



**CITY OF URBANA, ILLINOIS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

ENGINEERING

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Prussing and Members of the City Council

FROM: William R. Gray, Public Works Director
Jennifer J. Selby, Civil Engineer

DATE: April 3, 2008

SUBJECT: Bicycle Master Plan - Amendment to the Urbana Comprehensive Plan

Introduction

The City of Urbana contracted with the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) in January of 2007 to prepare a Bicycle Master Plan for the City. This plan originates from the Council Common Goal to “Get Urbana Bicycling.”

Public Involvement

The Plan was guided by a steering committee of community stakeholders including representatives from the Urbana Park District, Urbana School District, University of Illinois, CU-MTD and City staff. The Plan also involved an extensive public involvement component.

Two public meetings were held at the Urbana Middle School for the project – May 3, 2007 and December 6, 2007. Approximately 70 people attended the first meeting and approximately 50 people attended the second meeting.

The Bicycle Master Plan was released for public comment on February 15, 2008. The public comment period ended on March 17, 2008. Several comments were received during this time period. Based on these comments, staff recommended specific revisions to the Bicycle Master Plan which were subsequently incorporated in the draft Plan now under City Council review.

At their September 2007 meeting, the City’s Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC) reviewed the draft bicycle network. (See pages 8-1 through 8-52, and specifically Figures 8.1 and 8.2.) BPAC at their February 19, 2008 meeting reviewed the draft Bicycle Master Plan following which they voted unanimously to recommend approval the Plan.

As the Bicycle Master Plan is proposed to be adopted as an official element of the 2005 Urbana Comprehensive Plan, the Plan went to the Urbana Plan Commission for review and a recommendation. The Plan Commission opened an official public hearing regarding the draft Bicycle Master Plan on February 21, 2008. The hearing was continued to March 20, 2008 at which time the Commission voted 4 in favor and 1 against to recommend that the Urbana City Council approve the Plan. Minutes from the March 20, 2008 Plan Commission meeting are attached.

The draft Bicycle Master Plan was presented to the Mayor and City Council at the March 10, 2008 Committee of the Whole meeting.

The draft Bicycle Master Plan was revised based on comments received during the public comment period and the Final Bicycle Master Plan document has been presented to Council members for approval. Because the draft Bicycle Master Plan is voluminous, it has been provided in CD form. Should you desire a hard copy of the plan, please contact Ms. Jennifer Selby at (217) 384-2385 or jjselby@city.urbana.il.us.

2005 Comprehensive Plan

The 2005 Comprehensive Plan's goals, objectives, and implementation strategies envision bicycling as a viable transportation mode in the City, but the current Comprehensive Plan provides few details for how this can or should be achieved. The following are the goals and objectives addressing bicycle facilities most directly.

Goal 46.0 Improve access to transportation modes for Urbana residents.

Objectives

- 46.1 Work to improve pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access throughout Urbana.

Goal 47.0 Create a multi-modal transportation system.

Objectives

- 47.7 Promote bicycle/pedestrian access to major activity centers.

Goal 49.0 Avoid development patterns that can potentially create an over-dependency on the automobile.

Objectives

- 49.1 Promote alternatives to automobile travel, through provision of sidewalks, pedestrian access, bicycle pathways, and high quality transit service.

Appendix C of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, Greenways and Trails Classification Map, relates to bikeways but deals more directly with linking dedicated open spaces such as parks. The proposed Bicycle Master Plan provides with great clarity and specificity how bicycling facilities should be provided to achieve this vision.

Summary of the Bicycle Master Plan

Goals:

- Goal 1: Increase bicycle mode share in Urbana for all trip purposes by 50% in the next five years
- Goal 2: Achieve a Bicycle Friendly Community award through the League of American Bicyclists.
- Goal 3: Substantially expand the bicycle network

Objectives:

- ⌘ Create and maintain a bicycle network that is continuous, connected, and easily accessible for all users, and includes on-road and off-road facilities.
- ⌘ Provide a bicycle network that is safe and attractive for all users
- ⌘ Provide supporting facilities to make bicycle transportation more convenient
- ⌘ Educate residents about alternative modes of transportation and bicycle facilities
- ⌘ Secure funding and implement bicycle improvements

Bicycle Network:

The plan proposes an integrated bicycle network (See pages 8-1 through 8-52, and specifically Figures 8.1 and 8.2) based primarily on the following considerations:

- ⌘ Inventory of existing bicycle facilities and roadway characteristics;
- ⌘ Existing policies and plans for proposed bikeways;
- ⌘ Public input from bicyclists and others on the most desirable routes;

- ⌘ Input from public agencies, boards, and commissions, including the Urbana Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Committee;
- ⌘ Connecting activity centers, major destinations, and neighborhoods;
- ⌘ Bicycle Level of Service ratings of A, B, or C for “casual adult cyclists”;
- ⌘ Spacing of bikeways from 0.5 to 1.0 miles apart; and
- ⌘ Transportation standards and guidelines adopted by the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

Implementation (see Chapter 9) includes:

- ⌘ 0-5 year, 6-10 year and 10+ year implementation timeframes
- ⌘ Bike Lanes, Bike Routes, Share the Road, Shared Bike/Parking lanes, Shared Use Paths, Side Paths
- ⌘ Major north-south corridors include: Broadway Avenue, Kinch Street, Goodwin Avenue and Philo Road
- ⌘ Major east-west corridors include: Main Street, Washington Street, Florida Avenue and Windsor Road

Relative cost estimates in 2008 dollars (See attached table):

⌘ 0-5 year timeframe:	\$2,561,676 = Total City Share of Costs <u>\$2,294,486</u> = Total funding already projected in CIP \$267,189 = Total additional funding needed
⌘ 6-10 year timeframe:	\$231,372 = Total City Share of Costs <u>\$2,812</u> = Total funding already projected in CIP \$228,560 = Total additional funding needed
⌘ 10+ year timeframe:	\$6,036,249 = Total City Share of Costs <u>\$0</u> = Total funding already projected in CIP \$6,036,249 = Total additional funding needed*

*Many projects in the 10+ timeframe are associated with major road projects that are currently outside the City (i.e. Airport Road, future Olympian Drive, Curtis Road) or are highly desired sidepaths that may or may not come to fruition (i.e. Boneyard Creek path from UIUC to downtown Urbana and a railroad path from Wright Street to Smith Road.)

City Council Action

The Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Commission recommends approval of the Bicycle Master Plan. The Urbana Plan Commission likewise recommends that the City Council approve the attached Bicycle Master Plan as an official element of the 2005 Urbana Comprehensive Plan. City staff likewise recommends approval. Revisions recommended by the Plan Commission, based on staff review of public comments, have been incorporated within the attached document.

ORDINANCE NO. 2008-04-024

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CITY OF URBANA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2005

(Bicycle Master Plan amendment - Plan Case No. 2059-CP-08)

WHEREAS, the Urbana City Council on April 11, 2005 in Ordinance No. 2005-03-050 adopted the 2005 City of Urbana Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the 2005 Comprehensive Plan contains goals, objectives, policies, and other recommendations pertaining to transportation, including bicycling; and

WHEREAS, the 2005 Comprehensive Plan contains goals and objectives to improve pedestrian, bicycle and transit access throughout Urbana; to promote bicycling/pedestrian access to major activity centers; and to avoid development patterns which can create an over-dependency on automobiles by promoting alternative transportation such as bicycling; and

WHEREAS, changes in various circumstances since the 2005 Comprehensive Plan was adopted have indicated a need to amend the Comprehensive Plan to address bicycling needs; and

WHEREAS, after due publication and proper legal notification of a public hearing on February 21, 2008 which was

recessed until and concluded upon March 20, 2008, the Urbana Plan Commission voted 4 ayes to 1 nay to recommended that the Urbana City Council adopt the Bicycle Master Plan as an official amendment to 2005 Urbana Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Urbana City Council has adopted a goal to "Get Urbana Bicycling"; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that it is in the public interest to adopt an amendment to the 2005 Urbana Comprehensive Plan to provide a detailed plan to achieve these public policies.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CORPORATE AUTHORITIES OF THE CITY OF URBANA, ILLINOIS, as follows:

Section 1. The attached document entitled "Urbana Bicycle Master Plan", dated April 2008, and incorporated herein by reference is hereby adopted in whole as an amendment to the 2005 Comprehensive Plan of the City of Urbana, as amended.

Section 2. The City Clerk is directed to publish this Ordinance in pamphlet form by authority of the corporate authorities and thereafter file a certified copy in the Champaign County

Recorder's Office in conformance with Chapter 65, Section 11-12-7 of the Illinois Compiled Statutes (65 ILCS 5/11-12-7).

Section 3. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon the expiration of 10 days after the date of filing notice of the adoption of the comprehensive plan amendment with the Champaign County Recorder, in conformance with Chapter 65, Section 11-12-7 of the Illinois Compiled Statutes (65 ILCS 5/11-12-7).

PASSED by the City Council this _____ day of _____, 2008.

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSTAINS:

Phyllis D. Clark, City Clerk

APPROVED by the Mayor this _____ day of _____, 2008.

Laurel Lunt Prussing, Mayor

CERTIFICATE OF PUBLICATION IN PAMPHLET FORM

I, Phyllis D. Clark, certify that I am the duly elected and acting Municipal Clerk of the City of Urbana, Champaign County, Illinois. I certify that on the _____ day of _____, 2008, the corporate authorities of the City of Urbana passed and approved Ordinance No. _____, entitled: **"AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CITY OF URBANA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2005** (Urbana Bicycle Master Plan Amendment -- Plan Case No. 2059-CP-08), which provided by its terms that it should be published in pamphlet form. The pamphlet form of Ordinance No. _____ was prepared, and a copy of such Ordinance was posted in the Urbana City Building commencing on the _____ day of _____, 2008, and continuing for at least ten (10) days thereafter. Copies of such Ordinance were also available for public inspection upon request at the Office of the City Clerk.

DATED at Urbana, Illinois, this _____ day of _____, 2008.

**Summary of Urbana Bicycle Master Plan Changes
Based on Comments received during Public Comment Period
February 15, 2008 to March 17, 2008**

Urbana Public Works Department
City of Urbana
April 3, 2008

1. Pennsylvania Avenue from Race Street to Lincoln Avenue was changed from a bike route to bike lanes. The time frame is still 0-5 years. This change will require removal of parking on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue in this section.
2. Broadway Avenue from Michigan Avenue to Florida Avenue was changed from bike lanes to a bike route due to concerns about removal of parking along Blair Park. The time frame is still 0-5 years. Removal of parking in this segment will no longer be necessary.
3. The Norfolk Southern railtrack between McCullough Street and Broadway Avenue was changed from a Rail-to-Trail in the 10+ year timeframe to a Rail-with-Trail in the 0-5 year timeframe.
4. A Rail-to-Trail (shared-use path) was added along the Norfolk Southern railtrack between Coler Street and McCullough Street in the 10+ year timeframe.
5. A bike route was added on Orchard Street from Pennsylvania Avenue to Florida Avenue in the 0-5 year timeframe.
6. A sidepath was added on the north side of Florida Avenue between Broadway Avenue and Race Street in the 6-10 year timeframe.
7. A sidepath was added on the south side of Perkins Road between Eastern Avenue and Webber Park in the 10+ Year timeframe.
8. The bicycle facilities through the Urbana High School/Middle School/Aquatic Center campus were eliminated due to concerns from the Urbana School District.
9. The Green Street corridor from Wright Street to Lincoln Avenue was moved from the 10+ year timeframe to the 0-5 year timeframe.
10. The George Huff Drive bike route was moved from the 6-10 year timeframe to the 0-5 year timeframe.
11. Existing & future BLOS has been updated on all tables & maps based on new recommendations.

12. The following figures were added to Section 6.1.2.



M4-3



M6-1



M6-3



D1-1a

13. The following text was added to Section 8.1.26:

At the first public workshop for the Bike Master Plan process, attendees were broken up into groups geographically. There were two groups that represented Northeast Urbana – an area defined as North of I-74 east of Cunningham, PLUS Beringer Commons & Edgewood (east of University Ave. spur to I-74 and north of University Ave.). Both groups identified the I-74 overpass as an obstacle to safe bicycling on High Cross Road (See A1-2). Group 2b marked “Safe passage over interstate” on their group map (See A1-4). Group 2b also prioritized the overpass of High Cross Road over I-74 as their second prioritized issue (See A1-5). The recommendation to provide a safe crossing of High Cross Road over I-74 upon any future bridge reconstruction project is consistent with the public comment received. It is also consistent with the IL130/High Cross Road Corridor Plan.

14. Text was added at the end of Section 6.2.2 (University Bike Path) to indicate that the University of Illinois will be evaluating its bicycle system and developing a Campus Bicycle Plan in 2008, but the City of Urbana has no control over the recommendations that the University will decide.

15. This sentence was added to Section 8.1, on page 8-1: “The Bicycle Master Plan will be evaluated every year and updated every 5 years. This evaluation process will allow the City to recognize any future streets where bicycle facilities may be desired and identify them as such in the Plan.”

16. Throughout the document all references to streets were changed to include the entire street name (ex. Anderson “Street”, Florida “Avenue”, Gregory “Drive”)

17. All maps in the document were enlarged to 11x17, to improve legibility.

18. The proposed mileage for bike lanes and shared-use paths for each timeframe was added to Figures 9.1-9.3. Previously shown as “xx”.

19. The Hickman Tree Walk in Carle Park was removed from all maps as an existing bike facility.

20. Figure 6.32, Sign #4 in the draft document was replaced with a “Bikes Yield to Peds” sign.

21. Figures such as 8.8 where the Bike Route sign in the future view was not easily visible were changed to increase the visibility of the sign.

22. A small map was added to each section of Chapter 8 (Recommendations) for readers to be able to easily identify the location of the improvements recommended for each specific corridor section.
23. The Appendix was updated to include the Final Crystal Lake Park Master Plan, as received from the Urbana Park District.
24. The Weaver Park Master Plan was added to the Appendix, as received from the Urbana Park District.
25. The Menards site plan was removed from the Appendix as it was only preliminary and still changing.
26. The Downtown Bike Parking Map was updated and added to the Appendix.
27. The CUUATS Online Bicycle Route Survey Map has been added to the Appendix.
28. Goal 11.0, Objective 11.2, and Future Land Use Descriptions, Implementation strategies, and relevant Appendices from the 2005 Urbana Comprehensive Plan were added to the Policy Framework section of the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan Appendix. These materials were cited in the February 21, 2008 memo to Plan Commission, but not included in the draft Plan. They are included in the final Plan.

Urbana Bicycle Plan Implementation Matrix

Street Name	From (N/E)	To (S/W)	Treatment	Agency Responsible	Total Cost Estimate*	City's Share of Cost
<i>0-5 Years</i>						
FUNDED PROJECTS - Funding projected in CIP						
Broadway Avenue	Park St	Norfolk Southern RR	Lanes	City	\$2,368	\$2,368
Broadway Avenue	Norfolk Southern RR	Goose Alley	Lanes	City	\$3,367	\$3,367
Broadway Avenue	Goose Alley	Main St	Lanes	City	\$1,036	\$1,036
Broadway Avenue	Main St	Elm St	Lanes	City	\$888	\$888
Broadway Avenue	Illinois St	California Ave	Lanes	City	\$1,015	\$1,015
Broadway Avenue	California Ave	Washington St	Lanes	City	\$4,060	\$4,060
Goodwin Avenue	Springfield Ave	Gregory Dr	Lanes	City/University	\$15,281	\$7,641
Green Street	Busey Ave	Wright St	Lanes	City/University	\$8,732	\$4,366
Kinch Street	Washington St	Michigan Ave	Lanes	City	\$5,481	\$5,481
Kinch Street	Michigan Ave	Pennsylvania Ave	Lanes	City	\$740	\$740
Kinch Street	Pennsylvania Ave	S of Vermont Ave	Lanes	City	\$1,421	\$1,421
Kinch Street	S of Vermont Ave	Florida Ave	Lanes	City	\$1,184	\$1,184
Main Street	Scottswood Dr	Dodson Dr	Lanes	City	\$1,295	\$1,295
Main Street	Dodson Dr	Art Bartell Rd	Lanes	City	\$11,914	\$11,914
Main Street	Art Bartell Rd	Former Champaign County Nursing Home entry	Lanes	City	\$1,813	\$1,813
Main Street	Former Champaign County Nursing	Glover Ave	Lanes	City	\$10,360	\$10,360
Main Street	Glover Ave	Maple St	Lanes	City	\$9,135	\$9,135
Main Street	Maple St	Vine St	Lanes	City	\$4,144	\$4,144
Oregon Street	Lincoln Ave	Goodwin Ave	Lanes	City/University	\$6,475	\$3,238
Philo Road	Washington St	Pennsylvania Ave	Lanes	City	\$10,759	\$10,759
Philo Road	Pennsylvania Ave	Colorado Ave	Lanes	City	\$4,588	\$4,588
Race Street	Main St	Busey Bank entry	Lanes	City	\$777	\$777
Race Street	Busey Bank entry	Elm St	Lanes	City	\$777	\$777
Race Street	Elm St	Green St	Lanes	City	\$1,554	\$1,554
Race Street	Green St	Illinois St	Lanes	City	\$2,590	\$2,590
Race Street	Illinois St	Alley between Illinois St & California Ave	Lanes	City	\$777	\$777
Washington Street	Dodson Dr	Philo Rd	Lanes	City	\$26,677	\$26,677
Boneyard Path	University Ave	Main St	Shared-Use	City	\$207,071	\$207,071
RR Path	Broadway Ave	McCullough St	Rail-Trail	City	\$260,000	\$260,000
Cunningham Avenue	north city limits	Perkins Rd	Sidepath	City	\$589,957	\$589,957
Florida Avenue	High Cross Rd	Abercorn St	Sidepath	City	\$191,443	\$191,443
High Cross Road	University Ave	Windsor Rd	Sidepath	City	\$789,214	\$789,214
Windsor Road	High Cross Rd	Stone Creek Blvd	Sidepath	City	\$132,838	\$132,838
					\$2,309,731	\$2,294,487

Urbana Bicycle Plan Implementation Matrix

Street Name	From (N/E)	To (S/W)	Treatment	Agency Responsible	Total Cost Estimate*	City's Share of Cost
0-5 Years						
UNFUNDED PROJECTS - Additional funding required						
Amber Lane	Myra Ridge Dr	Philo Rd	Lanes	City	\$3,996	\$3,996
Bradley Avenue	Lincoln Ave	Goodwin Ave	Lanes	City	\$3,700	\$3,700
Bradley Avenue	Goodwin Ave	west city limits	Lanes	City	\$3,700	\$3,700
Broadway Avenue	High St	Illinois St	Lanes	City	\$740	\$740
Fairview Avenue	Lincoln Ave	Goodwin Ave	Lanes	City	\$3,700	\$3,700
Florida Avenue	Rutledge Dr	Lincolnwood Dr	Lanes	City	\$1,827	\$1,827
Florida Avenue	Lincolnwood Dr	James Cherry Dr	Lanes	City	\$1,480	\$1,480
Florida Avenue	James Cherry Dr	Philo Rd	Lanes	City	\$5,481	\$5,481
Florida Avenue	Philo Rd	Vine St	Lanes	City	\$15,225	\$15,225
Gregory Street	Illinois St	Oregon St	Lanes	City/University	\$3,626	\$1,813
Illinois Street	Vine St	Race St	Lanes	City	\$5,439	\$5,439
Main Street	Vine St	Cedar St	Lanes	City	\$7,252	\$7,252
Pennsylvania Avenue	Race St	Lincoln Ave	Lanes	City	\$7,400	\$7,400
Race Street	Pennsylvania Ave	Florida Ave	Lanes	City	\$2,368	\$2,368
Race Street	Florida Ave	Mumford Dr	Lanes	City	\$4,292	\$4,292
Race Street	Mumford Dr	Windsor Rd	Lanes	City	\$10,656	\$10,656
Washington Street	Philo Rd	Urbana Ave	Lanes	City	\$6,216	\$6,216
Adams Street	Fairlawn Dr	Florida Ave	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Anderson Street	Oregon St	Florida Ave	Route	City	\$1,020	\$1,020
Anderson Street	Mumford Dr	Scovill St	Route	City	\$680	\$680
Anderson Street	Scovill St	south terminus	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Beringer Circle	Slayback Rd	University Ave	Route	City	\$680	\$680
Beslin Street	Goodwin Ave	Wright St	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Bradley Avenue	Coler Ave	Lincoln Ave	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Broadway Avenue	Michigan Ave	Florida Ave	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Busey Avenue	Washington St	Iowa St	Route	City	\$340	\$340
California Avenue	Grove St	Urbana Ave	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Church Street	McCullough St	Orchard St	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Coler Avenue	Bradley Ave	Washington St	Route	City	\$2,380	\$2,380
Eads Street	Goodwin Ave	Wright St	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Elm Street	Walnut St extended	Broadway Ave	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Fairview Avenue	Orchard St	Lincoln Ave	Route	City	\$680	\$680
George Huff Drive	Mumford Dr	Race St	Route	City	\$680	\$680
Grove Street	Main St	Oregon St	Route	City	\$680	\$680
High Street	Walnut St	Broadway Ave	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Illinois Street	Urbana Ave	Vine St	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Illinois Street	Race St	Lincoln Ave	Route	City	\$1,020	\$1,020
Iowa Street	Busey Ave	Lincoln Ave	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Kerr Avenue	city limits	Broadway Ave	Route	City	\$1,020	\$1,020
Lanore Drive	Washington St	south terminus	Route	City	\$680	\$680
Main Street Spur	University Ave	Main St	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Main Street	Pfeffer Rd	Ennis Ln	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Main Street	Ennis Ln	Scottswood Dr	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Main Street	Springfield Ave	Goodwin Ave	Route	City	\$1,360	\$1,360
Mumford Drive	Philo Rd	Race St	Route	City	\$1,700	\$1,700
Nevada Street	Lincoln Ave	Goodwin Ave	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Orchard Street	Fairview Ave	Church St	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Orchard Street	Pennsylvania Ave	Florida Ave	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Oregon Street	Anderson St	Grove St	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Park Street	Broadway Ave	McCullough St	Route	City	\$680	\$680
Park Street	Goodwin Ave	Wright St	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Pennsylvania Avenue	Vine St	Race St	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Pfeffer Road	Main St	Washington St	Route	City	\$680	\$680
Scovill Street	Philo Rd	Anderson St	Route	City	\$680	\$680
Slayback Road	Beringer Circle	city limits	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Smith Road	Washington St	Florida Ave	Route	City	\$680	\$680
Urbana Avenue	Illinois St	California Ave	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Walnut Street	Green St	High St	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Washington Street	Vine St	Race St	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Washington Street	Race St	Busey Ave	Route	City	\$680	\$680
Smith Road	University Ave	Main St	Route + NB Shared Lane Marking	City	\$950	\$950
Airport Road	Cunningham Ave	Willow Rd	Share the Road	City	\$1,020	\$1,020
Colorado Avenue	Philo Rd	Vine St	Share the Road	City	\$1,020	\$1,020
Country Club Road	Cunningham Ave	Broadway Ave	Share the Road	City	\$680	\$680
High Cross Road	I-74	University Ave	Share the Road	City	\$680	\$680
Perkins Road	Brownfield Rd	Cunningham Ave	Share the Road	City	\$1,020	\$1,020
Race Street	Alley between Illinois St & California Ave	Pennsylvania Ave	Share the Road	City	\$1,020	\$1,020
Vine Street	Main St	Windsor Rd	Share the Road	City	\$3,060	\$3,060
Washington Street	Pfeffer Rd	Dodson Dr	Share the Road	City	\$680	\$680
Washington Street	Urbana Ave	Vine St	Share the Road + WB Shared Lane Markings	City	\$950	\$950
Windsor Road	Philo Rd	Race St	Share the Road	City	\$1,360	\$1,360
Anderson Street	Florida Ave	Mumford Dr	Shared Bike/Parking Lanes	City	\$7,205	\$7,205
Pennsylvania Avenue	Anderson St	Vine St	Shared Bike/Parking Lanes	City	\$3,275	\$3,275
Anderson Street	south terminus	Windsor Rd	Shared-Use	City	\$3,907	\$3,907

Lanore-Adams path	south terminus of Lanore	Adams at Fairlawn	Shared-Use	City	\$15,628	\$15,628
Florida Avenue	Mid-block between Kinch St & Rutledge Dr	Rutledge Dr	Sidepath	City	\$7,814	\$7,814
Lincoln Avenue	Pennsylvania Ave	Florida Ave	Sidepath	City/University	\$58,605	\$29,303
Windsor Road	Anderson St	Vine St	Sidepath	City	\$39,070	\$39,070
Wright Street	Park St	University Ave	Sidepath	City	\$23,442	\$23,442
Main Street	Lincoln Ave	Lincoln Ave	Refuge Island	City	\$15,000	\$15,000
					\$298,304	\$267,189
TOTAL COST OF PLAN FOR 0-5 YEAR TIMEFRAME IMPLEMENTATION:					\$2,608,035	
CITY'S COST OF PLAN FOR 0-5 YEAR TIMEFRAME IMPLEMENTATION:						\$2,561,676
TOTAL FUNDING ALREADY IDENTIFIED IN CIP:						\$2,294,487
TOTAL FUNDING NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT THE 0-5 YEAR PLAN:						\$267,189

Urbana Bicycle Plan Implementation Matrix

Street Name	From (N/E)	To (S/W)	Treatment	Agency Responsible	Total Cost Estimate*	City's Share of Cost
6-10 Years						
FUNDED PROJECTS - Funding projected in CIP						
Bradley Avenue	Coler Ave	Lincoln Ave	Lanes	City	\$2,812	\$2,812
					\$2,812	\$2,812
UNFUNDED PROJECTS - Additional funding required						
Florida Avenue	Broadway Ave	Race St	Sidepath	City	\$50,791	\$50,791
Florida Avenue	Race St	Orchard St	Sidepath	City/University	\$89,861	\$44,931
Lincoln Avenue	Killarney St	Bradley Ave	Sidepath	City	\$132,838	\$132,838
					\$273,490	\$228,560
TOTAL COST OF PLAN FOR 6-10 YEAR TIMEFRAME IMPLEMENTATION:					\$276,302	
CITY'S COST OF PLAN FOR 6-10 YEAR TIMEFRAME IMPLEMENTATION:						\$231,372
TOTAL FUNDING ALREADY IDENTIFIED IN CIP:						\$2,812
TOTAL FUNDING NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT THE 6-10 YEAR PLAN:						\$228,560
TOTAL COST OF PLAN FOR 0-10 YEAR TIMEFRAME IMPLEMENTATION:					\$2,884,337	
CITY'S COST OF PLAN FOR 0-10 YEAR TIMEFRAME IMPLEMENTATION:						\$2,793,047
TOTAL FUNDING ALREADY IDENTIFIED IN CIP:						\$2,297,299
TOTAL FUNDING NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT THE 0-10 YEAR PLAN:						\$495,748

* Costs do not include major roadway improvements (i.e. widening, resurfacing, etc.), r.o.w. acquisition or engineering. Costs only include striping, signage, pavement markings, etc.

Street Name	From (N/E)	To (S/W)	Treatment	Agency Responsible	Total Cost Estimate*	City's Share of Cost
10+ Years						
UNFUNDED PROJECTS - Additional funding required						
Green Street	Race St	Busey Ave	Lanes	City	\$6,956	\$6,956
Washington Street	Pfeffer Rd	Dodson Dr	Lanes	City	\$12,173	\$12,173
Cottage Grove Avenue	Rail-Trail	Main St	Route	City	\$340	\$340
Boneyard Path	Main St	Lincoln Ave	Shared-Use	City	\$175,815	\$175,815
Lierman Avenue path	Rail-Trail	Main St	Shared-Use	City	\$39,070	\$39,070
Myra Ridge/Deerfield Trails path	Windsor Rd	Marc Trail path	Shared-Use	City	\$148,466	\$148,466
RR Path	Smith Rd	Broadway Ave	Rail-Trail	City	\$605,585	\$605,585
RR Path	McCullough St	Wright St	Rail-Trail	City	\$351,630	\$351,630
Airport Road	Brownfield Rd	Cunningham Ave	Sidepath	City	\$441,491	\$441,491
Airport Road	Cunningham Ave	Apple Tree St	Sidepath	City	\$324,281	\$324,281
Country Club Road	Cunningham Ave	Broadway Ave	Sidepath	City	\$171,908	\$171,908
Cunningham Avenue	Future Olympian Dr	north city limits	Sidepath	City	\$355,537	\$355,537
Cunningham Avenue	Kenyon Rd	Country Club Rd	Sidepath	City	\$74,233	\$74,233
Curtis Road	High Cross Rd	Race St	Sidepath	City	\$976,750	\$976,750
Future Olympian Drive	Cunningham Ave	west city limits	Sidepath	City	\$836,098	\$836,098
High Cross Road	Windsor Rd	Curtis Rd	Sidepath	City	\$394,607	\$394,607
Lincoln Avenue	Future Olympian Dr	Killarney St	Sidepath	City	\$832,191	\$832,191
Race Street	Meadowbrook Park	Curtis Rd	Sidepath	City	\$218,792	\$218,792
Smith Road	Former CSX railbed	Main St	Sidepath	City	\$23,442	\$23,442
Wright Street	Church St	Park St	Sidepath	City	\$46,884	\$46,884
					\$6,036,249	\$6,036,249
TOTAL COST OF PLAN FOR 10+ YEAR TIMEFRAME IMPLEMENTATION:					\$6,036,249	
CITY'S COST OF PLAN FOR 10+ YEAR TIMEFRAME IMPLEMENTATION:						\$6,036,249
TOTAL FUNDING ALREADY IDENTIFIED IN CIP:						\$0
TOTAL FUNDING NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT THE 10+ YEAR PLAN:						\$6,036,249

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

APPROVED

DATE: February 21, 2008

TIME: 7:30 P.M.

PLACE: Urbana City Building
400 South Vine Street
Urbana, IL 61801

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tyler Fitch, Ben Grosser, Michael Pollock, Bernadine Stake, Marilyn Upah-Bant, James Ward

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Jane Burris, Lew Hopkins, Don White

STAFF PRESENT: Robert Myers, Planning Manager; Lisa Karcher, Planner II; Rebecca Bird, Community Development Associate; Teri Andel, Planning Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Megan Barcus, Brandon Bowersox, Jim Gonzalez, Daniel Hayes, Cynthia Hoyle, Susan Jones, Rick Langlois, Carol Lichtensteiger, Roger Meyer, Rita Morocoima-Black, Andrew Ogorzaly, Beverly and Tom Rauchfuss, Mike Rizzifrello, Michelle Thornley, Don Wauthier

OLD PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2059-CP-08: A request by the Urbana Zoning Administrator to adopt the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan as an amendment to the 2005 Urbana Comprehensive Plan (as amended) including a Proposed Bicycle Network Map indicating future bicycle routes.

Robert Myers, Planning Manager, introduced the case to the Plan Commission. He spoke about how the proposed Urbana Bicycle Master Plan relates to specific Goals and Objectives of the City's 2005 Comprehensive Plan. He then spoke about the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Strategies relating to the proposed Urbana Bicycle Master Plan. He showed Appendix C of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, which is the Greenways and Trails Map. Although the Greenways and Trails map was adopted in 2005, the network proposed in the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan is much more extensive. The proposed plan proposes a city-wide network of bicycle facilities. Another striking difference from what the City's current bikeway policy is that a variety of facility types is proposed, including on-road bike lanes, sidepaths, and off-road paths. Once people looked at bicycling principally as recreation, but we now look at bicycling as a form of transportation, and in response the City is looking to provide a network of bicycle facilities throughout our community.

Mr. Myers felt that the proposed plan is innovative or groundbreaking for Urbana in:

1. Creating an integrated bicycle network throughout the City.
2. Proposing many on-road facilities.
3. Basing its proposed network on a comprehensive roadway inventory of existing conditions.
4. Using “before” and “after” photographs extensively for visualization.
5. Designing the network based primarily on community and public input, which was then tested by transportation planning and engineering standards.

He introduced Rita Black and Gabe Lewis from the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission and Jennifer Selby of the City of Urbana Public Works Department. Ms. Black and Mr. Lewis approached the Plan Commission to give their presentation on the case.

Ms. Black discussed the following about the proposed Urbana Bicycle Master Plan:

- ◆ Timeline
- ◆ Background
 - ◆ Council Common Goal: Get Urbana Bicycling
 - ◆ Implementation Strategy
 - ◆ Resources Used
 - ◆ Champaign County Greenways and Trails Plan, 2004
 - ◆ Urbanized Area Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), 2004
 - ◆ City of Urbana Comprehensive Plan, 2005
- ◆ Study Area
 - ◆ Recreation
 - ◆ Alternative Transportation
 - ◆ Transportation Necessity
 - ◆ Map
- ◆ Goals
 - ◆ Goal 1: Increase bicycle mode share in Urbana for all trip purposes by 50% in the next five years.
 - ◆ Goal 2: Achieve a Bicycle Friendly Community award through the League of American Bicyclists.
 - ◆ Goal 3: Substantially expand the bicycle network
- ◆ Objectives
 - ◆ Create and maintain a bicycle network that is continuous, connected, and easily accessible for all users, and includes on-road and off-road facilities.
 - ◆ Provide a bicycle network that is safe and attractive for all users
 - ◆ Provide supporting facilities to make bicycle transportation more convenient
 - ◆ Educate residents about alternative modes of transportation and bicycle facilities
 - ◆ Secure funding and implement bicycle improvements
- ◆ Existing Conditions
 - ◆ Inventory of Existing Facilities
 - ◆ Research Existing Documents
 - ◆ Create Existing Conditions Database

- ◆ Determine Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS)
- ◆ Roadway Selection Guidelines
- ◆ Bikeway Types
 - ◆ Bikeway
 - ◆ Target Bicyclists
 - ◆ Mixture of on-road bikeways and off-road trails
 - ◆ On-Road Bikeways
 - ◆ Bike Lane
 - ◆ Bike Route
 - ◆ Shared Bike/Parking Lane
 - ◆ Share the Road Signage
 - ◆ Shared Lane Marking (“Sharrow”)
 - ◆ Off-Road Bikeway
 - ◆ Shared-Use Path (Trail)
 - ◆ Sidepath
 - ◆ Rail-to-Trail
- ◆ Future Conditions
 - ◆ Proposed Bicycle Network
 - ◆ Determine Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS)

Mr. Lewis discussed the following about the proposed Urbana Bicycle Master Plan:

- ◆ Recommended Bicycle Network
 - ◆ Corridor Recommendations
 - ◆ Washington Street
 - ◆ Main Street
 - ◆ Broadway Avenue
 - ◆ Kinch Street
- ◆ Bicycle Parking Recommendations
 - ◆ Recommended Bicycle Racks
- ◆ Drainage Grates Recommendations
 - ◆ Bicycle Safe Grates
- ◆ Bike Activated Stoplights Recommendations
- ◆ Implementation Plan
 - ◆ Implementation Plan Matrix 0 – 5 Years
 - ◆ Bicycle Network Improvements 0 – 5 Years Map
 - ◆ Implementation Plan Matrix 6 – 10 Years
 - ◆ Bicycle Network Improvements 6 – 10 Years Map
 - ◆ Implementation Plan Matrix 10+ Years
 - ◆ Bicycle Network Improvements 10+ Years Map

Ms. Black continued by discussing the following:

- ◆ Education
 - ◆ Recommendations for Bicyclists
 - ◆ Recommendations for Motorists

- ◆ Encouragement
- ◆ Enforcement
- ◆ Implementation Funding
- ◆ Bicycle Coordinator
- ◆ Next Steps
- ◆ Bike Plan Website

Chair Pollock asked if the stretch of Broadway Avenue between Lincoln Square and the Urbana High School is wide enough to have both bike lanes and parking. Mr. Lewis replied that the street is wide enough to allow parking on one side. It just falls short of allowing parking on both sides plus bike lanes.

Chair Pollock inquired if there were instances in which there might be bike lanes next to each other going in opposite directions. Ms. Black said no.

Ms. Stake noticed that the proposed plan mentions bicycles and motor vehicles together sharing the roadways, but it did not mention pedestrians. Ms. Black stated that there are examples like Race Street where they plan to have pedestrians and bicyclists on the same path. Ms. Stake expressed her concern about this. Sometimes you have to have enough space so that the pedestrians are safe. Ms. Black responded that they have taken this into consideration. There are places where it is impossible to provide bicycle facilities on the street, but there is enough width on one side of the roadway to widen the sidewalk to make it wide enough for both pedestrians and bicyclists. Most of the time there is enough room for bicyclists to share the street with the motorists, but when there is not enough room, they had to come up with other alternatives with what we have to work with.

Ms. Upah-Bant wondered how the proposed plan would accommodate residents on North Lincoln Avenue to get to campus. Ms. Black explained that the Plan is proposing a sidepath from the student residences on Lincoln Avenue north of Bradley Avenue to go along Bradley Avenue to Goodwin Avenue, where there is an existing bike facility to Springfield Avenue. They just received money to improve Goodwin Avenue between Springfield Avenue and Gregory Street to provide bike lanes along the whole segment. They chose Goodwin Avenue because it has lower traffic volumes. Also, since there is no truck traffic, it is a safer for bicyclists to use. Mr. Lewis added that on page 8-29 of the proposed Urbana Bicycle Master Plan, it is outlined in the text about the Lincoln Avenue Corridor.

Ms. Stake expressed concern about Carle Park. She explained that all of the other parks in the City area just plain green, but Carle Park is designated as part of the Hickman Tree Walk. It is misleading to have a bicycle facility shown on the proposed route map. There is a group of people who have been working together for about the last eight months on what to do with Carle Park. She thought they were to decide whether or not a bicycle facility is located there. Because it's premature to show bike paths in Carle Park, the group would like to have the bicycle facility shown in the proposed plan removed. Mr. Lewis replied that the map shows Carle Park as an existing bicycle facility. Ms. Black noted that they received this information from the Urbana Park District. Ms. Stake remarked that it is not an existing bicycle facility. It is a tree walk, not a bicycle path, and it should be deleted from the proposed plan.

Mr. Grosser expressed his appreciation for the great work that everyone has done to create the proposed Urbana Bicycle Master Plan. He acknowledged that there were a lot of people who worked on it. He believes that it will provide a lot of uses for many of the over-wide streets there are in the City of Urbana. It will also slow down traffic in places where people just exceed the speed limits.

Mr. Grosser inquired if there was a section in the proposed plan where there are specific recommendations for future development. Every time a new street is conceptualized is there a guideline for the developers or for Public Works as to how the street/bike paths should connect to the bike network. Ms. Black explained that the idea is for any new development, if they are going to provide bike paths, to connect to the proposed paths in the Plan. Mr. Myers added that the City can link development of bike paths through the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance by referencing the map that is in the proposed plan and by requiring developments that generate traffic demand to include bicycle facilities when they provide transportation facilities. Mr. Grosser commented that this would give the City leeway when Special Use Permit requests come before them. Mr. Myers pointed out that the Urbana Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance already has very specific standards about streets regarding width, thickness of the pavement, etc. The proposed Bicycle Master Plan could tie into that regulatory document.

Mr. Grosser questioned whether having marked bike lanes on the streets would make the Fire Department want to have the streets be even that much wider. In other words, the Fire Department always wants streets to be a certain width, so they can drive the fire trucks down them. Are they willing to drive on bike lanes if there is an emergency? Ms. Black said that she presumed that the Fire Department is willing to drive on bike lanes. Mr. Grosser explained that he is concerned about oversized streets. He feels some people like streets to be a lot wider than they need to be. Mr. Myers responded by saying there is not anything in the proposed plan that encourages narrowing of streets in such a way that they would not be safe for any type of vehicles that should be travelling on the street, including fire trucks.

Mr. Grosser stated that he likes to ride his motorcycle, but he sometimes has difficulty getting the signal activation to recognize his presence at a stoplight because of the motorcycle being lighter weight than a car or truck. He noticed there is a recommendation in the proposed plan for there to be signal activation sensors put in the road for bicyclists. The Plan also mentions motorcycles. Will the sensors also detect motorcycles? Will the sensors go all the way across the road or would they just be put in the bike lane? Ms. Black explained that the bike lanes end at the intersections because of the turning lanes. There will be signs placed at the intersections where bicyclists will need to place their bikes to be recognized by the sensors that are on the pavement.

Mr. Grosser asked how this would work for motorcyclists. Ms. Black said it would be the same way. It would be the same space that the bicyclists would use.

Mr. Grosser noticed that the proposed plan suggests reducing Race Street between Illinois Street and Main Street to two lanes from the existing four lanes. He wondered what the results were in the traffic study and how does it compare to any other places in the City that would be two lanes only without any turn lane. Mr. Lewis replied that the traffic count at Main Street is 5,385 vehicles in a 24 hour period. It increases to 6,555 at Green Street and to 7,725 at Illinois Street.

It, then, decreases to 6,755 south of Illinois Street. Ms. Black commented that these are high for a City, but you have to keep in mind that this area is considered downtown Urbana. We do not want people speeding in the downtown areas.

Ms. Black explained that the traffic counts are over 24 hours, and they are not just concentrated at one time. Ten percent is concentrated during the peak hours. This will happen even with the four lane section. The four lane section is a small segment, and it is not significant. She believes that if we reduce the number of lanes and install bike lanes, it will encourage more people to switch over from driving their vehicles to riding their bicycles. This will also reduce the traffic counts.

Mr. Grosser asked if there are other streets with that many traffic counts in the City of Urbana that are two lanes without a turn lane. Ms. Black stated that we would keep the turn lanes. Mr. Grosser asked if there would be right turn lanes as well. Ms. Black said no, there would only be left turn lanes. Mr. Lewis added that they are planning to keep the right turn lanes at the intersection of Main Street and Vine Street.

Ms. Stake questioned if the bike path would be part of the sidewalk. Ms. Black said no. It would be a shared use path. It will need to be at least 8 feet wide. Ms. Stake asked if motorcycles would be allowed to use it. Ms. Black said no. Chair Pollock added that it is illegal for motorcycles to use shared use paths and sidewalks.

Ms. Upah-Bant wondered if any other City that has extensive bicycle network systems requires helmets to be worn. Is it part of the proposed education program? Chair Pollock stated that every state gets to make their own laws about this issue. There was an Illinois Supreme Court case in the 1970's that had to do with motorcycles, in which the helmet law was declared unconstitutional. He suspects based on this that we can't make adults wear bicycle helmets if they choose not to.

Mr. Fitch exclaimed that the proposed plan is excellent. He was looking at the cost to construct the bicycle network and make the necessary changes to existing roadways. It seems that the entire project will cost over \$15,000,000 and will take beyond ten years. The City's portion will probably require a tax increase. He asked if they have talked to the Urbana Park District since their tax referendum failed about the amount they would be expected to contribute to the proposed plan. Ms. Black stated that they have not spoken to the Urbana Park District since prior to the tax referendum being denied. However, the Park District has participated throughout the entire process.

Chair Pollock commented that if the City is going to make a financial commitment to this, then it will no doubt have to be built into the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), which is a ten-year horizon. Has there been any discussion at either staff or council level about the willingness to dedicate those funds out ten years to some of the proposals that we are looking at? Mr. Myers stated that for major improvements that the City would be doing would need to be in the Capital Improvements Plan. It is possible that there may be able to be an on-going conversion that would not be considered capital improvements such as stripping. It is also possible that of the \$5.4 million that is the City's projected portion over 10+ years, some of it might actually be able to be the responsibility of major developments that would border on arterial roadways.

In terms of the bigger connector streets and arterials, Chair Pollock inquired as to whether the City currently has a requirement for developers to install bike paths when they construct the road, such as with the extension of Florida Avenue. Mr. Myers stated that we should reference the proposed Bicycle Master Plan in the Urbana Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance to ensure implementation in new developments. Chair Pollock stated that he is not sure how this would address future arterial streets that are not part of the map. How would the City keep the bicycle network if the City continues to expand without requiring the developers to build them in the new developments? Someone mentioned the requirement to connect. The flip side of this is the requirement to build.

Rick Langlois, of 1412 Mayfair Road in Champaign, stated that he is the Chairman of the Champaign County Bike Steering Committee. They have been involved in creating the proposed Urbana Bicycle Master Plan. The idea for the proposed plan came out of the big.small.all Plan that the Champaign County did. It was recognized that the citizens of Champaign County, the City of Champaign, and the City of Urbana want bicycle facilities. On behalf of the Champaign County Bike Steering Committee, they do like the proposed plan quite a lot.

Champaign County Regional Planning Commission and everyone involved has taken 30 years worth of experience from other cities around the country and have done their research and created a great plan. They looked at a variety of services and how to implement the plan. As a result, the proposed plan will make a huge difference in making Urbana a city that is for people.

He mentioned that the City of Champaign recently passed a similar plan. The City of Champaign and the City of Urbana along with the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission have been working together to make sure that the two plans connect.

He feels that the proposed plan will make money for the City. It will make the City really attractive and livable. It will attract people who want to be here and bicycling.

They are currently working to launch an education campaign to make sure that people understand the rules of the road. He pointed out that the Illinois Vehicle Code says that bicycles are vehicles, and bicyclists can go anywhere except on restricted access highways. The proposed plan makes it easier for the B Level riders to want to park the car and ride their bicycles.

Cynthia Hoyle, of 2207 South Cottage Grove, mentioned that when she and her husband were looking to relocate in 2000, they wanted to reduce their auto dependency. The two places they came down to were the City of Urbana and Toronto. Since moving here, they have been able to dramatically decrease their auto use. The City of Urbana has been a community that provides for mobility choices already, and she is very excited about the proposed plan and about the opportunity for our community to be certified as a bicycle friendly community.

She thinks an answer to part of the question and concern about revenues is that there will be more revenues forthcoming from the federal government for facilities for walking and biking. One reason is because the construction of roads is becoming more and more expensive. The highway system is essentially complete and our fuel taxes are not going up, so the federal government is looking for ways to reduce expenditures on roadway building. There are not too many things that are less expensive than bicycling. The other reason is the emphasis on health. The Center for Disease Control has said that obesity is an epidemic in this country. They have

really focused all of their research on our built environment. They feel that our built environment is a major contributor to the problem of obesity, so they working hard on getting communities to be built to allow for and encourage active transportation. We also have the issue of global warming, and the fact that the City of Urbana wants to be a sustainable City. All three of these things converge on providing people with options for active transportation.

She recommended that the City of Urbana adopt a Complete Streets Policy. It would help to address the question of new development that our new collector and arterial streets will be complete streets. It would also address the issue of not only does the City of Urbana require sidewalks for pedestrians, but for new developments we could require infrastructure for bicycling.

She mentioned that she is she is a Transportation Planning Consultant with the Mass Transit District (MTD). They did a survey when creating the miPlan, and they received over 7,000 responses. One of the major reasons people gave for not bicycling is because they do not feel safe. She feels this addresses the concerns of the less experienced cyclists. If there is not a lane or a sign, then they do not feel comfortable or that they have been invited and they do not feel that the roadway is shared with them. They indicated that having facilities for bicycling would help them feel more comfortable with using that mode of transportation.

Susan Jones, the representative for this district to the League of Illinois Bicyclists. When she first started in this position, Champaign and Urbana were most famous for Gary Zeiko's pictures of the hazards of the campus bikepath. This has been an exemplary series of what not to let happen with your bikepaths. Now, Champaign and Urbana are famous for having the most people coming and the most educated and actively involved and sane people working to make real solutions happen.

She suggested that instead of referring to bicycling as recreational or as alternative mode of transportation, we could make it more mainstream to be okay to use a bicycle. Many people look at her as a dynamite intrepid commuter. In fact, she would not be doing this anywhere, but in a place like this where the motorists are reasonable and the roads are already ready for bike paths.

Many people have worked together in creating this plan including bicyclists and people who have done the research. Therefore, she thinks it is an excellent integration of the specific things that bicyclists need and the knowledge and the experience of other places in the state and in the country.

She remarked that bicyclists will fight tooth and nail to keep multi use paths from looking too much like bike paths. Bicyclists would rather ride on the streets. They do not like to have to dodge kids and their strollers on the multi use paths. It hurts bicyclists when they fall down too.

Tom Rauchfuss, of Iowa Street near Carle Park, stated that the part that interests him about the planning processes is its integration with other planning processes that are currently being planned or discussed, such as Ms. Stake mentioned that her group is talking about Carle Park. The proposed plan discusses the eventual integration with the Rails-to-Trails process. He feels these interfaces are particularly important.

The one that interests him is that the Urbana School District is set on changing the high school into a commuter school, whereby they remove a lot of housing and essentially encourage the students to drive cars more. For the reasons Ms. Hoyle mentioned, he thinks it is the wrong move to encourage more driving to the center of town. He wondered if the proposed plan could not somehow inform the Urbana High School's plan for manifest destiny for their cars, because the biggest enemy of bicyclists is avoiding automobiles. It is a lethal encounter. So, when we have more traffic from students driving cars to school, it runs counter to what the bicycle path is all about.

With no further comments or questions from the public, Chair Pollock closed the public input portion of the hearing. He, then, opened the hearing up for Plan Commission discussion. He suggested that they talk more about the procedure.

He mentioned that the case is slated to go to the City Council in March. He asked if the other Plan Commission members were comfortable with voting on and making a recommendation to the City Council during this meeting.

Ms. Stake wondered if Mr. Myers would speak about the issue with Carle Park to get it changed. Mr. Myers explained that the Plan Commission's comments are part of the public process as well as the comments expressed by the public. City staff will take all the comments into consideration and make any necessary changes.

He pointed out that should the Plan Commission recommend approval of the proposed plan during this meeting, the public process is still taking place, so there may be minor adjustments made to the proposed plan afterward. Chair Pollock inquired as to what public process is still on-going. Mr. Myers explained that there is a 30-day public comment period for the proposed plan. This ends on March 17, 2008, and the City Council could conceivably take action on the proposed plan for approval. The Committee of the Whole will likely review this case on March 10, 2008.

Chair Pollock commented that if there is continuing public comment on the proposed plan, and the Plan Commission is responsible for making a recommendation to the City Council, should they not be aware of any future comments made prior to making a recommendation. Mr. Myers replied that the Plan Commission could continue the case to the March 6th Plan Commission meeting, which is a lot closer to the end of the public comment period. The other factor is that if there would be any major change once the Plan Commission makes a recommendation to the City Council, then the case would need to be brought back before the Plan Commission to review that change. Chair Pollock inquired as to who would decide what is a major change. Mr. Myers answered by saying that Libby Tyler, Community Development Director/Zoning Administrator, would make the decision in consultation with other City staff. He feels that minor tweaks could be incorporated without bringing the case back to the Plan Commission.

Chair Pollock questioned what the nature of the 30-day open comment period is. Are those comments coming into the staff at the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission? Are those comments coming into the City's staff in the Community Development Services Department? Ms. Black responded that for the ad that was placed in the News-Gazette regarding the public comment period, the comments would come back to the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission. So far, they have not received any comments. The comment period

began on February 15, 2008. Usually when a document, such as the proposed plan, has gone through a public involvement process, we do not get comments at the end of the process. During the public comment period for the Illinois Route 130 Plan, they did not receive any comments, because it was heavily produced by the public. Chair Pollock agreed that there was clearly an incredible amount of public involvement in producing this plan, so it might very well be that there are no public comments submitted during the 30-day open comment period. However, he suggested leaving the case open until the March 6th meeting. At that meeting, we will invite Ms. Black and Mr. Lewis back to speak again. If there is no further public comment, then perhaps, the Plan Commission might feel more comfortable making a recommendation to the City Council. If there are some comments, then the Plan Commission could discuss this issue again and decide at that point what the proper procedure would be.

Mr. Grosser likes the suggestion. It puts the Plan Commission in a difficult position of approving a plan that may change, and the delineation between what the Plan Commission recommends approval for and what might change probably would not be well communicated to the City Council. So, the City Council could not be clear on what the Plan Commission is necessarily recommending if there are any changes. This would give staff time to research how the traffic counts compare to other places in the City. Mr. Lewis stated that he can answer that now. On Main Street at Lierman Avenue, the traffic count is 7980. At Cottage Grove and Main Street, the traffic count is 10,320. Both places only have two lanes and the traffic count is higher than Race Street.

Ms. Stake agreed with Mr. Pollock's suggestion as well.

Mr. Ward commented that he agrees also. He is even uncomfortable with considering the case at the March 6th meeting, because it would still put them in the position of recommending approval on a plan that could still change. They have heard a lot of positive testimony during this meeting, and he would hate to see some of the good features could be removed for some reason. He does not suspect that this would happen, and he trusts the staff, but it still could happen. So, the Plan Commission is still placing themselves in a position of telling the City Council that they approve something that they do not even know what it is. He supports the plan very strongly. He feels it is a wonderful idea. He has heard some great suggestions of how we could even extend this further, but he is hesitant to recommend approval until it is final.

Ms. Upah-Bant expressed her curiosity as to why the Plan Commission is reviewing the case before the final public comments were in. Is there some urgency to have the City Council approve this by March 21st? Mr. Myers replied that there is not an urgency. They just wanted to follow the timeline that was set up.

Mr. Myers pointed out that there were changes made to Pages 8-11 and 8-48 in the proposed plan. The hard copies of the proposed plan reflect those changes, but the changes are not on the CD that was mailed out in the packet of information. There are some slight technical changes that the Steering Committee is recommending based on their most recent meeting. One change has to do with bicycle parking.

Chair Pollock stated that this is a really good illustration of why he does not want to rush through this before they are prepared to make a recommendation to the City Council. Therefore, he

February 21, 2008

recommended continuing the case to the March 6th Plan Commission meeting. At that point, the Plan Commission can decide what to do in terms of time tables. The Plan Commission agreed.

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING

URBANA PLAN COMMISSION

DRAFT

DATE: March 20, 2008
TIME: 7:30 P.M.
PLACE: Urbana City Building
400 South Vine Street
Urbana, IL 61801

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tyler Fitch, Ben Grosser, Lew Hopkins, Bernadine Stake, James Ward

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Jane Burris, Michael Pollock, Marilyn Upah-Bant, Don White

STAFF PRESENT: Robert Myers, Planning Manager; Teri Andel, Planning Secretary; Jennifer Selby, Civil Engineer

OTHERS PRESENT: Rita Black, Bjorg Holte, Susan Taylor, Ruth Wyman

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m., the roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared present.

In the absence of Michael Pollock, Chairperson for the Plan Commission, Mr. Grosser moved that Mr. Ward serve as Acting Chairperson. Ms. Stake seconded the motion. The Plan Commission agreed by unanimous voice vote.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Stake moved to approve the minutes from the March 6, 2008 meeting as presented. Mr. Grosser seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- ◆ Urbana Bicycle Plan Implementation Matrix
- ◆ Updated Staff Report for Plan Case No. 2059-CP-08 dated February 21, 2008

5. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Plan Case No. 2059-CP-08: A request by the Urbana Zoning Administrator to adopt the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan as an amendment to the 2005 Urbana Comprehensive Plan (as amended) including a Proposed Bicycle Network Map indicating future bicycle routes.

Robert Myers, Planning Manager, presented an update to the City staff report to the Plan Commission. He said that the written staff report, which he handed out prior to the start of the meeting, reiterated what was provided verbally at the previous Plan Commission meeting and highlighted some of the important aspects of the proposed plan.

Public input has been an integral part of the process in creating the proposed plan including creating a Steering Committee, holding a public workshop in May 2007, and holding a follow-up public workshop in December 2007. It also included having a League of Illinois Bicyclist representative on the consultant's team, reviewing the proposed plan with the City of Urbana's Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, conducting an online bike route survey, coordinating with the City of Champaign and the University of Illinois concerning connecting to bicycle routes in their respective jurisdictions, and consulting with other parties such as the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) and members of the League of Illinois Bicyclists.

He noted some of the most salient parts of the plan to review are Figure 8.1: Recommended Bicycle Network and Figures 9.1, 9.2, and 9.3, which show the Bicycle Network Improvements over time.

He stated that the Comprehensive Plan clearly expresses an overall desire that bicycling be a viable form of transportation in the City of Urbana; however, it does not really offer any details on how it can or should be achieved. The proposed Urbana Bicycle Master Plan provides clear and specific means to achieve a future bikeway system.

The Bicycle Network Recommendations were based on the following:

- ◆ Inventory of existing bicycle facilities and roadway characteristics;
- ◆ Existing policies and plans for proposed bikeways;
- ◆ Public input from bicyclists and others on the most desirable routes;
- ◆ Input from public agencies, boards and commissions, including the Urbana Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Committee;
- ◆ Connecting activity centers, major destinations, and neighborhoods;
- ◆ Bicycle Level of Service ratings of A, B, or C for "casual adult cyclists";
- ◆ Spacing of bikeways from 0.5 to 1.0 miles apart;
- ◆ Transportation standards and guidelines which incorporates safety standards.

He referred to Table 9.3: Implementation Matrix by Timeframe on Page 9-16 of the proposed plan. The table divides development of the bicycle network into 0-5 years, 6-10 years and 10+ years. He stated that a lot of the proposed improvements are just repainting of the existing streets. He handed out copies of the "Urbana Bicycle Plan Implementation Matrix", which Jennifer Selby, Civil Engineer for the City of Urbana's Public Works Department created.

In terms of costs, he noted that the two most expensive improvements shown in Table 9.3 are building a sidepath along Route 45/Cunningham Avenue from the Village of Rantoul to the future Olympian Drive (\$4.2 million) and the adding of a sidepath along High Cross Road from Curtis Road to the Village of Philo (\$1.7 million). These are not only in the 10+ year time frame but also outside the City and its future planning area.

In terms of funding, the City of Urbana has been quite successful in the last two years for acquiring grants for bikeways. The City received a \$900,000 grant for Goodwin Avenue and a \$500,000 grant for High Cross Road.

Mr. Myers, then, asked Ms. Selby to talk more about the funding for the proposed improvements.

Ms. Selby approached the Plan Commission to talk more about the handout. She pointed out that \$2,355,904 of the proposed improvements have already been identified in the Capital Improvement Fund (CIP) as part of funded projected.

She noted that the table in the handout is different than the tables in the proposed plan. The handout rearranges the table to show only the City of Urbana and the University of Illinois' projects. Page 2 shows that only \$265,001 of bikeway projects in the next five years haven't been earmarked for funding as part of the Capital Improvements Plan.

She said that City staff is going to apply for a grant for the Main Street project, which will run from Cedar to Scottswood. The grant would be for approximately \$1.5 million. Main Street already has funding set aside, so if the City receives the \$1.5 million grant, then it will be used towards the \$265,001. She pointed out that the majority of the \$265,001 improvements are for bike routes (share the road).

The total funding needed to implement the 6-10 year plan is \$228,560, of which \$2,812 has already been funded. This brings the total cost of the improvements that still need to be funded for the 0-10 year plan to \$493,560. City staff will be applying for grants to cover this amount.

Ms. Selby mentioned that the improvements listed in the 10+ year plan include roads that are not currently in the City of Urbana limits or roads that do not currently even exist yet. Therefore, she does not want the Plan Commission to focus on the 10+ year plan, because it appears to be rather costly and gives the impression that we still need to come up with \$6,036,249. When, in fact, no one knows when the roads will be built or brought into the City, and these improvements are things that would normally be associated with development projects anyway. For example, when building Olympian Drive, the sidewalks or shared use paths would be incorporated, just as drainage, etc. would be.

Mr. Fitch said that he is the Plan Commissioner who raised the question about funding at their previous meeting. He stated that the handout was very helpful. He is glad to see that a lot of the funding has already been identified.

He clarified that at the previous meeting, he meant to say that in general, it is clear that someone is going to have to raise their taxes. He did not mean to imply that it would be the City of Urbana. Clearly, the Urbana Park District's portions of the proposed plan are contingent on them having the necessary resources.

Mr. Myers noted that these numbers will change as the years go by. The matrix is intended to give an order of relative costs. It is not intended to state specifically to the dollar how much the projects would cost. Ms. Selby added that the treatments listed as lanes, the amount shows the cost of the paint. So while they resurface say Philo Road from Pennsylvania to Colorado Avenue, the \$4,500 listed is just the cost of the paint. When we resurface a project, we have to paint it anyway. Therefore, the amount of cost would be less, because there would be some element of stripping anyway.

Mr. Grosser felt that the handout is very helpful and should be helpful to the City Council as well. He noticed an error on the final table. It shows it as being for the 6-10 year plan, but Ms. Selby had referred to it as being the 10+ year plan. Ms. Selby clarified that it should say 10+ year plan.

Mr. Grosser wondered if the City was planning to redo Race Street between Meadowbrook and Curtis Road. Rita Black, of Champaign County Regional Planning, answered that it is just a collection street. It is part of the Greenways and Trails Plan.

Mr. Grosser asked if all of the sidepaths in the 10+ year plan, which are the bulk of the costs, are on streets that are already built and not going to be changed in anyway. Ms. Selby reviewed each improvement listed under the 10+ year plan noting whether or not each would require road improvements and the reason why each is on the 10+ year plan. Mr. Grosser stated that he just wanted to get a sense of how much money the City is hoping would come along for roads that are not going to get improved to build sidepaths next to them. It appears there are only two. Ms. Selby pointed out that the more bike paths the City gets in place, the better our chance is of getting grants to make the connections.

Mr. Fitch wondered if there would be a sidepath along University Avenue. Ms. Selby replied that it would be the rail trail.

Mr. Grosser expressed a concern about the issue with the trail going or not going through the Urbana High School and Middle School campuses. In looking at the plan, it appears that there will be a big hole in the middle of the bike network without this connection. How do we fix this issue?

Mr. Myers responded that they had looked at extending it through the High School and Middle School campuses, but after further inquiry with the school district, it is not workable. It is not just a policy question, but also a physical barrier, because the Urbana School District has plans to build across where the bike path would go. So instead of a through path, bikeways will be leading to and from a major traffic generator – the school.

Mr. Grosser wondered if City staff had considered removing parking on Race Street in this stretch. Ms. Selby explained that even with the removal of parking, the street would not be wide enough for bike lanes. They also use Race Street to stack buses. She did not know what the Urbana School District had planned.

Mr. Grosser recalled talking about developers being held responsible to provide bike path connections and facilities in future developments at the previous Plan Commission meeting. Elizabeth Tyler wrote in a memo responding to the concerns and questions of the Plan

Commission that a simple amendment to the Urbana Subdivision and Land Development Code could enforce this idea. He asked if the simple amendment would ensure connectivity. Mr. Myers answered that the first step is to adopt the proposed plan as an element of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. In the Subdivision and Land Development Code there currently are various places where it requires developments to comply with the Urbana Comprehensive Plan, including any successive amendments. The other thing is that the proposed plan has some segments that new development would have to contribute towards. Finally, most development along the fringes of the City of Urbana is done through annexation agreements. Annexation agreements spell out which parties are responsible for certain improvements. This would include bikeways.

Mr. Grosser inquired as to whether there is language in the Subdivision and Land Development Code that states that future developed streets should connect to existing streets. Mr. Myers said yes. He mentioned that City staff could also add an additional section or line in the Subdivision Regulations to strengthen the language further, and that could take place following approval of the Bike Plan. We also have Appendix D, the Mobility Map, in the Comprehensive Plan that is a skeletal framework for how the City of Urbana will grow. It is a blueprint for the major arterial and collector streets.

Mr. Grosser questioned whether the Traffic Commission has reviewed the proposed bike plan at all? Ms. Selby answered by saying that Joe Smith, Senior Civil Engineer, serves on the Traffic Commission, and has not looked at it. Council member, Dennis Roberts, serves on the Traffic Commission, and she assumes he has reviewed it as the rest of the Council members have. They sent a copy to Mike Bily, Chief of Police, who is the other member of the Traffic Commission. In addition, they sent a copy to the Fire Department, who responded and said that they do not have any problems with the proposed plan.

Mr. Grosser asked who in the City staff deals with traffic flow. Ms. Selby replied that would be Mr. Smith. She does not believe that he has read the entire plan. She stated that the Traffic Commission is scheduled to meet on Tuesday, March 25, 2008, and City staff plans to discuss the removal of parking on Main Street, so they can begin applying for the grant to cover those improvements.

She mentioned that when there is a road diet, the Public Works Department has software that they can use to tell them whether the street will fail or not. She noted that they plan to do this with each of these projects listed in the matrix tables.

Ms. Stake commented that one thing that was discussed is requiring complete streets for all new developments. Mr. Myers responded that we need to approach complete streets smartly in terms of what is realistic about what roadways could accommodate complete streets. We are looking at a network where the facilities are spaced a half mile to a mile apart. So, if we have a blanket requirement that every new street become a complete street, bikeway segments might be provided outside the proposed network. The other thing is that we need to have complete streets installed where it is realistic to do so, where there is enough width for the bikeways and for pedestrian paths or whatever those additional facilities may be. Acting Chairperson Ward added that complete streets goes far beyond simply bicycles. Therefore, it would not be appropriate for a bicycle ordinance to go beyond the scope of the plan. It needs to be a more comprehensive approach to planning.

Ms. Stake commented that maybe it should not be part of the proposed plan. Maybe it should be in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Fitch said that he bikes through the Urbana High School and Middle School campuses all of the time. He understands that Vine Street is too busy, especially in the morning and when school lets out in the afternoon. The Washington Street/Vine Street four-way stop is very busy as well, and it is a problematic intersection. Although it is beyond the scope of the proposed plan to talk about whether the stop signs will be sufficient, he feels it should be on someone's radar screen to at least monitor the intersection. Acting Chairperson Ward commented that he feels that the Plan Commission has identified this particular area of the City as one that needs some consideration in terms of connectivity of bike paths. He understood the school also being concerned about school safety with a thoroughfare running through their campus, especially if they change it to a closed-campus. He is willing to defer to the Urbana School District's interest at this particular point.

With no further questions for City staff, Acting Chairperson Ward opened the public hearing up to gather input from the audience.

Bjorg Holte, of 1001 North High Cross Road, asked who the Zoning Administrator is. Mr. Myers replied that the City of Urbana's Zoning Administrator is Elizabeth Tyler. Ms. Tyler is also the Director of Community Development Services Department.

Ms. Holte read the paragraph from the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan Comments on Page 3, which states as follows:

Comment: Regarding High Cross Road north of I-74, [we] agree that it is important to preserve the natural setting of the roadway, which was expressed in the Urbana Comprehensive Plan 2005 and the High Cross Road Corridor Study after significant public input. In the Urbana Bike Plan there is a statement about adding bike lanes on the bridge if it is rebuilt. That statement could cause confusion that we recommend rebuilding the bridge or even widening the roadway or opening up High Cross Road to more cars north of I-74. I suggest to avoid this confusion we add a statement such as "Please refer to the Urbana Comprehensive Plan 2005 or the High Cross Road Corridor Study for information about retaining the rural, natural setting of High Cross Road north of I-74". [The Plan Commissioner] also had the suggestion of considering a side-path on that stretch in the future.

She also read the following paragraph from the same page:

The following text will be added to Section 8.1.26 (page 8-21) of the Bicycle Master Plan:

At the first public workshop for the Bike Master Plan process, attendees were broken up into groups geographically. There were two groups that represented Northeast Urbana – an area defined as North of I-74 east of Cunningham, PLUS Beringer Commons & Edgewood (east of University Ave. spur to I-74 and north

of University Ave.). Both groups identified the I-74 overpass as an obstacle to safe bicycling on High Cross Road (See A1-2). Group 2b marked "Safe passage over interstate" on their group map (See A1-4). Group 2b also prioritized the overpass of High Cross Road over I-74 as their second prioritized issue (See A1-5). The recommendation to provide a safe crossing of High Cross Road over I-74 upon any future bridge reconstruction project is consistent with the public comment received. It is also consistent with the IL 130/High Cross Road Corridor Plan.

She commented that she participated in the IL 130/High Cross Road Corridor Plan Study. She understood that north of Route 150, High Cross Road is to stay as is and not to be developed or widened. So, she did not feel that the last paragraph that she read is what the public attending the study workshops had in mind. She feels that the first paragraph more expresses their goal. Therefore, she suggested that the Plan Commission delete the last paragraph and to add the first paragraph read.

Acting Chairperson Ward remarked that the proposed comments are a proposal for an addition to the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan. The Master Plan already is fairly clear on what happens north of Interstate 74 on High Cross Road. The proposed comments do not change anything. They are merely an addendum.

Ms. Holte referred to Page 8-21 of the proposed Urbana Bicycle Master Plan. Under 8.1.26 High Cross Road (IL 130), the third bullet point states, "*Over Interstate 74: Provide a safe crossing of I-74 upon any future bridge reconstruction project. Coordinate with IDOT.*" She did not know whether this appeared in either the 2005 Comprehensive Plan or the IL 130/High Cross Road Corridor Plan. So, does this mean that the City is planning to change these two documents regarding this issue? Acting Chairperson Ward said no. There are no plans to change the bridge at this point. If at some point in the future, there is a plan to change the bridge, then it should be made safe for bicyclists.

Ms. Holte wondered if the change would be made part of the Comprehensive Plan. Acting Chairperson Ward said no. No one is suggesting that change now. At this point, there are no plans to change the bridge. If some future group a year from now, 10 years from now, or 20 years from now decides to change the bridge, the City is only recommending that the new bridge be made bicycle safe.

With no further comments, Acting Chairperson Ward closed the public input portion of the hearing. He, then, opened the hearing up for any questions, discussions, and/or motions by the Plan Commission on this particular case.

Ms. Stake agreed with Ms. Holte in that the High Cross problem has been with us for a long time. People worked very hard when the City developed the 2005 Comprehensive Plan to make sure that the area on north High Cross Road would be protected.

She referred to Section 21-3 Scope on Page 2 of the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan Comments handout. It states as follows:

Section 21-3 Scope.

- (C) *The requirements, standards and specifications of this chapter do not relieve the developer of compliance with any other applicable requirements which regulate land development, including but not limited to:*
- (1) *The Urbana Official Comprehensive Plan, 1982, as may be amended;*

She suggested changing “1982” to “2005”, since we recently updated the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Myers explained that this is the actual wording in the Subdivision and Land Development Code. City staff is currently working on updating the Subdivision and Land Development Code to incorporate changes and updated references such as this.

Acting Chairperson Ward inquired if according to the statute, the 2005 Comprehensive Plan is an amendment to the 1982 Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Stake expressed that she did not understand how the Official Comprehensive Plan could be 1982. Mr. Myers explained that this was the date of the Comprehensive Plan in place at the time when the Subdivision and Land Development Code Ordinance was last adopted. Ms. Stake wondered about the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Myers pointed out that Section 21-3 Scope does say “*as may be amended*”. This refers to later changes in the Comprehensive Plan, so it would take into consideration the 2005 Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Stake expressed her concern about the wording in the last paragraph that Ms. Holte had read earlier. The bridge reconstruction should not be the project. It should talk about putting in a sidepath. The wording makes it look like they are planning to expand the bridge to more lanes. More lanes mean more traffic, and then, with more traffic come more problems with trying to preserve the natural setting of High Cross Road. Ms. Black clarified that they are not proposing bike lanes at all on this particular segment of the roadway. They are proposing that bicyclists and motor vehicles share the road. They are also not proposing any additional bicycle facility in the area. The idea of improving the bridge, if ever, is to widen it to meet the current standards. Right now, each lane measures 10 to 11 feet in width. The regular width of a lane should be 11 feet to be safe for any traffic to cross over the bridge.

Ms. Black noted that they do not want to add a sidepath, because it would only be problematic for the bicycle traffic to merge back onto the shared roadway. If they provide a sidepath over the bridge, then they would need to provide a sidepath the entire length of IL Route 130/High Cross Road segment to the north. They do not want this. Ms. Stake asked why not. Ms. Black explained the reason is because there is no right-of-way available to provide for a sidepath. There are houses located near the roadway that would not allow them to use the right-of-way for sidepaths.

Ms. Stake commented that if they wanted to widen the road, then they would find a way to do it. Why should it be different for sidepaths? Bicycles are just as important as cars. So, a sidepath in this nice historic area would be a good idea. Acting Chairperson Ward clarified that Ms. Black was trying to say that there is not sufficient right-of-way. Ms. Black added that it might be a good idea, but it would be really expensive to get the right-of-way to provide for a sidepath. In order to keep the area low volume of traffic, they do not want to widen the road. Low volume of traffic hopefully means it will be easier and safer for bicycles and vehicles to share the road.

Acting Chairperson Ward remarked that obtaining the right-of-ways would also involve infringe upon property owners' property.

Ms. Black said that this is why it is not viable to have sidepaths over the bridge. It would be really difficult for bicyclists to reconnect to the shared roadway, and it would be confusing to drivers as well. So, they are proposing that, if ever the bridge is reconstructed, that they consider widening the lanes a little and leave it as a shared path. Mr. Myers stated that a shared road means putting up signs saying that bicycles and motor vehicles share the same lanes.

Mr. Fitch said that they could strike the language. Or is the purpose to indicate that they only plan to share the road until or unless some unforeseen reconstruction of the bridge happens? Acting Chairperson Ward mentioned that if you read this carefully, the Comments handout is a reporting of what took place at one of the study workshops. It is not a policy statement. Ms. Stake argued that it will be if it is approved. Mr. Ward does not feel that there is a policy statement in the paragraph. The purpose of the paragraph being included in the proposed Bicycle Master Plan he assumed would be to show the people that attended the study workshop that their comments were heard. He has no problem with taking the paragraph out, because he feels it does nothing either positively or negatively. Mr. Fitch agreed.

Mr. Hopkins pointed out that on Page 8-21 of the proposed Urbana Bicycle Master Plan, where the paragraph would be inserted, there is a policy statement. It states as such, "*Provide a safe crossing of I-74 upon any future bridge reconstruction project. Coordinate with IDOT*". He understands Ms. Stake's and Ms. Holte's concern, but bridges do not last forever. Bridges get reconstructed even to be exactly what they were before. Therefore, it does seem to him to be appropriate to have it included in the proposed plan to have it as a reminder that this area is a high demand bicycle point and a bottleneck. When we rebuild the bridge, we should redesign it to be consistent with the type of bicycle path being used, which at the moment is a shared path.

He feels that the Plan Commission is arguing more about what the policy statement is rather than the last paragraph being added. He feels that the policy statement should be kept in, and he would be happy putting the additional paragraph in as well, because it is explanatory and does give feedback to the public participants that they are being listened to. It also might help explain why the policy statement is included in the plan, since we do not have similar statements for every single road and bridge reconstruction in the City. Mr. Fitch agreed and feels that the statement should be left alone.

Mr. Ward pointed out that at the moment, there has been no motion made to approve the proposed plan. Therefore, there is nothing to amend. If there was a motion and someone wanted to propose an amendment, then this might be the way to expedite this particular issue. Mr. Hopkins asked if the current status of what they would vote on if someone made a motion to recommend this case to the City Council would include the underline paragraphs in the Comments handout. Acting Chairperson Ward said yes.

Mr. Grosser moved that the Plan Commission forward Plan Case No. 2059-CP-08 to the City Council with a recommendation of approval with the specific changes underlined in the addendum titled "Urbana Bicycle Master Plan Comments" and dated March 14, 2008. Mr. Fitch seconded the motion.

Mr. Grosser spoke about his motion. He strongly agrees with Mr. Hopkins. He feels that the statement listed on Page 8-21 in the proposed plan about the bridge is simply saying that when the bridge is reconstructed, we should make sure that it is safe and consistent with the shared path that leads to and away from the bridge.

Ms. Stake moved to amend the motion to add the March 1, 2008 comment to the proposed plan and remove the suggested underlined text in the last paragraph on Page 3 of the handout. With no second, the motion to amend died.

Ms. Stake moved to amend the motion to add the March 1, 2008 comment to the proposed plan. With no second, the motion to amend died.

Mr. Grosser feels that the City Traffic Engineer should be asked to review the proposed plan and give approval. Mr. Ward asked if it was on the agenda to discuss the proposed plan at the next Traffic Commission meeting. Ms. Selby said no. They were planning on discussing the removal of parking on Main Street to allow room for bike paths.

Roll call on the motion was as follows:

Mr. Fitch	-	Yes	Mr. Grosser	-	Yes
Mr. Hopkins	-	Yes	Ms. Stake	-	No
Mr. Ward	-	Yes			

The motion was approved by a vote of 4 ayes to 1 nay.

Mr. Myers noted that this case will go before the City Council on April 7, 2008. City Council has already had a detailed briefing on the proposed plan already at a previous Committee of the Whole meeting.

6. OLD BUSINESS

There was none.

7. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

8. NEW BUSINESS

There was none.

9. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was none.

10. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Myers, Planning Manager, reported on the following topics:

- ◆ Major Variance request by the Vermilion Development, Inc. to allow a setback encroachment will go before the City Council on March 24, 2008. They are proposing a three-story commercial building with retail on the first and offices on the second and third floors at the southwest corner of Lincoln and University Avenues.
- ◆ Major Variance request by the Atkins Group to allow an LED sign at The Pines will go before the City Council on March 24, 2008. They are proposing one shopping center sign with a message board that changes every ten seconds in lieu of having other signs for each store/tenant.
- ◆ 2008 Official Zoning Map Annual Review will go before the City Council on March 24, 2008.
- ◆ A budget amendment for the University Avenue Corridor Study will go before the City Council on March 24, 2008. This is a corridor project between Cunningham Avenue and Downtown Champaign along University Avenue. It concerns both what should happen within the right-of-way and also development potential/opportunities for selected areas within the corridor.
- ◆ A Historic Preservation Landmark Application for the Historic Lincoln Hotel has been submitted and will be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission on April 2, 2008.
- ◆ Menards will be submitting a formal submission of plans and an annexation agreement for review and approval.

11. STUDY SESSION

There was none.

12. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Myers, AICP
Secretary, Urbana Plan Commission