

URBANA TRAFFIC COMMISSION
Tuesday, November 15, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Madigan, City Council Member, Ward 6, Chair
Craig Shonkwiler, Assistant City Engineer
Pat Connolly, Police Chief

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

OTHERS PRESENT:

John Collins, Operations Manager
Robin Shaw, 903 Crestwood Drive
Helen Saddoris, 807 South Wabash Avenue
Carrie Wilson, 711 South Lynn Street
Gerald Graner, 709 South Lynn Street

The meeting began at 5:04 p.m. The meeting was held at the Urbana City Council Chambers, 400 South Vine Street, Urbana, Illinois 61801.

Approval of Minutes:

Craig Shonkwiler moved to approve the minutes of the September 13, 2016 meeting. Pat Connolly seconded the motion. The Commission voted 3-0 to approve the minutes of the September meeting.

Additions to the agenda:

There were no additions to the agenda.

Public Input

Those attending asked to speak during the time the items were discussed.

Unfinished Business

Item #1- Update on the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan.

Craig Shonkwiler reviewed past discussions of the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan stating that the Urbana Traffic Commission did not endorse specific recommendations of the plan, but that the Commission did support the plan in theory. He explained that the Commission would not be asked to endorse specific recommendations of the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan at the time of the November meeting since the Traffic Commission was charged with reviewing those

recommendations as each one was to be implemented. As an update, Mr. Shonkwiler said that some comments made by Alderman Charlie Smyth and Mr. Jeff Yockey of Champaign County Bikes were incorporated into the plan. Mr. Shonkwiler detailed the changes as 1) the addition of a more visionary executive summary to the document, 2) inclusion of Vision Zero goals, 3) an increase in the goal for mode share for bicycles, and 4) a reduction in crashes. He added that the plan was to go before the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission later in the evening. He continued by stating that the plan would be heard before the Urbana Plan Commission on December 8th and then heard before the Committee of the Whole and possibly by the City Council if recommended by the Committee of the Whole.

Michael Madigan asked if there were any substantive changes to the plan.

Mr. Shonkwiler said that the increase in mode share and reduction in crashes with bicyclists were the significant changes. He added that reduction in speed limits might help achieve the goal of increased mode share.

Mr. Madigan said that it would be interesting to know the costs associated with restriping roads for bicycle infrastructure.

Mr. Shonkwiler stated that the goals were points to strive toward, but that the plan for the bicycle network had not changed. He said he would research Vision Zero to see how it could be applied.

Mr. Madigan said that goals were good, but he was concerned about the future impact of the enhancements on motorists.

New Business

Item #2- Discussion of parking restrictions on Webber Street, Lynn Street and Wabash Avenue between Washington Street and Oregon Street.

Craig Shonkwiler summarized a concern received by Kyle Hensch from the Urbana Fire Department. Mr. Shonkwiler said that as a result of a fire engine being unable to access Lynn Street during an emergency call, Mr. Hensch asked the Commission to consider parking restrictions on Lynn Street to allow parking on one side of the street and access for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Hensch explained that firefighters were responding to a health call on August 29, 2016, and were unable to travel on Lynn Street between Washington Street and Oregon Street because two vehicles were parked directly across from one another. He added that if they had an incident where an aerial ladder truck was needed, they would need at least 14 feet of road width.

Michael Madigan asked if the equipment was getting bigger.

Kyle Hensch said that the engines were bigger to accommodate the equipment's safety features. He said that the cab was eight and a half feet wide and firefighters needed to be able to open the doors on both sides.

Helen Saddoris recalled that she had attended a prior Traffic Commission meeting where the same issue was discussed. Ms. Saddoris expressed the same concerns as she had expressed at an earlier meeting about the ability of ambulances, fire trucks and snow plows to get through.

Mr. Shonkwiler asked if Ms. Saddoris had a preferred side for the restrictions.

Ms. Saddoris said that she would prefer parking on the west side. She asked if the residents could receive some notice before the restrictions were installed.

Michael Madigan said that the residents would be notified.

Robin Shaw expressed concern about parking on both sides of any narrow street. Ms. Shaw said that the street where she lived (Crestwood) was narrow and parking on both sides made travel difficult when cars parked directly across from one another. She asked why the City did not require vehicles to move off the road when construction or snow removal occurred. Ms. Shaw said that she did not want to bother the Police Department about the parked cars narrowing access, but she felt it was unsafe.

Chief Connolly urged Ms. Shaw to notify the Police Department when she saw violations and not to worry about whether the call would be a bother to the Police. He continued that bringing the situation to the Police's attention might allow the Police to take action to avoid an accident.

Craig Shonkwiler explained that the City did temporarily restrict parking when working on street projects. Mr. Shonkwiler indicated that private utilities determine whether or not they can safely work in the street without closing lanes and/or streets. He said that citizens could contact the Public Works Department if there were concerns about safety.

Ms. Shaw said that she had to change her travel route during the water company's repairs to avoid an area she felt was unsafe.

John Collins stated that maintaining a minimum of 12 feet of clearance for snow removal would be preferred. He said that the Operations Division would prefer parking be restricted to one side for Webber Street, Lynn Street, and Wabash Avenue.

Gerald Graner stated that parking was restricted on the east side of Lynn Street south of Washington Street. He asked if it would work to continue the restriction to the east side on Lynn Street north of Washington Street.

Mr. Shonkwiler stated that maintaining parking restrictions on the same side was not mandated since there was a stop sign on Lynn Street at Washington Street to help motorists adjust to parking restrictions on the opposite side if it was decided that parking would be restricted on the west side of Lynn Street north of Washington Street.

Mr. Graner stated that he would prefer that the parking restriction for Lynn Street north of Washington Street be on the east side.

Craig Shonkwiler reviewed the observations made by the Engineering Division staff. He stated that Webber Street, Lynn Street and Wabash Avenue from Oregon Street to Washington Street were all streets with curb and gutters and 25 feet in width with 8-foot wide parking areas, which left nine feet of clearance for moving vehicles when parking occurred on both sides. He mentioned that when the issue regarding parking restrictions was first heard by the Traffic Commission, the request included additional streets (Urbana Avenue, Maple Street and Grove Street). He said that Council approved parking restrictions on the west side of Urbana Avenue, on the east side of Maple Street and on the west side of Grove Street in October 2012. (He added that those three streets were the same width as Webber Street, Lynn Street and Wabash Avenue.) He said that parking restrictions were approved on the east side of Anderson Street in February 1958. Mr. Shonkwiler stated that staff calculated the current number of available for each side of each street.

Webber Street

West side—19

East side—13

Lynn Street

West side—21

East side—18

Wabash Avenue

West side—17

East side—21

Mr. Shonkwiler suggested that in making the decision about parking restrictions, consideration should be given to where fire hydrants were located (since parking would not be allowed within ten feet of a fire hydrant), the number of spaces being removed (removing the least number of spaces would be preferred) and possibly the location of streetlight poles (since the no parking signs could be installed on the streetlight poles instead of adding more posts on the street).

Michael Madigan stated that the analysis to determine the best condition for public safety vehicles should be the overriding priority with less concern about individual convenience.

Craig Shonkwiler mentioned that previous meeting minutes stated that the delay in response time to an emergency could be as much as three to four minutes.

Kyle Hensch recommended that restricting the parking on the side where the fire hydrants were located would be best.

Michael Madigan asked if Public Works and Fire, and possibly Police, could determine the best action regarding on which side parking should be restricted.

Pat Connolly moved to restrict parking to one side of the street on Webber Street, Lynn Street and Wabash Avenue between Washington Street and Oregon Street based upon the recommendation of City staff.

Craig Shonkwiler seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 3-0. City staff will meet to discuss which side of each street will have parking restricted. This item will go to Council for consideration.

An e-mail from Lisa Powers was read into the record. Ms. Powers agreed with the recommendation to restrict parking as Webber Avenue was too narrow for parking on both sides.

Item #3- Discussion of traffic concerns on Washington Street in front of Dr. Williams Elementary School.

Craig Shonkwiler discussed concerns from Ms. JaNelle Pleasure regarding obstructions to the school speed feedback signs and speeding vehicles in the school zone on Washington Street near the Dr. Williams Elementary School. (Mr. Shonkwiler shared pictures provided by Ms. Pleasure of the trees near the school speed feedback signs.)

Michael Madigan mentioned that the pictures sent by Ms. Pleasure showed the signs from the vantage of the grass between the sidewalk and the street, not from the vantage of the street.

Mr. Shonkwiler said that staff looked at the visibility distances. He defined visibility distance as the distance from the time a motorist saw the sign until the motorist could react to the sign and stop. He said that staff used distances for 30 miles per hour since the driver would require a longer distance to react than the driver travelling 20 miles per hour would need. He added that the observations were made from the street where vehicles would be travelling and not from the sidewalk. He stated that staff's review determined that the signs were visible even for motorists going 30 miles per hour. He said that if there had been a visibility issue, the Arbor Division would have been asked to remove any obstructions caused by the trees.

In response to concerns about speeding vehicles, Mr. Shonkwiler reviewed the results of a speed study conducted on Washington Street in front of Dr. Williams Elementary School. He said that the study was performed on Thursday, September 15, 2016, for a 24-hour period. He mentioned that the speed was posted at 30 miles per hour with a 20 mile-per-hour school speed zone on school days when students were present. He said that school speed feedback signs were active in the morning and afternoon and for a short period during the noon hour when students were travelling to and from school. He reported that during the 24-hour period of the study, the violation rate was over 50% for both the eastbound and westbound traffic. He said that during that 24-hour period, the 85th percentile speeds were 36.2 miles per hour for eastbound traffic and 35.3 miles per hour for westbound traffic. During the 20 mile-per-hour morning time frame, the violation rate for eastbound traffic was 62.3%; westbound traffic violation rate was 47.2% and during the 20 mile-per-hour afternoon time frame, the violation rate for eastbound traffic was 78.3%; westbound traffic violation rate was 60%. . Mr. Shonkwiler recommended that since the speed averages were more than five miles over the posted speed limits, action should be taken.

Chief Connolly said that he would assign officers to STEP detail in that area during school hours.

Craig Shonkwiler said that at the time when the road diet was installed on Washington Street from Philo Road to Smith Road, a speed study was not conducted, so it was not known if the road diet slowed speeds.

Michael Madigan said that it was unknown whether or not the road diet reduced speeds, but there appeared to be a need for STEP enforcement. He added that the road diet had reduced the number of vehicle lanes for students to cross.

Pat Connolly moved to assign STEP detail to Washington Street near Dr. Williams Elementary School.

Craig Shonkwiler seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 3-0.

Item #4- Discussion of traffic control at Main Street and Smith Road.

Brian Nightlinger expressed concerns about traffic at Main Street and Smith Road. He stated that from Vine Street to the eastern City limits, there were few north/south roads connecting University Avenue to the city of Urbana. He said that Smith Road was one roadway that connected University Avenue to Main Street and that during peak hours, traffic stacked up on Smith Road—sometimes backing up west onto University Avenue. Chief Nightlinger noted that motorists were impatient waiting on Smith Road. He added that there was foot traffic from the Scottswood neighborhood, with people walking in the street. He also noted that there were bus stops near the intersection, which added to the congestion. Chief Nightlinger said that walking across Main Street to Weaver Park was dangerous since motorists traveled above the speed limit.

Craig Shonkwiler reviewed the Manual on Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) guidelines for the installation of multi-way stop signs. Mr. Shonkwiler explained that the MUTCD was a manual containing national standards for traffic control. He reported that the speed limit on Main Street was posted at 35 miles per hour and the speed limit, which was not posted, on Smith Road was 30 miles per hour. Regarding warrant for traffic signals (Criterion A), he said that the intersection did warrant traffic signals, but that did not mean that traffic signals would be added to control traffic at this intersection since the peak times when the warrant was met were very short and could be controlled with stop signs. Another aspect of the intersection that was reviewed was the number of correctable crashes that occurred at the intersection in any given year. Mr. Shonkwiler said that in 2014, there were five accidents within a 12-month period that might have been corrected with the installation of stop signs, so that warrant was met for Criterion B. He further explained that three of the accidents resulted in rear-end crashes when motorists on Smith Road started to pull into the intersection, failed to find gaps in traffic on Main Street, stopped and were hit by the vehicles behind them; two of the accidents resulted in crashes when vehicles were turning from Smith Road to Main Street and did not have the gaps to enter the intersection resulting in collisions with vehicles on Main Street. When collecting data for minimum volumes, Mr. Shonkwiler said that the 85-percentile speed for westbound traffic on Main Street was 42.3 miles per hour in a 35 mile-per-hour zone. He added that the 85-percentile speed exceeding 40 miles per hour was critical to the study since it allowed the minimum benchmark numbers to be reduced to 70% because a stop sign

could create gaps for vehicles on Smith Road turning onto Main Street (Criterion C.3). He added that minimum volumes were met during the period studied (443 units per hour during an eight-hour period measured on Main Street exceeded the 300-unit average for any eight-hour period; and 233 units per hour for an eight-hour period measured on Smith Road exceeded the 200-unit average for a minor street). Mr. Shonkwiler admitted that the reduced delay time was not met (70% of 30 seconds equals 21 seconds), but the delay time did exceed 32 seconds for one 15-minute period and was close to 20 seconds on average (19.7%). He explained that an average 20-second delay during an hour would be enough to warrant stop signs considering all of the other factors. He said that Engineering Division staff recommended the installation of stop signs on Main Street at Smith Road.

Pat Connolly asked how many warrants were needed to be met to justify the installation of the multi-way stop signs.

Craig Shonkwiler said that one warrant would be enough.

Chief Connolly confirmed that three warrants were met for the installation of multiple stop signs at the intersection of Main Street and Smith Road.

Michael Madigan said that travel on that stretch was problematic and difficult to negotiate at times. He agreed that the intersection should be a three-way stop based upon the results of the study.

Pat Connolly moved to install stop signs on Main Street at Smith Road.

Craig Shonkwiler seconded the motion.

The motion passed 3-0.

This item will go to Council for consideration.

Item #5- Discussion of traffic control at Tatman Court and Industrial Circle.

Craig Shonkwiler reviewed a concern regarding right-of-way at the intersection of Tatman Court and Industrial Circle. He stated that a motorist had almost been hit by an eastbound vehicle while leaving the post office on Tatman Court. At that time, he said that the intersection was uncontrolled--there were no stop signs at the intersection. Mr. Shonkwiler explained that a stop sign could be warranted at the intersection of a minor road and a major road where the installation of a stop sign would define right-of-way. He said that the intersection of Tatman Court and Industrial Circle met that warrant.

Michael Madigan said that future growth in the area may require review of the intersection at a later date.

Pat Connolly moved to install a stop sign for eastbound traffic on Tatman Court at Industrial Circle.

Craig Shonkwiler seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 3-0.

This item will go to Council for consideration.

With no other business at hand, the meeting was adjourned at 6:04 p.m.

The next regularly scheduled Traffic Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 13, 2016, at 4:00 p.m. at the Urbana Public Works Department, 706 South Glover Avenue, second floor conference room.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Stiehl
Recording Secretary

Dear Commission Members:

I likely will not be able to attend the Nov. 15 special meeting concerning parking restrictions on Webber, Lynn and Wabash streets, so am writing in advance to convey my views. I reside at XXX Webber Street.

Five or six years ago I was one of several residents who proposed that parking be restricted to one side of Webber Street (and I believe Lynn and Wabash were part of the proposal). There was a well-attended public meeting with divided views, and I recall that some city officials denied that the parking situation was a problem for emergency vehicles, snow plows and street sweepers. The Commission ultimately rejected the proposal.

I can tell you from having lived here for over 10 years that Webber Street is too narrow for parking on both sides. I am glad to know that the Commission is revisiting the issue with more serious consideration in light of the Fire Department's experience. There is no good reason to allow parking on both sides of the street to continue. I am hopeful that you will approve the restrictions.

Very truly yours,

Lisa M Power

Stiehl, Barb

From: Shonkwiler, Craig
Sent: Wednesday, November 23, 2016 10:46 AM
To: Stiehl, Barb
Subject: FW: Webber - Lynn - Wabash Parking Restrictions

Barb,
See below for the parking prohibition locations.
Craig

From: Hensch, Kyle
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2016 5:55 PM
To: Shonkwiler, Craig
Cc: Nightlinger, Brian; Gray, William; Collins, William (John)
Subject: Re: Webber - Lynn - Wabash Parking Restrictions

Craig, I concur with your recommendations. Thank you.

Kyle Hensch
Division Chief
Urbana Fire Department

On Nov 17, 2016, at 4:35 PM, Shonkwiler, Craig <ceshonkwiler@urbanaindinois.us> wrote:

At Tuesday's meeting the Traffic Commission approved no parking restrictions on Webber, Lynn, and Wabash between Washington and Oregon. The commission left it up to Public Works and the Fire Department to decide what side to remove parking.

For your reference here is a table showing the available number of parking spaces and the side any fire hydrants are currently located on:

	Parking Spaces	
	West Side	East Side
Webber St	19	13*
Lynn St	21	18*
Wabash St	17*	21

*Fire Hydrant on this side

My recommendation is to remove parking on:

The east side of Webber – less available parking spaces and mid-block fire hydrant on this side
The east side of Lynn – less available parking spaces and end of block fire hydrant on this side
The west side of Wabash – less available spaces and mid-block fire hydrant on this side

Please let me know if you concur with this recommendation.

Thanks,
Craig

Speed Study Summary

Washington Street E of Kinch St at Dr. Williams School
Thursday September 15, 2016
City Staff

Time Period	Duration	Speed Limit	% Exceeding Speed Limit		85th Percentile Speed	
			Eastbound	Westbound	Eastbound	Westbound
12:00 pm to 12:00 pm	24 hour	30 mph	57.8%	49.4%	36.2 mph	35.3 mph
7:30 am to 8:30 am	1 hour	20 mph	62.3%	47.2%	26.6 mph	23.9 mph
2:30 pm to 3:30 pm	1 hour	20 mph	78.3%	60.0%	28.4 mph	25.9 mph

Speed Feedback Sign On & Off Times

7:30 am to 9:10 am
11:20 am to 11:40 am
12:50 pm to 1:10 pm
2:30 pm to 3:40 pm

MUTCD 2009 Criteria for Multi-Way Stop Control Intersection

Intersection:	Smith Road & Main Street	Date:	11/15/2016
Major Street:	Main Street	Analyst:	Craig Shonkwiler
Major Street Speed:	35 mph (posted), WB 85th 42.3 mph	Agency:	City of Urbana
Minor Street:	Smith Road	Traffic Count Date:	8/30/2016
Minor Street Speed:	30 mph (prima facie)		

MUTCD Multi-way Stop Installation Guidance, Section 2B.07		Comment	Warrant Met?
A. Where traffic control signals are justified, the multi-way stop is an interim measure that can be installed quickly to control traffic while arrangements are being made for the installation of the traffic control signal.		Traffic signal warrants #1A & #2 were met.	Yes
B. Five or more reported crashes in a 12-month period that are susceptible to correction by a multi-way stop installation. Such crashes include right-turn and left-turn collisions as well as right-angle collisions.		Five crashes were reported in a 12-month period in 2014. All five crashes are susceptible to correction by a multi-way stop installation. Three were rear-end crashes in which the front driver had pulled forward to assess traffic and two were turning crashes.	Yes
C. Minimum Volumes:			
1. The vehicular volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 300 vehicles per hour for any 8 hours of an average day; and		The vehicular volume entering from the major street approaches averaged 443 vehicles per hour for the highest 8 hours and the combined vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volume entering the intersection from the minor approaches averaged 233 units per hour for the same 8 hours. <u>The average delay to minor-street traffic for the 7:15 to 8:15 am period was found to be 20 seconds per vehicle. Of note, the delay to minor-street traffic for the 7:45 to 8:00 am period was found to be 32 seconds per vehicle.</u>	No
2. The combined vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volume entering the intersection from the minor street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours, with an average delay to minor-street vehicular traffic of at least 30 seconds per vehicle during the highest hour; but			
3. If the 85 th -percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph, the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values provided in Items 1 and 2.		The 85 th -percentile approach speed of the major-street westbound traffic was 42.3 mph. The major street vehicle volume of 443 vs 210 vehicles per hour, minor street combined volume of 233 vs 140 units per hour and <u>20 vs 21 seconds per vehicle of minor street delay.</u>	Yes, considering minor street delay sufficiently close to required threshold
D. Where no single criterion is satisfied but where Criteria B, C.1, and C.2 are all satisfied to 80 percent of the minimum values. Criteria C.3 is excluded from this condition.		Criteria B (5 vs 4) and C.1 (443 vs 300) are satisfied to 80 percent of the minimum values. Criteria C.2 (233 vs 160, yes but 20 vs 24, no) is not satisfied to 80 percent of the minimum value.	No

Conclusion:

Criteria A, B and C.3 were met. Recommend multi-way stop installation.