

# Urbana Bicycle Master Plan Comments

Urbana Public Works Department  
City of Urbana  
(March 14, 2008)

The following comments on the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan were received during the time period February 15 - March 14, 2008. Comments are shown as follows with responses by Bicycle Master Plan staff following each in ***bold and italics***. Whenever a revision to the draft Bicycle Master Plan is proposed, the corresponding change proposed by Bicycle Plan staff is shown as underlined.

## City of Urbana Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Commission Comments

### February 27, 2008

Comment: My compliments to the staff for a good Bike Master Plan and all the work that went into it. And my compliments to [Jennifer & Brandon] for your leadership. I regret missing the last meeting and do not mean for these comments to impede the progress of approval of the Plan. Accept them as thoughts on more yet to do.

I attended the Bike Diet webinar (?- a new word for me) and was impressed by the improvements indicated by such development. Marked Bike Lanes appear much safer than just indicated Bike Routes and send a clear message of support to alternate transportation. It also strike me that older bike riders such as myself feel significantly more secure. For example, I drive Pennsylvania between Race and Lincoln almost every day but will not ride a bike on it because of the traffic, using one of the less traveled side streets. With a designated bike lane, I would. As the elderly, but active, population planned for Orchard Downs comes on board, I believe this is relevant for southeast access to campus. The same can be said about Race and Vine routes to downtown Urbana. If I have misinterpreted the Plan and designated bike lanes rather than just indicated routes for these streets are part of it, all the better! In summary, the Road Diet presentation persuaded me on the value of painted Bike Lanes for both safety reasons and the message they send of strong support for alternate transportation. Please share as you see appropriate.

*The Bike Master Plan document will be changed to show bike lanes on Pennsylvania Avenue between Race Street and Lincoln Avenue instead of a bike route. A new BLOS will be calculated for this segment and the new BLOS will be reflected on Figure 7.11 on page 7-7. The new BLOS Difference will be reflected on Figure 7.12 on page 7-8. Figures 8.1 and 8.2 on pages 8-2 and 8-3 will be changed to show bike lanes instead of a bike route in this segment. Section 8.1.42 as well as figures 8.88 and 8.89 will be changed to reflect bike lanes instead of a bike route. The implementation tables in Chapter 9 will be changed to reflect the cost of bike lanes vs. a bike route. It will also be noted in the implementation tables that bike lanes in this segment will require removal of parking on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue.*

## Urbana Plan Commission

February 21, 2008

Comment: Suggest that we add text/recommend an ordinance that requires developers of future subdivisions to link to the bike network, for those paths & streets that are not currently shown on the proposed network map.

***The Bike Master Plan will be evaluated every year and will be 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. Text will be added to Chapter 8 (Recommendations) stating this.***

*Since the Bike Master Plan will be an official element of the Comprehensive Plan, the City can require conformance to the Bike Master Plan without an ordinance change. Below are references in the Subdivision and Land Development Code requiring conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.*

*Section 21-2 Purposes. ...this chapter is adopted for the following purposes:*

*(2) To guide the future growth and development of the city, in accordance with the official comprehensive plan, as amended;*

*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;*

*Section 21-4 Definitions.*

*Official comprehensive plan means the City of Urbana 1982 Comprehensive Plan including any successive amendments thereof or any successive comprehensive plan.*

*Section 21-4. Definitions*

*Street. Arterial street means a street used, or intended to be used, primarily for through traffic including freeways, highways, as well as major streets and parkways. As specified in the official comprehensive plan, there are both principal and minor arterial streets (See Illustration #1).*

*Section 21-17*

*B. Approval procedure [for Minor Developments]. Unanimous approval must be given by the administrative review committee. Approval must include affirmative findings that:*

*(4) The proposed development will not:*

*e. Conflict with the Urbana Official Comprehensive Plan;*

*Section 21-36 Design of Streets.*

*(A)(3) All streets shall be properly integrated with the existing and proposed system of streets and thoroughfares as established in the Urbana Official Comprehensive Plan.*

***Section 21-38 Right-of-way and easement dedications.***

***(C) Developers shall dedicate any required rights-of-way for streets and alleys, in accordance with the standards set forth in Table "A," "Minimum Street and Alley Design Standards" and the official comprehensive plan.***

***Section 21-54 Streets and Curbs.***

***(A) Streets shall be constructed in accordance with the "Code of Ordinances of the City of Urbana," the "Official Comprehensive Plan," "Subgrade Stability Manual" and the "Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction," all as amended from time to time.***

**March 1, 2008**

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.

***Bike lanes are not proposed anywhere on High Cross Road (see p. 8-21). High Cross Road north of University Avenue is planned for "Share the Road."***

***From Page 2-4 of the IL130/High Cross Road Corridor Plan:***

***"Investigate measures to improve access, traffic flow and safety, while also protecting the rural residential character of the corridor north of Interstate 74."***

***From Table 5-1: Implementation Matrix for Preferred Alternative Projects of the IL130/High Cross Road Corridor Plan:***

***"Saline Ditch Bridge at High Cross Road, widen to at least 2 full lanes"***

***"Widening decreases potential conflict for all modes"***

***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 IL130/High Cross Road Corridor Plan.***

## City Staff Comments

**Doug Miller, Projects Coordinator, Urbana Public Works, March 4, 2008**

Comment: If the next five years includes 2013 then I would include Green Street Lincoln to Wright in that time frame also. Green Street from Lincoln to Race is still 10+ years out at this point.

*The Bike Master Plan document will be changed to show the Green Street corridor from Wright Street to Lincoln Avenue in the 0-5 year timeframe instead of will the 10+ year timeframe. Figures 8.1 and 8.2 on pages 8-2 and 8-3 will be changed to show the timeframe change for this segment. The implementation tables in Chapter 9 will be changed to reflect the timeframe change.*

*Green Street (Lincoln Avenue - Race Street) will remain in the 10+ timeframe. No changes to the document.*

Are you adding the Florida section from Race to Broadway to the 6-10 years section?

*The Bike Master Plan document will be changed to show a sidepath on the north side of Florida Avenue between Broadway Avenue and Race Street in the 6-10 year timeframe. Figures 8.1 and 8.2 on pages 8-2 and 8-3 will be changed to show this newly proposed segment. The following bullet will be added after the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet in section 8.1.21 on page 8-18:*

- *Broadway to Race: Sidepath on north side of the road.*

*The implementation tables in Chapter 9 will be changed to reflect this newly proposed segment.*

Why isn't the bike route on George Huff in the 0-5 year timeframe?

*The Bike Master Plan document will be changed to show the George Huff bike route in the 0-5 year timeframe instead of will the 6-10 year timeframe. Figures 8.1 and 8.2 on pages 8-2 and 8-3 will be changed to show the timeframe change for this segment. The implementation tables in Chapter 9 will be changed to reflect the timeframe change.*

**Libby Tyler, Community Development Director, February 22, 2008**

Comment: The subdivision ordinance requires conformity to the comprehensive plan, of which the bicycle master plan is a component. I think it would be helpful to add some language to the subdivision ordinance to reference provision of both sidewalks and bicycle lanes/paths in order to require their construction, but I don't think we need to be lockstep with a map for future facilities - after all the future local streets are also not depicted. One purpose of the subdivision/development regulations is to guarantee their provision. We can do this for bicycles and peds as well. I believe we can do this even without the amendment language, but it would be good to add it.

*See response to Plan Commission above.*

**Brandon Bowersox, Bicyclist and Pedestrian Advisory Commission representative, February 21, 2008**

Comment:

After watching Plan Commission I have two more suggestions about the Bike Master Plan:

First, I think we should address the commissioners' questions about how to require bike facilities in new streets that are in new developments. If the Subdivision Code references the Bike map but the map doesn't show these new streets, how will we get developers to build the facilities?

*See response to Plan Commission above.*

One idea is to recommend a "complete streets" approach that would allow us to require any new subdivisions to put appropriate bike facilities on appropriate streets (even if those streets don't exist on our Bike Master Plan map yet). Another idea is simply to update the plan more often or to show expected future arterial streets in rough future locations.

***This is a bicycle plan, therefore, recommending the implementation of the "Complete Street" concept is not appropriate considering that this concept involves more than the provision of bicycle facilities. Furthermore, if a street has a high truck traffic percentage, high traffic counts, provides no connectivity to other facilities, it will be unsafe for bicyclists to use. Therefore, we are not recommending that Complete Streets be required for every street project. No changes will be made to the Plan based on this comment.***

Second, for Robert I suggest that we do something to address the "fiscal impact" question in the staff memo. A few Plan Commissioners referred to this as a very expensive plan and said we even needed to raise taxes for this! On the contrary, most of the plan is just paint and signs and is very cheap compared to building new roads. Moreover, only a fraction of the total dollar amount is the City's responsibility, it happens over 10+ years, and much of the large project dollar amounts will come from grants. In the last 12 months we've already received \$1.5M in grants that I can think of (\$900K for Goodwin, \$500K for Route 130 sidepath) not including pending SRTS grants or Durbin's rails-to-trails funding commitment. If my math is right, the City's 0-10 year bike projects add up to \$1.7M (from Table 9.2), which is nearly the amount of money we've already received in grants. But even without any grants, spending \$1.7M over 10 years is only 3% of the CIP in the next 10 years (the CIP shows about \$56M of spending over the next 10 years). So even if we get no grant money, it would only take 3% of the CIP to fund all the City 0-10 projects. It seems very reasonable to spend 3% of the CIP on bikes given that bikes are 7% of Urbana's mode share. In conclusion, I suggest providing some numbers and analysis about this in the "fiscal impact" section of the memo.

**City Staff is preparing a table with the total cost of implementing each phase of the proposed network to provide to Plan Commission members at their March 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. This table will also be included in Chapter 9.**

**Urbana School District Comments  
February 25 and 26, 2008**

Comment: The Administrative Team of the Urbana School District is not interested in having a cut through area in the UMS/UHS campus. They recommend as the best route to go around the perimeter of the facilities.

***The Bike Master Plan document will be changed to eliminate bicycle facilities through the Urbana High School/Middle School/Aquatic Center campus. Figures 8.1 and 8.2 on pages 8-2 and 8-3 will be changed to delete this segment. The entire section entitled "Through Urbana School District Campus" on page 8-11 will be deleted from the document. Figures 8.29 and 8.30 will be deleted from the document. The implementation tables in Chapter 9 will be changed to reflect the deletion of this segment.***

*Using the widened sidewalk on Vine Street as a perimeter bike route around the School District campus will create modal conflicts when school begins and ends.*

*Race Street does not have enough room for a sidepath, and not enough room for bike lanes. The current conditions lead us to a recommendation of Share the Road, which caters to more advanced cyclists, but is not part of the bicycle network for the target audience of the Plan. Therefore, staff does not recommend a route around the perimeter of the school grounds and the Plan will not show one.*

**Public Comments**

Comment: RE: Lincoln Ave [sidepath] at LAR: The University treats it as one of its own - they plow and salt it. We don't want to remind them otherwise! ;-)

*This facility is owned by the City, but maintained by the University, just as a sidewalk is owned by the City but maintained by the property owner. This is shown in the Plan as a City sidepath, not a University bike path. Therefore, no changes to the document will be made.*

Overall, this is a great plan. Hopefully, we can implement its recommendations with modifications as suggested below!

Some comments on a first, quick read and my apologies in advance if I've misinterpreted something:

In the objectives, I would love to see Objective 3-1 expanded a bit to include apartments - I forget what's required but some of the smaller units aren't included in our current regs and it's a nuisance as I see bikes chained up all over around these smaller units.

*Community Development will be studying changing the bicycle parking article of the zoning ordinance to address such issues.*

In none of the objectives, do I see the word "complete streets". I think this need to be incorporated into our engineering thinking and note that Champaign has it in their Transportation Plans. Our plan should incorporate the strengths of the Champaign plan.

***A Complete Streets ordinance will require bicycle facilities with all new street construction projects. If a street has a high truck traffic percentage, high traffic counts, and/or provides no connectivity to other facilities, it will be unsafe for bicyclists to use. Therefore, we are not recommending that Complete Streets be required for every street project. In addition, this is a bicycle plan. Recommending complete streets mean that we are recommending facilities to accommodate all modes of transportation and that is not the purpose of this Plan.***

I'd like to know if Chicago has increased the use of Sharrows or replaced bike lanes with sharrows under certain circumstances. [A friend and I] recently drove down one road in Chicago where there was a mix of both lanes and sharrows noting that the bike lanes were 5 feet wide BETWEEN the paint and that parking was generous as well (see I've also included 5 pictures that we took of the Illinois Street bike lane for contrast.

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/17989832@N02/sets/72157603676862736/>

In the pictures, you will note that the Illinois Street bike path is narrow and paired with narrow parking. In Chicago, they've got wide parking and wide bike lanes paired up and they seem to use sharrows where the parking is narrow - Lawrence Avenue where we drove for several miles alternated as needed between sharrows and bike lanes. In an interesting twist, the width of the sharrow in Chicago of 53 inches (from parking paint line to the outermost bit of paint of the sharrow is the same width as the bike lane between the paint on Illinois Street. When parking and width was tight, sharrows are being used instead. I would hate for us not to learn from Chicago and other cities' experiences just because the standards allow for narrow bike lanes next to narrow parking.

***Jennifer Selby, an engineer at Urbana Public Works, spoke with David Gleason, a traffic engineer in the bike program at the Chicago Department of Transportation in January of 2008 regarding this issue. Mr. Gleason said that the City of Chicago typically uses shared lane markings on 42 ft. wide streets. If a street is 44 ft. wide, they follow the Chicago Bike Lane Design Manual and stripe 7 ft. parking lanes, 5 ft. bike lanes and 10 ft. vehicle travel lanes. Shared lane markings are currently not in the MUTCD (Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices), but are expected to be in the 2009 edition. At this time, a City must request permission from FHWA (Federal Highway Administration) to use this experimental treatment. The City of Urbana plans to submit a joint request with the City of Champaign to install shared lane markings between now and when the 2009 MUTCD is issued.***

In Chapter 6 for signage, I'd like to see included a distance sign per the Chicago example above.

**The following figures will be added on page 6-7. These figures are proposed in the new MUTCD to come out in 2009.**



M6-3



D1-1a



M4-3



M6-1

Also I think if we are going to be doing road diets to 3 lane widths, some of these may also call for raised refuge areas in mid street....Lincoln Ave could use these and we (the city) should revisit this need some time.

*No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.*

We should also note at the bottom of Chapter 6 that the University is undergoing it's own review of bike access and is developing it's own bike plan.

*Text will be added at the end of Section 6.2.2 (University Bike Path) on page 6-15 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.*

In Chapter 8, recommended signage for the Farmer's market - what about for the Library? Are there a handful of standard destinations that could be included?

*Currently in Chapter 8, destinations are only listed for bike routes. However, destinations will also be added on streets recommended for bike lanes (ex. Section 8.1.29 Kinch Street and Section 8.1.34 Main Street Corridor). Some of these destinations include Meadowbrook Park, UIUC Campus and Downtown Urbana. These destinations will be used on signs such as D1-1a and M4-3 above along the routes. A special note was made about Market at the Square since it will be temporary signage (May-November), whereas all other destination signage will be permanent. Destinations include major intersecting streets, Downtown Urbana, Campus, schools, parks, etc.*

In the recommended routes, there are 2 N-S sections that I think, as a bicyclist, are missing:

Orchard from Orchard Downs to Pennsylvania - we really need to connect this section of students up to N. campus. Any bike map should serve students and future residents of this area well.

*The Bike Master Plan document will be changed to show a bike route on Orchard Street between Pennsylvania and Florida. The existing and future BLOS will be calculated for this segment and will be added to Figures 7.10 and 7.11 on pages 7-6 and 7-7. The BLOS Difference will be added to Figure 7.12 on page 7-8. A bike route will be added in this segment to Figures 8.1 and 8.2 on pages 8-2 and 8-3. A new section between 8.1.39 Future Olympian Drive Corridor and 8.1.40 Oregon Street will be added for Orchard Street. The implementation tables in Chapter 9 will be changed to add a bike route in this segment. A recommendation for bikeway treatment on Orchard south of Florida cannot be implemented by the City, as it is a University street.*

And with the Meijer opening up on Philo, I think we should have an additional N-S route between Anderson and Philo. So, I have in mind Cottage Grove from Main to Mumford. This gives you some connectivity to Philo as well and we know folks are going to sneak in along the roads between Mumford and Scovil so that they can cross directly into Meijer at the light there.



***Cottage Grove:***

- ***Main-Washington: too dangerous. BLOS is 3.61 (D) from Main to Oregon, 3.34 (C) from Oregon to Philo. It is 2.49 (B) from Philo to Washington, but the facility cannot end at Philo with no connection to anything else.***
- ***Washington-Mumford: Washington to Mumford is a continuous route with sufficient width, however the 2-way stops at Cottage Grove & Florida and at Cottage Grove & Colorado make it difficult to cross the busy east-west streets. These difficult intersections do not meet the identified characteristic for inclusion in the bicycle network of “Good crossings of busy roads: Many arterial streets are difficult to cross, particularly during peak travel periods. The bicycle network should provide good roadway crossings for the safety and convenience of its users.” (page 5-2) Philo Road and Anderson Street are the two proposed N-S routes. Both routes have 4-way stops or a stoplight at Florida and at Colorado, making it easier to cross through the intersection. Philo Road and Anderson Street are only ½ mile apart from each other, which meets a Plan guideline for facility placement (page 5-1).***
- ***Mumford to Scovill: Cottage Grove is offset at Mumford and only continues for one block south of Mumford. To continue south to Scovill from Cottage Grove at Mumford, a bicyclist would have to turn east on Mumford for one block to Cottage Grove, turn south on Cottage Grove for one block to Eliot, turn east on Eliot for ½ block to Pond, turn south on Pond for one block to McHenry, turn east on McHenry for ½ block to Pond and take Pond south about one block to Scovill. This does not meet the identified characteristic for inclusion in the bicycle network of “Not many stops or turns.”***

***No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.***

And then there's the unofficial route from Lincoln to First Street along Hazelwood. As I understand it Fox Development is working with the College of ACES and others to develop a grant application to establish a multiuse path here. It's interesting that the present map includes the pretty lousy road between the fence at Orchard Downs on Hazelwood and Lincoln Ave but it is used and should be developed properly by the university as part of the Arboretum plans. Has anyone talked to Bill Kruidenier about this section?

***Champaign County Regional Planning Commission Staff is working jointly with the University and Fox Development on the St. Mary's Road Corridor Plan, which will consider the path along Hazelwood Drive. No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.***

On Bradley, it is my understanding that Champaign is looking at a road diet/3 lane road here...do we have the road width to match this from Goodwin to the city line?

***Yes, 43' wide, same width from Lincoln-Goodwin. Bike lanes are recommended in the Plan west of Goodwin to match the City of Champaign's Bicycle Vision Plan. See Page 8-8. No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.***

Walnut Street Corridor at Milos. Milos is moving to the Pines. However, if this space gets reused as restaurant space with outdoor seating, is there space to expand eastward with the sidewalk to take the jutting out affect into account?

***No, the Federal Courthouse erected a fence, not leaving much parkway width between the existing path and fence. No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.***

Also, if Common Ground moves to the SE corner of Lincoln Square, additional bike parking will be needed here which will also benefit the Market.

***The City is currently installing 16 additional bicycle parking spaces at LSV. Additional parking needed beyond these 16 spaces will be evaluated as needed. No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.***

I assume there isn't room on the road for sharrows in this area of Lincoln Square?

***Shared lane markings are not necessary. This is recommended to be a Bike Route, with wayfinding signage to assist bicyclists to and around Lincoln Square Village back to Broadway Avenue on both sides of the mall. No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.***

8.1.9 The agreement with Carle includes maintaining bicycle and pedestrian access around the west side of their building. This needs to be reflected in the plan. We should include a copy of their plan as part of the document.

***This is shown in Appendix 6. No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.***

Also, for McCullough to be really useful for bikes, on street biking will be appropriate.

***It is recommended that the City not promote this as an on-street Bike Route, although bicyclists may still ride here, just as they legally may on any other street. Traffic counts may increase once the loop road around the Carle medical campus is complete. Also, there are many northbound right-turn movements by motorists, which will not be safe for bicyclists. There is already an off-street shared-use path between Park Street and the Carle loop road. Staff will be contacting IDOT to request implementation of a pedestrian lead interval at the University/McCullough intersection. No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.***

It would be good to work with everyone involved to extend McCullough south of the RR tracks so that you have a connection to Main Street. Along with access along Coler, this gets you a N-S route all the way to Bradley from two different parts of Urbana - downtown and the WUNA area.

***This is not feasible. The City does not have any right-of-way between the Carle loop road and Griggs Street that would be McCullough extended so a path can not be constructed here. Also, McCullough between Griggs and Main is a brick street and, per the Plan guidelines for facility placement (page 5-2), on-road facilities should not be implemented on brick roads. There is also not enough right-of-way to construct an off-street sidepath in this segment. No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.***

Personally, I think there's too much thinking of sidepaths in this document and not enough about just going for complete streets. Remember, for the commuter, a sidepath doesn't always work well and if you are going to do 8 or 10 feet of concrete, why not just do it as part of widening the road?

***It is much more expensive to remove and replace curb and gutter and widen a road with 8" thick pavement than to expand an existing sidewalk or construct a 6" thick sidepath.***

If you want pedestrian access then do something like on Windsor between Race and Wright Street.

***Windsor Road west of Race Street is a rural cross-section, and this cross-section can not be implemented on City streets with curb and gutter.***

I'm reminded of the Goodwin path between Springfield and Bradley - a waste of concrete that would have been better used on making the street wider. Does anyone use this criss crossing the road in multiple places?

***Goodwin is brick for part of the segment where the sidepath was installed. On-road facilities should not be implemented on brick roads, and is a Plan guideline for facility placement (page 5-2).***

My criticism of this approach extends to plans for Florida. And for George Huff. If you are going to do construction, let's do complete streets as mentioned in several sections. Same comments for sidepaths north of I74. The majority of people that are going to use these are cyclists headed out of town on road bikes and they aren't going to move to a sidepath if it's on the wrong side of the road.

***This Plan is for Type B bicyclists, the casual adult bicyclist. On-street facilities are not appropriate where roadways will be adjacent to land uses that produce heavy truck traffic, as will be the case on Lincoln Avenue north of I-74. Also, with proper access management, sidepaths are suitable facility recommendations for future arterial streets, such as Olympian Drive, that is not planned to have many access points. No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.***

Main Street. Having continuity of a bike lane through downtown is important given the destinations on the west end of Main - groceries and coffee. Having bike lanes TO downtown will more than outweigh gains that could be made by having some additional parking along Main St, particularly if there is expanded sidewalk space for outdoor cafe and displays. Cars are already served in this part of town, bikes are not. You will not solve the bikes on sidewalk problem that currently exists without bike lanes on the street.

***Agreed. No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.***

8.1.3 While we are looking at this section, I can see huge advantages for all forms of transportation if there was some connectivity between University and Main. This would provide access to Philo Road shopping area as a destination without having to go E to 130 or W to Vine.

***No on-road or off-street facility is possible in this area. Maple Street is not conducive to cycling for basic riders, and no off-street opportunities exist in the immediate area. Broadway (to the west) and the Cottage Grove corridor (to the east) are both proposed as a***

*way to travel between University and Main, and are spaced 0.6 miles apart, meeting the Plan's route placement guidelines (page 5-1). No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.*

Olympian [Drive] - why would you want to do a sidepath here? what/who will it serve? Again, put the 8 feet of concrete on the road half on each side and get good bike access east west.

*This Plan is for Type B bicyclists, the casual adult bicyclist. On-street facilities are not appropriate where roadways will be adjacent to land uses that produce heavy truck traffic, as will be the case in this segment. Also, with proper access management, sidepaths are suitable facility recommendations for future arterial streets, such as Olympian Drive, that is not planned to have many access points. No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.*

Washington: Cottonwood to 1800. Having biked this road for the past 25 plus years, a sidepath is a waste of concrete/asphalt. See above. Just keep going with the bike lanes from Menards if anything as this road gets reconstructed. Menards development will provide plenty of paths in the backyards for those who don't want to be part of traffic. COMPLETE STREETS whenever and wherever possible. that's my mantra for today and the rest of this project!

*This is included because it is listed in the Greenways & Trails Plan. With the Plan being evaluated every year and updated every 5 years, if development occurs in this area, the appropriate facility can be analyzed at that time. No development is planned at this time along Washington Street east of Cottonwood Road. No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.*

Washington going west...is there no room for sharrows between Anderson and points west?

*Dodson Drive to Urbana Avenue: Bike Lanes are recommended, to be implemented in the 0-5 Year timeframe.*

*Urbana Avenue to Vine Street: Sharrows are recommended, to guide bicyclists through the intersection at Vine Street.*

*Vine Street to Busey Avenue: Bike Route, with destination signage.*

*No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.*

Similarly, can't we do a bit more between Philo and Race along Windsor for the north side?

*There is an existing sidepath on the south side of Windsor Road in this segment. This is the proposed route. On-street facilities are not recommended in this segment as they do not meet the BLOS for a casual adult cyclist. No changes to the Plan are proposed based on this comment.*

Parking: Let's start by immediately improving bike parking around the city building. The wave in the back is almost useless as it's hard to get connected to though I appreciate the sheltered aspect. In front, we can only park 3 bikes at best. See comment about looking at our ordinances for improving bike parking at apartments and businesses - this could be mentioned in the document.

***Bike parking is addressed on Page 8-49: Section 8.2 states:***

***“Some recommended locations to provide, increase, or upgrade bicycle parking facilities include...***

- ***Commercial establishments in downtown Urbana***
- ***Commercial areas in the University District...***
- ***Major commercial establishments, banks, and government offices...***
- ***Apartment complexes”***

***Community Development will be studying changing the bicycle parking article of the zoning ordinance to address such issues.***

Drainage Grates - some of them, even though they look ok for bikes, really aren't. There are two types in use on Lincoln and one of them is superior to the other. I'll try to go take pictures of what I mean.

***City staff is currently reviewing their standards to find a figure that depicts a bicycle safe grate that can be included in Section 8.3 on pages 8-49 and 8-50.***

Love the idea of improving bike detection at lights. Warnings are needed not just at Lincoln and Main but something should be added for Lincoln and Stoughton as that's a major route through campus avoiding the problems of Main through the Seibel Center quad.

***We are not recommending Stoughton Street (from McCullough to Goodwin) as a Bike Route for the following reasons:***

- ***Crossing Lincoln at Stoughton is too close to the intersection of Lincoln & Springfield***
- ***Less street width than Main***
- ***2-way stop at Coler (On Main: 4-way stop at Coler)***
- ***Brick intersection at Busey (not so on Main)***
- ***Main provides connectivity to Downtown Urbana. Stoughton does not.***
- ***Stoughton does pass the Phillips Recreation Center, but the Boneyard Trail will achieve that.***
- ***Pavement is really poor***

***No changes to the plan are proposed based on this comment.***

9: If we do the area bike map properly, Urbana won't need one of it's own. Duplicate costs/expenses. I think we should just work with LIB to include all aspects of map desired.

***It is still our recommendation that the City of Urbana produce its own bicycle map. The CCB/LIB map is good for the current state of bicycling in C-U, but promotes routes that are not recommended for the same or any treatment in the Urbana Bicycle Master Plan. The CCB/LIB map includes streets that are ranked and recommended by bicyclists. The City of Urbana map only includes streets that have been evaluated based on width, speed limit, ADT,***

*etc. and meet a Bicycle Level or Service of “B” or greater - the comfort level for the casual adult bicyclist (the target user of this plan). No changes to the plan are proposed based on this comment*

I would recommend inclusion of a section, between 9.5 and 9.6 for implementation of recommended ordinance changes (anything we need to do with respect to bike parking facilities or complete streets concept).

*Urbana’s Community Development Department will be studying changing the bicycle parking article of the Zoning Ordinance to address such issues.*

### **Additional Changes Based on Further Internal Review**

Based on Bicycle Master Plan Steering Committee comments that were not able to be changed before the release of the draft Plan:

- All maps in the document will be enlarged to 11x17, to improve legibility
- The Hickman Tree Walk in Carle Park will be removed from all maps as an existing bike facility.
- Figures such as 8.8 where the Bike Route sign in the future view is not easily visible will be changed to increase the visibility of the sign.
- If Carle Hospital plans are updated before the April 7th Council meeting, they will be updated in the Appendix.
- The Appendix will be updated to include the Final Crystal Lake Park Master Plan, as received from the Urbana Park District
- The Weaver Park Master Plan will be added to the Appendix, as received from the Urbana Park District
- The proposed mileage for bike lanes and sidepaths for each timeframe will be added to Figures 9.1-9.3. Currently shown as “X”
- Throughout the document all references to streets will include the entire street name (ex. Anderson “Street”, Florida “Avenue”, Gregory “Drive”)
- A small map will be 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. An example is attached for reference.

Based on information received from City staff, the following changes will be made to the bicycle network recommendations:

Broadway Avenue (Michigan-Florida): The Bike Master Plan document will be changed to show a bike route on Broadway Avenue between Michigan Avenue and Florida Avenue instead of bike lanes. A new BLOS will be calculated for this segment and the new BLOS will be reflected on Figure 7.11 on page 7-7. The new BLOS Difference will be reflected on Figure 7.12 on page 7-8. Figures 8.1 and 8.2 on pages 8-2 and 8-3 will be changed to show a bike route instead of bike lanes in this segment. Section 8.1.7 will be changed to reflect a bike route instead of bike lanes. The implementation tables in Chapter 9 will be changed to reflect the cost of a bike route vs. bike lanes. Removal of parking in this segment will no longer be

necessary and therefore the comment about parking removal will be removed from the implementation tables.

Rail to Trail: The Bike Master Plan document will be changed to show a Rail-with-Trail along the existing Norfolk Southern railtrack between McCullough and Broadway in the 0-5 year timeframe instead of a Rail-to-Trail in the 10+ year timeframe. Currently Figures 8.1 and 8.2 on pages 8-2 and 8-3 show a shared-use path in this segment in the 10+ timeframe. These figures will be changed to show the shared-use path in this segment in the 0-5 year timeframe. The Plan document will also be changed to show a newly proposed Rails-to-Trails (shared-use path) between Coler and McCullough in the 10+ year timeframe. A shared-use path will be added in this segment to Figures 8.1 and 8.2 on pages 8-2 and 8-3. Due to these two proposed changes, the section entitled “Existing Norfolk Southern railtrack” in Section 8.1.46 (pages 8-39 and 8-40) will be changed as shown below:

- Smith-Broadway: Rails-to-Trails (shared-use path). Seek right-of-way acquisition if opportunity becomes available. See Section 8.5.4 for recommendations on providing a shared-use path on the Vine Street railroad bridge.
- Broadway-McCullough: Rails-with-Trails (shared-use path) to connect Carle medical campus to Downtown Urbana
- McCullough-Wright: Rails-to-Trails (shared-use path) Seek right-of-way acquisition if opportunity becomes available. Provide a safe crossing at Lincoln & University Avenues by allocating signal time to bicyclists to cross this intersection. Take advantage of opportunities to extend the trail west into the City of Champaign, and to link it to the Martin Luther King Trail in Champaign.

The implementation tables in Chapter 9 will be changed to reflect these changes.

Perkins Road (Eastern Avenue to Webber Park): The Bike Master Plan document will be changed to show a sidepath on the south side of Perkins Road between Eastern Avenue and Webber Park in the 10+ Year timeframe. A sidepath will be added in this segment to Figures 8.1 and 8.2 on pages 8-2 and 8-3. A 4<sup>th</sup> bullet will be add to “Perkins Road” in Section 8.1.6 that reads:

- Webber Park-Eastern Avenue: Sidepath on south side of the road.

The implementation tables in Chapter 9 will be changed to add a shared-use path in this segment.

Based on information received from City staff, the following changes will be made to the plan document:

- Page 6-7: Sign dimensions for Figure 6.18 (Bike Route) will be added to the list in Figure 6.19.
- Page 6-14: Figure 6.32, Sign #4 will be replaced with a “Bikes Yield to Peds” sign
- The Downtown Bike Parking Map will be updated and added to the Appendix.