

Multi-way Stops - The Research Shows the MUTCD is Correct!

W. Martin Bretherton Jr., P.E.(M)

Abstract

This paper reviewed over 70 technical papers covering all-way stops (or multi-way stops) and their success and failure as traffic control devices in residential areas. This study is the most comprehensive found on multi-way stop signs

The study looked at how multi-way stop signs have been used as traffic calming measures to control speed. There have been 23 hypotheses studied using multi-way stop as speed control. The research found an additional 9 hypotheses studied showing the effect multi way stops have on other traffic engineering problems.

The research found that, overwhelmingly, multi-way stop signs do NOT control speed except under very limited conditions. The research shows that the concerns about unwarranted stop signs are well founded.

Introduction

Many elected officials, citizens and some traffic engineering professionals feel that multi-way stop signs should be used as traffic calming devices. Many times unwarranted stop signs are installed to control traffic. The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)(16) describes warrants for installing multi-way stop signs. However, it does not describe many of the problems caused by the installation of unwarranted stop signs. These problems include concerns like liability issues, traffic noise, automobile pollution, traffic enforcement and driver behavior.

This paper is a result of searching over 70 technical papers about multi-way stop signs. The study concentrated on their use as traffic calming devices and their relative effectiveness in controlling speeds in residential neighborhoods. The references found 23 hypotheses on their relative effectiveness as traffic calming devices. One study analyzed the economic cost of installing a multi-way stop at an intersection. The reference search also found 9 hypotheses about traffic operations on residential streets.

The literature search found 85 papers on the subject of multi-way stops. There are probably many more references available on this very popular subject. The seventy-one references are shown in Appendix A. There was a problem finding the 14 papers found in literature searches. The 14 papers are listed in Appendix B for information only. Most of the papers were from old sources and are probably out of print.

Multi-Way Stop Signs as Speed Control Devices

A summary of the articles found the following information about the effectiveness of multi-way stop signs and other solutions to controlling speeds in residential neighborhoods.

1. Multi-way stops do not control speeds. Twenty-two papers were cited for these findings. (Reference 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 39, 45, 46, 51, 55, 62, 63, 64, 66 and 70).

2. Stop compliance is poor at unwarranted multi-way stop signs. Unwarranted stop signs means they do not meet the warrants of the MUTCD. This is based on the drivers feeling that the signs have no traffic control purpose. There is little reason to yield the right-of -way because there are usually no vehicles on the minor street. Nineteen references found this to be their finding. (Reference 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 39, 45, 46, 51, 55, 61, 62, 63 and 64).

3. Before-After studies show multi-way stop signs do not reduce speeds on residential streets. Nineteen references found this to be their finding. (Reference 19 (1 study), 55 (5 studies), 60 (8 studies) and 64(5 studies)).

4. Unwarranted multi-way stops increased speed some distance from intersections. The studies hypothesizing that motorists are making up the time they lost at the "unnecessary" stop sign. Fifteen references found this to be their finding. (Reference 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20,39, 45,46, 51, 55, 70 and 71).

5. Multi-way stop signs have high operating costs based on vehicle operating costs, vehicular travel times, fuel consumption and increased vehicle emissions. Fifteen references found this to be their finding. (Reference 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 45, 55 ,61, 62, 63, 67 and 68).

6. Safety of pedestrians is decreased at unwarranted multi-way stops, especially small children. It seems that pedestrians expect vehicles to stop at the stop signs but many vehicles have gotten in the habit of running the "unnecessary" stop sign. Thirteen references found this to be their finding. (References 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 45, 51, 55 and 63).

7. Citizens feel "safer" in communities "positively controlled" by stop signs. Positively controlled is meant to infer that the streets are controlled by unwarranted stop signs. Homeowners on the residential collector feel safer on a 'calmed' street. Seven references found this to be their finding. (Reference 6, 14, 18, 20, 51, 58 and 66).

Hypothesis twelve (below) lists five references that dispute the results of these studies.

8. Speeding problems on residential streets are associated with "through" traffic. Frequently homeowners feel the problem is created by 'outsiders'. Many times the problem is the person complaining or their neighbor. Five references found this to be their finding. (References 2, 15, 45, 51 and 55).

9. Unwarranted multi-way stops may present potential liability problems for undocumented exceptions to accepted warrants. Local jurisdictions feel they may be incurring higher liability exposure by 'violating' the MUTCD. Many times the unwarranted stop signs are installed without a warrant study or some documentation. Cited by six references. (Reference 7, 9, 19, 46, 62 and 65).

10. Stop signs increase noise in the vicinity of an intersection. The noise is created by the vehicle braking noise at the intersection and the cars accelerating up to speed. The noise is created by the engine exhaust, brake, tire and aerodynamic noises. Cited by five references. (Reference 14, 17, 20, 45, 55).

11. Cost of installing multi-way stops are low but enforcement costs are prohibitive. many communities do not have the resources to effectively enforce compliance with the stop signs. Five references found this to be their finding. (Reference 1, 10, 45, 51, 55).

12. Stop signs do not significantly change safety of intersection. Stop signs are installed with the hope they will make the intersection and neighborhood safer. Cited by five references. (Reference 55, 60, 61, 62, 63).

Hypothesis seven (above) lists seven references that dispute the results of these studies.

13. Unwarranted multi-way stops have been successfully removed with public support and result in improved compliance at justified stop signs. Cited by three references. (Reference 8, 10, 12).

14. Unwarranted multi-way stops reduce accidents in cities with intersection sight distance problems and at intersections with parked cars that restrict sight distance. The stop signs are unwarranted based on volume and may not quite meet the accident threshold. Cited by three references. (Reference 6, 18, 68).

15. Citizens feel stop signs should be installed at locations based on traffic engineering studies. Some homeowners realize the importance of installing 'needed' stop signs. Cited by two references. (References 56, 57).

16. Multi-way stops can reduce cut-through traffic volume if many intersections along the road are controlled by stop signs. If enough stop signs are installed on a residential or collector street motorists may go another way because of the

inconvenience of having to start and stop at so many intersections. This includes the many drivers that will not stop but slowly 'cruise' through the stop signs. This driving behavior has been nicknamed the 'California cruise'. Cited by two references. (Reference 14, 61).

17. Placement of unwarranted stop signs in violation of Georgia State Law 32-6-50 (a) (b) (c). This study was conducted using Georgia law. Georgia law requires local governments to install all traffic controls devices in accordance with the MUTCD. This is probably similar to traffic signing laws in other states. Cited by two references. (Reference 19, 62).

18. Special police enforcement of multi-way stop signs has limited effectiveness. This has been called the 'hallo' effect. Drivers will obey the 'unreasonable' laws as long as a policemen is visible. Cited by two references. (Reference 39, 46).

19. District judge orders removal of stop signs not installed in compliance with city ordinance. Judges have ordered the removal of 'unnecessary' stop signs. The problem begins when the traffic engineer and/or elected officials are asked to consider their intersection a 'special case'. This creates a precedent and results in a proliferation of 'special case' all-way stop signs. Cited by two references. (Reference 59, 62).

20. Some jurisdictions have created warrants for multi-way stops that are easier to meet than MUTCD. The jurisdiction feel that the MUTCD warrants are too difficult to meet in residential areas. The reduced warrants are usually created to please elected officials. Cited by two references. (Reference 61 and 70).

21. Citizens perceive stop signs are effective as speed control devices because traffic "slows" at stop sign. If everybody obeyed the traffic laws, stop signs would reduce speeds on residential streets. Cited by one reference. (Reference 55).

22. Removal of multi-way stop signs does not change speeds but they are slightly lower without the stop signs. This study findings support the drivers behavior referenced in item #4, speed increases when unwarranted stop signs are installed. Speed decreases when the stop signs were removed! Cited by one reference. (Reference 64).

23. Multi-way stops degrade air quality and increase CO, HC, and Nox. All the starting and stopping at the intersection is bad for air quality. Cited by one reference. (Reference 68).

Speed Control Issues

24. There are many ways to "calm" traffic. Cited by twenty-two references. (Reference 1, 14, 20, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53 and 66).

They include:

(a) Traffic Chokers (f) Sidewalks and Other Pedestrian Solutions

(b) Traffic Diverters (g) Neighborhood Street Design

(c) Speed Humps (h) On-Street Parking

(d) Roundabouts (i) One Way Streets

(e) Neighborhood Speed Watch (j) Street Narrowing

25. Other possible solutions to residential speed. Most speeding is by residents - Neighborhood Speed Watch Programs may work. This program works by using the principle of 'peer' pressure. Cited by seven references. (Reference 2, 30, 31, 36, 42, 48 and 53).

26. Reduced speed limits are not effective at slowing traffic. Motorists do not drive by the number on the signs, they travel a safe speed based on the geometrics of the roadway. Cited by five references. (Reference 1, 20, 39, 46 and 69).

27. Local streets should be designed to discourage excessive speeds. The most effective way to slow down traffic on residential streets is to design them for slow speeds. Cited by two references. (Reference 43, 52).

28. Speeding on residential streets is a seasonal problem. This is a myth. The problem of speeding is not seasonal, it's just that homeowners only see the problem in 'pleasant' weather. That's the time they spend in their front yard or walking the neighborhood. Cited by one reference. (Reference 2).

29. Speed variance and accident frequency are directly related. The safest speed for a road is the speed that most of the drivers feel safest driving. This speed creates the lowest variance and the safest road. Cited by one reference. (Reference 47).

30. The accident involvement rate is lowest at the 85th percentile speed. The 85th percentile speed is the speed that most drivers feel comfortable driving. The lowest variance is usually from the 85th percentile speed and the 10 mph less. Cited by one reference. (Reference 47).

31. Psycho-perceptive transverse pavement markings are not effective at reducing the 85th percentile speed but do reduce the highest speed percentile by 5 MPH. Cited by one reference. (Reference 47).

32. The safest residential streets would be short (0.20 miles) non-continuous streets that are 26 to 30 feet from curb to curb width. The short streets make it difficult of drivers to get up to speed. Cited by one reference. (Reference 52).

Economics of Multi-Way Stop Signs

Studies have found that installing unwarranted stop signs increases operating costs for the traveling public. The operating costs involve vehicle operating costs, costs for increased delay and travel time, cost to enforce signs, and costs for fines and increases in insurance premiums.

The total costs are as follows (Reference 55):

Operating Costs (1990) (\$.04291/Stop)	\$ 111,737/year
Delay & Travel Costs (1990) (\$.03401/Stop)	\$ 88,556 /year
Enforcement Costs (1990)	\$ 837/year
Cost of Fines (19 per year)	\$ 1,045/year
Cost of 2 stop signs (1990)	\$ 280
Costs of increased insurance (1990)	<u>\$7,606/year</u>

Total (1990) \$210,061/year/intersection

The cost to install two stop signs is \$280. The cost to the traveling public is \$210,061 (1990) per year in operating costs. This cost is based on about 8,000 vehicles entering the intersection per day.

Another study (62) found that the average annual road user cost increased by \$2,402.92 (1988 cost) per intersection when converting from two to four way stop signs for low volume intersections.

Summary of Stop Signs as Speed Control Devices

Researchers found that multi-way stop signs do not control speed. In analyzing the 23 hypotheses for multi-way stop signs, five were favorable and 18 were unfavorable toward installing unwarranted all-way stop signs. The Chicago study (6) was the only research paper that showed factual support for "unwarranted" multi-way stop signs. They were found to be effective at reducing accidents at intersections that have sight distance problems and on-street parking.

It is interesting to note that residential speeding problems and multi-way stop sign requests date back to 1930 (63). The profession still has not "solved" this perception problem.

Summary of Economic Analysis

Benefits to control speeds by installing multi-way stop signs are perceived rather than actual and the costs for the driving public are far greater than any benefits derived from the installation of the multi-way stop signs.

W. Martin Bretherton Jr., P.E.

Chief Engineer, Traffic Studies Section

Gwinnett County Department of Transportation

75 Langley Drive

Lawrenceville, Georgia 30045

770-822-7412

brethema@co.gwinnett.ga.us

Appendix A

References used in Research of Multi-Way Stop Signs

1. Gerald L. Ullman, "Neighborhood Speed Control - U.S. Practices", ITE Compendium of Technical Papers, 1996, pages 111- 115.
2. Richard F. Beaubien, "Controlling Speeds on Residential Streets", ITE Journal, April 1989, pages 37-39.
3. "4 Way Stop Signs Cut Accident Rate 58% at Rural Intersections", ITE Journal, November 1984, pages 23-24.
4. Michael Kyte & Joseph Marek, "Collecting Traffic Data at All-Way Stop Controlled Intersections", ITE Journal, April 1989, pages 33-36.
5. Chan, Flynn & Stocker, "Volume Delay Relationship at Four Way Stop Controlled Intersections: A Response Surface Model", ITE Journal, March 1989, pages 27-34.
6. La Plante and Kripidlowdkki, "Stop Sign Warrants: Time for Change", ITE Journal, October 1992, pages 25-29.

7. Patricia B. Noyes, "Responding to Citizen Requests for Multi Way Stops", ITE Journal, January 1994, pages 43-48.
8. Chadda and Carter, "Multi-Way Stop Signs - Have We Gone Too Far?", ITE Journal, May 1983, pages 19-21.
9. Gary Moore, "Gwinnett County Legal Opinions on Unwarranted Multi-Way Stops",
March 6, 1990.
10. Chadda and Carter, " The Changing Role of Multi-Way Stop Control", ITE
Compendium of Technical Papers, 1983, pages 4-31 to 4-34.
11. Lovell and Haver, "The Safety Effect of Conversion to All-Way Stop Control", Transportation Research Record 1068, pages 103-107.
12. "Indiana Suggests Ways to Halt Stop Sign Misuse", Transafety Reporter, February 1989, page 7.
1978.
14. "State of the Art: Residential Traffic Management", US DOT, FHWA/RD-80/092, December 1980, pages 63-65,
22-23.
15. Dick Williams, "A New Direction for Traffic Dispute", Atlanta Journal, January 14, 1988, Section E, page 1.
16. "Warrants for Multi-Way Stop Signs" (2B-6), Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, US DOT , FHWA,
pages 2B-3 to 2B-4.
17. "Stop and Yield Sign Control", Traffic Control Devices Handbook, US DOT, FHWA, 1983, pages 2-14 to 2-16.
18. La Pante & Kropidlowdki, "Stop Sign Warrants ", Presented at ITE Conference, San Diego, CA, September 18,
1989.
19. Walt Rekuc, "Traffic Engineering Study of Multi-Way Stop Signs", City of Roswell,
February 15, 1988.
20. Homburger, etal, Residential Street Design and Traffic Control, ITE, Washington, DC, 1989.
21. Speed Zone Guidelines, ITE, Washington, DC, 1993.
22. A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, AASHTO, Washington, DC, 1994.
23. A.J. Ballard, "Efforts to Control Speeds on Residential Collector Streets", ITE
Compendium of Technical Papers, 1990, pages 445-448.
24. C.E. Walter, "Suburban Residential Traffic Calming", ITE Compendium of Technical Papers, 1994, pages 445-448.
25. K.L. Gonzalez, " Neighborhood Traffic Control: Bellevue's Approach", ITE Journal, Vol. 43, No.5, May 1993,
pages 43-45.
26. Brian Kanely & B.E. Ferris, "Traffic Diverter's for Residential Traffic Control - The Gainesville Experience", ITE
Compendium of Technical Papers, 1985, pages 72-76.
27. Marshall Elizer, "Guidelines for the Design and Application of Speed Humps", ITE

Compendium of Technical Papers, 1993, pages 11-15.

28. T. Mazella & D. Godfrey, "Building and Testing a Customer Responsive Neighborhood Traffic Control Program", ITE Compendium of Technical Papers, 1995, pages 75-79.
29. W.M. Bretherton and J.E. Womble, "Neighborhood Traffic Management Program", ITE Compendium of Technical Papers, 1992, pages 398-401.
30. J.E. Womble, "Neighborhood Speed Watch: Another Weapon in the Residential Speed Control Arsenal", ITE Journal, Vol. 60, No. 2, February 1990, pages 1- 17.
31. Michael Wallwork, "Traffic Calming", The Genesis Group, unpublished.
32. Doug Lemov, "Calming Traffic", Governing, August 1996, pages 25-27.
33. Michael Wallwork, "Traffic Calming", The Traffic Safety Toolbox, ITE, Washington, DC, 1993, pages 234-245.
34. Ransford S. McCourt, Neighborhood Traffic Management Survey, ITE District 6, Technical Chair, unpublished, June 3, 1996.
35. Halbert, etal, "Implementation of Residential Traffic Control Program in the City of San Diego", District 6 Meeting, July 1993.
36. Anton Dahlerbrush, "Speed Humps & Implementation and Impact on Residential Traffic Control", City of Beverly Hills, California, District 6 Meeting, July 1993.
37. Firoz Vohra, "Modesto Speed Hump Experience", District 6, ITE Meeting, July 1993.
38. Patricia Noyes, "Evaluation of Traditional Speed Reduction in Residential Area", District 6 ITE Meeting, July 1993.
39. Cynthia L. Hoyle, Traffic Calming, American Planning Association, Report No 456, July 1995.
40. Sam Yager, Use of Roundabouts, ITE Technical Council Committee, 5B- 17, Washington, DC, February 1992.
41. Guidelines for Residential Subdivision Street Design, ITE, Washington, DC, 1993.
42. Residential Streets, 2nd Edition, ASCE, NAHB & ULI, 1990.
43. Traffic Calming, Citizens Advocating Responsible Transportation, Australia, 1989.
44. Traffic Calming in Practice, Department of Transport, etal, London, November 1994.
45. Todd Long, "The Use of Traffic Control Measures in the Prevention of Through Traffic Movement on Residential Streets", unpublished, Masters Thesis, Georgia Tech, September 1990.
46. Patricia Noyes, "Evaluation of Traditional Speed Reduction Efforts in Residential Areas", ITE Compendium of Technical Papers, District 6 Meeting, 1993, pages 61-66.
47. G.E. Frangos, "Howard County's Speed Control in Residential Areas Utilizing Psycho-perceptive Traffic Controls", ITE Compendium of Technical Papers, 1985, pages 87-92.

48. Halbert, etal, "Implementation of Residential Traffic Control Program in the City of San Diego", ITE Compendium of Technical Papers, District 6, 1993, pages 23-60.
49. Radwan & Sinha, "Gap Acceptance and Delay at Stop Controlled Intersections on Multi-Lane Divided Highways", ITE Journal, March 1980, page 38.
50. Borstel, "Traffic Circles : Seattle's Experience", ITE Compendium of Technical Papers, 1985, page 77.
51. D. Meier, "The Policy Adopted in Arlington County, VA, for Solving Real and Perceived Speeding Problems on Residential Streets", ITE Compendium of Technical Papers, 1985, page 97.
52. Jeff Clark, "High Speeds and Volumes on Residential Streets: An Analysis of Physical Characteristics as Causes in Sacramento, California", ITE Compendium of Technical Papers, 1985, page 93.
53. Wiersig & Van Winkle, "Neighborhood Traffic Management in the Dallas/Fort Worth Area", ITE Compendium of Technical Papers, 1985, page 82.
54. Improving Residential Street Environments, FHWA RD-81-031, 1981.
55. Carl R. Dawson, Jr., "Effectiveness of Stop Signs When Installed to Control Speeds Along Residential Streets", Proceedings from Southern District ITE Meeting, Richmond, Virginia, April 17, 1993.
56. Arthur R. Theil, "Let Baton Rouge's Traffic Engineers Decide Whether Signs Are Needed", State Times, LA, August 30, 1983.
57. Gary James, "Merits Being Totally Ignored in This Instance", Morning Advocate, Baton Rouge, LA, July 30, 1983.
58. James Thomason, "Traffic Signs Allow Crossing", Morning Advocate, Baton Rouge, LA, July 30, 1983.
59. "City-Parish Must Move Stop Signs", Morning Advocate, Baton Rouge, LA, 1983.
60. Synthesis of Safety Research Related to Traffic Control and Roadway Elements, Vol. 2, FHWA Washington, D. C., 1992.
61. B.H. Cottrell, Jr., "Using All-Way Stop Control for Residential Traffic Management", Report No. FHWA VTRC 96-R17, Virginia Transportation Research Council, Charlottesville, Virginia, January, 1996.
62. Eck & Diega, "Field Evaluation at Multi-Way Versus Four-Way Stop Sign Control at Low Volume Intersections in Residential Areas", Transportation Research Record 1160, Washington, DC, 1988, pages 7-13.
63. Hanson, "Are There Too Many Four-Way Stops?", Traffic Engineering, November 1957, pages 20-22, 42.
64. Beaubien, "Stop Signs for Speed Control", ITE Journal, November 1976, pages 26-28.
65. Antwerp and Miller, "Control of Traffic in Residential Neighborhoods : Some Considerations for Implementation", Transportation 10, 1981, pages 35-49.
66. Lipinski, "Neighborhood Traffic Controls", Transportation Engineering Journal, May 1979, pages 213-221.
67. Richardson, "A Delay Model for Multi-Way Stop Sign Intersections", Transportation Research Record 1112, Washington, DC, 1987, pages 107-114.
68. Briglin, "An Evaluation of Four-Way Stop Sign Control", ITE Journal, August 1982,

pages 16-19.

69. Ullman and Dudek, "Effects of Reduced Speed Limits in Rapidly Developing Urban Fringe Areas", Transportation Research Record 1114, 1989, pages 45-53.

70. Robert Rees, "All-Way STOP Signs Installation Criteria", Westernite, Jan-Feb 1999, Vol 53, No. 1, pg 1-4.

71. Wes Siporski, "Stop Sign Compliance", posting on Traffic Engineering Council List Serve, Jan 15, 1999.

Appendix B

Additional References for Multi-Way Stop Signs

Not included in Analysis - Reports not available

1. Improving Traffic Signal Operations, ITE Report IR-081, August 1995.

2. Kunde, "Unwarranted Stop Signs in Cities", ITE Technical Notes, July 1982, page 12.

3. "In search of Effective Speed Control", ITE Technical Notes, December 1980, pages 12-16.

4. "Stop Signs Do Not Control Speed", ITE Technical Notes, July 1978, pages 6-7.

5. "An Evaluation of Unwarranted Stop Signs", ITE San Francisco Bay Area, February 1979.

6. "Cost of Unnecessary Stops", Auto Club of Missouri, Midwest Motorists, 1974.

7. Nitzel, Schatter & Mink, "Residential Traffic Control Policies and Measures", ITE

Compendium of Technical Papers, 1988.

8. Weike and Keim, "Residential Traffic Controls", ITE Compendium of Technical Papers, Washington DC, August 1976.

9. Landom and Buller, "The Effects on Road Noise in Residential Areas", Watford, United Kingdom, October 1977.

10. Wells and Joyner, "Neighborhood Automobile Restraints", Transportation Research Record 813, 1981.

11. Byrd and Stafford, "Analysis of Delay and User Costs of Unwarranted Four Way Stop Sign Controlled Intersections", TRR 956, Washington, DC, 1984, pages 30-32.

12. Marconi, "Speed Control Measures in Residential Areas", Traffic Engineering, Vol. 47, No. 3, March 1977, pages 28-30.

13. Mounce, "Driver's Compliance with Stop Sign Control at Low Volume Intersections", TRR 808, TRB, Washington, DC, 1981, pages 30-37.

14. Orlob, "Traffic Diversion for Better Neighborhoods", Traffic Engineering, ITE, Vol. 45, No. 7, July 1975, pages 22-25.

Count: 

C:\WPERF60\MARTIN\MULTIWAY.WPD