

Kelly Olsen

RAVALLI COUNTY ORDINANCE #19
SPEED LIMIT FOR EAST FORK ROAD

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of this Ordinance is to establish a speed limit for East Fork Road, Sula, MT, to promote the health and safety of motorists, other roadway users, and area residents.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the Ravalli County Road and Bridge Department conducted a traffic speed study between April 6, 2009 and April 13, 2009, "which determined 45 mph represented the approximate 85th percentile west of French Basin Road, and 45 mph represented the approximate 50th percentile east of French Basin Road"; and

WHEREAS, the Ravalli County Board of Commissioners have addressed the alignment of the roadway, the roadside environment and the wildlife that inhabits the area, as well as the benefit of a consistent speed limit the entire length of the roadway; and

WHEREAS, Sections 7-14-2113 and 61-8-310, MCA allow Boards of County Commissioners to establish speed limits on any county road, subject to certain parameters;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF RAVALLI COUNTY AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. SPEED LIMIT ESTABLISHED

A regulatory speed limit of 45 miles per hour shall be established for East Fork Road, from U.S. Highway 93 to (N) Forest Road #5765 (end of the paved roadway) for a total of 14.9 miles in length, Ravalli County, Montana.

SECTION 2. SPEED LIMIT SIGNS

Upon receiving notice of the regulatory speed limit established by this Ordinance, and after the passage of at least thirty days from the date this Ordinance is adopted, the Road and Bridge Department shall erect the appropriate signs giving drivers notice of the regulatory speed limit established by this Ordinance.

SECTION 3. PENALTY

Penalty for violation of this Ordinance or any provision thereof shall be enforced according to Title 61, Chapter 8, MCA, or any other applicable state or local law.

SECTION 4. SEVERABILITY

If any part of this Ordinance is held to be invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other parts which can be given effect without the invalid part. To this end, provisions of this Ordinance are to be severable.

SECTION 5. EFFECTIVE DATE

This Ordinance shall be effective at the later of thirty days from the adoption of this Ordinance or upon the posting of appropriate signs giving notice of the regulatory speed limit on the affected roadway or portion thereof.

Ord. Commissioner

APPROVED AND INITIALLY ADOPTED AT FIRST READING THIS 31 DAY OF August, 2009.

Carlotta Grandstaff
Carlotta Grandstaff, Chairman

Jim E. Rokosch
Jim Rokosch, Vice-Chairman

Greg Chilcott
Greg Chilcott, Member

Kathleen Driscoll
Kathleen Driscoll, Member

J.R. Iman
J.R. Iman, Member

Attest: Clerk & Recorder

APPROVED AND ADOPTED AT SECOND READING THIS 14th DAY OF September 2009.

Carlotta Grandstaff
Carlotta Grandstaff, Chairman

Jim E. Rokosch
Jim Rokosch, Vice-Chairman

Greg Chilcott
Greg Chilcott, Member

Kathleen Driscoll
Kathleen Driscoll, Member

J.R. Iman
J.R. Iman, Member

Regina Hattenberg
Attest: Clerk & Recorder



8/31 + 9/14 readings

Glenda Wiles

From: David Ohnstad
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2009 4:43 PM
To: Glenda Wiles
Subject: east fork speed

This looks good – a few suggestions on the final paragraph. Thank you - David

David I have set the first reading on 8/31 at 0900 and the second reading at 9/14 at 2:00 p.m.

Questions for you:

- Is the East Fork in Sula? Yes – begins immediately north of the Sula Store and heads east.
- Did you have a citizen petition on this road? No – this action is initiated by the Road & Bridge Department
- What was the Length of East Fork that you want to set the speed limit on – From Highway 93 to? (N) Forest Road 5765 (end of paved roadway), 14.9 miles in length
 - Based on the traffic study you guys did between April 6 – April 13th will my correct wording be "45 mph constituted approximately the 85th percentile of the sampled traffic, indicating that a 45 mph speed limit is appropriate and safe." ?
45 mph represents the approximate 85th percentile west of French Basin, 45 mph represents the approximate 50th percentile east of French Basin
 - I think I will add another WHEREAS, based upon the email you sent to the state addressing the alignment, wildlife etc. with this insert: WHEREAS, the Ravalli County Board of Commissioners have addressed the alignment of the roadway, the roadside environment and the wildlife that inhabits the area, as well as the ~~need to be consistent with~~ benefit of a consistent speed limit ~~on~~ the entire length of the roadway ~~(or the mileage from and to)~~. What do you think about that?

Do Ordinance

First Reading 8/31 @ 0900
2nd Reading ~~9/29 @~~
9/14 / 2:00 0900

David Ohnstad

From: Cameron, Glen [gcameron@mt.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 31, 2009 8:58 AM
To: David Ohnstad
Cc: Stack, Shane
Subject: RE: east fork speed limit

Dave - I can agree with a 45 mph for the entire length. As I previously said, it may be a little restrictive in the middle section under ideal roadway conditions, but will provide for a consistent speed limit on the route.

I will look over the plans and see if I can add anything. As far as the speed limit signs I would just add a sign at each end of the route and a supplemental in the middle somewhere.

thanks -glen

From: David Ohnstad [mailto:dohnstad@ravallicounty.mt.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2009 9:43 AM
To: Cameron, Glen
Cc: Stack, Shane; Amber M Lewis; Carlotta Grandstaff
Subject: FW: east fork speed limit

Glen -

I forwarded the 70% plans from FHWA separately. Can you locate the placement of the signs (speed limit and others that you find appropriate) on the plans or do you want me to? I believe a 45 mph limit on the entire roadway would not be inappropriate given the alignment of the roadway, the roadside environment and the wildlife that inhabits the area. I do not believe we could support a 55 mph limit anywhere on the East Fork. If you agree, I will prepare an ordinance for the B.O.C.C. to consider.

Amber - any issues with a 45 mph speed limit? Any other signage requests that can be included in the project?

David

From: Gifford, Greg K. [mailto:Greg.Gifford@fhwa.dot.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2009 8:35 AM
To: David Ohnstad
Cc: Cameron, Glen
Subject: RE: east fork speed limit

Dave,

I would suggest that you mark up or locate sign locations on the 70% review plans that I sent the link for

earlier. We can incorporate them now fairly easily.

Greg Gifford, PE, PMP
Project Manager
(360) 619-7622

From: David Ohnstad [mailto:dohnstad@ravallcounty.mt.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2009 2:27 PM
To: Gifford, Greg K.
Cc: Cameron, Glen
Subject: FW: east fork speed limit

Hello Greg –

Glen asked about this issue this morning and I could not remember if I ever got back to you (I can not find any e-mail record). My apologies if I failed to do so. I do recall sending the speed study results to your team. Is it too late to add speed zones and advisory signing to the project? If it is still possible, that would be great.

David

From: Cameron, Glen [mailto:gcameron@mt.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2009 8:15 AM
To: David Ohnstad
Subject: RE: east fork speed limit

Dave - I apologize, this email got buried. As per my previous email regarding my comments on the sampled speed statistics, the final recommendation lies with you. 45 mph may be a little restrictive for ideal road conditions, but may also be the most realistic speed limit for the entire route.

I do not see any benefits of installing the signs this year vs. next year with the rehab project, you will just have to survive another year fielding phone calls. Yes, I would encourage installing advisory / advance warning signs at several locations along the route.

thanks - glen

From: David Ohnstad [mailto:dohnstad@ravallcounty.mt.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2009 9:06 AM
To: Cameron, Glen
Subject: FW: east fork speed limit

Glen -

We will drop off to your office copy of the traffic study(s) we did in April for the rehab project. We would

concur with the 45 mph (+/-) (85 percentile) recommendation of the study @ French Basin, but could not recommend the 55 mph (+/-) on the two locations to the east. Please review and see what you think.

As far as posting now as opposed to waiting until the rehab project next year, I do not see the urgency to do it now. In addition to the ordinance process and placement of the regulatory signs, we would also want to consider advisory / advance warning signs at several locations. Please let me know which you prefer.

David

From: Gifford, Greg K. [mailto:Greg.Gifford@fhwa.dot.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2009 7:17 AM
To: David Ohnstad
Cc: Cameron, Glen
Subject: RE: east fork speed limit

Yes, we are moving along on the PS&E for the project.

I don't see a problem with you going ahead and posting the road. Those would be new signs and would not need replacement as part of the project.

Please let me know what you decide to post at so we can show it on our plans.

Greg Gifford

greg.gifford@fhwa.dot.gov

From: David Ohnstad [mailto:dohnstad@ravallicounty.mt.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2009 10:20 AM
To: Gifford, Greg K.
Cc: Cameron, Glen
Subject: east fork speed limit

Hello Greg -

I trust all is well in Vancouver.

I have received calls on the lack of speed limit postings on the East Fork Road as has Glen Cameron, District One Traffic Engineer for the MDOT.

I have explained that speed postings may be included in the reconstruction project (???). In the interim, based upon the traffic data that we sent your office, would it complicate your project if we determined an appropriate limit and posted such yet this summer?

Thank you.

David

DAVID H. OHNSTAD
COUNTY ROAD SUPERVISOR

8/6/2009

TimeMark Incorporated

Description 1 : EAST FORK PM13.0
 Description 2 :
 Description 3 :

0643
 Site: 9700
 Monday, 4/6/2009, 11:06:43 AM
 Monday, 4/13/2009, 11:23:43 AM

Speed Grand Totals Combined

	Total	Hourly Averages												
		0 - < 15	15 - < 20	20 - < 25	25 - < 30	30 - < 35	35 - < 40	40 - < 45	45 - < 50	50 - < 55	55 - < 60	60 - < 65	65 - < 70	70 - < 200
12:00 AM	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
1:00 AM	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2:00 AM	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3:00 AM	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
4:00 AM	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5:00 AM	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6:00 AM	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.3	0.9	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0
7:00 AM	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.1	0.7	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
8:00 AM	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.3	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.0
9:00 AM	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	1.7	0.9	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.0
10:00 AM	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.4	1.4	1.0	1.0	0.3	0.7	0.1	0.0
11:00 AM	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.5	1.1	1.2	0.9	0.2	0.0	0.0
12:00 PM	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	1.3	0.6	0.9	1.0	1.4	0.4	0.0	0.0
1:00 PM	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.6	1.3	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.0	0.0
2:00 PM	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.6	1.1	1.7	1.6	0.1	0.6	0.1	0.0
3:00 PM	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.7	1.3	1.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
4:00 PM	7.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.4	1.3	0.4	0.7	1.0	0.6	0.3	0.6
5:00 PM	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.7	1.6	1.4	1.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
6:00 PM	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.4	1.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.0
7:00 PM	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
8:00 PM	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
9:00 PM	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10:00 PM	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
11:00 PM	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ADT	74.8	1.3	0.4	0.1	1.7	2.5	7.7	12.9	17.1	14.0	9.9	4.2	1.7	1.3

Percentile Speeds
 (mph)

10.0%	15.0%	50.0%	85.0%	90.0%
35.9	38.2	48.0	57.3	59.6

10 mph Pace Speed

Number in pace	41.4 - 51.4 236 (44.5 %)	Average 47.7 mph
		Minimum 5.6 mph
		Maximum 82.7 mph

Speeds Exceeded

	45.0 mph	55.0 mph	65.0 mph
Count	64.3 % 341	22.8 % 121	4.0 % 21

Study Grand Totals

	Total	0 - < 15	15 - < 20	20 - < 25	25 - < 30	30 - < 35	35 - < 40	40 - < 45	45 - < 50	50 - < 55	55 - < 60	60 - < 65	65 - < 70	70 - < 200
E/B	268	5	0	0	4	7	20	41	62	61	34	22	6	6
W/B	262	4	3	1	8	11	35	50	59	38	36	8	6	3
Combined	530	9	3	1	12	18	55	91	121	99	70	30	12	9
		1.7%	0.6%	0.2%	2.3%	3.4%	10.4%	17.2%	22.8%	18.7%	13.2%	5.7%	2.3%	1.7%

STATE OF MONTANA RAVALLI COUNTY
 RECORDED: 09/14/2009 4:07 PF

622684

Page 9 of 9