July 15, 2010

Russ White

Director of Real Estate

ALDI Inc.

4400 S. Charleston Pike

P.O. Box 2997 (45501)

Springfield, OH 45502

RE: Traffic Signal at SR 159 & Aldi (Chillicothe, OH)

Dear Mr. White:

Thank you for coming to ODOT, District 9 this week for the meeting regarding the traffic control for the Aldi store located on Bridge Street (SR 159) in Chillicothe, OH. We discussed the situation regarding the traffic signal that is currently in operation in flash mode. As requested, I have included information below regarding the traffic signal.

This traffic signal was installed by the developer and the signal warrant analysis that was used to justify the signal was performed by a consultant that was hired by the developer. This study was based on a proposed development on the East side of Bridge Street that included the Aldi store, a fast food restaurant and a sit down restaurant. The traffic projections used in the study were based on the ITE Trip Generation manual. The planned expansion has not developed as the study indicated. The restaurants were not built, and the traffic volumes being generated by the Aldi store are lower than projected.

The Ohio Department of Transportation receives many requests in favor of and in opposition to signals. In order to maintain consistency and ensure that a signal is the appropriate form of traffic control, the Federal Highway Administration publishes a section on traffic signals in their Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Ohio must comply with these regulations; therefore they are adopted in the Ohio Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (OMUTCD).

These regulations require that in order to consider a traffic signal, a signal warrant must be met. There are 8 different signal warrants in the OMUTCD. The applicable signal warrants are based on the traffic volumes on both the main street (SR 159) and on the side street. The volumes must meet the minimum threshold values in order to meet the signal warrant.

*Section 4C.01 Studies and Factors for Justifying Traffic Control Signals* of The Ohio Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (OMUTCD) states the following:

*At a location that is under development or construction and where it is not possible to obtain a traffic count that would represent future traffic conditions, hourly volumes should be estimated as part of an engineering study for comparison with traffic signal warrants. Except for locations where the engineering study uses the satisfaction of Warrant 8 to justify a signal, a traffic control signal installed under projected conditions should have an engineering study done within 1 year of putting the signal into stop-and-go operation to determine if the signal is justified. If not justified, the signal should be taken out of stop-and-go operation or removed.*

A complaint was received regarding the intersection. When it was investigated, a traffic count was taken and the signal warrants were evaluated. The existing traffic volumes at the intersection do not meet any of the signal warrants.

The OMUTCD also points out that there are pros and cons to operating a stop and go traffic signal at an intersection. Engineering judgment plays an important role in determining when a traffic signal is the best form of traffic control for an intersection. *Section 4B.03 Advantages and Disadvantages of Traffic Control Signals* of the OMUTCD states the following regarding disadvantages of traffic signals:

*Traffic control signals are often considered a panacea for all traffic problems at intersections. This belief has led to traffic control signals being installed at many locations where they are not needed, adversely affecting the safety and efficiency of vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic.*

*Traffic control signals, even when justified by traffic and roadway conditions, can be ill-designed, ineffectively placed, improperly operated, or poorly maintained. Improper or unjustified traffic control signals can result in one or more of the following disadvantages:*

*A. Excessive delay;*

*B. Excessive disobedience of the signal indications;*

*C. Increased use of less adequate routes as road users attempt to avoid the traffic control signals; and*

*D. Significant increases in the frequency of collisions (especially rear-end collisions).*

Enclosed is a copy of the ODOT signal removal process that we followed. The process is finished except for the conversion of the 3-section signal heads to single section heads and removal of the “signal under study for removal” signs. The signal will remain in flash mode flashing yellow for Bridge St. (SR 159) and red for the side streets. The equipment will not be removed. It is our intent that the signal will revert back to stop and go operation if/when the traffic volumes are high enough to meet a signal warrant.

Please feel free to contact Patricia Wetzel at (740) 774-8983 if you have any questions or if you wish to discuss this further.

Respectfully,

Patricia Wetzel, P.E.

Transportation Engineer

Ohio Department of Transportation

District 9

Enclosure

C: T. Day D. Buskirk G. Baird R. Chaffin J. Phillips M. Johansen J. Brushart