Signal Warrant Analysis Summary

SCI-139 & Rosemount Rd.

2/6/14

Since the plans for the SCI-139-1.63 PID 84964 were progressing, and the plans were proposing to reconstruction the existing stop and go traffic signal as an overhead flasher, it was decided that the signal removal process should be performed prior to sale of the project, so that when the contractor begins construction, the signal will be on flash, and the signal removal process will be completed.

A meeting was held to discuss this 11/15/13 (See meeting minutes [\\D09FS206\J\_Drive\Traffic\73 SCIOTO\SR 139\SR 139 Rosemont CR 377\2013 SIGNAL REVISIT](file:///%5C%5CD09FS206%5CJ_Drive%5CTraffic%5C73%20SCIOTO%5CSR%20139%5CSR%20139%20Rosemont%20CR%20377%5C2013%20SIGNAL%20REVISIT))

Rechecked signal warrants. Will likely recheck again right before we start removal process, which will likely be right before project sells (2017)

Traffic Count was performed 12/4/13.

Signal Warrants were analyzed 2/6/14.

Discussion of what factors to use:

* The right turn reduction factors were applied. The TEM indicates right turn reduction for an existing signal isn’t required, but since we are analyzing this for the reconstruction of the signal it was questionable if this reduction should be applied. The analysis was performed with and without the reduction, and it did not change the outcome of the warrant study.
* Speed limit on SR 139 is 35 MPH, so this doesn’t qualify for the 70% reduction
* This is just outside the corp limits of Portsmouth, but the population of Portsmouth is 20,226 according to the 2010 census, so this doesn’t qualify for the 70% reduction
* The crashes are difficult to determine since there is an existing signal. My interpretation of the reduction in the thresholds for crashes would be if you were analyzing an unsignalized intersection, and the number of crashes in the unsignalized condition were over the threshold, then you could reduce the threshold. Since the number of crashes that would be occurring without the signal is unknown, the crashes were looked at prior to the installation of the signal, and that would not have triggered the reduction in the threshold. The signal warrants were analyzed with and without the reduction, and it did not change the outcome of the warrant study.

Signal Warrant outcome:

**No signal warrants were met**