

## Traffic Commission Minutes

City of Rock Hill, South Carolina

January 17, 2024

A public hearing of the Traffic Commission was held Wednesday, January 17, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. in City Council Chambers at City Hall, 155 Johnston Street, Rock Hill SC.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Derrick Lindsay, Jimmy Bagley, Clifton Goolsby, Captain Jim Grayson, Ivan McCorkle, Terrence Nealy, Ken Cushman

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Steven Varnadore

**STAFF PRESENT:** Chris Herrmann, Arthdale Brown, Tommy Feemster, Diana Fragomeni, Rob Walsh.

### 1. Call to Order

Mr. Lindsay called the meeting to order at 10:00 A.M.

### 2. Approval of Minutes of the November 15, 2023 meeting.

Mr. Lindsay asked if there were any additions, corrections or deletions from the November 15, 2023 meeting minutes. Mr. Goolsby then made a motion that the minutes be approved as presented; this was seconded by Mr. Bagley and was unanimously approved.

### 3. Business:

#### A. Faith Blvd / Home Depot Blvd

Staff Member Mr. Herrmann provided an overview of the area highlighting termini, signage, road width, grading and curvature. Mr. Herrmann explained it is the understanding of staff that the City of Rock Hill owns and maintains Faith Blvd and Southcross Blvd, while Home Depot Blvd is privately owned and maintained. Mr. Herrmann then noted that this location was requested for Traffic Commission review due to safety concerns.

Mr. Herrmann then transitioned to review results of an on-site assessment completed by staff. Mr. Herrmann summarized that the approach of Home Depot Blvd and Southcross Blvd to Faith Blvd are both stop controlled, Home Depot Blvd is the through movement to and from Cherry Road. Mr. Herrmann noted that roadway pavement markings and all signage seems to be appropriate and typical for this type of intersection. Mr. Herrmann did point out that trees running along the northwestern side of Faith Blvd that could create some overgrowth that may impact sight distance and visibility, depending on the time of year. Other than that one item, nothing stood out to staff that would characterize this intersection as being irregular when compared to other intersections across the City.

Mr. Herrmann then asked Captain Grayson to provide any feedback related to the accident report, also asking if anything stands out as irregular? Captain Grayson responded that nothing stands out within the accident report as irregular and the statistics for collisions at this intersection are very low. Mr. Herrmann agreed and stated that the statistics show that this is the only accident reported at this intersection within a 5-year timeline. Discussion then followed regarding the accident report, as members reviewed the time, date, and weather conditions of the accident.

Mr. Goolsby then transitioned to note that he had accessed SCDOT roadway ownership information as the other members were discussing the accident report. He noted that it appears that SCDOT actually owns the majority of Faith Blvd. Mr. Bagley then asked for Mr. Tommy Feemster (SCDOT District 4 Assistant Traffic Engineer) to confirm that and if it is a state roadway, then SCDOT staff should address the trees that may be impacting sight distance and visibility. Mr. Feemster affirmed that he would do this.

Traffic Commission then unanimously recommended staff to coordinate with SCDOT to confirm roadway ownership and work to address the trees on the northwestern side of the roadway.

## **B. Reid Street**

Mr. Herrmann provided an overview of the area; highlighting termini, signage, road width, grading and curvature. Mr. Herrmann explained that the City of Rock Hill owns and maintains Reid Street. Mr. Herrmann noted that the roadway width is somewhat narrow at 24 feet. Mr. Herrmann then explained that Mr. Kevin Mattingly (137 Reid Street) presented a concern regarding on-street parking to be reviewed by Traffic Commission.

Mr. Herrmann then transitioned to review existing “No Parking” signage along Reid Street, which includes limitations on the eastern portion of the roadway and limitations on the western portion near Main Street. Mr. Herrmann explained that Mr. Mattingly had requested Traffic Commission to evaluate any changes that may be made to improve parking functionality along Reid Street. Mr. Lindsay then inquired whether the resident had concerns regarding daily parking or event parking, since the roadway is so near to Fountain Park and the White Home? Mr. Herrmann responded that it seemed to be both. Mr. Herrmann then stated that this was one resident presenting concerns, if Traffic Commission were to consider significant changes to the parking scheme on the roadway then staff would recommend coordination with Neighborhood Services to contact other residents and businesses on the street to provide feedback before approving any significant changes.

Traffic Commission then discussed the impact of large event parking on Reid Street. Mr. Bagley suggested that it may be best for Rock Hill Police Department (RHPD) to monitor the situation during the next large events, engage in targeted enforcement, and evaluate whether any changes are necessary.

Mr. Herrmann then transitioned to explain that Mr. Mattingly also had concerns regarding speeding on Reid Street. Mr. Herrmann noted that the roadway is currently un-posted so as a residential street it would technically have an un-posted speed limit of 30 MPH. However, Mr. Herrmann explained that there is somewhat of a gray area that causes some confusion in regards to enforcement for RHPD as it relates to the City Ordinance for speed limits. While residential streets would have an un-posted speed limit of 30 MPH, the Ordinance also states that any un-posted roadway in a business district has a speed limit of 20 MPH. Mr. Herrmann then inquired whether the business district language should be interpreted to include all of the Old Town or downtown area of Rock Hill or not? Mr. Herrmann stated that if this is indeed the case, then roadways like Reid Street may qualify as an un-posted 20 MPH rather than un-posted 30 MPH. Discussion amongst members then followed. Mr. Bagley then suggested that as long as the majority of the street is of residential use, then it would likely be considered a specific residential street. Mr. Nealy added that some other cities identify downtown districts or business districts with different street name signage. Mr. Rob Walsh (Campco Engineering) then noted that given the short length of Reid Street and the presence of on-street parking with a

more narrow width of roadway, it is not likely that there is a significant speeding issue. Mr. Lindsay and others agreed. Following further discussion, Mr. Bagley noted that it may be beneficial for staff to coordinate with RHPD to evaluate locations where the business district vs residential street has been an issue and provide more information to consider at a future meeting.

Traffic Commission then unanimously recommended that the RHPD monitor parking on Reid Street during upcoming large events in order to evaluate any changes necessary, as well as engage in targeted enforcement. Traffic Commission also recommended that staff coordinate with RHPD to evaluate unposted business district areas and unposted residential streets that have presented a question of how to apply the existing City Ordinance, and for staff to provide further information at a future meeting.

### **C. Church Street**

Mr. Herrmann provided an overview of the area; highlighting termini, signage, road width, grading and curvature. Mr. Herrmann explained that the City of Rock Hill owns and maintains this roadway. Mr. Herrmann then explained that the requestor, Mr. Jeffrey Shugart (23 Church Street) had concerns regarding on-street parking on the small segment of Church Street located east of Poe Street and Quantz Street. Mr. Herrmann noted that the resident explained that there were “No Parking” signs on this street in the past, but they may have perhaps been removed during the improvements to the roadway and Shared Use Path completed in the Poe / Quantz Street project in 2018. Mr. Herrmann stated that he was unable to confirm that “No Parking” signs were indeed on site in previous years.

Mr. Herrmann then transitioned to provide details regarding the narrowed width of Church Street as it extends further from the Poe Street / Quantz Street intersection. Mr. Herrmann summarized the roadway does indeed narrow very quickly from 24 feet in width to 14 feet in width. This has not been a significant problem with multiple complaints because this area of Church Street only has two driveways accessed from it and no through traffic is allowed along this section of the roadway, thus traffic is very minimal. However, the resident did explain that they are experiencing issues with accessing their own driveway, which is the last on the street before it dead ends. Other issues have also included access for mail deliveries, sanitation service, etc. Mr. Herrmann explained that the resident noted that neighbors are parking on Church Street in a manner that blocks access to their own driveway access.

Mr. Herrmann then stated that staff would support implementing new “No Parking” signage for this roadway given the short length, the narrow width of the roadway, and the dead end nature of the street. Mr. Goolsby stated that it seems logical that “No Parking This Side of Street” signs could be added to both sides of the short segment of Church Street given the length between the dead end and the intersection. Mr. Nealy agreed. Discussion amongst members then followed. Mr. Goolsby noted that it may be beneficial for staff to coordinate with Neighborhood Services to provide communication to the residents to notify them of these changes regarding on-street parking.

Traffic Commission then unanimously recommended that staff coordinate with Neighborhood Services to provide communication regarding upcoming changes to on-street parking limitations. Traffic Commission also recommended that staff coordinate with Public Works to implement “No Parking This Side of Street” signage on this segment of Church Street.

## **D. Christopher Circle**

Mr. Herrmann provided an overview of the area: highlighting termini, signage, road width, grading and curvature. Mr. Herrmann explained that the SCDOT owns and maintains this roadway. Mr. Herrmann explained the roadway does have a posted speed limit of 35 MPH. Mr. Herrmann explained that the requestor, Mrs. Cindy Casale (1014 Christopher Circle) had safety concerns regarding the posted speed limit being too high for this residential street. Mr. Herrmann then explained that most of the other roadways in this neighborhood area do have a posted speed limit of 25 MPH, making Christopher Circle an outlier in that regard.

Mr. Feemster then explained that SCDOT staff completed an on-site assessment and confirmed all other roadways in the neighborhood area had a consistent 25 MPH posted speed limit. Mr. Feemster stated that SCDOT recommends a decrease in the posted speed limit from 35 MPH to 25 MPH.

The Traffic Commission then unanimously agreed to reduce the posted speed limit on Christopher Circle from 35 MPH to 25 MPH. Traffic Commission also recommended targeted enforcement to be conducted by RHPD following the speed limit changes.

## **E. Main Street / Confederate Ave**

Mr. Herrmann provided an overview of the area: highlighting termini, signage, road width, grading and curvature. Mr. Herrmann explained that SCDOT owns and maintains both roadways. Mr. Herrmann then stated that this is a safety concern brought forth by City staff. Mr. Herrmann added that this is a follow-up item that has been discussed in multiple previous meetings as part of the Status Report, but this was last reviewed as an agenda item by Traffic Commission in April 2023.

Mr. Herrmann then transitioned to summarize previous safety improvements that have been implemented on both Main Street and Confederate Ave in response to previous safety concerns with this intersection based on recommendations by Traffic Commission. Mr. Herrmann stated that the last recommended improvement by Traffic Commission in 2023 was to remove the mid-block crosswalks that were existing on Main Street and Mr. Herrmann confirmed that work was completed last year. Mr. Herrmann then went on to explain that SCDOT has conducted on-site assessments and completed turning movement counts at this intersection to evaluate any necessary improvements.

Mr. Herrmann then asked for Mr. Feemster to summarize the results of those assessments and evaluations. Mr. Feemster explained that evaluations showed evidence of behavioral issues of drivers at this intersection. Most notably, Mr. Feemster observed drivers fully disregarding stop signs on Confederate Ave, or performing rolling stops rather than complete stops as are legally required at stop signs. Mr. Feemster then stated that based on turning movement counts, SCDOT staff would not recommend a four-way stop controlled intersection at this location, as has been considered in the past. Mr. Feemster stated that SCDOT would recommend applying pavement markings on the street to indicate "Stop Ahead" on both approaches of Confederate Ave, noting that this has been shown to improve driver behavior in other locations.

Mr. Feemster next reviewed a preliminary design for a mini-roundabout that could be considered at this intersection. However, Mr. Feemster noted that this would need to be a larger construction project and no funding is currently identified for such an improvement. Mr. Bagley then inquired whether this was an improvement that could be completed without the need of additional ROW? Mr. Feemster noted that this is indeed

a working assumption, but that would need to be vetted during a full civil design phase. Discussion amongst members then followed regarding the potential mini-roundabout and other possible physical changes to both roadways. Mr. Goolsby stated that without an identified funding source the larger improvements and physical changes may have to be considered for a longer term improvement. Mr. Goolsby continued that perhaps on the near term, the “Stop Ahead” pavement markings may be a beneficial improvement and a logical next step in the progression in an attempt to improve safety at this intersection. Mr. Nealy then inquired whether Traffic Commission had ever considered rumble strips for approaches to stop signs at intersections like this location? Mr. Walsh explained that these types of improvements have been considered in the past, but the feeling amongst Traffic Commission members was that they would not likely be supported by neighboring property owners as there is quite a noise impact associated with rumble strips.

Traffic Commission then unanimously recommended that City staff coordinate with SCDOT to implement “Stop Ahead” pavement markings on the approaches of Confederate Ave to accompany the existing stop signage and stop bars.

#### **F. Confederate Ave / Annafrel Street**

Mr. Herrmann provided an overview of the area: highlighting termini, signage, road width, grading and curvature. Mr. Herrmann explained that SCDOT owns and maintains Annafrel Street, while the City of Rock Hill owns and maintains both this section of Confederate Ave and Morris Street that intersect with Annafrel Street. Mr. Herrmann then added that this is a follow-up item that has been discussed in multiple previous meetings as part of the Status Report, but this was last reviewed as an agenda item by Traffic Commission in April 2023.

Mr. Herrmann then stated that this is a safety concern brought forth by City staff and was identified during evaluations for changes for the My Ride Transit service routes and bus stops. Mr. Herrmann also noted that city staff had received multiple concerns from residents in this area regarding sight distance and visibility due to the angle of intersecting roadways and on-street parking that occurs in the area. Mr. Herrmann then transitioned and asked Mr. Goolsby to summarize the evaluation that he completed as a part of the changes to My Ride Transit routes and bus stops in this area. Mr. Goolsby provided that summary, highlighting that he had requested that SCDOT consider an all-way stop for this intersection. Mr. Herrmann then asked Mr. Feemster to provide any feedback available from evaluations completed to date by SCDOT. Mr. Feemster responded that SCDOT had completed a preliminary design concept for an all-way stop at this intersection. This preliminary design concept was then reviewed with Traffic Commission. Mr. Feemster then explained that SCDOT will need to complete a turning movement count at this intersection to evaluate whether they should support the request for an all-way stop at this intersection.

Mr. Walsh then highlighted the nearby Northside Elementary School, and inquired whether the design concept for the all-way stop would have any negative impact for stacking for car-ridership for the school? Mr. Herrmann then reviewed the location of car rider drop-off for the school and the traffic pattern associated with it. Mr. Walsh felt that the all-way stop would not likely have any negative impact, based on the information provided by staff. Mr. Lindsay inquired whether staff had been in communication with representatives from Northside School or the School District regarding this potential change to the intersection? Mr. Herrmann and Mr. Feemster both stated that neither SCDOT staff nor City staff had contacted the school about this subject. Mr. Herrmann

noted that this could be done ahead of the next time this item is considered by Traffic Commission.

Traffic Commission then unanimously recommended that City staff coordinate with SCDOT regarding the further evaluation of an all-way stop at this intersection location and to provide further information at a future meeting. Traffic Commission also recommended that staff communicate with Northside Elementary to receive feedback regarding the potential changes.

#### **4. Other Items**

##### **A. Status Report**

Mr. Herrmann briefly summarized the Status Report which outlines follow-up action items from the previous meetings as well as action items completed by staff administratively.

Mr. Herrmann then transitioned to explain that the traffic analyzer units that are utilized by RHPD to conduct stealth traffic studies for Traffic Commission are experiencing technical issues. Captain Grayson then summarized that the both of the two units that RHPD currently has have experienced technical failure and are in desperate need of replacement. Mr. Herrmann noted that with both of these units unavailable, the only method available to conduct traffic studies at this time is the in-roadway sensors that are utilized by Public Works.

Captain Grayson then explained that RHPD have provided cost estimates for two new traffic analyzer units to Mr. Herrmann for Traffic Commission to consider. Mr. Herrmann then asked Captain Grayson if it was fair to say that these units are utilized for Traffic Commission more than any other function or purpose? Captain Grayson affirmed that this is indeed fair to say. Captain Grayson noted that the cost estimates would equal approximately \$5,000 for two new units to replace the existing two units that have failed. Mr. Herrmann then explained that in terms of precedence, Traffic Commission did approve funding the replacement of new in-roadway sensors for Public Works in 2023.

Mr. Bagley then stated that the units need to be replaced, simply not having them available is not an option. Other members in attendance agreed. Mr. Bagley suggested for staff to move forward with purchasing two new replacement units and to communicate with City Management if this funding is needed for further Traffic Commission improvements during the fiscal year.

##### **B. 2024 Meeting Schedule**

Mr. Herrmann summarized the proposed meeting schedule for the remainder of 2024. Mr. Herrmann requested approval from Traffic Commission. Mr. Bagley then made a motion that meeting schedule be approved as presented; this was seconded by Mr. Goolsby and was unanimously approved

#### **5. Next Meeting:**

Mr. Herrmann explained that the next meeting has been scheduled for February 21, 2024, at 10:00 AM in Council Chambers.

#### **6. Adjourn:**

There being no further business, Mr. Goolsby made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Nealy seconded, and the motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:20 AM.