



To: MAYOR AND COUNCIL

Agenda Item #: IV. F.

From: Mark K. Nolan, AICP, Transportation Planner

Action

Discussion

Date: August 18, 2015

Information

Subject: Traffic Safety Committee Reports of June 3 and July 1, 2015

Action Requested:

Review and approve the Traffic Safety Committee Reports of June 3 and July 1, 2015.

Information / Background:

The Edina Transportation Commission (ETC) reviewed the June 3 and July 1, 2015 Traffic Safety Committee Report at their July 16 meeting and moved to forward the report to the City Council for approval; see attached draft minutes.

Attachments:

- Traffic Safety Committee Report of June 3, 2015
- Traffic Safety Committee Report of July 1, 2015
- Draft ETC Meeting Minutes of July 16, 2015

Traffic Safety Report

Wednesday, June 03, 2015

The Traffic Safety Committee (TSC) review of traffic safety matters occurred on July 01. The Public Works Director, City Engineer, Police Lieutenant, Traffic Safety Coordinator, Sign Coordinator, and Assistant City Planner were in attendance for this meeting.

From these reviews, the recommendations below are provided. On each of the items, persons involved have been contacted and staff recommendation has been discussed with them. They were informed that if they disagree with the recommendation or have additional facts to present, these can be included on the July 16 Edina Transportation Commission and the August 18 City Council agenda.

Section A: Items on which the Traffic Safety Committee recommends action

A1. Request for replacing a Yield sign with a Stop sign at the exit of the parking garage in the 50th and France district

This request comes from a resident who noted that the middle ramp in the 50th and France district has a yield sign located at its exit, however this is inconsistent with state statute 169.31. This statute states that “The driver of a vehicle within a business or residence district emerging from an alley, driveway, or building shall stop such vehicle immediately prior to driving onto a sidewalk or into the sidewalk and shall yield the right-of-way to any pedestrian and all other traffic on the sidewalk.” All other city-owned parking structures and lots have stop signs at their exit, but other driveways in the area have no control at their exit. No other yield signs were observed in the district’s driveways.



Photo : Exit from the Center Ramp



Photo : An unsigned, wide driveway in the 50th and France business district

After review, staff recommends approving this item, and signing the exit with a Stop sign. This is done for consistency with other city owned parking areas, as well as compliance with the Minnesota State Statute.

Section B: Items on which the Traffic Safety Committee recommends denial

B1. Request for yellow painted curb, between 5105 and 5107 Wooddale Avenue driveways

This request comes from a resident on Wooddale Avenue who has a driveway close to the neighbor's, and notes that vehicles park between the two. The end of radius of these driveways is 9 feet apart, with the edge of pavements being 16 feet apart behind the sidewalk. Edina Statue Ordinance Code 26-35(2) does not allow parking within 5 feet of any driveway. Using the larger measurement, there is 6 feet of space between the driveways available for parking, but a SmartForTwo™ is 8 feet long, and would be unable to fit into the space. Residents of both properties were supportive of a measure to deal with the issue. The adjoining neighbor seconded the request.

After review, staff recommends denial of this request. This decision was made considering that both of these properties have secondary access, and that yellow curb painting is rare in the city, and only used for specific circumstances.

B2. Increased safety along Creek Valley Road from Nordic Circle through Scandia Lane, specifically Crosswalks across Creek Valley Road

This request came from a parent of a Creek Valley Elementary student, who believed that the previous action of asking parents not to park in a no parking zone on Gleason Road (item A2 in the February 4th, 2015 Traffic Safety Report) created a dangerous situation on Creek Valley Road, as walkers and bikers from the school now had to navigate several parked vehicles picking up children. A camera was placed in this location for three school days. The vehicle queue did not reach the intersection of Nordic Circle. Safety was seen as a possible concern with the number of drivers using the intersection of Nordic Circle and Creek Valley Road to execute U-



Map : 5105/ 5107 Wooddale Avenue



Photo : Straight curb between driveways



Map : Proposed improvements along Creek Valley Road



Photo: The video camera's view during school release.

turns or three-point-turns, where all children were crossing Nordic Circle. This action will be restricted with the new island being placed in this location (pending City Council approval). While in excess of twenty pedestrians crossed Creek Valley Road in this segment, no strong concentration of a specific crossing point was seen. Pedestrians and bicyclists also used all areas of the street and drivers were cautious, slowed down, and yielded right-of-way to the children during school release.

After review, staff recommends denial of this request. This decision is based on the small number of issues observed, the lack of concentration for crossings, a lack of sidewalks on the south side of the street, and standards for how to walk in the roadway indicating different crossing points for pedestrians walking in opposite directions. In addition, an island being painted and having flexible plastic posts will soon be tested in the area, and will mitigate some conflicts.

C Items : Items to be considered for more review

CI. Request for a Crosswalk across 66th Street at Warren Avenue

This request came from several neighbors in the Brookview Heights neighborhood, who noted that high speeds on 66th Street and the lack of pedestrian infrastructure made the area unwelcoming to pedestrians, and made getting to the park an unwanted experience. Video was gathered of the area on May 8th-May 10th of 2015 and was evaluated. A maximum of 15 people crossed in the maximum two-hour period, which does not meet warrants. The weather was mixed, with temperatures in the sixties, and rain on Sunday, May 10th. There are no sidewalks currently in the area, but one along 66th Street is planned. Crosswalk warrants are attached in Appendix A.

After review, staff recommended denial of this request due to not meeting crosswalk volume warrants. The Edina Transportation Commission asked for a second review of the engineering judgement of the crossing, as the location is adjacent to a public park.



Map : 66th St and Warran Ave



Photo: A group of pedestrians, as seen from the video camera

D Items: Other items handled by Traffic Safety

D1. A resident called about the intersection of Trunk Highway 62 and France Avenue, noting the danger present in the intersection. The comment was noted, and requestor was informed that the City of Edina is working with MnDOT and Hennepin County to improve the intersection.

D2. A staff person at a local senior apartment complex called for information relating to unsigned lane-drops and merges at the exit of the complex's parking area. The requestor also asked if the Traffic Safety Coordinator would be willing to look at the intersection in person and speak to residents. The

site was reviewed and found to be awkward, but on private property, questions were taken at the center with management present. Management has been made aware of the issue several times in the past, and has not taken action to rectify the situation. Recommendations on how to properly mark or sign the exit to clarify the situation were provided.

D3. A resident noted that a large tree blocked sightlines and was within the clear zone of 56th Street and Beard Avenue. The site was investigated and the tree was found to be largely in the clear view triangle at the intersection, a letter has been sent to the property owner, and if no action has been taken within ten days, the City Forester will take action.

D4. A resident called to inform engineering that Arcadia Avenue was impassable due to the Starbucks queue. This was forwarded to the City Engineer who is currently in talks with the business.

D5. A resident and staff person were confused on the right of way rules at the intersection of Merritt Circle and Doncaster Way. General T-intersection right-of-way rules and reasons for why these would not apply were identified, and discussed.

D6. A resident of Minneapolis wanted to discuss the City of Edina's experiences with flashing beacon pedestrian signals.

D7. The Traffic Safety Coordinator noticed that there was insufficient pedestrian time at the intersection of 77th and Trunk Highway 100, on the west side of the freeway. New timings were sent to MnDOT with a request for change.

D8. A resident called to ask about traffic light timings at the intersection of Tracy Avenue and Vernon Avenue, the questions and concerns were forwarded to Hennepin County, which controls the signal.

D9. A resident called, concerned about the Southdale Mall exits. In discussion it was found that this exit was not a typical mall exit, but an emergency exit. A quick review of the situation was undertaken to confirm and the exit was clearly not intended for everyday use. The caller was also informed that Southdale is private property and therefore the City of Edina cannot place traffic signs on the property without Southdale's consent. The caller was told that this request was more appropriate for Southdale Mall itself, and not the City of Edina.

D.10 Two residents were concerned with sight distances at the corner of Scott Terrace and Morningside Road, due to construction crews in the area. A radar study was performed (for 2 hours and 20 minutes) indicating an 85th percentile speed of approximately 27 miles per hour. Rain likely lowered speeds slightly, thus staff used 30 miles per hour as the design speed of the roadway. This and other sight distance information was then forwarded to the Redevelopment Coordinator.

Appendix A:

Crosswalk Warrants

- A. Marked crosswalks are placed at locations that are unusually hazardous or at locations not readily apparent as having pedestrian movement.
- B. Marked crosswalks will only be placed in an area that has 20 or more pedestrian crossings in a two-hour period.
- C. Marking for crosswalks will be established by measuring the “Vehicle Gap Time”. This is the total number of gaps between vehicular traffic recorded during the average five minute period in the peak hour. Criteria for markings are:
 - a. More than five gaps – pavement marking and signage only.
 - b. Less than five gaps – add actuated pedestrian signals.
- D. Crosswalks will not be placed on arterial roads or roads with a speed limit greater than 30 mph unless in conjunction with signalization.
- E. Other conditions that warrant crosswalks:
 - a. Routes to schools
 - b. Locations adjacent to libraries, community centers, and other high use public facilities.
 - c. Locations adjacent to public parks.
 - d. Locations where significant numbers of handicapped persons cross a street.
 - e. Locations where significant numbers of senior citizens cross a street.
- F. Crosswalks will only be placed at intersections.

Traffic Safety Report

Wednesday, July 01, 2015

The Traffic Safety Committee (TSC) review of traffic safety matters occurred on July 01. The Public Works Director, Transportation Planner, Traffic Safety Coordinator, Sign Coordinator, and Assistant City Planner were in attendance for this meeting.

From these reviews, the recommendations below are provided. On each of the items, persons involved have been contacted and staff recommendation has been discussed with them. They were informed that if they disagree with the recommendation or have additional facts to present, these can be included on the July 16 Edina Transportation Commission and the August 18 City Council agenda.

Section A: Items on which the Traffic Safety Committee recommends action

No Items

Section B: Items on which the Traffic Safety Committee recommends no action

BI. Request for controlling the intersection of Grove Street and Merold Drive

This request was forwarded from residents, by staff on the reconstruction of the Countyside H neighborhood this summer. This intersection was measured for sight-distance, with an uncontrolled intersection requiring 115 feet on each approach for 25 mph design speed (from the AASHTO “Green Book”, A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets), and this intersection was found to not be able to meet those required safe sight-distances. This was due to significant grade changes and small setbacks blocking sight distances. In 2014 Grove Street south of the intersection had an ADT of 363 and an 85th-Percentile speed of 25.5 mph, a count was conducted on Grove Street, east of the intersection which had an ADT of 348 and an 85th-Percentile speed of 20.7 mph. Due to road conditions, Grove Street, east of the intersection was counted close to the intersection and the speeds were likely lower than further from the intersection.



Map : Grove Street and Merold Drive



Photos : Grove Drive, looking west towards the intersection, sight distance obstructions are shown here.

There have been no reported accidents, correctable by traffic control, in this location in the past 5 years.

After review, staff recommends denial of the request. With no history of accidents, it is unlikely that placing a stop sign would increase safety at this intersection. Additionally, the low speeds observed indicate that drivers are slowing as they approach the intersection, likely to gain proper sight distances.

B2. Request for alley speed bumps on the block bounded by 55th Street, 54th Street, Xerxes Avenue and York Avenue

This request comes from a resident who has concerns that a recent alley paving project increased speeds in the alley, such that it is no longer safe for anything but use by vehicles. A traffic counter was placed in the alley and drivers were found to be in excess of the 10 mph speed limit slightly less than half the time, however, the 85th-percentile speed was 14.5 mph. The policy on alley speed bumps is attached in Appendix A. Another homeowner on the block expressed concern that the speed bumps were a ploy to gain control of the alley.



Photo: Neighbors are using small plastic men and flags in an attempt to slow drivers

After review, staff does not recommend placing the alley speed bumps. This is based off of low speeds in the alley as it currently exists. A cost estimate has been prepared and has been sent to residents should they wish to circulate a petition.


B3. Request for traffic controls and reduced speeds on 64th Street and Wilryan Road

This request comes from a resident who is concerned that the intersection of 64th Street and Wilryan Road is dangerous, and that Wilryan Road has too much traffic in excess of the speed limit. A counter was placed and found that Wilryan had an ADT of 676 vehicles per day and 85th-percentile speeds of 29.4 mph. 64th Street was counted last year and has an ADT of 500 vehicles per day. No accidents in the last five years have been reported as related to the intersection.

After review, staff recommends denial of this request. The 85th-Percentile of drivers' speeds was below the speed limit, and warrants for controlling the intersection were not met. Discussion of staff also determined that this route was likely receiving higher use than typical due to construction north of the area, but the data collected this year did not meet



Photo: Wilryan Avenue, looking south towards W. 65th Street




Map: Wilryan Avenue from W. 66th St. to W. 64th St.

warrants, even with the additional vehicle traffic.

B4. Request for “Not a Thru Street” sign on Cornelia Drive and Gloucester Road

This request comes from a resident who is concerned with the volume of traffic circling the block of Cornelia Drive, Gloucester Road and 72nd Street looking for an access to Interstate 494. A counter was placed at the far southern end of the circular roadway, and it was found that fewer than 100 vehicles per day use the segment, and the 85th percentile speed is 22 mph. There have been no reported accidents due to this condition in the last five years.

After review, staff recommends denial of this request. The low speeds and low volumes found indicate that this action of circling the block is infrequent, and likely is due to residents from nearby properties using the segment to access their property.



Map: The requestor’s assumed traffic pattern




Photo: Southern end of Cornelia/Gloucester

B5. Request for traffic calming on Code Avenue near Windsor Avenue

This request comes from a resident who is concerned with vehicle speeds on Code Avenue near Windsor Avenue. A counter was placed in this location, and the 85th-percentile speed was observed as 28.5 mph, and an ADT of 262 vehicles per day was also observed. There have been no reported accidents due to this condition in the last five years.



Photo: Code Avenue, looking north towards Windsor



Map: Code Avenue at Windsor Avenue

After review, staff recommends denial of this request, based on 85th-percentile speeds below the speed limit. The area has been referred to the police department for placement of the speed trailer.

B6. Request for mitigation of drive-thru queue on Arcadia, from Starbucks

This issue was a C item on the November 05, 2014 report, and after further investigation, staff is prepared to make a recommendation on the issue. From the November 05 report; the requestor states that the Starbucks' drive-thru queue consistently is long enough for cars to be stopped on city streets, both Arcadia and Gus Young Lane. The requestor feels that this is an issue because the road is not wide enough for queued cars to be passed on their side of the centerline, and this leads to drivers crossing a double yellow line, violating expectations from drivers. In site visits queues were present in both directions, with both left-turning (northbound) and right-turning (southbound) queues appearing on their respective right hand sides of the roadway. In discussions with property management and Starbucks management, it was made clear that they were aware of the issue and had exhausted all their possibilities in dealing with the situation. Arcadia has 1186 ADT just north of this location, and Gus Young Lane has 4275 ADT in this location, with 85th-percentile speeds of 20 and 22 mph respectively. Arcadia in this location is 29.5 feet wide.

New information from a video study of the site shows that on the two days recorded, the morning rush (from 6:00 AM to 10:00 AM) had over 200 left hand turns, which caused most of the issues in the location. While only fifteen times over the two day period did the back-up from the Starbucks cause delays, block, or otherwise impede other traffic. Fourteen of the fifteen issues observed occurred within the hours of 7:30 AM and 9:30 AM, while 107 drivers turned left into the parking lot and drive through during this time. Delays may have lasted a few minutes as drivers waited for a space in the drive-thru line and included delays behind vehicles, as well as delays from the roadway acting as a single lane roadway for a short distance between the two queues out of the parking lot.

After review, staff recommends no action on this item, as even at the highest concentrations of issues, less than ten percent of drivers caused delays to others. Additional reasons for denial include safety concerns being minimal, and inconvenience being seen as the main factor in the requests, as well as the redevelopment planning and



Photo : Arcadia, looking south



Map : Queuing along Arcadia



Map : Queues on Arcadia for Starbucks

transportation study of the Public Works site, Arcadia Avenue may be redesigned in the future to accommodate changing land uses.

Section C: Items the Traffic Safety Committee recommends delay, for further study

No Items

Section D: Other items handled by traffic safety

D1. A resident requested restrictions on truck traffic on Blake Road. The requestor noted that the intersection of Blake Road and Interlachen was congested, that high speeds were present as people are trying to go faster than US Highway 169 on Blake Road, and that a manhole was clanging outside his home. The resident was informed that the City of Edina does not restrict traffic from using roadways, a counter was placed at the location and speed data was forwarded to the police department. In site visits, the manholes did not seem to be moving, this has been forwarded to public works.

D2. Residents on Interlachen are doing construction work on their home, and have a retaining wall across most of their frontage with Interlachen. Where they do not have a retaining wall there is a No Parking sign. They requested that the sign be relocated so that work can continue, this was forwarded to the sign shop.

D3. A resident was concerned with high speeds on Benton Avenue, as well as the lack of bicycle and pedestrian amenities along the road and the time needed before a reconstruction would be able to address these issues. A counter was placed along Benton Avenue and the speed data has been forwarded to the police department.

Appendix A:

Edina Alley Speed Bump Policy

1. The provisions of the Minnesota Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) shall be followed.
2. Traffic analysis, engineering, and property use facts and data shall be reviewed when considering on placement of alley speed bumps.
3. The City of Edina will consider the installation or citizen removal of the speed bumps upon receipt of a petition signed by greater than 75% of all adjacent residents/property owners.
4. A minimum of two speed bumps should be used for each alley block. The City of Edina will determine their locations.
5. Speed bumps shall be installed on concrete or bituminous surfaced alleyways only.
6. The affected block is responsible for installation costs. Price per speed bump location will be noted on the petition. These costs must be collected and submitted to staff before installation of the speed bump. The special assessment procedure will not apply to any alley speed bumps requests.
7. The City of Edina will remove the speed bumps by November 1st and reinstall after April 15th each year.

Appendix B:

Stop Sign Warrants

When it is determined that a full stop is always required on an approach to an intersection a STOP (R1-1) sign shall be used.

At intersections where a full stop is not necessary at all times, consideration should first be given to using less restrictive measures such as YIELD signs.

The use of STOP signs on the minor-street approaches should be considered if engineering judgment indicates that a stop is always required because of one or more of the following conditions:

- A. The vehicular traffic volumes on the through street or highway exceed 6,000 vehicles per day;
- B. A restricted view exists that requires road users to stop in order to adequately observe conflicting traffic on the through street or highway.
- C. Crash records indicate that three or more crashes that are susceptible to correction with the installation of a STOP sign have been reported within a 12-month period, or that five or more such crashes have been reported within a 2-year period. Such crashes include right-angle collisions involving road users from the minor street failing to yield the right-of-way to traffic on the through street or highway.

Additional warrants from the city of Edina list that:

1. If an intersection experiences five (5) or more right angle accidents in a three (3) year period, stop signs should be considered.
2. If the presence of a sight obstruction is contributing to accidents at an intersection, removal of the sight obstruction should be sought before considering a stop sign.
3. If the 85th percentile speed on any leg of an intersection is more than five (5) MPH over the posted speed limit, a stop sign should be considered for the intersecting street.
4. If traffic volumes exceed 1,000 vehicles per day on each of the intersecting streets, stop signs should be considered.
5. Residential stop signs shall not be installed in an attempt to control speed.
6. Residential stop signs shall not be installed in an attempt to control volume.

**MINUTES OF
CITY OF EDINA, MINNESOTA
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
July 16, 2015, 2015
6:00 P.M.**

ROLL CALL Answering roll call were members Bass, Boettge, Campbell, Iyer, Janovy, LaForce, Loeffelholz, Nelson, Olson, and Spanhake.

ABSENT Rummel

APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

**Motion was made by member Nelson and seconded by member Olson to approve the meeting agenda. All voted aye.
Motion carried.**

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF MAY 21, 2015

**Motion was made by member Nelson and seconded by member Olson to approve the amended minutes of May 21, 2015.
All voted aye. Motion carried.**

Traffic Safety Reports of June 3 and July 1, 2015

June 3 Report

B.1. Member Janovy asked if the City has a policy on painting no parking on curbs and planner Nolan said they do not have a policy and it is not something they normally do. She said one of the reasons for the denial doesn't seem relevant while the burden is placed on the residents who are not violating the law. She suggested enforcement or a non-commercial parking sign.

B.3. Member Nelson said it seems like there should be a marked path to the park and requested that this be reviewed again. Member Loeffelholz said speed and volume should be considered coming down the hill on W. 66th Street. Member Boettge said there was a lot of conversation on Next Door about this street. She said even though warrants are not met they need to be flexible. Member Janovy concurred and said she does not believe the denial is consistent with the Living Streets and Crosswalk policies. Member Iyer asked about the cost but planner Nolan did not know the cost because it depends on the type of application. He also asked how many parks have crosswalks and planner Nolan did not know this either; however, planner Nolan said he has been in conversation with Park and Recreation director Kattreh about this and councilmember Brindle has also expressed interest.

Motion was made by member Janovy and seconded by member LaForce to move Item B.3. to Section C and forward the June 3 and July 1, 2015, TSC report to the City Council.

All voted aye.

Motion carried.