

**AGENDA
BLOOMINGTON TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2018 4:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
109 EAST OLIVE STREET
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS**

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

4. MINUTES: Review and approve the minutes of the October 16, 2018 regular meeting of the Bloomington Transportation Commission.

5. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. **TC-2018-07:** Approval of Proposed Policy on Establishing Reduced Speed Limit Areas
- B. **Information:** November Citizen Comments/Complaints Summary

6. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Any old items brought back by the Commission

7. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Any new items brought up by the Commission

8. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

9. ADJOURNMENT

For further information contact:

Philip Allyn, City Traffic Engineer

Department of Public Works

Government Center

115 E. Washington Street, Bloomington, IL 61701

Phone: (309) 434-2225 ; Fax: (309) 434-2201; E-mail: traffic@cityblm.org

**MINUTES
BLOOMINGTON TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2018 4:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
109 EAST OLIVE STREET
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Angela Ballantini, Ms. Jill Blair, Ms. Maureen (Reenie) Bradley, Mr. Michael Gorman, Ms. Elizabeth Kooba, Ms. Kelly Rumley

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Katherine Browne

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Diana Hauman, Ward 8 Alderman; Mr. George Boyle, City Attorney; Mr. Jim Karch, Director of Public Works; Mr. Philip Allyn, City Traffic Engineer; and several members of the public and media.

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Gorman called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm.

2. ROLL CALL: Mr. Allyn called the roll. With seven members in attendance, a quorum was established.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Public Comments were heard from Ms. Surena Fish. Ms. Fish lines on Wood Street immediately across from the main entrance to Miller Park. Ms. Fish expressed a concern about speeding along Wood Street between Center and Morris, especially during the summer. It is dangerous for people crossing into the park since there is not cross walk. This past summer was an accident where someone speeding hit a parked car, pushing it up into the yard, tried to get away and hit another parked vehicle. Ms. Fish is worried that someone will get hurt. Please consider this during our speeding discussion.

4. MINUTES: Reviewed and approved the minutes of the September 18, 2018 regular meeting of the Bloomington Transportation Commission. Ms. Ballantini motioned to approve the minutes. Ms. Blair seconded the motion. The motion was approved by the Transportation Commission unanimously via voice vote.

5. REGULAR AGENDA:

A. TC-2018-04: Discussion of City Speed Limits and Residential Neighborhoods

Mr. Allyn indicated that today is the next step in the discussion. We have returned with information requested previously. In addition, Staff came up with a list of potential targeted solutions to help combat speeding to be discussed today. The intent not being to have a final decision on each item, but simply to gain direction on which items the Commission would like Staff to further refine and which to stop considering.

Mr. Allyn briefly discussed the crash and fatality statistics for the City over the past four years. There have been five fatalities total, two in Fiscal Year 2015, and one each in FY 2016, 2017, and 2018. Of these, the fatalities in FY 2016 and 2018 were pedestrians. There were no bicycle crashes resulting in fatalities. The pedestrian fatalities did not appear to be speed related.

Mr. Allyn briefly discussed the noise analysis. The main takeaway from the data is that there is not a significant difference in noise generated when a vehicles speed is changed by 5 or 10 mph. For example, the change from 30 to 40 mph corresponds to a change in noise of 63 decibels versus 68 decibels. This 5-decibel difference is roughly the same as the sound difference between a running shower and a normal volume conversation. Noise pollution is more significantly impacted by other factors such as pavement type and condition, distance from the roadway, and number of vehicles.

Mr. Allyn stated each of the six items for discussion has its own advantages and disadvantages and quickly summarized each one. The first three items are related in that they are varying degrees of implementation. The first item changes the statutory speed limit City-wide. The second item is similar, but is only applied over an area, such as the defined downtown area or a specific neighborhood. The third item focuses on specific locations of known concern and would likely include physical changes to curb lines, striping or signage. This item changes what we already have. The fourth item involves changes to the City Manual of Practice, which is the set of rules for Developers controlling what they build in our City. Changes would will encourage slower travel speeds. This item will generally only apply to new construction of streets by developers or projects not utilizing any State or Federal funding. The fifth and six items are related to the enforcement aspect. The fifth item increases police staffing, while the sixth utilizes technology in the form of speed cameras similar to the red-light running cameras being utilized in the Chicago area.

Ms. Blair asked for clarification on the crash data. Mr. Allyn indicated that the total crash numbers in the first three rows are the overall totals and include the breakdown numbers for pedestrian and pedal cycles below.

Mr. Gorman indicated an interest in an area speed reduction where a percentage of the residents apply to the City, and then the City reaches out to everyone in the area. The downtown is an obvious area as are some of the residential areas around town. Mr. Allyn indicated that there are some pros and cons to this item. The east side residential areas with limited access points from arterials are easy to define. Older parts of the City with a grid network of streets are more difficult to define.

Ms. Rumley indicated that the first thing we should look at is enforcing the current posted speed limits and see if that is effective. If we reduce the limit from 30 to 25, there could be confusion between Bloomington and Normal on certain streets and will people obey that or continue at their regular speed. As people bring specific locations to us then we can address them and see if there are things we can do.

Mr. Gorman asked about the cost for a viable, impactful traffic enforcement division. Assistant Chief Bayes indicated that to have an impact, 4-6 officers would need to be committed to just traffic enforcement. Currently there are a number of empty positions in other divisions such as drug enforcement and violent crimes. Additional officers would likely fill these other areas first as they are critical to reduce the number of violent crimes in our community. With respect to traffic enforcement, looking at the numbers between 2005 and 2017, there does not appear to be a correlation between crashes and enforcement as measured by tickets issued. Crash numbers seem to run fairly steady regardless of a decline or an increase in enforcement. AC Bayes indicated that roadway design was more effective because it is present all the time as opposed to a police officer who is only rarely present in a given location. For a traffic division of 4-6 officers with appropriate supervision, it would cost approximately \$750,000 per year. This would be after they were able to fill the other higher importance positions.

Ms. Blair asked if similar crash data was available for other communities of similar size. Mr. Allyn indicated that we do not currently, but we can see what we can find.

Ms. Bradley agreed that it would be difficult to lower the speed limit in gridded neighborhoods. She does not believe that a blanket lowering would work here. Normal likely would not agree to lower their statutory speed limit. She thinks that by lowering the speed limit, some drivers would slow to the new limit creating a discrepancy of speed making traffic flow unpredictable. This does not address the issue of what to do in some of the neighborhoods. She would like to see a more targeted approach on specific locations. Lower vehicle speeds in the gridded areas are needed, but it is unclear how an area speed limit change would work since there are not defined boundaries. People would be more focused on the changing speed limits than their other surroundings. Other options may be more effective, low-cost options such as reducing parking at intersections, updating crosswalks and signage, etc. There is concern about ability of effectiveness in the gridded neighborhoods.

Mr. Gorman stated that with regard to the gridded streets, a natural boundary would be the arterial streets surrounding an area. Mr. Allyn indicated that the difficulty comes from the larger number of access points to the area. It is not insurmountable, but it is more difficult. That is where the various criteria of the policy come into play.

AC Bayes asked if the perception is that 30 mph is too fast or that people are driving faster than 30 mph. Ms. Rumley responded that her perception is that people are driving faster than 30 mph. The problem is not the speed limit, the problem is people obeying the speed limit. AC Bayes reiterated that obeying the speed limit would still be a problem with a lower speed limit as it would not likely slow the driving speeds.

Ms. Bradley asked for an opinion on what would slow people down if changing the speed limit will not. What other ideas are there? Mr. Allyn indicated that if you cannot do consistent, heavy enforcement, then you need engineering controls such as curb bump outs, road diets, and other traffic calming. This plays into Item C and to a lesser extent Item D. Item C would have a process of collecting a list of the trouble locations and then addressing each of them with a targeting solution that is appropriate for that location. Some solutions are cheaper, while some are more expensive. In order to do the level of work that is needed to complete a project similar to Front Street in other locations is not sustainable on a recurring basis. We do not currently have the funding or the Staff resources. The engineering would likely need to be outsourced to a consultant. We would need to have a set amount of funding set annually in the budget similar to the annual sidewalk program that would cover both construction and engineering. We would then start at the top of the list and get down each year as much as possible with the funding that is available.

Mr. Allyn indicated that in his opinion, the citywide speed limit change (Item A) would not be very effective based on available data and studies. The area speed limit change (Item B) could be more effective, specifically in the downtown area. It would be an easier thing to do. The Manual of Practice changes (Item D) resets the bar moving forward, but we are not really building new streets any more. The other downside of Manual of Practice changes would be losing the benefit of staying similar to Normal with regard to development requirements if they do not agree to changes.

Ms. Blair asked for verification that these items were not mutually exclusive. Mr. Allyn confirmed that was correct. We could pursue anywhere from one to all of the items. The intent is to focus staff time on the items of greatest interest and eliminate any that the Commission does not feel are worth moving forward. Ms. Blair mentioned that it did not seem that there was much support for the citywide speed limit change.

Ms. Rumley preferred not to do a blanket speed limit change, or even just in defined areas, but indicated support for increased enforcement based on road type with more police on the higher volume roads and focused changes on the problem areas whether that is curb bump outs, road diets,

or signage. Road diets would not need to be necessarily expensive curb changes, but could just be striping.

Ms. Rumley suggested removing Items A (Citywide reduction) and F (automated enforcement). Ms. Bradley agreed with regard to removing Items A and F with some hybrid of the rest of the items. Ms. Bradley asked about the opportunity for special targets higher enforcement. AC Bayes indicated that this was possible through the STEP program as well as use of radar signs. For example, they received complaints of speeding on Broadmoor. They placed signs that confirmed high numbers of violations. Other deployments have shown that there are not a high number of violations. On Ireland Gove Road last spring, there was data to support a significant number of violations that triggered the STEP program being enacted there. AC Bayes coordinates the deployment of the radar signs to determine times of highest violation and then staffs at those times. The Police Department does do traffic enforcement, they just do a lot of other things as well. They can target enforcement; they just need to know where. There is already of list of places they are looking at.

Mr. Gorman also expressed support for removing Items A and F and requested discussing Item C further. Ms. Ballantini and Ms. Kooba confirmed support for removing Items A and F. Ms. Blair confirmed removing Item A, but asked about the costs between Items E (traffic division) and F (automated enforcement). Mr. Allyn indicated that Item F was likely cheaper than Item E. Ms. Blair indicated that she did not love the cameras, but thought that it might be an effective and lower cost alternate to Item E. Mr. Gorman recognized that they may be effect, but thought that during previous discussions, the legality was unclear. Mr. Allyn indicated that in Illinois, speed cameras currently are only allowed in construction zones and in Chicago school zones and park districts. Moving forward with this item would initially consist of recommending that the City Manager and Council and/or other local elected officials petition the state representatives to change the state law.

Mr. Gorman stated that with respect to funding on Item C (targeted engineering changes) Safe Routes to School grants would be a good source of funding that could both improve school walking routes as well as install curb extensions or other similar features to increase safety for pedestrians overall. A large portion of the City is within the required distance of a school. He suggested policy level changes that both encourage this sort of engineering change and look at a longer-term plan for where we might make these types of changes in the future. Mr. Gorman suggested looking at Bryan Street in Normal where most intersections were installed with planters, which help keep people from parking too close to intersections as well as slowing people down as the perceived lane width is smaller. It also improves the pedestrian experience by decreasing the time to cross the street. We should look for opportunities to do this Citywide.

Ms. Rumley expressed support for exploring the Safe Routes to School funding tying into both Items B (Area Speed Limit Reductions) and C (spot engineering changes). She is not sure that there is a need for Item D (Manual of Practice). We should look by neighborhood to identify locations and apply this funding. Ms. Rumley favored moving forward with Items B, C, and E. (increased enforcement).

Ms. Bradley indicated that she agreed with getting buy-in from all the stakeholders. Councilmembers should canvas their areas for their top location concerns. Also, get feedback from others such as Connect Transit, solid waste collection staff, police, etc. Get a list gathered, prioritize it, and start knocking locations off and funding allows. Cheaper projects can be combined with more expensive to needed to utilize all funding allocated. Mr. Gorman indicated that the Town of Normal has put out some GIS based crowd sourcing tools for submitting suggested locations. Something similar might be helpful in identifying our locations.

Ms. Rumley asked if there was a heat map available showing crash locations. Mr. Gorman indicated that he had built one a couple years ago using IDOT's data. He will send a link to it to Mr. Allyn to broadcast out to the group.

Mr. Gorman requested discussion of Item D (Manual of Practice). It is his understanding that the Manual of Practice (MOP) is mainly used for new construction, but it also applies to existing streets when doing reconstruction or resurfacing. Mr. Allyn indicated that typically when doing just a mill and overlay, we do not expand the scope of the project to bring the street into full compliance if there is not a problem or a strong reason to. For example, if a street is a couple feet narrower than the MOP indicates it should be based on classification, we will not increase the construction cost by removing and replacing all the curb and gutter and widening the pavement. There have been some cases where there were width issues such as residents pulling up over deteriorated curb and parking with one wheel in the yard because the road was not wide enough. We would replace the deteriorated curb in this case and widen the road to the MOP width. Mr. Gorman stated that he still believed that the MOP was relevant to existing streets within the core of the community because it states what we believe a street should look like even if we do not have to comply with it. It would still be beneficial to identify changes that would help. Mr. Gorman believes that one of the outcomes of the sustainability of street funding discussion is that since narrower roads will be cheaper to maintain, making changes to the MOP is a way to win on both speeding issues and sustainable funding. For instance, look at whether we need to allocate space for parking by default or if it should be on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Allyn confirmed concurrence from the Commission on keeping Item D

Mr. Gorman summarized eliminating A (citywide speed limit change), explore further B (area speed limit change), C (targeted spot changes), and D (Manual of Practice changes), and eliminate F. With regard to E (establish traffic division), Mr. Gorman believed that there was not support on the Council to include an additional \$750,000 in funding and this item should be eliminated.

Ms. Rumley suggested increasing efforts to notify public of the ability to submit speeding complaints and request increased enforcement. AC Bayes agreed with this increased notification, but indicated that they currently are not short on complaints; they are short on officers to address them.

Ms. Rumley suggested dropping Item E from consideration. Mr. Allyn asked if this item could be modified to requested funds for additional radar signs. AC Bayes indicated that they have been purchasing a couple each of the last several years, but could probably use some additional ones.

Mr. Allyn indicated that we would be returning with Item B, C, and D as separate items in the future.

Mr. Gorman asked if the Manual of Practice was available online. Mr. Allyn indicated it was. Mr. Gorman requested that a link be sent out to the Commissioners if possible.

C. Information: October Citizen Comments/Complaints Summary

Ms. Bradley asked about Item 19, the Gill Street cul-de-sac with a number of different signs regarding trucks and yielding that are confusing. She suggested taking down all the signs and starting over. Near that location is the intersection of Vladimir Dr. and Tatiana Court/Keisha Dr. There is not any traffic control on Tatiana/Keisha that stops traffic from going straight out into Vladimir. Could Staff please review this intersection?

Mr. Gorman asked about Item 16, the request for an all-way stop or other enhancement at Stone Mountain and College. Mr. Allyn indicated that we completed traffic counts at the intersection and speed data on College. The intersection does not meet warrants for traffic signals or an all-way stop. We are painting a crosswalk and installing advance-warning signs. We are also talking with Ameren

about installing a second light on the south side of the intersection where the bike train crosses Stone Mountain. Mr. Gorman asked if speed data on College was gathered because it seems that traffic moves very fast on College and wondered about the safety of a crosswalk in this location. Mr. Allyn responded that we did gather it, but did not have the details with him. Mr. Gorman indicated that this might be a good location for the pedestrian activated signs being used on Front Street and asked whether it was to be a regular or high-visibility crosswalk. Mr. Allyn indicated that he could not recall immediately which was chosen. Ms. Bradley expressed concern about the speed limit on College remaining at 35 mph with the presence of the school, the popular park and all the residential driveways. Ms. Rumley echoed concerns about locating a cross walk at this location with the speed on College without using a high-visibility or even raised crosswalk. Mr. Allyn indicated that there currently are a large number of people crossing at this location to get to Tipton Park with no signage or markings. We felt that establishing something to tell drivers about the pedestrians was better than nothing.

Mr. Allyn indicated that Staff is currently working with the Town of Normal to develop defined criteria for the use of several traffic control devices such as Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons so that we have a set process rather than a completely arbitrary system.

6. OLD BUSINESS:

- A. Mr. Gorman requested an update on the funding discussion. Mr. Allyn indicated that due to the construction season still ongoing, staff members needed for the next step of providing and compiling historical data on life cycle lengths have been unavailable. Mr. Gorman requested a copy of the outdated hot-mix asphalt aging table that was included in a previous presentation but was not in the packet. Mr. Allyn will send it out.
- B. Ms. Bradley asked if there was an update on the Post Office. Mr. Allyn indicated that there has not yet been a response. Mr. Karch confirmed that he has not yet seen a response.

7. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. None

8. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

Mr. Gorman reminded the Commission that there was a reception for members of the City Boards and Commissions at the BPCA that started at 5 pm and encouraged members to head there after the meeting.

Mr. Gorman mentioned that there was a discussing at the previous City Council meeting about adding an additional member to the Transportation Commission that would represent the needs of citizens with disabilities. It sounded like the Council Members were supportive. The time frame that this will be happening is unclear, but there may be a new member sometime in the next several months.

Ms. Bradley asked if this was an assumption that the Commission is not currently able to advocate for the needs of citizens with disabilities. Mr. Gorman indicated that members may not have the same experiences as those who are for example wheelchair bound and that they could bring a unique perspective. He believed this was sparked by a conversation on social media regarding the sidewalk curb ramp work that was recently completed at Main and Mulberry. Mr. Gorman voiced a concern that Staff is not adequately prioritizing allocation of street Right of Way in the best interests of those who are unable to get around on two feet. Having an additional person on the Commission who can provide that first hand perspective might be valuable. For example, Mr. Gorman suggested decreasing the driver experience by installing a bump out that reduces Main Street to one travel lane

in order to increase the pedestrian accommodations. Mr. Allyn indicated that the work at the intersection was done to bring a non-compliant intersection into ADA compliance. That was done and the intersection is currently compliant. He acknowledged that additional accommodations with impacts to other users and the resources for other improvements would have been possible.

Ms. Bradley stated that she is not opposed to this idea of adding a member with a specific disability, but questioned how it is determined. We are talking about wheelchair bound. Why not also consider the visually impaired or hearing impaired? There are many concerns that the Commission should be taking into account without necessarily needing every concern specifically represented.

Mr. Gorman stated that it is not the Commission's responsibility to determine who sits on the Commission. Ms. Bradley stated that she is not opposed to adding someone with first hand experience, but rather hopes the Council considers this with a broad brush rather than just focusing on an individual ramp issue.

Ms. Blair stated that any time we can add diversity to a Commission is good. This should not be taken as a negative on what the Commission is currently doing.

9. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:16 pm unanimously by voice vote; motioned by Ms. Blair and seconded by Ms. Rumley.

Respectfully,

Philip Allyn
City Traffic Engineer

**CITY OF BLOOMINGTON
REPORT FOR THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
November 20, 2018**

CASE NUMBER:	SUBJECT:	ORIGINATING FROM:
TC-2018-07	Review of Proposed Policy on Establishing Reduced Speed Limit Areas	Philip Allyn, PE, PTOE City Traffic Engineer
REQUEST:	Initial review and comment by the Transportation Commission of a DRAFT Policy for Establishing Reduced Speed Limit Areas to be finalized and brought back with the associated Council Ordinance at a later meeting for final discussion and approval.	

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Review and Feedback

Staff requests review and feedback on the initial draft Policy on Establishing Reduced Speed Limit Areas. Comments received will be incorporated into the final document to be approved at a subsequent meeting. In addition, a proposed Council Ordinance will be prepared for recommendation to Council to address any City Code modifications required as a result of the policy.

1. ATTACHMENTS:

- a. See previous packet and attachments from vehicle speed discussions at August and October, 2018 Commission Meetings
- b. DRAFT Policy on Establishing Reduced Speed Limit Areas

2. BACKGROUND AND SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

At the October, 2018 Transportation Commission meeting, the Commission provided direction to Staff to move forward with development of a policy to establish a reduced statutory speed limit in certain neighborhoods or other defined areas. Staff submits the attached draft policy for review and comment by the Commission.

As discussed previously, there are several positives that could be reasonably assumed with a reduction in the Statutory Speed Limit within a larger area or neighborhood:

- 1. Lowering the statutory speed limit should slow some drivers on City streets. Drivers following the current speed limit because it's the law may slow to the new posted speed limit. Drivers who are accustomed to driving a certain amount over the posted speed limit may slow to this same amount over the new speed limit. It's unclear based on available data how large of an effect this would be and whether this effect would be temporary or longer term.
- 2. The publicity resulting from the changed speed limit should draw the attention of the community to the dangers of speeding and may have an overall traffic calming effect on all roads (not just City streets with a new lower posted speed) at least temporarily if not

longer term. In addition, this increased focus may lead to an opportunity for other safety measures that may have a longer lasting effect.

3. By limiting the scope of the change to a defined area, it is highlighting the areas where reduced speed is more important such as where there are higher than average volumes of pedestrians or where there could be children present. This could have a greater effect on reducing speed in these areas.
4. By reducing speed limits within defined areas and not on the arterials that border them, through traffic is encouraged to remain on the arterial streets rather than “cutting through” on residential streets, keeping them with lower volumes and thus fewer potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts.
5. Many residential subdivisions built within the last several decades have reduced points of entry from arterials streets reducing the signage effort and cost required to adequately notify of the reduced speed limit area.

Similarly, there are several negatives that could be reasonably assumed with a reduction in the Statutory Speed Limit within a larger area or neighborhood:

1. Absent other controls (increased enforcement or physical changes to the roadway), many drivers will likely continue to drive at the speed they feel is safe and reasonable. This will increase violation rate without increased enforcement or more expensive traffic calming.
2. May increase speed differential between fastest and slowest drivers. Drivers following the current speed limit because it’s the law may slow to the new posted speed limit. Drivers who drive a certain amount over the posted speed limit may slow to this same amount over the new speed limit. However, absent other controls, many drivers will likely continue to drive at the speed they feel is safe and/or reasonable, creating less-safe situations for motorists and pedestrians. Faster drivers will come up on slower drivers more suddenly. At intersections, it may be harder to judge adequate gaps in traffic, both by turning vehicles and pedestrians trying to cross. Pedestrians may gain a false sense of safety assuming vehicles are traveling slower, leading to more risky crossings.
3. Will not be able to change roads under other jurisdictions (State, County, Town, etc.) leading to potential confusion for drivers about the speed limit for the street on which they are driving.
4. Cost of new installation and future maintenance of a significant number of new signs indicating both the start and end of the reduced speed limit area.
5. Many of the older residential subdivisions within the grid system of streets are not as defined of an area and have significantly more points of entry from arterials streets. This could make adequately notifying drivers of the reduced speed limit area more challenging.
6. Similarly, the longer, straight streets within these older neighborhoods are more conducive to speeding than the curvy streets of newer subdivisions and thus are more at risk.

The Draft Policy was written with several goals:

1. Provide a process that requires significant involvement from the residents of the area. This involvement will create personal investment in the change by the residents that should increase the chances of the reduced speed limits actually reducing driving speeds. Without buy-in from the affected community, this policy won’t be nearly as effective at making our streets safer.

2. The areas targeted by the policy are areas with a high likelihood of pedestrians and other users that are more vulnerable to vehicles traveling at higher speeds.
3. Create larger sized, well defined areas so that it is more obvious to drivers that they are entering a new area. This should increase the likely hood that drivers will reduce their speed in these areas as opposed to not realizing that the speed limit changed.

If the Commission wishes to continue moving forward with this new policy, Staff will refine the policy based on comments received, solicit comments on the policy from other City Staff such as Planning, Police, Fire, Legal, City Manager, etc. and prepare a final version for approval by the Commission at a subsequent meeting. In addition, a Council Ordinance will be prepared for review and recommendation to Council to address any City Code modifications required as a result of the policy.

3. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff requests review and feedback on the initial draft Policy on Establishing Reduced Speed Limit Areas.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip Allyn, PE, PTOE
City Traffic Engineer

CITY OF BLOOMINGTON

POLICY ON ESTABLISHING REDUCED SPEED LIMIT AREAS

The current Statutory Speed Limit within the City of Bloomington is 30 mph. This Policy defines a procedure to establish a lower 25 mph Statutory Speed Limit within a defined area. This policy is only applicable to urban streets within an Urban District and does not apply to rural areas even if they are within the corporate limits. This policy does NOT modify any Altered Speed Limits within the designated area. Any Altered Speed Limits will remain in place and be evaluated according to applicable City Code and State Statute.

Goals and Objectives

There is a distinct difference between vehicle speeds and posted speed limits. Decreasing vehicle travel speeds should result in safer roadways; however, simply lowering a posted speed limit should not be expected to result in these same safety benefits if there isn't a corresponding decrease in vehicle travel speed. All local residents in Reduced Speed Limit Areas need to be actively involved in following the lower speed limit when driving in their neighborhood. Residents should set an example that others can follow. Don't assume that the problem is someone else!

The goals of establishing Reduced Speed Limit Areas are to:

- Improve the quality of life within residential neighborhoods.
- Increase safety and convenience for pedestrians and bicyclists, as long as such changes do not interfere with the safe operation of other users of the roadways.
- Reduce the number and severity of crashes.

Specific objectives of establishing Reduced Speed Limit Areas include:

- Reduction in the speed of traffic in residential or high-pedestrian areas
- Reduction in the volume of through traffic traveling through residential areas.
- Shifting unnecessary cut-through traffic on local streets to streets designated as collector or arterial streets.
- Promote other modes of travel (walking, cycling, mass transit).

Laws Concerning Traffic Control Devices and Posted Speed Limits

The Federal Highway Administration approved and issued the 2009 edition of the "Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways" as a national

standard for all highways open to public travel. The current version includes Revision 1 and Revision 2, dated May 2012.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 11-301 of the Illinois Vehicle Code, the Illinois Department of Transportation adopted this manual as the official manual for a uniform system of traffic control devices for the State of Illinois.

Section 11-301 of the Uniform Vehicle Code contains the legal authority for the manual. The responsibility for the erection and maintenance of traffic control devices for local roads and streets is established in Section 11-304 and reads as follows:

"Local traffic-control devices. Local authorities and road district highway commissioners in their respective maintenance jurisdiction shall place and maintain such traffic control devices upon highways under their maintenance jurisdiction as are required to indicate and carry out the provisions of this Chapter and local traffic ordinances, or to regulate war, or guide traffic. **All such traffic control devices shall conform to the State manual and Specifications and shall be justified by traffic warrants stated in the manual.** Placement of traffic control devices on township or road district roads also shall be subject to written approval of the County Superintendent of Highways."

Section 5/11-604 (b) of the Illinois Vehicle Code reads as follows:

"Whenever any such park district, city, village, or incorporated town determines, upon the basis of an engineering or traffic investigation concerning a highway or street on which it is authorized by this Section to establish speed limits, that a maximum speed limit prescribed in Section 11-601 of this Chapter is greater or less than is reasonable or safe with respect to the conditions found to exist at any place or along any part or zone of such highway or street, **the local authority or park district shall determine and declare by ordinance a reasonable and safe absolute maximum speed limit at such place or along such part or zone, which:**

- (1) **Decreases the limit within an urban district, but not to less than 20 miles per hour;** or
- (2) Increases the limit within an urban district, but not to more than 55 miles per hour; or
- (3) Decreases the limit outside of an urban district, but not to less than 35 miles per hour, except as otherwise provided in subparagraph 4 of this paragraph; or
- (4) **Decreases the limit within a residence district, but not to less than 25 miles per hour,** except as otherwise provided in subparagraph 1 of this paragraph.

The park district, city, village, or incorporated town may make such limit applicable at all times or only during certain specified times. Not more than 6 such

alterations shall be made per mile along a highway or street; and the difference in limit between adjacent altered speed zones shall not be more than 10 miles per hour.”

Qualifying Criteria

Criteria to qualify Areas for a Reduced Speed Limit have been developed by the City of Bloomington Public Works Engineering Division and approved by the City Transportation Commission and may be revised from time to time by the same said groups if deemed necessary.

To qualify for implementation of a Reduced Speed Limit Area, the following criteria must be met:

- 1) The area should consist of one of the following land uses:
 - a) Residential
 - b) Central Business District (CBD) with pedestrian volumes higher than other commercial areas
 - c) Campus (educational or corporate) with higher volumes of pedestrians than the surrounding areas.

- 2) The area should meet the following size and mobility requirements:
 - a) The total area shall be at least 20 acres (80 acres for Campus).
 - b) The area shall include at least 900 centerline feet along every street not wholly contained within the area.
 - c) The establishment of the Reduced Speed Limit Area shall not result in more than four (4) speed limit changes within any one (1) mile section of any street. This includes portions of the street located outside of the area.

- 3) To be successful and to limit driver confusion regarding the speed limit in effect on a given street, the limits of the proposed area shall be chosen such that a driver experiences crossing a line of separation from the surrounding area.
 - a) The entire proposed area should generally be of the same land use (e.g. 90% residential) rather than mixed (e.g. 2/3 residential and 1/3 commercial).
 - i) The “feel” and character of the area should be used to determine the acceptable amount of mixed use rather than a hard ratio or percentage.
 - ii) Institutional uses such as schools, churches or libraries located within a larger residential area should not disqualify a residential area, provided they do not constitute a major portion of the area.
 - iii) Apartments above commercial properties and/or other multi-story high-density residential mixed within a Central Business District should not disqualify a CBD area.
 - iv) An Educational Campus area may also include adjacent residential areas if they are predominately associated with staff or student use or have high volumes of pedestrians.

- b) The following items can be considered Defined Boundaries for the purpose of identifying the proposed area:
 - i) Established, named Neighborhood borders that are signed on the street as such.
 - ii) Arterial or Major Collector roads or streets as indicated on the Bloomington-Normal Street and Highway Plan.
 - iii) Natural or manmade features that create a physical divider with limited access across such as creeks, rivers, railroad tracks, interstate highways, etc.
 - iv) Corporate Boundary
 - v) Other such boundaries that create an easily distinguished line of separation from the surrounding area as determined by City Staff.
 - c) Multiple phases of the same subdivision (e.g. Meadowlark I and Meadowlark II) or adjacent subdivisions, should generally be evaluated as one (and requested by all applicable neighborhood or homeowners associations) if they are not separated by a Defined Boundary as discussed above.
 - d) The streets surrounding a school will not be considered as its own area. School Zone Speed Limits are more effective and should be pursued in this case. Streets surrounding a school may be considered as part of a larger overall neighborhood area.
- 4) If needed, Staff will suggest modifications to the petitioner to modify originally submitted proposed boundaries to assist with meeting these criteria. The proposed boundaries will be finalized prior to the initiation of the formal balloting discussed below.
 - 5) During evaluation of the request, Staff will gather speed data from the street locations within the area with the highest likelihood for high vehicle travel speeds. If the 85th percentile speed on these streets is 27 mph or lower, then the area is assumed to be self-policing and will NOT be considered for establishment of a Reduced Speed Limit Area.
 - 6) An area will NOT be considered until building lots in the proposed area are built out to at least 85 percent of available lots.
 - 7) If City Staff believes it is in the best interest of the City to waive any of the above-defined conditions, the City Traffic Engineer will present the request to the City Transportation Commission for approval of a waiver. Any approved waivers will be included in the case documentation.

Procedure for Establishing a Reduced Speed Limit Area

City staff members recognize that there are many different neighborhoods and districts within the City of Bloomington, each with unique characteristics. A uniform procedure is set for requesting, evaluating, authorizing, and implementing Areas of Reduced Speed on Bloomington streets within these areas. That procedure is set forth below.

Policy on Requests for Establishing a Reduced Speed Limit Area:

It is the policy of the City of Bloomington to accept requests for a Reduced Speed Limit Area. All requests will be evaluated using our City of Bloomington Policy on Establishing Reduced Speed Limit Areas, State and Federal Standards and accepted engineering practice.

Requests for the establishment of a Reduced Speed Limit Area within a Residential area shall be initiated by the neighborhood or homeowner association(s) for that area, City government officials, or other similar resident organizations with a stakeholder interest in the area to be considered. In the event that an area does not have a neighborhood or homeowner association, a group of individual citizens owning a minimum of ten (10) residences in the area may initiate a request together.

Requests for the establishment of a Reduced Speed Limit Area within a Central Business District (CBD) area shall be initiated by the business owner association(s) for that area, City government officials, or City Planning Department Staff. In the event that an area does not have a business owner association, a group of at least ten (10) individual business owners may initiate a request together.

Requests for the establishment of a Reduced Speed Limit Area within a Campus setting shall be initiated by the Educational or Business entity responsible for said campus area or by City government officials.

All such requests must be made in writing and directed to the City of Bloomington Public Works Engineering Division using the request/complaint process. Requests received through phone calls will not be evaluated. Any party submitting a letter of request will be notified as to the disposition of the request after the evaluation is completed. Every attempt will be made to grant requests or in the case of a decline, to provide a satisfactory answer to the requesting party.

For requests submitted by associations, citizens or businesses to be considered, a petition utilizing the attached form must be included with the request. The petition shall include signatures from at least 15 property owners or 15% of all properties located within the area to be considered, whichever is greater.

For requests submitted by educational institutions or businesses for a campus area to be considered, a petition utilizing the attached form must be included with the request. The petition shall include signatures from the owners of at least 15 properties or 15% of all properties located within the area to be considered as part of the Campus area, whichever is greater. Alternatively, signatures associated with property covering at least 50% of the acreage of the proposed area will be allowed.

The Engineering Division will assist petitioners with determining the number of signatures required if requested. However, it is the responsibility of the petitioner to collect and document all signatures.

Preliminary Review:

The City Traffic Engineer will initially review each submitted request for preliminary compliance with the stated criteria and requirements. If a request does not meet the requirements for establishing a Reduced Speed Limit Area, the requesting party will be notified of the requirement(s) not met and advised that the issue may be resubmitted in one year for further consideration if conditions change. The person or group making the original request or complaint will be notified in writing of the action the City intends to take regarding the request. Requests to establish a Reduced Speed Limit Area passing the Preliminary Review will proceed to the evaluation phase to determine if all qualifying criteria are met.

Evaluation of Conditions

Requests to establish a Reduced Speed Limit Area that pass preliminary review will proceed to the evaluation phase. The evaluation phase involves the collection of data including street classifications, volume, speed, traffic crash history, and other relevant information not already collected. This information gets collected and evaluated by the Engineering Division of the Public Works Department. Engineering Staff will gather input from other City departments and officials including, but not limited to the following:

- City Planner for concurrence with the Comprehensive Plan and future development patterns
- Police Department for review of enforceability or other concerns
- Fire Department for potential impacts to Emergency Services
- Local Alderman
- City Manager
- Other stakeholders deemed necessary due to the characteristics of the particular area under consideration.
- The Transportation Commission may be consulted in the case of waivers of qualifications or controversial requests.

Public Meeting

The City will host a public meeting to discuss the proposed Reduced Speed Limit Area with residents of the area under study. Other residents and business owners in areas adjacent to the study area may also be specifically invited. However, voting on the proposal is limited to the affected property owners within the Defined Boundary of the proposed Reduced Speed Limit Area.

Vote on Adoption of a Reduced Speed Limit Area

A super-majority (60%) of affected property owners is required for establishment of a Reduced Speed Limit Area to proceed. Ballots only go to property owners whose lots are located within the proposed area. In order to assess support for the establishment of a Reduced Speed Limit Area, a mailed ballot system is used. Passage of a traffic calming initiative requires at least 70% of the returned traffic calming ballots be marked in support of the initiative. To be counted, mailed ballots must be returned within 14 days of the postmarked mailing date.

**POINT OF DISCUSSION FOR COMMISSION: Vote by property owner or resident?
One vote per parcel ID, mailing address, family unit or dwelling unit?**

Implementation

When a Reduced Speed Limit Area initiative passes, the implementation phase begins. The City Traffic Engineer will prepare a draft ordinance to modify City Code for the inclusion of the Reduced Speed Limit Area and present it to the City Transportation Commission for recommendation. The ordinance will then be presented to the City Council for approval and incorporation into the City Code.

Following approval by the City Council, Engineering staff in the Public Works Department will determine locations and signage required to implement the Reduced Speed Limit Area. Signage installation will be done in the order the Reduced Speed Limit Areas are approved, absent extenuating circumstances. The number of Reduced Speed Limit Areas signed each year depends on the availability of City resources.

All local streets within the approved zone will be reduced to 25 mph. Arterial and Major Collector Streets will remain at their currently posted speed limit. In addition, any Minor Collector Streets with Altered Speed Zones will remain at their currently posted speed limit. Variances may be evaluated in rare extenuating situations based on the character and use of the roadway (i.e. whether it feels and functions more as a through street or a local street).

Reduced Speed Limit Area Designation Removal Process

The designation of a Reduced Speed Limit Area may be removed through a successful neighborhood petition. To be successful, this process requires approval of at least 90% of property owners of lots whose owners were eligible to vote on the original initiative. The removal process may not be started until the designation has been in place for at least a one year (365 day) period.

Selective Traffic Enforcement Program

The availability, structure, and operation of the Selective Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) will be governed by Bloomington Police Department Policy.

**CITY OF BLOOMINGTON
REPORT FOR THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
November 20, 2018**

CASE NUMBER:	SUBJECT:	ORIGINATING FROM:
INFORMATION	Summary of Citizen Comments/Complaints Received November, 2018	Philip Allyn, PE, PTOE City Traffic Engineer
REQUEST:	Item submitted as information for the Transportation Commission. Any feedback or comments are welcome.	

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: N/A
Staff submits the following information to the Commission. Any comments or feedback is appreciated.

1. ATTACHMENTS:

- a. None

2. BACKGROUND AND SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:

The following comments were received by the Engineering Department between October 10, 2018 and November 13, 2018 or are updates of previous comments (additions to previous updates are **Bold-Underlined**):

- 1) Received request from Dunraven Homeowner’s Associate to restrict parking on west side of Glenbridge between Ballybunion and Dunloe. Letters were delivered to neighborhood requesting feedback on proposed parking ban on west side of street. Responses received overwhelmingly favor restricting parking. Mailed letter to residents notifying them that the parking restriction would be put in place. Engineering will evaluate over next 90-120 days and incorporate into City Code provided there are no unintended consequences that arise. Signs scheduled to be installed on or after April 24; no additional comments received to date. Continuing to monitor until August 30, 2018. No additional complaints or comments received. City Code will be updated to reflect changes. Item considered closed.

- 2) Received request to review restricting parking to one side of street and install traffic calming on Tanner between Park Lake and Springfield. Reviewed file and location has been reviewed several times in past years with no findings of excessive speeding. Speed and traffic data to be gathered to evaluate request when weather and staffing allows.

- 3) Received request to remove a No Parking sign in front of a house and an old utility pole which no longer has any lines on it along the back of the property. Reviewed request: parking restriction required to allow room for school buses and garbage trucks to turn around (house is on the end of a street without a cul-de-sac). Currently verifying owner of the pole, believed to be Ameren about its removal. Confirmed Ameren owned pole and contacted them about removal; also provided contact info to resident. Resident indicated school buses no longer use her street (child no longer school age) and garbage trucks use alley. Discussed further with internal staff on sign and confirmed that parking restriction needed to allow garbage trucks to turn from the alley. Staff to replace existing faded sign.
- 4) Received request to allow parking along the south side of Westport Court. Reviewed current restrictions and signing. Letters being developed to be delivered to neighborhood requesting feedback on proposed parking changes. Feedback received in favor of allowing additional parking. Signs scheduled to be installed on or after May 3; no additional comments received to date. Continuing to monitor until September 30, 2018. No additional complaints or comments received. City Code will be updated to reflect changes. Item considered closed.
- 5) Received request from multiple residents along the 1300 and 1400 blocks of Oak Street to restrict parking with a Tow Away Zone on both sides of the street from 6 am to 6 pm, Monday through Friday. Letters being developed to be delivered to neighborhood requesting feedback on proposed parking ban. Results returned with enough votes to put in the requested parking ban. However, some of the comments against the parking ban indicated a significant hardship (i.e., at least one house without a driveway who needs to be able to park in the street). We are working to contact these individuals to discuss potential options. Implemented requested parking ban on July 17, continuing to monitor until October 30, 2018. Immediately following change, received minor complaints that were able to be resolved. **No additional complaints or comments received. City Code will be updated to reflect changes. Item considered closed.**
- 6) Received request for handicap spot on 1200 block of Oak Street. Waiting to receive supporting documentation of plaque or license plate from requestor.
- 7) Received Request to replace faded parking restriction signs along Washington Street. Need to visit site and submit work order to sign crew.
- 8) Received complaint of speeding on E. Oakland east of Hershey, especially around Watford. Due to hill east of Warford, can be worrisome turning from Watford onto Oakland and being overtaken. Request reduction from 40 mph to 30 mph. Completed field check. There is a hill to the east of Watford limiting the view of the intersection from westbound Oakland. There is also an existing "intersection warning" sign with a 30 mph plaque. Could consider speed reduction, but would need speed study. 85th percentile likely closer to 40 mph than 30 mph. Will gather speed data and review crash data.

- 9) Received request for increased pedestrian warnings at US 51 (Madison) and Front Street. To be reviewed following completion of Front Street work and likely referred to IDOT for consideration. May modify crosswalks with new ADA ramps.
- 10) Received request for clearly marked drop-off at the Arena on US 51 (Madison). To be reviewed and responded to but likely unable to provide due to moving lanes of traffic and IDOT jurisdiction. Passenger loading and unloading zone is currently posted on Front Street west of Madison.
- 11) Received request for crosswalk warnings at East and Locust for crossing from BCPA to/from north parking lot. To be reviewed and responded to after updating crosswalk policy.
- 12) Received request to relocate “CT” to Front Street by Arena. Need to contact submitter and clarify.
- 13) Received four coordinated requests for an all-way stop or other pedestrian warning enhancements at Stone Mountain and College for pedestrians walking north and south to/from Tipton Park. Due to close proximity to Northpoint Elementary School, will be reviewed and data collected when school resumes in the fall. Traffic counting completed. Traffic signal warrants not met. All-way stop warrants not met. Sent work order to mark crosswalk across College and install pedestrian warning signs at the crosswalk and in advance. **Crosswalk has been marked. Warning signs still needed. Need to evaluate sign indicating school crossing is further west at the school.**
- 14) Received complaint about truck traffic on Fort Jesse Road. Need to review.
- 15) Received request for traffic signals at Fort Jesse Road and Airport Road. Intersection currently 4-way stop with plans to signalize in near future. **Traffic counting and data collection completed. Need to review signal warrants.**
- 16) Received complaint of speeding and request for “Children at Play” signs on Gill Street at pass-through-cul-de-sac west of Airport. Need to evaluate “Yield” sign usage for clarity.
- 17) Received complaint of Park Drive on Chestnut being blocked by park traffic. Need to contact resident and clarify concern.
- 18) Received request for traffic calming on Eastport Drive between Clearwater and Empire. Need to gather speed and traffic volume data and compare to Traffic calming policy.
- 19) Received request for traffic calming on Gloucester Circle between Hersey and Dover. **Collected speed and traffic volume data. Does not qualify for traffic calming under Traffic Calming Policy (excessing speeding threshold not met).**

- 20) Received request for traffic calming on W. Oakland between Livingston and Euclid. Need to gather speed and traffic volume data and compare to Traffic calming policy.
- 21) Received request to add flashing yellow arrows at Emerson and Towanda due to confusion of eastbound left turn drivers and non-90 degree angle of intersection. Contacted requester and indicated flashing yellow arrows are beginning to be incorporated as other signal maintenance work is completed at an intersection. This particular location will be reviewed closer due to unique geometry.
- 22) Received report of missing no parking sign at McGregor and Oakland. Need to visit site and review.
- 23) Received report of defaced handicapped parking sign on University. Visited site, graffiti cleaned from sign. Need to complete work order for replacement of faded parking sign at same location.
- 24) Received request to remove school zone on southbound Center Street by Thornton's for Corpus Christi is no longer needed due to school closing. Need to confirm if this zone was just for Corpus Christi and not also Bent Elementary.
- 25) Received request for school crossing sign added at Washington and Darrah. Need to determine which intersection leg is being requested and evaluate request.
- 26) Received concern about an increase in collisions on GE Road between Golden Eagle and Towanda Barnes Road. Need to pull accident data, review for trends and evaluate options.
- 27) Received two separate concerns about commercial parking on residential portion of Norma Drive. Need to contact residents and discuss.
- 28) Received request for stop or yield sign at Ark and Matthew. Need to visit site and review.
- 29) Received request for no parking in front of a residence on Colton due to constant blocking of driveway. Need to visit site and review.
- 30) Received complaint of landscaping creating a sight obstruction at Peirce and Mercer. Need to visit site and review.
- 31) Received complaint of out of town school buses parking and blocking alley behind Elmwood Road and the BHS football/baseball fields during school sports activities. Need to visit site and review.
- 32) Received complaint about new power poles at Hershey and Jumer causing a sight obstruction. Visited site to review. Contacted Ameren to discuss poles. Ameren agreed at least one of the poles may not be necessary; they are reviewing internally.

- 33) Received report of signals at Four Seasons and Oakland not detecting northbound left turns. **Referred issue to electricians to check detection hardware and settings.**
- 34) Received request for street light at College and Stone Mountain. Evaluating options to add a street light to the southeast quadrant to light the south leg and the bike path crosswalk. Need to contact Ameren for an estimate to install.
- 35) Received request for additional school zone signage around Corpus Christi School. Need to visit site and review current signage.
- 36) Received complaint of signals at Empire and Empire Crossing not detecting southbound traffic. Need to have electricians check detection hardware and settings.
- 37) Received complaint of speeding on GE Road between Towanda Barnes and Airport Road with numerous accidents on a consistent basis. Request study of adding traffic signals and/or stop signs. Contacted and will gather speeding and crash data.
- 38) Received request to limit parking on Beecher between Fell and Horenberger due to sight distance reasons. Need to visit site and evaluate.
- 39) Received request from Benjamin Elementary School for No Parking along Black Oak Lane adjacent to the school. Need to evaluate.
- 40) Received complaint of stop sign obstructed by a tree limb at westbound Raspberry and Woodbine. Need to evaluate and coordinate with Parks Dept. for trimming.
- 41) Received notification of missing No Parking signs on S. Williamsburg and Yorktown. Existing signs have severely faded. Need to visit site and replace signs as needed.
- 42) Received concern about no turn on red at Six Points Road and S. Morris. Need to contact to clarify.
- 43) Received request for reason parking not being allowed on Elmwood between Colton and Towanda. During football games many cars park on Colton, creating unsafe conditions, when they should be able to park on Elmwood. Need to research and evaluate.
- 44) Received request for extending the northbound left turn lane on Airport at Ft. Jesse. Traffic backs up past the left turn lane preventing left turners from entering it. Evaluated in field. Existing painted median allows for the turn lane to be extended and additional 70 feet, doubling the available storage. New markings have been laid out in field, need to complete work order for pavement marking crew. **Pavement marking work has been completed. Item considered closed.**
- 45) Received complaints of bicyclists blowing stop sign at Bunn / Buchanan and Buchanan / Clayton. Request to evaluate options for additional signage and increased enforcement.

- 46) Received request for stop sign on Baker at Roosevelt (T intersection). Will review accident history and evaluate sight distance.
- 47) Received concern about a no parking sign at Lincoln and Main. Need to contact and determine exact concern.
- 48) Received concern about inadequate school zone signage for Corpus Christi School. Requested multiple blinking lights. Complained of cars extending out onto Lincoln during pickup and drop-offs. Need to visit site and review school zone signage and discuss modifications to drop-off and pickup routing on school site with school.
- 49) Received concern about parking availability in neighborhoods surrounding Sarah Raymond School during school drop-off, pickup, and special events. Need to evaluate parking in area and discuss with school.
- 50) Received concern about speeding and stop sign running in neighborhoods surrounding Corpus Christi School during school drop-off and pickup to avoid all-way stop at Lincoln and Mercer. Need to discuss modifications to drop-off and pickup routing on school site with school.
- 51) **NEW:** Received concern about number of crashes at Lee and MacArthur. We have been attempting several ways over last several years to reduce crashes at this intersection. We continue to look for new solutions.
- 52) **NEW:** Received request for school crossing guard at Irving.
- 53) **NEW:** Received request for curb painting at Summerfield and Hershey.
- 54) **NEW:** Received complaint about delays on westbound Ireland Grove Road at Towanda Barnes. Can the traffic signal times be changed? Contacted submitter and indicated that widening for additional turn and through lanes on Ireland Grove was originally part of the current project but was removed from the project by the City Council. Staff will re-balance the signal timings once the southbound right turn lane installation is complete, which may help Ireland Grove traffic. **Item considered closed.**
- 55) **NEW:** Received request for temporary traffic signals at Rhodes Lane and US 150. To be reviewed and referred to IDOT for consideration. **This intersection will be eliminated with the Hamilton Road project.**
- 56) **NEW:** Received request for traffic calming in the form of speed bumps or four way stops on East Grove Street. **Responded that this street is not eligible for speed bumps per the current traffic calming policy. Concern has been forwarded to the police for potential additional enforcement. Item considered closed.**
- 57) **NEW:** Received complaint of stop sign obstructed by a tree limb on westbound Oakland at Mercer. Completed work order to Parks Dept. for trimming. Verified tree had been trimmed. **Item considered closed.**

- 58) **NEW:** Received complaint about the Ireland Grove Road and Towanda Barnes project not including any enhancements to Ireland Grove westbound. There are more than 20 minute backups due to changes in school start times. Can the traffic signal times be enhanced or additional improvements be made? Contacted submitter and indicated that widening for additional turn and through lanes on Ireland Grove was originally part of the current project but was removed from the project by the City Council. Staff will re-balance the signal timings once the southbound right turn lane installation is complete, which may help Ireland Grove traffic. **Item considered closed.**
- 59) **NEW:** Received multiple requests for arrows to be painted on Evans Street indicating direction of travel. Currently exploring options to better control wrong-way traffic.
- 60) **NEW:** Received complaint of cars not stopping for stopped school bus at Harvest Pointe and Dry Sage Circle. Request 4-way stop, reduced speed limit or Children at Play sign. Need to evaluate further.
- 61) **NEW:** Received request for stop sign at corner of Sugarberry and Winterberry in the Grove (“T” intersection). Need to evaluate and complete work order if sign is warranted.
- 62) **NEW:** Received comment indicating pavement markings on Chestnut between Center and Main have not been restored since the street was resurfaced. Responded that weather has delayed the contractor from placing the new markings. Temporary markings will be placed since it is unlikely that weather will allow the permanent markings to be restored prior to winter.
- 63) **NEW:** Received request for street light on Cottage between Perry and Graham. Need to visit site and evaluate lighting levels.
- 64) **NEW:** Received request for handicap markings to be repainted on Grove Street following resurfacing. Unable to complete this year due to weather, but will repaint in spring.
- 65) **NEW:** Received concerns about the speed of traffic on Beich Road presenting a hazard to drivers entering and exiting the candy plant. An employee inadvertently pulled onto Beich and was involved in a collision. The interstate presents an optical distraction. Need to review crash data and potentially gather speed data. Posted speed on this rural road is currently 45 mph. Will contact requestor for additional information.
- 66) **NEW:** Received request to consider changing speed limit on Streid Drive and Oakland between Hershey and Streid to reduce the speed of vehicles on these roads. Speed data currently being gathered and analyzed.
- 67) **NEW:** Received request for right turn lanes at Rhodes Lane and US 150. Responded that turn lanes would require IDOT approval as well as a widening of the railroad crossing, which would be a multi-year process. This intersection will be eliminated

with the Hamilton Road project. **Item considered closed unless additional questions are received.**

- 68) **NEW:** Received request for an update on the status of traffic signals for the intersection Hersey and Hamilton. Responded that there are not plans in the five-year-plan to install signals at this intersection. Criteria is not currently met and future growth is uncertain. **Item considered closed.**

3. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff submits the above information to the Commission. Any comments or feedback is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip Allyn, PE, PTOE
City Traffic Engineer