




---

DATE: Wednesday, June 5, 2019  
 TIME: 4:00 P.M.  
 PLACE: Urbana Public Works Department, 706 South Glover Avenue

---

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Eric Jakobsson, City Council Member, Ward 2, Chair (arrived at 4:05 p.m.)  
 Craig Shonkwiler, Interim City Engineer  
 Bob Fitzgerald, Interim Deputy Chief

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

OTHERS PRESENT:

Shannon Beranek, Civil Engineer, Public Works Department  
 Carol Mitten, City Manager/Interim Public Works Director, City of Urbana  
 Cynthia Hoyle  
 Audrey Ishii

The meeting began at 4:04 p.m. *Craig Shonkwiler assumed the chair in the absence of Mr. Jakobsson.*

**Approval of Minutes:**

Bob Fitzgerald moved to approve the minutes of the May 1, 2019 meeting. Craig Shonkwiler seconded the motion. The Commission voted 2-0 to approve the minutes of the May meeting.

**Additions to the agenda:**

There were no additions to the agenda.

**Public Input**

Those wishing to provide input did so as items were discussed.

**Unfinished Business**

*Eric Jakobsson assumed the chair at 4:05 p.m.*

1 **Item #1- Discussion of parking restrictions on Green Street between Lincoln Avenue and**  
2 **Race Street.**  
3

4 Craig Shonkwiler stated that Project 5 of the Multimodal Corridor Enhancement Project (MCORE) on  
5 Green Street between Lincoln Avenue and Race Street was in the design phase with construction  
6 expected to begin late this year and last all next year. He reviewed some of the proposed improvements  
7 for the corridor: significant improvements for pedestrians to walk along the corridor, the addition of  
8 bus shelters for westbound traffic and pads for eastbound traffic, designated bike lanes on both sides of  
9 the street, and the complete removal and replacement of the pavement. He explained that on-street  
10 parking was primarily located on the north side of Green Street between Busey Avenue and Cedar  
11 Street, which would be removed to accommodate the proposed improvements within the current street  
12 width. He summarized the process used to notify the public about the proposed changes, including the  
13 removal of on-street parking. He noted that there were several public meetings where the plans to  
14 remove parking were presented. He said that property owners were notified by mail or e-mail and  
15 residents were notified by door hangers that parking restrictions would be discussed at this Traffic  
16 Commission meeting. Mr. Shonkwiler said that the suggested parking restrictions were brought to a  
17 previous Traffic Commission meeting to inform the Commissioners of the proposed plan, but no  
18 action was taken at that time since the MCORE Phase 5 Project was not scheduled to begin for a  
19 couple of years. He added that a parking utilization study was conducted prior to that meeting which  
20 revealed that the majority of the vehicles parked on street belonged to University of Illinois students.  
21 He said that there has been an increase in on-street parking since the parking utilization study was  
22 originally performed, but he stated that there was no noticeable change that would account for the  
23 increase. Mr. Shonkwiler said that it would be difficult to assess the utilization of side streets parking,  
24 but many of the apartment units provided off-street parking. He explained that Green Street project  
25 was part of a larger, multi-jurisdictional plan that would provide a vital connection between the  
26 University of Illinois and downtown Urbana once completed. He added that the project as designed  
27 received federal approval and funding.  
28

29 Mr. Jakobsson asked how many spaces would be eliminated.  
30

31 Shannon Beranek said that approximately 25 vehicles parked along Green Street at that location.  
32

33 Mr. Shonkwiler said that individual spaces were not delineated on Green Street, but he estimated the  
34 number to be between 20 and 30 vehicles. He explained that a decision to maintain on-street parking  
35 would require the City to redesign the project and return to the Illinois Department of Transportation  
36 with a revised plan. He mentioned that doing so could jeopardize the funding of the project.  
37

38 Mr. Jakobsson stated that he had no objections to the removal of parking. He wondered if another  
39 plan could be used for on-street parking in nearby areas.  
40

41 Mr. Shonkwiler moved to restrict parking on Green Street from Lincoln Avenue to Race Street.  
42

43 Deputy Chief Fitzgerald seconded the motion.  
44

45 Mr. Jakobsson asked then the parking restrictions would go into effect.  
46

47 Mr. Shonkwiler stated that the restrictions would not go into effect until construction began. He  
48 explained that the City intended to allow on-street parking for as long as possible. He said that at some  
49 point during the construction, sections of Green Street would be fully closed and the restrictions would  
50 be installed as the project was completed.

1  
2 The motion was approved 3-0.

3  
4 This item will go to Council for consideration.

5  
6 **New Business**

7  
8 **Item #2- Discussion of crosswalks on Lincoln Avenue at Stoughton Street, Main Street**  
9 **and Clark Street.**

10  
11 Cynthia Hoyle stated that the recommended design for Lincoln Avenue was a big improvement for  
12 people trying to cross the road, as she believed crossing was a dicey proposition She believed that the  
13 improvements would help downtown traffic. Although she thought that the proposed pedestrians  
14 warning signs both in advance of and at the site of the crosswalks were definitely an improvement, she  
15 noted that the improvements did not include the installation of Stop for Pedestrians signs (R-1), which  
16 seemed to her to be warranted based upon crosswalks guidelines. Ms. Hoyle felt there was a multi-lane  
17 crash threat if a motorist travelling the same direction as a stopped vehicle approached an area with the  
18 pedestrian crossing warning signs and arrows indicating where pedestrians might cross. She felt that  
19 the approaching motorist would not know why the other vehicle had stopped. Ms. Hoyle indicated  
20 that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) recommended the use of Red Rapid Flashing  
21 Beacons (RRFB) to warn of midblock crossings in areas with lower traffic volumes and more visibility.  
22 She felt the RRFBs would be sufficient on Lincoln Avenue. She said she understood the concerns  
23 about implementation of some of the traffic control devices she recommended, but she indicated that it  
24 was better to error on the side of safety.

25  
26 Mr. Jakobsson asked if Ms. Hoyle had looked at pedestrian crossings on Springfield Avenue. He felt  
27 those crossings were very effective. (Grainger Library and University High School)

28  
29 Ms. Hoyle said that there were no serious crashes, low vehicular crashes and that the crosswalks were  
30 very successful. She said that the drivers found the crosswalks very annoying because the roadway was  
31 only two lanes. She stated that the crosswalks were very, very successful. She looked at national  
32 research to determine if pedestrians were more likely to walk out in front of vehicles with this type of  
33 facilities. She stated that the data said that they were no more likely to walk out in front of vehicles  
34 with this infrastructure than they would be to walk out in front of vehicles on a roadway with  
35 unmarked crosswalks. She believed that there was no significant problem with pedestrians walking out  
36 in front of vehicles on Springfield Avenue.

37  
38 Mr. Shonkwiler asked for the source of the study.

39  
40 Ms. Hoyle stated that the study she cited was a study based on marked versus unmarked crosswalks,  
41 not crosswalks with the signage recommended for Lincoln Avenue.

42  
43 Deputy Chief Fitzgerald said that the Police Department had received numerous complaints about  
44 pedestrians walking out in front of vehicles on Springfield Avenue. He stated that the Police  
45 Department cited pedestrians for walking out in front of cars along that corridor on Springfield Avenue  
46 and at Grainger Library and University High School. He said that pedestrians were supposed to make  
47 sure the roadway was clear before walking out into the roadway.

48  
49 Ms. Hoyle said that drivers interpret the law to mean that pedestrians cannot cross until traffic is clear.  
50 She said that in her opinion motorists harass pedestrians regularly on Lincoln Avenue even though the

1 pedestrians had legally established themselves in the crosswalk. She said that pedestrians could walk  
2 out in front of vehicles if they gave vehicles enough time to stop. She said that there was an equal  
3 problem with motorists not stopping for pedestrians as with pedestrians walking out in front of  
4 vehicles.

5  
6 Mr. Shonkwiler asked if there was a comparison of compliance when using a pedestrian warning sign  
7 versus using a Stop for Pedestrian sign.

8  
9 She said she could look and see, but she did not have that information.

10  
11 Mr. Shonkwiler said that the issue was before the Traffic Commission for a final review.

12  
13 Ms. Hoyle commented that the study looked at the crosswalks that were properly designed and marked.

14  
15 Mr. Shonkwiler said that he was familiar with the study Ms. Hoyle had referenced, but the design on  
16 Lincoln Avenue would not be an unmarked crosswalk. He said that if the study had been conducted to  
17 describe the effectiveness of pedestrian warning signs compared to Stop for Pedestrian signage, the  
18 study would have been relevant. He agreed with Deputy Chief Fitzgerald's observations that  
19 pedestrians on campus were not active when crossing roadways. In other words, he explained that  
20 pedestrians did not make eye contact with motorists to make certain they were seen and they crossed  
21 the roadway when it was not safe for them to do so. He said that when referencing studies, it would be  
22 helpful to know the details to make sure it applied to the situation being discussed.

23  
24 Ms. Hoyle cited some materials she looked at, but she agreed that the crosswalk guidelines would not  
25 recommend putting a crosswalk on a four-lane roadway without additional treatment.

26  
27 Mr. Shonkwiler asked for the data that studied the recommended design for Lincoln Avenue between  
28 Springfield Avenue and University Avenue. He asked if there was a definitive study that showed that  
29 advanced warning signs posed a danger in a multi-lane crosswalk. He noted that Ms. Hoyle had given  
30 her opinion, but he asked if there was any study that supported her opinion that a Stop for Pedestrian  
31 sign was more effective than an advanced warning sign for a multi-lane crosswalk.

32  
33 Carol Mitten asked how the guidelines were applied to develop the design staff presented.

34  
35 Mr. Shonkwiler indicated that the City used crosswalk guidelines established by the Champaign County  
36 Regional Planning Commission, which were based on a recognized standard developed by the City of  
37 Boulder, Colorado.

38  
39 Ms. Mitten explained that the City of Urbana had adopted a set of guidelines, which all had agreed to  
40 and that within those guidelines there were certain characteristics that needed to be reconciled before  
41 making recommendations. Ms. Mitten wanted to make sure that the design reconciled all of the factors  
42 (type of street, number of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists crossing, etc.) in the guidelines. She  
43 added that staff sought and received feedback from the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) to make  
44 sure that there was nothing overlooked.

45  
46 Audrey Ishii expressed her concern about traffic fatalities in the city of Urbana.

47  
48 Ms. Mitten asked if those figures tracked differently than those for the rest of the country.

49

1 Ms. Ishii said that it was much worse in Illinois, but the statistics were not separated between rural and  
2 urban. She stated that there was a fatality on Vine Street and Main Street. She added that there was a  
3 problem on University Avenue. She mentioned that the speed went from 35 miles per hour in Urbana  
4 on University Avenue to suddenly dropping to 30 miles per hour in Champaign. She noted that there  
5 were more crashes in Champaign, but they had fewer fatalities and more reasonable injuries.  
6

7 Ms. Mitten mentioned that as part of the University Avenue project, the Illinois Department of  
8 Transportation had recommended lowering the speed limit to 30 miles per hour on University Avenue  
9 between Maple Street and Wright Street.  
10

11 Ms. Ishii said that the speed limit reduction would help, but she said that the State was not on her side.  
12 Ms. Ishii then discussed concerns about traffic speeds in Urbana.  
13

14 Ms. Mitten pointed to the design of the Lincoln Avenue roadway and noted that the area where  
15 pedestrians would cross would be shortened and the lanes for motorists would be tightened to provide  
16 pedestrians with less exposure to motorists. She also noted that tightening the lane widths usually  
17 resulted in reduced vehicle speeds.  
18

19 Mr. Shonkwiler reviewed the scope of the Lincoln Avenue Resurfacing Project, which would extend  
20 from north of Green Street to University Avenue. He explained that within that corridor three  
21 intersections (Stoughton Street, Main Street and Clark Street) were of concern as the project was  
22 designed. He discussed the research conducted by his staff in preparing the design for this corridor.  
23 He explained that staff conducted twelve-hour traffic counts, looked at IDOT counts, and conducted  
24 field assessments. He discussed the scope of the project, including the resurfacing of Lincoln Avenue  
25 from Green Street (the site of the recently completed MCore Phase 1 Project) to University Avenue  
26 (the proposed site of an IDOT improvement project). The project would include intersection  
27 improvements at Stoughton Street, Main Street, and Clark Street. In addition, staff was guided by  
28 recommendations in the 2016 Urbana Bicycle Master Plan, which identified the intersection of Lincoln  
29 Avenue at Main Street as a difficult location for bicyclists and pedestrians to cross. Mr. Shonkwiler  
30 looked at future development near Clark Street and determined that crossing Lincoln Avenue at Clark  
31 Street was a significant intersection to study. He noted that Lincoln Avenue at Main Street was  
32 currently 70 feet in width with no warning signage. He and his staff reviewed the Manual on Uniform  
33 Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), which was used by IDOT and was referenced in Urbana's  
34 codebook as the guideline to be used by the City. Staff found no definitive guidance for signing the  
35 crosswalk in the MUTCD. He explained that since 2015, City staff had been using crosswalk guidelines  
36 from the City of Boulder, as a standard for crosswalk installations. He explained that in 2017, the  
37 Champaign Urbana Urbanized Area Transportation Study (CUUATS) group developed the Champaign  
38 Urbana crosswalk standards. He mentioned that the guidelines were approved by the CUUATS  
39 Technical Committee, which was comprised of professional transportation planners and engineers, and  
40 endorsed by the CUUATS Policy Committee. Mr. Shonkwiler explained the specific considerations  
41 included in the creation of the design. He noted that staff looked at the speed limits on Lincoln  
42 Avenue and observed traffic control upstream and downstream from this corridor to determine  
43 whether it would be realistic to move traffic to signalized crossings or to improve crossings at the  
44 nearest intersections. Staff reviewed various crosswalk treatments and determined that narrowing the  
45 lanes and adding refuge islands would be the best design as it reduced lane widths thereby decreasing  
46 pedestrian exposure to vehicular traffic and making it less comfortable for motorists to travel at higher  
47 speeds. Staff also considered a design that made pedestrians waiting to cross the roadway more visible  
48 to motorists and motorists more visible to pedestrians. Mr. Shonkwiler pointed out that the guidelines  
49 did not recommend installing stop bars on major corridors like Lincoln Avenue. He read from page  
50 13 of the Champaign-Urbana Pedestrian Crossing Enhancement Guidelines, "*On major corridors like*

1 *Lincoln Avenue, stop bars are not used; instead advanced pedestrian warning signs are installed at the beginning of the*  
2 *road where pedestrians are expected, and pedestrian crossing warning signs are installed at each unsignalized approach to*  
3 *an intersection.”*  
4

5 Ms. Ishii said that installing stop bars on Lincoln Avenue was not prohibited.  
6

7 Mr. Jakobsson said the crosswalks on Springfield Avenue were very effective. He said that crossing at  
8 Grainger Library was very successful and at Goodwin Avenue, most people obeyed the sign.  
9

10 Mr. Shonkwiler stated that the crossing at Grainger Library was a pedestrian activated RRFB signal. He  
11 noted there was no Stop for Pedestrians signage at that location.  
12

13 Mr. Jakobsson stated that he was not an expert on the guidelines nor was he a technical expert on  
14 traffic, but he thought that whatever could be done to replicate the success of Springfield Avenue near  
15 the Grainger Library would work best. He conceded that the number of lanes on Springfield Avenue  
16 was different from the number of lanes on Lincoln Avenue, but he did not believe that the number of  
17 lanes that a pedestrian and/or bicyclist had to cross would make any difference.  
18

19 Ms. Mitten said that there was a difference in pedestrian volumes on Springfield Avenue west of  
20 Lincoln Avenue compared to Lincoln Avenue between Springfield Avenue and University Avenue.  
21

22 Mr. Jakobsson said that when the development of the Gather was complete there would be a significant  
23 increase in the volume of pedestrian traffic along Lincoln Avenue.  
24

25 Ms. Mitten mentioned that staff made allowances in their design for traffic increases from the Gather  
26 and the Retreat once they were completed.  
27

28 Mr. Shonkwiler explained the planned traffic control for each intersection. He stated that as one  
29 travelled north on Lincoln Avenue there would be an advanced pedestrian warning sign installed  
30 approximately 100 feet before reaching Stoughton Street. At the intersection of Stoughton Street and  
31 Lincoln Avenue, Lincoln Avenue would be tightened, the left turn lane for northbound traffic would be  
32 eliminated, a refuge island would be installed--significantly decreasing the crosswalk distance. He  
33 mentioned that the crosswalk would be consolidating pedestrians to the southern leg of the intersection  
34 since there was not enough volume to warrant a crosswalk on the northern leg of the intersection. He  
35 added that crossing would not be prohibited on the northern leg, but pedestrians would have less  
36 exposure to traffic on the southern leg.  
37

38 At the Main Street intersection, Mr. Shonkwiler said that the configuration would be similar to that on  
39 Stoughton with wider medians and significantly shorter crossing areas for both the northern and  
40 southern legs of the intersection. He noted that signage and curb ramps would be installed to warn  
41 traffic of both pedestrian and bicycle movements across Lincoln Avenue. He explained that to the east  
42 of Main Street, bicyclists would be moved onto a multi-use path. He said that bicyclists would have an  
43 option to use the crosswalks and refuge island or the street to cross Lincoln Avenue. Since the area to  
44 the east of Lincoln Avenue was an historical neighborhood, some brick sidewalks would remain in the  
45 area.  
46

47 Ms. Hoyle suggested using permeable bricks since those bricks were not as slippery when they became  
48 wet.  
49

1 Mr. Shonkwiler explained that the brick sidewalks had to be restored using the same type of bricks as  
2 were currently in place.

3  
4 For Clark Street, Mr. Shonkwiler stated that the configuration would include the tightened intersection  
5 with crosswalks on both the northern and southern legs of the intersection. Staff determined that the  
6 proposed developments near Clark Street would warrant the inclusion of both legs in the project. He  
7 noted that there would be an advanced pedestrian warning sign located south of University Avenue for  
8 southbound traffic.

9  
10 Mr. Shonkwiler mentioned again that staff used the guidelines approved by the City. He said that the  
11 guidelines state not to use stop bars on Lincoln Avenue. He showed a map with all of the various  
12 traffic control methods for pedestrian crossings on a map (traffic signals, Stop for Pedestrian signage,  
13 advanced pedestrian warning signs and RRFBs to provide context for how the Lincoln Avenue  
14 improvements are part of an overall plan for the City. He pointed to the distribution of the Stop for  
15 Pedestrian signage and noted that those were located near schools and on the University of Illinois  
16 campus. He said that those signs were not used in other locations in the City. He explained that the  
17 advanced pedestrian warning signs were used in high vehicle traffic areas where unsignalized pedestrian  
18 and bicycle crossings might occur. Mr. Shonkwiler discussed the used of RRFBs in areas where  
19 additional warning was needed due to high volume of pedestrians and or vehicles. He stated the design  
20 was created with flexibility to adapt to future growth. To date, Mr. Shonkwiler said that there had been  
21 no crashes nor fatalities within the project area, but the design could be upgraded if problems occurred.  
22 He specified that if there were problems, the design would remain and RRFBs would be added. He  
23 clarified that the treatment on Lincoln Avenue between Nevada Street and Pennsylvania Avenue  
24 included programmable flashing lights instead of the pedestrian activated RRFBs.

25  
26 Ms. Mitten asked if RRFBs were warranted at this time.

27  
28 Mr. Shonkwiler stated that RRFBs were not warranted.

29  
30 Ms. Mitten asked if the pedestrian volumes on Lincoln Avenue between Nevada Street and  
31 Pennsylvania Avenue were higher than the volumes between Stoughton Street and Clark Street.

32  
33 Mr. Shonkwiler said that the pedestrian volume was significantly higher between Nevada Street and  
34 Pennsylvania Avenue than between Stoughton Street and Clark Street.

35  
36 Deputy Chief Fitzgerald said that the Urbana Police Department had details on Lincoln Avenue  
37 between Nevada Street and Pennsylvania Avenue because pedestrians were stepping out in front of  
38 vehicles. He said there were concerns with both pedestrians walking out in front of vehicles and  
39 motorists failing to stop for pedestrians within the crosswalks.

40  
41 Mr. Shonkwiler stated that there were some areas in the guidelines that needed to be clarified, but he  
42 felt comfortable with the design presented for Lincoln Avenue between Stoughton Street and Clark  
43 Street. He said that Engineering staff sent the design to RPC for their review to see if there were any  
44 considerations that City staff may have missed. He read from an e-mail that he received from Mr.  
45 Gabe Lewis, Transportation Planner at the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission and  
46 author of the Champaign-Urbana Pedestrian Crossing Enhancement Guidelines. In the e-mail, Mr.  
47 Lewis said that even though Stop for Pedestrian signage was used as a crosswalk treatment, it was not  
48 recommended as a treatment for the Lincoln Avenue improvements between Stoughton Street and  
49 Clark Street for the following reasons: 1) Stop Here for Pedestrian signage was recommended for two-  
50 lane roadways. Lincoln Avenue was a four-lane roadway and would remain a four-lane roadway at this

1 location; 2) the current existing signage on Lincoln Avenue between Pennsylvania Avenue and Nevada  
2 Street used advanced pedestrian warning signs. The design for Lincoln Avenue between Stoughton  
3 Street and Clark Street would use the advanced pedestrian warning signs and provide a consistent  
4 message to motorists; and 3) although the guidelines state the Stop Here for Pedestrian signage should  
5 be considered, it was not mandated at the locations. The guidelines say that engineering judgement  
6 should be used to determine their use.

7  
8 At Stoughton Street on Lincoln Avenue, there would be pedestrian crossing signage at the intersection;  
9 there would be a bump out to reduce the crossing distance for pedestrians; the crossing would be  
10 consolidated to the south side of the intersection; a refuge island would be installed; and the left turn  
11 lane on Lincoln Avenue for northbound traffic would be eliminated. At Main Street on Lincoln  
12 Avenue a refuge island would be installed to reduce the length of the crossing for users; curb ramps  
13 would be added; bicycle and pedestrian crossing signage would be added. Mr. Shonkwiler mentioned  
14 that the Urbana Historic Preservation Commission wanted to keep the brick sidewalks to the east of  
15 Lincoln Avenue and requested that the bicycle lanes on Main Street be separate as bicyclists approached  
16 Lincoln Avenue on Main Street. He added that there would be advanced warning signs on Lincoln  
17 Avenue for southbound traffic. Mr. Shonkwiler stressed that the goal of traffic control within the city  
18 of Urbana was to provide consistency. He said that staff consistently monitored traffic situations and  
19 approached problems using incremental steps as needed. He said that if there were problems within  
20 the next five years, the City would look at the installation of RRFBs. He added that the design of the  
21 intersections gave the City flexibility to add activated signalization to the locations in the future, but he  
22 said those tools were not warranted at this time.

23  
24 Ms. Ishii was concerned about the visibility triangle. She said that staff needed to think about visibility  
25 concerns.

26  
27 Mr. Shonkwiler asked Ms. Ishii to clarify what she meant by the term, visibility triangle. He stated that  
28 there were no visibility triangle concerns within the project. He asked if she was referring to a multi-  
29 lane threat.

30  
31 Ms. Ishii was concerned that a vehicle in the outside lane would stop for a pedestrian and another  
32 vehicle approaching from the outside lane would not see the pedestrians and fail to stop.

33  
34 Mr. Jakobsson said that the City should pay attention to the guidelines, but that staff had to determine  
35 what made sense.

36  
37 Ms. Ishii said that the guidelines did not specifically prohibit the use of stop bars on Lincoln Avenue,  
38 but instead, she argued, the guidelines said that stop bars “are not used.” She argued that the term, “are  
39 not used” was not the same as the term, “prohibited.” She said that the guidelines used Lincoln Avenue  
40 as an example of where stop bars should not be used.

41  
42 Ms. Ishii stated that when she used to cross Stoughton Street as a pedestrian, there was no signage so  
43 she used more care because she knew motorists were not going to be expecting pedestrians at that  
44 location. She was concerned that the crosswalk might make students less vigilant when walking across  
45 the street. She said that pages 12 and 13 of the guidelines needed to be re-read.

46  
47 Mr. Shonkwiler reiterated that the author of the guidelines stated that stop bars were not recommended  
48 on Lincoln Avenue. He stated that the City used those guidelines and engineering judgment to design  
49 the roadway. He explained that the City favored the use of signage to provide direction to motorists  
50 since paint could be obscured by snow. He added that the paint lost reflectivity after a year so signage



1 provided a better message. Mr. Shonkwiler explained the reasoning behind the use of signage with the  
2 proposed design. He stated that no one could guarantee that there would be no problems in the future,  
3 but that placing the stop bar in the middle of the intersection was dangerous because the expected  
4 response was not clear. He noted that Stop for Pedestrians signs were used in the campus area for the  
5 reasoning listed earlier.

6  
7 Deputy Chief Fitzgerald stated that the plan had flexibility to allow changes in the future. He said that  
8 there had not been any crashes reported in that location.

9  
10 Mr. Shonkwiler stated that signs do not provide protection. He said that the changes were trying to  
11 improve travel for pedestrians and bicyclists in that location.

12  
13 Ms. Ishii said that she did not like Stop Here for Pedestrians signage, but she stated that she did like  
14 stop bars. She agreed that the crosswalk guidelines needed to be reviewed.

15  
16 Mr. Shonkwiler stated that the guidelines needed to be reviewed to clarify some recommendations. He  
17 stated that the City would proceed with the design presented and work with the Regional Planning  
18 Commission to provide more clarity in the guidelines.

19  
20 Ms. Hoyle said that there was a multi-lane crash threat at the intersections. She felt that RRFBs were  
21 necessary.

22  
23 Mr. Shonkwiler explained that the goal of using the RRFBs was to use them in areas where they were  
24 warranted based upon the many factors reviewed as part of the design study for the Lincoln Avenue  
25 location. He said RRFBs were not warranted on Lincoln Avenue between Springfield Avenue and  
26 University Avenue.

27  
28 Mr. Jakobsson said that the stop bars could be added without the signs.

29  
30 Ms. Beranek stated that without signage motorists would not have any clues to explain the purpose of  
31 the stop bars.

32  
33 Ms. Mitten explained that the reduction of the distance required to cross Lincoln Avenue would reduce  
34 traffic speeds.

35  
36 Mr. Shonkwiler stated that the City tries to maximize resources when designing roadway projects. He  
37 explained that overdesigning the project would not be necessary. He said that the design was safe and  
38 followed a standard of care. He said that to include additional markings and signage would add  
39 expense to the project that was not necessary and decrease funding that might go to other projects.

40  
41 Mr. Jakobsson said that motorists adapted to the signage on Springfield Avenue so he felt they could  
42 adapt to the signage on Lincoln Avenue.

43  
44 Mr. Shonkwiler said that the redesign would calm traffic and signal to drivers that pedestrians are  
45 present. He said that staff was mindful that review might be necessary after the completion of the  
46 Gather.

47  
48 Mr. Jakobsson believed the signage and crosswalks would slow motorists because they would be aware  
49 of the possibility of pedestrians and bicyclists being present. He said that he was in support of the plan  
50 as presented, but he suggested that more might be needed as developments were completed in the area.

1 He said the Gather would change traffic patterns. He also mentioned that improvement on Green  
2 Street would improve connectivity and have an effect on traffic between downtown Urbana and  
3 campus.

4  
5 Deputy Chief Fitzgerald moved to approve the plan for Lincoln Avenue between Springfield Avenue  
6 and University Avenue as presented.

7  
8 Mr. Shonkwiler seconded the motion.

9  
10 The motion was approved 3-0.

11  
12 No further action is required.

13  
14 Ms. Ishii asked when this item would go to Council.

15  
16 Mr. Shonkwiler said that the project would go for bids.

17  
18 Ms. Ishii asked who would prosecute if the markings were to appear on the street.

19  
20 Ms. Mitten said the markings would be removed.

21  
22 Mr. Jakobsson said that even though the Commission approved the project, Ms. Hoyle and Ms. Ishii  
23 could still fight the decision.

24  
25 With no other business at hand, the meeting adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

26  
27 The next scheduled Traffic Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 3, 2019, at 4:00 p.m.  
28 at the Urbana Public Works Department, 706 Glover Avenue, second floor conference room.

29  
30 Respectfully submitted,  
31 Barbara Stiehl, Recording Secretary