**Meeting Minutes**

**March 24, 2010**

**ODOT District 9 Planning Conference Room**

**Meeting attendees:**

**Mark Johansen ODOT District 9 Staff Specialist**

**Doug Buskirk ODOT District 9 Planning Administrator**

**Devon Shoemaker Ross County Planning Department**

**Tom Day City of Chillicothe Engineer**

**Richard Chaffin ODOT District 9 Traffic Management Anlyst**

**Gary Cochenour ODOT District 9 Production Administrator**

**Darrel Armstrong ODOT District 9 Highway Management Admin.**

**Greg Baird ODOT District 9 Bridge & Traffic Engineer**

**Jennifer Phillips ODOT District 9 Transportation Engineer**

**Patricia Wetzel ODOT District 9 Transportation Engineer**

**This meeting was held as a follow up to the July 22, 2009 meeting where the decision was made to begin the signal removal process. The signal was then put on flash on 12/17/09. The signal removal process is outlined below. The 90 day flash period ended on 3/17/10.**

**The signal warrants were reviewed again. No signal warrants were close to being met.**

**The complaint log was passed out, including the 2 letters that were received during the 90 day flash period. This was discussed. It was noted that the main concern was drivers trying to make a left turn out of the side streets were having difficulty finding a gap, especially during peak times on Bridge Street. It was discussed that it would be difficult to justify a signal based on this since there are so many private drives on Bridge Street that would be no different.**

**There was discussion on potential development on both the East and West sides of Bridge St. Devon indicated that the County has been successful with their negotiations for the easement that would someday connect the apartments and the church drive over to the Tractor Supply drive. Tom Day indicated that there has been some interest in the vacant property on the East side of Bridge St. next to Aldi’s. It was determined that if/when any changes are developing, we will revisit the signal warrants.**

**It was decided that the intersection would remain a flashing beacon since we are anticipating that the development may someday be large enough to meet a signal warrant. There was an in depth discussion regarding what to do with the signal heads. The two options discussed were**

1. **Leave the existing 3-section signal heads as they are now, flashing yellow for SR 159, and red for the side streets**
   1. **Pros**
      1. **No work needing to be done, therefore savings in man-hours**
      2. **Ready for if/when the signal meets signal warrants, the equipment is already there, and ready.**
      3. **May be more enticing for developers to connect over to this intersection since it appears more ready for a signal operation.**
   2. **Cons**
      1. **If the power goes out to the signal, and the signal is dark, it will appear to be a dark signal instead of a flasher. This could cause confusion for the vehicles on Bridge St. if they should stop or not. A familiar driver may continue through, but an unfamiliar driver may stop (assuming they know the law on dark signals).**
      2. **Signal removal policy references conversion of the traffic signal to a flashing intersection control beacon, which was interpreted to mean changing the heads to single-section. Leaving the 3-section heads could be veering from the intent of the policy.**
2. **Convert the heads to single-section heads, flashing yellow for SR 159, and red for the side streets.** 
   1. **Pros**
      1. **The traffic control does not legally change for the intersection if the signal is dark. (The side streets still stop, and Bridge Street does not.)**
      2. **It would follow the signal removal process more closely.**
   2. **Cons**
      1. **More work to change out the heads now.**
      2. **More work to change them back if/when the signal is put back in stop and go operation.**
      3. **Appears to the developers less like a traffic signal, therefore potentially inhibiting potential connectivity to the intersection.**

**The decision was made to convert them all to single-section heads.**

**Comments p8 – p10 have been added to the procedure below.**

Meeting Agenda with minutes

July 22, 2009

ODOT District 9 Planning Conference Room

**Meeting attendees:**

Mark Johansen ODOT District 9 Staff Specialist

Doug Buskirk ODOT District 9 Planning Administrator

Devon Shoemaker Ross County Planning Department

Tom Day City of Chillicothe Engineer

Keith Jones City of Chillicothe Signal Electrician

Richard Chaffin ODOT District 9 Traffic Managmnt Anlyst

Gary Cochenour ODOT District 9 Production Administrator

Darrel Armstrong ODOT District 9 Highway Management Admin.

Greg Baird ODOT District 9 Bridge & Traffic Engineer

Jennifer Phillips ODOT District 9 Transportation Engineer

Patricia Wetzel ODOT District 9 Transportation Engineer

* **ROS-159 & Aldi’s/Tractor Supply**
  + Signal installed approx. Nov 2007 based on projected counts
  + Complaint came in that signal didn’t have enough traffic to need signal Jan 2009.
  + Obtained new traffic count 6/2/09
  + No signal warrants are met.
  + Possible connection proposed from Tractor Supply to Apartments/new Church

Thorough discussion on whether to leave the signal in stop & go operation or to put it on flash until there is enough traffic to warrant the signal. Mixed opinions on the issue. Discussion regarding possible future development beside Aldi’s and on the East side of Bridge St. The County is in the process of getting an easement dedicated for an access road connecting Tractor Supply drive with the Apartments drive to the North. Since this development is speculative, and we have no way of knowing how long it would be before it will be there, or if it will be there, or if will generate enough traffic to warrant the signal, a decision was made to put the signal on flash and follow the procedure in the TEM to determine if it should be removed. “Removed” meaning operating it as a flasher. No intent to remove the equipment, but possibly change the 3-section heads to 1-section heads. Below is the signal removal process with notes of who is doing what. Patricia is going to continue to pursue getting the signal agreement signed, but also will send a letter to notify them of our intent to study the intersection for removal. The letter will let them know that we have no intent to remove the equipment.

***401-4 Removal of Traffic Signals Under ODOT Jurisdiction***

*If a traffic engineering study indicates that the traffic signal is no longer justified, the traffic signal should be removed by a uniform procedure that will consider public input, accidents, site considerations and an appropriate replacement type of traffic control device. Therefore, when* ***ODOT*** *determines that an existing traffic signal installation no longer meets signal warrants as contained in the* ***OMUTCD****, or is no longer the appropriate form of traffic control, the* ***District*** *shall proceed through the following removal process to document and determine if the signal installation should be removed:*

1. *To determine if the traffic signal is still needed, the* ***District*** *shall prepare a traffic engineering study for the signal installation documenting the following information, as appropriate:*
2. *Warrant analysis summary. If reasons other than the standard warrants were used to justify the signal installation, determine if these reasons are still valid.*
3. *Accident history.*
4. *Site conditions, especially sight distance problems.*
5. *Public, business, school board or governmental complaints resulting in the original signal installation.*
6. *Present and future developmental growth.*
7. *Known reasons for change in traffic patterns or volumes.*
8. *Capacity analysis for the alternate traffic control scheme most likely to be installed if the signal is removed.*
9. *Analysis of the cost of continued signal operation versus a one time signal removal cost.*
10. *Discussion of traffic volume growth needed to warrant the signal.*
11. *Based on the traffic engineering study, the* ***District*** *shall decide whether to proceed with the*

*removal process or defer signal removal. If the removal is deferred, the* ***District*** *shall*

*document the reasons for deferral. The signalized location shall be reconsidered for removal*

*every year until a signal warrant or other determination of permanent retention is satisfied.*

1. *If the* ***District*** *decides to proceed with the removal process, the following steps shall be*

*taken:*

1. *Inform the local media, schools, governmental agencies and local emergency/safety*

*forces of* ***ODOT's*** *intent to study the signalized location for removal.*

1. *Remove or reduce intersection sight distance restrictions, if needed.*
2. *Install the SIGNAL UNDER STUDY FOR REMOVAL (W3-H12) sign next to the signal*

*heads on each approach.*

1. *Check the controller cabinet wiring to ensure that the color of the flashing indications will*

*agree with the alternate traffic control scheme.*

1. *Install the alternate traffic control devices, such as STOP signs and advance Warning*

*Signs. Existing Stop Lines on the uncontrolled approaches should not be removed at this*

*time.*

1. *Place the signal in flashing operation for ninety days, in conjunction* ***with item 3e above****.*
2. *If the signal is put in flashing operation for ninety days in anticipation of removal, the* ***District***

*shall monitor accident experience during the ninety-day flashing period:*

1. *If accidents of types susceptible to correction by traffic signal control have increased by*

*more than two, the signalized location shall remain in flashing operation for an additional*

*sixty-day period. If more than two such accidents occur in the second sixty-day period,*

*the* ***District*** *should retain the signal in stop-and-go operation until the site conditions can*

*be improved to reduce the accident frequency.*

1. *If accidents of types susceptible to correction by traffic signal control have not increased*

*by more than two, continue with the removal process.*

1. *The* ***District*** *shall also monitor, investigate and respond to the concerns of the public*

*during this period.*

1. *If the* ***District*** *decides to proceed with the removal process after considering the information*

*gathered in* ***item 4****:*

1. *The signal heads shall be bagged or removed, and the traffic signal turned off for a sixty*

*day period.*

1. *The accidents shall be monitored to determine if the absence of flashing traffic signals*

*results in an increase in accidents. If accidents occur, the* ***District*** *may consider*

*conversion of the traffic signal to a flashing intersection control beacon.*

1. *If it is decided to continue with removal of the signal, the* ***District*** *shall remove the signal*

*heads, poles, foundations (1 foot below grade), pull boxes, overhead cables and controller.*

*Underground conduit and cables may be abandoned in place. If the* ***District*** *wants to monitor*

*the site for an extended period of time, the poles and cables may be left in place for one year.*

1. *The* ***District*** *shall notify all affected parties of the removal of the signal and the termination of*

*any agreements that were in effect. If a signal permit exists for the signal removal location,*

*the* ***District*** *will notify the* ***Office of Traffic Engineering*** *of the signal removal so that a*

*statewide database on* ***Village*** *signal permits can be maintained.*