

APPROVED Meeting Minutes
Transportation Commission
Tuesday, August 10, 2021 – 7:00 PM
Remote Participation Meeting

1. Call to Order

Transportation Commission Chair Ron Burke called the remote participation meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

Staff Liaison Jill 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, Ryan Peterson, Aaron Stigger, Ron Burke

Absent: Garth Katner, Meghann Moses, James Thompson

Staff: Staff Liaison Jill Juliano, Parking Mobility Services Manager Sean Keane, Village Engineer Bill McKenna

2. Non-Agenda Public Comment

Staff Liaison Juliano noted that there are two written public comments included in the meeting's agenda and therefore, did not need to be read aloud. Staff Juliano also noted that as an addition to the night's meeting Parking Mobility Services Manager Sean Keane had submitted a draft of the parking pilot survey to be included into the work plan and looking for feedback from the Commission on the update.

Chair Burke suggested adding review of the revised parking pilot survey as #8 on the agenda after the 2022 work plan item but could possibly be included in that discussion.

3. Agenda Approval

Chair Burke requested that the agenda be amended to include review of the revised parking pilot survey as Item #8.

Commissioner Peterson made a motion to amend the agenda, seconded by Commissioner Stigger.

The roll call on the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Peterson, Stigger, Fink, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

4. Approval of the Draft July 13, 2021 Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Stigger made a motion to approve the draft July 13, 2021 Transportation Commission meeting minutes and was seconded by Commissioner Peterson.

The roll call on the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Stigger, Peterson, Fink, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

5. 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 9, 2021, MAY 11, 2021, JUNE 8, 2021 & JULY 13, 2021 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS)

Chair Burke gave a summary of previous discussions and goals related to this item.

Staff Liaison Juliano stated there are heat maps and a scoring table that is shared with the Commission.

Village Engineer McKenna stated the Village works with MGP Consultants for GIS services which provided heat maps of crash/traffic data. The source data was provided by both the state and local agencies. The maps which included crashes from 2016-2020. There is still work to be done on the look and feel of the maps as they aren't currently very intuitive or easy to read. The traffic data would be useful for showing high traffic areas in unexpected places, which would be the primary use. It will also show hot spots.

Chair Burke said based on past discussions the Commission is in support of using the heat maps as part of the screening/prioritization process.

Staff Liaison Juliano showed and explained the proposed scoring table in comparison to existing scoring table.

Chair Burke said under the proposed changes, fewer submissions would move forward based on new scoring method. It was previously agreed it is better to focus on transportation issues instead of community interests which could skew things.

Commissioner Stigger said he envisioned this change to make the rules stricter, but it seems more lenient. He brought up how the Village is compared to the national average. His challenge was to be better than the average. He would really like to see the Village tighten up and improve its standards, since we can do so now in making these edits.

Staff Liaison Juliano asked for clarification of stricter; more points given for the vehicle speed and more for the crash history? Commissioner Stigger said yes.

Chair Burke noted that under the proposed system a higher percentage of the score would come from crash history, vehicle speed and vehicle volumes compared to the existing scoring system. Chair Burke acknowledged Commissioner Stigger wants this to be done to an even greater extent.

Staff Liaison Juliano asked if he is looking for more points for lower speeds. Commissioner Stigger said yes, but asked clarification on if the maximum score 100 points is per intersection. Staff Liaison Juliano said yes, this is the maximum any petition could get. Chair Burke stated this score would determine whether a petition would be heard at all. Currently petitions must score at least 25 points.

Commissioner Stigger believes vehicle speed is a huge issue because it's one that people complain about all the time. Living in Oak Park for 47 years it's always been an issue and how much do we want to enforce it? He thinks that it can be predicted which areas need them and what can we do as whole instead of having residents coming to the Commission, filling out forms, taking up staff's and the Village Board's time. What proactive steps can be taken to address the speeding issue? But if this is the only option, make it count, make the points higher.

Commissioner Ryan agreed with Commissioner Stigger.

Commissioner Fink asked how does this relate to the heat maps; was this a guide in reallocating points?

Staff Liaison Juliano answered by saying the heat maps would be the first step in prioritizing and prescreening the petitions. Then the data collection on crashes and speeds would be considered.

Village Engineer McKenna confirmed the heat map would be an internal tool used as prescreening and would work with the Commission to determine what are the minimal thresholds to move a petition forward. This would reduce processing time and cost to the Village on data collection needed, compiled crash data and preparing agenda items. Then it would go through the Commission traffic calming petition process. These revisions would help prioritize the locations based on the scores.

Chair Burke asked if staff is envisioning a two-step process? Step one being, is this petition focused on a part of village where the heat map shows there is a problem if not the petition won't be processed but there are other tools available. If they are close to a problem spot, the petition will be scored and moved into priority petitions if they score accordingly. Or the heat map informs the crash history of this process or even add something to the scoring system that relates to the heat maps.

Village Engineer McKenna responded it could be either. The heat map option could be excluded as a tool for the petitions and just modify the scoring table creating a screening tool in and of itself. Keeping in mind the heat map could be an internal reference. But downside is it would still make it necessary to go through data collection and making it a longer process and a dollar commitment for every petition.

Chair Burke recapped by saying that the Commission is trying to avoid a full-blown traffic analysis for every petition. A two-step process might be best. Village Engineer McKenna answered by saying a two-step process could work or another option could be whether or not it qualifies for data collection making a three step process. Or not having a third step, meaning anything that clears the heat map would go to the Commission by way of the scoring method or a modified version.

Chair Burke asked if without the analysis, would critical information be left out like volume and speed of vehicles. Village Engineer McKenna answered vehicle speed would be a gap and depending on the nature of the petition, current information might not be available.

Chair Burke asked the Commission for feedback or comments regarding implementing the prioritization approach.

Commissioner Ryan likes the proposal as presented by staff.

Chair Burke asked for clarification. Does it mean a two-step process. If so, Chair Burke thinks staff needs to come back with more specificity around recommendation on how to use heat maps on first step in process.

Commissioner Camille thinks the point distribution is fine with some minor tweaking. It seems to meet the goal of paring down what comes to the Commission.

Commissioner Stigger want more enforcement in areas the Village knows to be hot spots. He feels speed radar signs are a band aid fix. He would like to see more investment in traffic enforcement by utilizing new staff in these areas; paying specific attention to during morning and evening rush hours.

Chair Burke suggested including the topic of enforcement in the 2022 Work Plan discussion. He also reiterated points brought up by the Commission such as revision of scoring system and bumping up the points on speed and how to use the heat maps with the hopes for discussion at the next meeting.

Village Engineer McKenna stated that staff's next steps would be determining thresholds on the heat map system to move forward. Would it be accident rate-based? Staff can make a recommendation or if the Commission is happy with staff's presentation, a final recommendation can be made while looking at speeds again. Staff does use 85th percentile speed with most drivers driving at or below that speed which is industry standards, though this doesn't really capture the outliers.

Staff Liaison Juliano reminded the Commission speed data is listed in bins. When it comes to outliers in regard to speeding; how many cars does it have to be to be considered an outlier.

Village Engineer McKenna mentioned that from staff's perspective, they would also package in what streets would not be eligible for a petition especially if the petitioner lives on a major street. Staff would also be looking at the funding table for the recommended improvements.

6. RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD REVISED PRINCIPLES AND GOALS FOR THE VILLAGE'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM NETWORK (CONTINUATION FROM THE FEBRUARY 9, 2021, MAY 11, 2021, JUNE 8, 2021 & JULY 13,2021 TRANSPORTAION COMMISSION MEETINGS)

Staff Liaison Juliano gave a brief synopsis of previous discussions.

Chair Burke also followed up with a summary of past discussions. He then asked the Commissioners for comments and what their thoughts are on the draft goals he assembled. From that document, the Commission may recommend a set of goals to go to the Village Board after some process of public input.

Commissioner Stigger said that he would like to have a meeting with the Village Board. He feels there is a huge disconnect and a lot of ground could be gained from a meeting with them to be truly heard.

Commissioner Peterson wondered if these goals would be for 2022 only or will there be isolation of long- and short-term goals. What is the time line for these goals?

Chair Burke responded by saying what his vision is for the long-term.

Commissioner Peterson said having overarching pillars to work off of with actionable items beneath them such as increasing accessibility (pillar) by creating an ADA transition plan (actionable item) with completion in the next 2 to 3 years. He leans more towards that approach but feels the process outlined by Chair Burke is a good one.

Chair Burke stated that because of constraints on meetings, time must be set aside during Commission meetings to generate these items.

Staff Liaison Juliano mentioned that other Commissions have done two meetings per month when there has been a need.

Chair Burke asked if there is anything preventing Commissioners from submitting to staff a document with suggestions. Staff answered this could be done.

Commissioner Peterson asked if staff could blind copy all Commissioners with the changes.

Village Engineer McKenna said staff would have to get back with the Commission on what level of collaboration could be done outside the meeting.

Chair Burke asked if the Commission is okay with putting some time in the next meeting to make changes to the draft.

Commissioner Peterson said that he would like to see this as a standing agenda item for a while until something is completed and sent off to the Village Board.

7. DEVELOP THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION'S DRAFT 2022 WORK PLAN

Staff Liaison Juliano gave a quick description of the Work Plan process and provided the status of the 2021 work plan items.

Chair Burke asked if the Commission will be able to evaluate Madison Street next year. Village Engineer McKenna responded the intent is to collect data this Fall with the recommendations made available to the Commission the first or second quarter of 2022.

Chair Burke asked if there were any objections to carrying forward this item to the 2022 Work Plan? There were no objections.

Chair Burke asked about the Parking Pilot Program since conversations had started but felt that there is more to come on the topic.

Parking Mobility Services Manager Sean Keane spoke of the plan is, pending any further changes, to get the survey out before Labor Day with the goal of having it open for a month. Based on feedback and analysis, staff is looking to bringing forward recommendations to the Commission in early 2022.

Chair Burke asked if there were any objections to adding this item to the 2022 Work Plan as well. There were no objections.

Village Engineer McKenna reiterated the Board approved a budget of \$250,000 for a consultant to help get through backlog so that first item would be heavy. Staff is in the process of generating an RFP to have a consultant in place hopefully by late September and then processing petitions to get that backlog out of the way.

Staff Liaison Juliano mentioned the Village Board approved the goal for the Vision Zero coming before the Commission in the first quarter of 2022.

Chair Burke asked what tasks the Commission would be asked to do. Village Engineer McKenna said the goal would be to establish a plan for improved pedestrian safety.

Regarding the Neighborhood Greenways Plan, Chair Burke asked if it made sense to recommend a portion of the plan to be implemented? Village Engineer McKenna said the answer is yes based on the current 5-year capital plan, there is funding set aside for two runs of implementation, approximately \$100,000 a piece. The first being on Scoville Ave by the High School.

Chair Burke asked if it would be prudent to wait on direction from staff to determine which portions of the Neighborhood Greenways Plan would make sense to be implemented next? Village Engineer McKenna responded the priority of this could be a little later from a timing perspective, we have enough direction for the first phase next year. Staff would then look to the Commission for recommendations when moving into that second round to implement in 2023. This could be third quarter item for next year. Staff would also engage with local bike advocacy groups for shared recommendations to the Commission.

Chair Burke asked if there was any way to get Neighborhood Greenways Plan implemented in 2022. Village Engineer McKenna answered that it would be a budgetary consideration for the Village Board.

Chair Burke asked if there were any objections to keeping this item in the 2022 Work Plan? No objections.

Chair Burke asked the Commissioners asked about adding a project to the 2022 Work Plan that relates to enforcement which is directed towards Police Department as opposed to Transportation Staff and develop some recommendations.

Commissioner Stigger feels enforcement is the main issue; and it would be a good idea to include it.

Chair Burke asked staff when the Work Plan would have to go the Village Board. Staff Liaison Juliano answered later in the Fall, but she doesn't have exact timeline.

Village Engineer McKenna clarified that for the Vision Zero component more information on intent and scope would be found out through the budget process.

Chair Burke asked what if a project was added to the Work Plan described as traffic enforcement recommendations with a note it could potentially be included in the Vision Zero item. Chair Burke asked who would be in favor of creating traffic enforcement recommendations for the Village Board.

Commissioner Peterson answered he is generally supportive, if it's not quantified into a metric, otherwise you'll just be creating things out of nothing. Looking at current policies and coming up with more equitable strategies is a step in the right direction.

Commissioner Fink wondered if developing enforcement goals wouldn't be the responsibility of a different Commission altogether or maybe even fall under the Police Department itself.

Village Engineer McKenna said it is under the purview of the Transportation Commission to look at it as a component of transportation and safety. Staff could invite the Police Department to a Commission meeting as they are currently looking to create more of a neighborhood traffic group for these kinds of items.

Chair Burke didn't feel that this is the right time to invite the Police Department just yet and possibly move this to the fourth quarter or first quarter item next year.

Commissioner Peterson said that there are third party apps that could engage the citizens and residents to go about enforcing on their own to take some of the burden off Police and staff. It would also create more educational outreach to people about why their actions are unsafe, thereby serving to educate as well.

Staff asked the Commission, what outcomes would it like to achieve for this item?

Chair Burke responded to make recommendations to the Village Board on how to improve traffic enforcement.

Commissioner Stigger added a recommendation of increased enforcement.

Chair Burke thought that based on statistics, certain ethnic groups might be unfairly targeted. He recommends to fold the issue of traffic enforcement into developing the Vision Zero plan. That the plan will organically touch upon traffic enforcement.

Commissioner Peterson added the outcome of decreasing unsafe behavior on the roads regardless of demographic or socioeconomic group. Chair Burke felt this might be digging a bit too deep.

Chair Burke felt recommendations are to be determined on traffic enforcement and decide it later. Village Engineer McKenna stated that there has to be an outcome on the item such as: Recommend revised enforcement policies to improve safety or reduce speeds to show why an item is being considered.

8. REVISED PARKING PILOT SURVEY QUESTIONS

Parking Mobility Services Manager Keane gave an update on the status of the revised survey and asked for any additional changes to be submitted to staff via email so that they may be incorporated before Labor Day.

9. Adjourn

With no further business, Commissioner Peterson made a motion to adjourn the meeting and was seconded by Commissioner Stigger.

The roll call on the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Peterson, Stigger, Fink, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

Submitted by:

Shawnya Williams

Customer Service Representative II