

APPROVED Meeting Minutes
Transportation Commission
Tuesday, May 11, 2021 - 7:00 PM
Remote Participation Meeting

1. Call to Order

Transportation Commission Staff Liaison Jill Juliano called the remote participation meeting to order at 7:05 PM

Staff Liaison Juliano read the following statement into the record:

"The Village President has determined that an in-person meeting is not practical or prudent due to the COVID-19 outbreak during the Governor's disaster proclamation. It is not feasible to have a person present at the regular meeting location due to public safety concerns related to the COVID-19 outbreak during the Governor's disaster proclamation."

Roll Call

Present: Camille Fink, Garth Katner, Meghann Moses, Chair Ron Burke

Absent: Aaron Stigger, James Thompson

Staff: Development Customer Service Director Tammie Grossman, Village Engineer Bill McKenna, Parking Restrictions Coordinator (PRC) Cinthya Redkva, Development Customer Service Budget and Revenue Analyst Sean Keane, Staff Liaison Jill Juliano

2. Non-Agenda Public Comment

Commissioner Katner asked when the Commission will be able to meet in person and is the Village thinking about it. Director Grossman responded the Village has not made a decision yet. The Village is waiting to see what the Governor's orders are relating to the phases and when it will be feasible to start holding public meetings.

3. Agenda Approval

Commissioner Katner made a motion to approve tonight's agenda as presented.

Chair Burke stated if there's enough time, he believes the work plan item to recommend to the Village Board revised principles and goals for the Village's transportation system network

could be included in the tonight's Item 7, review the effectiveness of the existing citizen petition process/system for implementing traffic calming measures.

Commissioner Fink seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes – Katner, Fink, Moses, Burke

Nays – None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

4. Approval of the draft February 9, 2021 Transportation Commission meeting minutes

Commissioner Fink made a motion to approve the draft February 9, 2021 Transportation Commission meeting minutes as presented.

Commissioner Katner seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes – Fink, Katner, Moses, Burke

Nays – None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

5. REMOVAL OF FENWICK ON-STREET PERMIT PARKING (WITH THE COMPLETION OF THE FENWICK PARKING GARAGE)

PRC Redkva stated Fenwick High School completed construction on their parking garage and it was thought they wouldn't need any on-street permit parking. Recently Village staff received calls from parents concerned about parking availability. Staff is requesting to withdraw or table this item until staff can have another meeting with Fenwick to confirm they have sufficient parking spaces before removing any on-street parking.

Chair Burke asked the timeline for resubmitting this item.

PRC Redkva responded staff expects the item will be at the next Transportation Commission meeting.

The item is withdrawn by Village Staff.

6. EXTENSION OF Y8 PERMIT PARKING ON THE SOUTHSIDE OF WASHINGTON BLVD FROM HUMPHREY AVE TO TAYLOR AVE

PRC Redkva gave a brief presentation on the item summarizing why staff is looking to extend the Y8 permit parking area.

- Staff sent a courtesy letter to permit holders with map showing where they can park.
- Staff received feedback from residents stating there is permit parking on south side Washington Blvd between Humphrey Ave and Taylor Ave but it is not shown on the map.
- Staff reviewed the site and noted old permit parking sign on south side of Washington Blvd west of Humphrey Ave.
- Sign has been there since 2006
- Because enforcement had not been issuing tickets in that section, many residents thought that section was part of the overnight zone
- Presently staff have installed temporary Y8 permit parking signs in that section.
- To avoid confusion and clean up the maps, staff is recommending to extend Y8 permit parking zone to include the southside of Washington Blvd between Humphrey Ave and Taylor Ave

Below is a summary of the Commissioners' questions with staff response.

- Why wasn't that area originally parking of the Y8 permit parking area? Typically, permit parking is not on both sides of Washington Blvd. But because residents have been parking there for so long, staff was not aware, parking enforcement recognized it as a valid zone. Staff wants to clean up the map so it matches the actual zone.
- Are the signs temporary or permanent? The signs will be permanent if the Village Board approves.
- Didn't the Commission already recommend expansion of the permit parking zones? Yes, but this section wasn't one of the areas of expansion.
- Why was the letter sent out? Courtesy letters are sent out when a permit parking area is expanded or when a lot of residents call to ask where they can park.
- Is this information online? Yes

Commissioner Fink made a motion to approve the staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Katner.

Ayes: Fink, Katner, Moses, Burke

Nays: none

The motion passed 4 to 0.

7. REVIEW THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE EXISTING CITIZEN PETITION PROCESS / SYSTEM FOR IMPLEMENTING TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES AND THEN MODIFYING OR REPLACING THEM IF WARRANTED (CONTINUATION FROM THE FEBRUARY 11, 2021 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING)

Chair Burke provided a short summary of what was discussed at the February 9th Transportation Commission meeting.

Key points are:

- The overall goal is good.
- Want to make it easier for citizens to engage in the process, especially those in multi-unit homes.
- Make the process more equitable.
- Limited funds in the budget for traffic calming measures.
- Is there a better way to prioritize use of the funds rather than first come, first served?
- Came up with some alternatives but they seemed to have downsides as well.
- Struggling to find effective ways to achieve these goals within the limitations.

Chair Burke would like to see if the Commission could come up with one or two suggestions for improving the process to forward as recommendations to the Village Board. If the Commission can't come up with anything, we can stay the course and keep things the way they are.

Chair Burke reiterated asking the Village Board to adopt goals that would help inform the Commission's decision-making around items like this. What are the priorities for the Village when it comes to transportation?

Village Engineer McKenna stated while the Commission is looking for methods to improve the ease of the petition process for residents; presently, staff can't keep pace with the current process. He wants to make sure whatever the Commission may recommend is doable from a staffing standpoint. There is a backlog of petitions. Staff is looking for ways to vet the petitions before going to the Commission or even before the traffic data collection process because staff can't keep pace.

Chair Burke said there could be a way to prescreen based on some criteria to prioritize the petitions into Tier 1 which go to the Commission and Tier 2 which are filtered out.

Village Engineer McKenna indicated staff does have good volume data which is generally related to speeds and crash data from the State; but it is dated. Most recent crash data is

from 2019. An issue is if road conditions change or a recent severe crash is not included in the analysis. It would get pushback from residents. If the Commission is supportive of some kind of methodology for prescreening; any procedure that streamlines the petition process for other applicants might work as long as there are prescreening tools.

The Commission discussed aspects of a prescreening approach.

- How does it affect the equity issue?
- While concerns may be legitimate, due to capacity limitations it needs to rise to a certain level to make it to the Tier 1 within a specific time frame.
- What happens if petition remains in Tier 2? What is the process?
- Crash data is broken out by mode including pedestrians and bicyclist as well as severity of crash.
- How to score for crash information.
- Are there areas people avoid walking or biking because they are dangerous?
- Staff to bring suggestions to the Commission on how to prescreen.
- Is there way to truncate the data collection and analysis to expedite the process?

Commissioner Katner asked about backlog of petitions and how has Covid contributed to not being able to collect traffic data. Staff responded there are 19 petitions in the queue. Traffic volumes on Village streets had been low and not consistent with what was observed on a typical day. Many people were working from home or not at all. Traffic needs to return to typical patterns for data collection to occur. Only recently have workers been called back into the office and traffic volumes and patterns started to return to what had been observed on a typical day. Staff have begun to resume traffic data collection

Discussion occurred regarding the problem of an issue (parking or traffic) being bumped over to another block when it is addressed on a petitioning block. Discussion regarding if a measure is placed on petitioning blocks could the Village preemptively decide to do it on other blocks and put it out for comment?

The Commission next discussed possible options to make it easier for people to participate in the petition process. They include:

- Development of a document to gauge interest that a resident can send to his/her neighbors
- Electronic docu-sign document forwarded between residents of a block for signature.
- Announce a call for petitions/proposals to the residents
- Is the equity issue being addressed? Commission is struggling to think of ways to address this aspect.

- There is an outreach issue based on comments on different Oak Park social media groups or forums
- Include a data element such as crashes so people understand where their block falls in terms of being a hot spot or not. Try to be as transparent as possible regarding the screening process.
- All items including prescreening tools would be recommendations to the Village Board for the consideration and a decision.

The comment was made that maybe the prescreening process should be tested on the backlog of existing petitions to see if it works before a call for petitions/proposals is announced.

The discussion turned to the work plan item: developing mission statement and/or guiding principles for the Transportation Commission and the Village's transportation system.

The Commission decided to hold off debating this item but instead discussed what the Commissioners and staff could do between the Commission meetings to prepare for this topic. Items discussed included:

- Chair Burke to talk with different Village Board Trustees regarding getting input from the public on what they want
- Commission needs agreed upon goals to be guideposts for the Transportation Commission when making decisions or recommendations.
- Use community input to inform the Commission's recommendations to the Village Board for the Village's transportation goals.
- Recommend to Village Board process of getting community input.
- Using public input, draft recommendations for the Village's transportation goals to forward to the Village Board for review and a decision.
- Want Village Board approval to move forward on getting public input process due to staff involvement and associated costs for a robust public input campaign.
- Possible option: public meeting to discuss what the Village's transportation goals are and invite the public to the meeting to participate and not involve staff resources.
- Question of: how broad of an audience do you want to reach.
- Public input could be in the form of both public meeting and a survey.
- Due to Covid and backlog, need to be realistic on level of public input and what is feasible.

For the next meeting, Staff:

- To provide recommendations regarding preapproval/prescreening process for petition backlog. If viable, may use for items such as call for petitions/proposals.

For the next meeting, the Commissioners:

- Think about ways for getting community input so the Commission is ready to discuss the issue. In addition, what are goals, product and deliverable for the process.
- Research what other similar type agencies or municipalities have done regarding this process and their transportation goals.

8. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Commissioner Fink made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Moses.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Fink, Moses, Katner, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:02 PM.

Submitted by:

Jill Juliano

Staff Liaison Jill Juliano