

DISTRICT 9 SAFETY REVIEW TEAM MEETING

Tuesday, June 15, 2010
9:00 a.m.

Attendees:

Mark Johansen, Staff Specialist
Doug Buskirk, Planning Administrator
Darrel Armstrong, Highway Management Administrator
Gary Cochenour, Production Administrator
Greg Baird, Traffic Studies Engineer
Patricia Wetzel, Transportation Engineer
Jennifer Phillips, Transportation Engineer
Richard Chaffin, Traffic Management Analyst (DSRT Chairperson)

AGENDA:

Pike County, State Route 32 & 220/Germany Road

This location was previously studied as part of the District Safety Annual Work Plan. The approved safety project is well progressed into design and a couple of questions have been raised concerning possible revisions to the project. (1) Should we remove the median crossing between State Route 220 and Germany Road on State Route 32 and make the Germany Road side right/in, right/out like we are doing with the S.R. 220 side of the intersection? (2) Should we still install a traffic signal at the intersection of S.R. 32 & Schuster Road as part of the project since the District has changed focus to try to not install any new traffic signals on the State Route 32 corridor?

Question (1) discussion: The team reviewed the old study collision diagram and compared it to the newest three year accidents occurring at the intersection. The accidents have dropped significantly. There were thoughts that the accident reduction could be attributed to most of the S.R. 220 traffic has already diverted to the Schuster Road intersection and now that the bridge is open on Darst Road it is possible that some of the Germany Road traffic has diverted to that intersection. There was discussion that in the old DSRT meeting minutes the team was concerned that if we close or restrict Germany Road we will cause the current Germany Road traffic to use Darst Road which is a narrow road with a bad bridge on it. Also, there was concern about the impact to the new gas station/convenient store business at the intersection. The business owner has threatened to take action if we restrict the Germany Road intersection with S.R. 32. After discussion, the team still has the same concerns that we may have to upgrade Darst Road and we may have a law suit from the business owner if we close the median crossing on S.R. 32 between Germany Road and S.R. 220. The Darst Road upgrade would be very costly because of the bad bridge. In conclusion, the team determined our current project does improve safety and we would have a difficult time justifying the need to close the

median since the accidents have reduced and the potential added costs of upgrading Darst Road and damaging the convenient store would be very high. The team decided to leave the intersection as currently designed in the safety project but we do want to look at trying to supplement the design by placing a physical obstruction in the median to try to deter motorists from making illegal crossing maneuvers. The team wants to look into the quick curb delineation system or some equivalent to prohibit the crossing maneuvers.

Question (2) discussion: The team discussed our new focus is to not install new signals on State Route 32 so we can preserve the corridor traffic flow. However, the safety project for S.R. 32 & 220/Germany Road has S.R. 220 diverted to Schuster Road and a traffic signal to be installed on S.R. 32 at the intersection. The discussion was whether or not to install the new signal. The data shows that the signal is warranted by traffic volumes. It does not meet an 8 hour warrant but it does meet the peak hour warrant and a 4 hour warrant. The intersection was re-analyzed using the right turn reduction method and it still meets the same warrants according to the 2006 traffic counts but we are not experiencing many accidents. There were only 2 accidents for years 2006 thru 2008. It was also stated that the intersection operates well currently without the signal and most of the S.R. 220 traffic has already diverted to this intersection. The team discussed removing the signal from the plans but there was concern about potential future angle accidents and the liability of going against the DSRT recommendation to install the signal. It was discussed that we could install the signal as part of the project but put the signal on flash instead of stop and go operation. However, the concern is that if we construct the signal we will be pressured into turning it on stop and go operation. It was discussed we should be looking at other improvements such as "J" turns or interchanges. The problem with these types of improvements is they are costly and funding is always difficult to obtain. After considerable discussion the team decided to do new traffic counts and also do some type of delay study during the peak hours to see how well the intersection is operating. After we have that information the team will get back together and determine if we should remove the signal from the project.

RDC
file