.
- (e) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Navotas City: Figure 2.41 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Navotas City. Three traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.42 shows the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in Navotas City.



Source: JPT

Figure 2.41: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Navotas City



Source: Google and JPT

Figure 2.42: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Navotas City

### 10) Parañaque City

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** Sidewalks and pedestrian crossingss must be improved.
- (b) **Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks:** Unruly driving behavior and manual override of active traffic lights by traffic enforcers compose approximately 85%.
- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** Measure plans by all way are not prepared well and it was only for one out of three intersections.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Evaluation of measure plans in all ways is implemented at all intersections.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: Parañaque City has sufficient staff except for the engineering section. Parañaque City's traffic management covers various ways except for traffic control at national and local roads. At residential/ subdivision roads, they carry out lane marking and regulation and enforcement of tricycles.

- (f) **Budget and Positiveness:** No data is available on budget. LGU's response to the questionnaire was comparatively slow. Several data are still missing.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Parañaque City: Figure 2.43 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Parañaque City. Three traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.44 shows the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in Parañaque City.



Figure 2.43: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Parañaque City



Source: Google and JPT

Figure 2.44: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Parañaque City

### 11) Pasay City

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** The sidewalk is narrow and lane marking has been degraded over time. The guide for both vehicles and pedestrians by road facilities is unclear.
- (b) Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks: Three causes: Unruly driving behavior, boarding/ alighting practice of PUJs at intersections and illegal roadside parking compose approximatelyly 70% of the total causes. All major causes seem to be solved by enforcement and regulation. However, it's important to make road users understand where they should drive or walk clearly with proper physical facilities such as lane marking and signage.
- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** Measure plans by enforcement are prepared well however, other measures are not prepared at almost all intersections.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Evaluation of measure plans by enforcement is prepared well however, other measures are not prepared at almost all intersections.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: No data is available on human resources and understanding of LGU's responsibility.

- (f) **Budget and Positiveness:** No data is available on budget. LGU's response to the questionnaire was comparatively slow. Several data are still missing.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Pasay City: Figure 2.45 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Pasay City. Five traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.46 shows the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in Pasay City.



Figure 2.45: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasay City



Figure 2.46: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasay City

# 12) Pasig City

Pasig City identified 30 traffic bottlenecks. This number is the highest among all LGUs in Metro Manila.

- (a) Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks: Traffic signals for pedestrians are not installed well. Ten (10) intersections don't have pedestrian bridges and pedestrian signals. Pedestrians must always be careful in crossing a road. The width of the sidewalk is generally narrow.
- (b) **Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks:** Three causes: Unruly driving behavior, boarding/ alighting practice of PUJs at intersections and saturated demand.
- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** Measure plans by all way, infrastructure, safety facilities and enforcement is not prepared at almost all intersections.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Evaluation of measure plans by enforcement is implemented at 26 out of 30 intersections, however evaluation of measure plans by other ways are not implemented so far.
- (e) **Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility:** No data is available on human resources and understanding of LGU's responsibility.
- (f) **Budget and Positiveness:** No data is available on budget. LGU's response to the questionnaire was comparatively slow. Several data are still missing.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Pasig City: Figure 2.47 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Pasig City. Thirty (30) traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.48 to Figure 2.53 show the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in Pasig City.



Source: JPT

Figure 2.47: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City



Figure 2.48: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City (1)



Source: Google and JPT

Figure 2.49: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City (2)



Figure 2.50: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City (3)



Source: Google and JPT

Figure 2.51: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City (4)



Figure 2.52: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City (5)


Source: Google and JPT

Figure 2.53: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pasig City (6)

### 13) Municipality of Pateros

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** Lane markings and pedestrian crossing must be improved. Pedestrian safety must be secured at small intersections.
- (b) Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks: Five causes: mixed traffic with pedestrians, unruly driving behavior, boarding/ alighting practice of PUJs at intersections, illegal roadside parking and poorly designed intersections comprise approximately 90% of causes. Percentage of illegal roadside parking and inadequate signal phasing is much higher than the average of other 17 LUGs.
- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** Measure plans by all way, infrastructure, safety facilities and enforcement are prepared at almost all intersections.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Evaluation of measure plans by safety facilities and enforcement is implemented at almost all intersections.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: Municipality of Pateros has plenty of staff in the enforcement section. Municipality of Pateros traffic management covers various ways except for traffic control at national and local roads. At residential/subdivision roads, they work on tricycle management, roadside parking, and pedestrian management.
- (f) **Budget and Positiveness:** Municipality of Pateros secured approximately 6.3 million PHP for traffic management in 2019. LGU's response to the questionnaire was comparatively slow, but the data missing is limited.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Pateros: Figure 2.54 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Municipality of Pateros. Nine (9) traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.55 and Figure 2.56 show the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in the municipality of Pateros.



Source: JPT

Figure 2.54: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pateros



Figure 2.55: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pateros (1)



Figure 2.56: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Pateros (2)

# 14) Quezon City

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** Traffic signals, lane markings and pedestrian facilities must be improved. Also, the pavement must be maintained frequently.
- (b) Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks: Five causes: mixed traffic with pedestrians, unruly driving behavior, boarding/ alighting practice of PUJs at intersections, saturated demand, and illegal roadside parking comprise approximately 80% of causes. This is the most average characteristics among 17 LUGs.

- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** Measure plans by all way, infrastructure, safety facilities and enforcement are not prepared at almost all intersections.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Evaluation of measure plans by enforcement is comparatively implemented well.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: No data is available on human resources and understanding of LGU's responsibility.
- (f) **Budget and Positiveness:** No data is available on budget. LGU's response to the questionnaire was comparatively slow. Several data are still missing.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Quezon City: Figure 2.57 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Quezon City. Twenty (20) traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.58 to Figure 2.61 show the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in Quezon City.



Source: JPT

Figure 2.57: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Quezon City



Figure 2.58: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Quezon City (1)



Source: Google and JPT

Figure 2.59: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Quezon City (2)



Figure 2.60: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Quezon City (3)



Figure 2.61: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Quezon City (4)

# 15) San Juan City

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** Pedestrian bridge and pedestrian crossing are both not installed at 5 intersections.
- (b) **Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks:** Regardless of the specific cause, eight (8) types of causes were identified to some extent.
- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** Measure plans by enforcement are prepared at almost all intersections.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Evaluation of measure plans by infrastructure is comparatively implemented well.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: San Juan City has plenty of staff in the enforcement section. San Juan City's traffic management covers activities related to traffic signal at intersections that consists of national roads. They also handle intersection improvement, traffic control, and pedestrian management of other national and local roads.
- (f) Budget and Positiveness: San Juan City secured approximately 19.5 million PHP for traffic management in 2019. Main areas of expenditure are accountable forms, trainings and seminars and communication equipment. LGU's response to the questionnaire was comparatively quick with limited data missing.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by San Juan City: Figure 2.62 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in San Juan City. Fifteen (15) traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.63 to Figure 2.65 show the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in San Juan City.



Figure 2.62: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in San Juan City



Figure 2.63: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in San Juan City (1)

The Project for Comprehensive Traffic Management Plan for Metro Manila TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 2: QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY TO MMDA AND LGUS



Figure 2.64: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in San Juan City (2)



Figure 2.65: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in San Juan City (3)

# 16) Taguig City

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** Traffic signals, lane markings and pedestrian facilities must be improved.
- (b) **Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks:** 3 causes, missed traffic with pedestrians, unruly driving behavior and illegal roadside parking comprise 100% of the causes.
- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** Measure plans by all way, infrastructure, safety facilities and enforcement are prepared at almost all intersections.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Evaluation of measure plans by all way, infrastructure, safety facilities and enforcement are implemented at almost all intersections.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: No data is available on human resources and understanding of LGU's responsibility.
- (f) **Budget and Positiveness:** No data is available on budget. LGU's response to the questionnaire was comparatively slow. Several data are still missing.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Taguig City: Figure 2.66 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Taguig City. Nine (9) traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.67 and Figure 2.68 show the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in Taguig City.



Figure 2.66: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Taguig City



Figure 2.67: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Taguig City (1)



Source: Google and JPT

Figure 2.68: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Taguig City (2)

#### 17) Valenzuela City

- (a) **Physical Issues on Traffic Bottlenecks:** Traffic signal especially for pedestrians is not installed at almost all intersections. Pedestrian facilities must be improved.
- (b) Cause of Traffic Bottlenecks: Five causes: mixed traffic with pedestrians, unruly driving behavior, boarding/ alighting practice of PUJs at intersections, saturated demand and illegal roadside parking comprise approximately 80% of the causes. This is the most average characteristics among 17 LUGs.

- (c) **Improvement Measure Planning:** Measure plans by all way, infrastructure, safety facilities and enforcement are prepared at almost all intersections.
- (d) **Evaluation of Implemented Measures:** Evaluation of measure plans by all way, infrastructure, safety facilities and enforcement are implemented at almost all intersections.
- (e) Human Resources and Understanding of LGU's Responsibility: No data is available on human resources and understanding of LGU's responsibility.
- (f) **Budget and Positiveness:** No data is available on budget. LGU's response to the questionnaire was comparatively slow. Several data are still missing.
- (g) List of Traffic Bottlenecks Identified by Valenzuela City: Figure 2.69 shows the location of the traffic bottlenecks in Valenzuela City. A total of 26 traffic bottlenecks were identified based on the questionnaire survey. Figure 2.70 to Figure 2.75 show the characteristics of traffic bottlenecks in Valenzuela City.



Figure 2.69: Location of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City



Figure 2.70: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City (1)



Figure 2.71: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City (2)



Figure 2.72: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City (3)



Figure 2.73: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City (4)



Figure 2.74: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City (5)



Source: Google and JPT

Figure 2.75: Characteristics of Traffic Bottlenecks in Valenzuela City (6)