

APPROVED Meeting Minutes
Transportation Commission
Tuesday, September 14, 2021 – 7:00 PM
Remote Participation Meeting

1. Call to Order

Transportation Commission Chair Ron Burke called the remote participation meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Village Engineer Bill McKenna 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: Garth Katner, Megan Moses, Ryan Peterson, James Thompson, Ron Burke

Absent: Camille Fink, Aaron Stigger

Staff: Village Engineer Bill McKenna, Parking & Mobility Services Manager Sean Keane, Deputy Chief of Police Joseph Moran

Guest: Village Trustee Arti Walker-Peddakotla

2. Non-Agenda Public Comment

Village Engineer Bill McKenna read the non-agenda written public comment from the Bike Walk Oak Park Group aloud. The statement, in its entirety, is attached to these minutes.

3. Agenda Approval

Commissioner Peterson made a motion to approve the agenda and was seconded by Commissioner Moses.

The roll call on the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Peterson, Moses, Katner, Thompson, , Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 5 to 0.

4. Approval of the Draft August 10, 2021 Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Chair Burke had one edit to the minutes regarding the work plan. There was a conversation around traffic enforcement initiated by Commissioner Stigger. Missing is his recommendation to fold this issue into developing the Vision Zero plan will touch on traffic enforcement.

Village Engineer McKenna stated that the minutes could be modified to include Chair Burke's recommendation and brought back for approval. He also stated that since the minutes contain no actionable items, there is no need to vote on approval of the minutes at tonight's meeting staff will bring it back for approval at the next Commission meeting

Chair Burke concurred with Village Engineer McKenna's recommendation. The other Commissioners agreed.

5. DEVELOP THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION'S DRAFT 2022 WORK PLAN (CONTINUATION FROM THE AUGUST 10, 2021 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING)

Village Engineer McKenna gave a brief recap on previous discussions as well as updates on staff progress. In response to Chair Burke's question as to whether a timeline has been established for tackling the Vision Zero item, Village Engineer McKenna shared that the Village Board is hoping to have recommendations from the Transportation Commission in the first quarter of 2022. Since the Vision Zero item is potentially a large endeavor, staff would recommend the Commission to try have those recommendations to the Board on how to develop a Vision Zero plan and goals for a Vision Zero plan completed by the second quarter of 2022 that is the end of the first quarter of 2022.

Chair Burke asked his fellow Commissioners their opinion on including the traffic enforcement issue within the Vision Zero item and not as a separate item on the 2022 work plan.

When asked for clarification by Commissioner Peterson, Chair Burke stated the Commission's recommendation to the Village Board on how to develop a Vision Zero plan and what should go into it; that conversation should include a conversation about traffic enforcement. He is not recommending that traffic enforcement ultimately be part of the Vision Zero plan but a conversation that we have in the context of the Vision Zero planning process. Whether it gets into the Commission's recommendations is a whole other question.

Commissioner Peterson stated he doesn't see a strong Vision Zero program without law enforcement being touched on within that conversation or that policy

Commissioner Moses agreed with what Commissioner Stigger offered on the topic of law enforcement as a reasonable way to proceed. Commissioner Katner agreed as well, but given the gravity of the issue, there should be as many Commissioners present as possible to get a full response to the issue.

Village Engineer McKenna offered a recommendation regarding the work plan to remove the traffic enforcement item completely and include as part of the Vision Zero plan, but one of the outcomes could be how enforcement can best be utilized to achieve a Vision Zero plan which would give the Commission leeway for, enforcement a tool that should be used or not.

Chair Burke agreed with the recommendation with a small change of “whether” and “how” enforcement should be used.

Commissioner Moses wondered if it’s possible as part of that Vision Zero work to start getting regular data or incident reports on pedestrian crashes to know the status on a regular basis of how many and where to get a sense of patterns.

Village Engineer McKenna said that getting this kind of data is possible. Staff just needs to know what kind frequency the Commissions wants. Staff has begun scrubbing data for 2016-2020 for bike and pedestrian hits; there isn’t a lot. Staff can update the Commission on occurrences as they happen or on a quarterly basis. Staff has not validated the numbers from the email for accuracy. The speed at which staff can obtain these numbers would be based how fast they come from the Police or the State.

Commissioner Moses doesn’t know how staff can say crashes happen infrequently when she has witnessed at least 2 crashes in the last 6 months.

Village Engineer McKenna responded that his comment is based on the email in the public comment. Based on the public comment, these incidents would equal to 60+ crashes a year and he doesn’t believe it’s as frequent as the numbers cited in the email.

Chair Burke agreed that Commissioner Moses’ request relates to the conversation on staff’s work of putting together the heat maps and making them available to the Commission as well as staff utilize them as well in the screening process for the traffic calming petitions.

Village Engineer McKenna agreed there is some similarity and that it could be part of that Vision Zero conversation as to how the Commission is updated with this data and who will review these accidents to identify new hotspots for bike or pedestrian incidents.

Commissioner Moses would like to see these reports monthly, not as a separate work plan item but named in the Vision Zero work plan item. Commissioner Moses would like to edit the work plan item to read “will include a review of pedestrian and bicycle crash data.”

Village Engineer McKenna is agreeable to that change if the frequency is left vague at this time until staff knows how frequently the data can be obtained. If it can be done monthly, staff will provide it that frequently.

Chair Burke asked if there are other outcomes the Commission would like to see come from the Vision Zero planning process. Chair Burke also asked Village Engineer McKenna his sense of direction received from the Village Board. Do they want the Commission and staff to write a Vision Zero Plan and present it to them as a draft; or to recommend a process?

Village Engineer McKenna answered the Village Board is looking to the Commission to recommend a process on how to develop that Vision Zero plan and the Commission to recommend what goals the plan to be (what are you trying to achieve with the plan). Beyond that would be discussion for other outcomes such as the enforcement and the bike/pedestrian to be included in the bullet point box.

Chair Burke pointed out that that it reads “Staff to present a Zero Vision plan to the Commission.”

Village Engineer McKenna answered that the project name can be changed based on understanding of Board goals which could be “Recommend how to develop Vision Zero plan” as the project with the outcomes could be developing goals for a Vision Zero plan, the enforcement item, the review of bike/pedestrian accidents by the Transportation Commission and any other items the Commission would like to add to the outcomes with a due date of end of the first quarter of 2022.

Village Trustee Arti Walker-Peddakotla stated she is the Board member that introduced the Vision Zero plan during the Board goals and her understanding is different from staff's. It's not just that the Commission should recommend the process of how the plan should be formulated, but also what are the elements that need to be addressed within the Vision Zero plan itself for this Village to have a comprehensive Vision Zero plan? She would love if the Commission in partnership with other Commissions and Village staff doing the community outreach which would help drive development of an actual plan that the Board can ultimately vote on. Community outreach piece is a big part of the development of the plan.

Chair Burke asked who would be responsible for writing the plan: staff, consultants, or both?

Village Engineer McKenna responded it would be consultants based on staff recommendations as staff does not have the capacity to lead a full Vision Zero plan at the moment.

Chair Burke asked for other outcomes the Commission would like to see included in the plan.

Commissioner Peterson would like to see community engagement and equity included.

Village Engineer McKenna restated the Commission's project description with the following: "Recommend processes to develop Vision Zero plan" and the outcomes are listed as: community engagement, equity, data driven, whether and how traffic enforcement can best be utilized to achieve Vision Zero, and review pedestrian/bike accidents by the Commission as part of the Vision Zero plan.

Village Engineer McKenna pointed out the remaining work plan items are time frames for the citizen petition process and other priorities for the Commission.

Chair Burke responded that it would depend on staff recommendation and where staff stands in its ability to help the Commission implement that two or three step process to do the screening largely determines the schedule.

Village Engineer McKenna thought this might be possible for the first quarter of 2022 as there are several recommendations still being worked on with the GIS consultants for heat maps. Staff does not anticipate bringing this item back for the next Commission meeting due to staff priorities.

Chair Burke agreed with scheduling for the first quarter of 2022.

Village Engineer McKenna said the other item for discussion is Develop Mission Statement and/or Guiding Principles for the Transportation Commission and Village Transportation Network.

Chair Burke suggested doing the same for this item since it's on the agenda for this meeting to discuss and then circle back to establishing a timeframe.

Village Engineer McKenna said that staff would type up the work plan, forward it to the Commission to make sure the language matches the intent and get it to the Village Manager's Office by the end of the month. He also confirmed that Deputy Chief Moran could exit the meeting.

Chair Burke confirmed.

Deputy Chief Moran thanked the Commission and stated that he would be willing to attend future meetings. In parting he also stated that the Police's role is very important, and that enforcement is more about education and slowing down that motorist as opposed to writing tickets. The Police Department also views enforcement as being present and making traffic contact and stated that more warnings are issued over tickets.

6. 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, MAY 11, JUNE 8, JULY 13, AND AUGUST 10, 2021 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS)

Chair Burke did a recap of past discussions and asked staff to give an update on progress.

Village Engineer McKenna provided an update on the refinements to the scoring table (adjusting points per measure, vehicle speeds and crash history) and draft heat maps. He mentioned that staff will be taking a break on the item to address other time sensitive matters.

Chair Burke asked if the Commission could recommend the changes to the scoring table?

Discussion occurred on the following topics:

- Can the Commission make a recommendation to change the existing scoring table as a standalone?
- How to use heat maps as a prescreening tool once finalized
- Whether to have a prescreening of a petition before employing the scoring table
- How to structure the screening process
- Explanation of difference between proposed scoring table (first iteration compared to second iteration)
- Commission preference of the various proposed scoring tables
- Discussion of the definition of traffic generators
- Discussion of what minimum score should be
- Implementation of changes (extra screening measures) would be applied to future petitions and current petitions are processed under the system which they applied. Revisions to scoring criteria could occur under existing system.
- Concern changing policy after seeing the Village results. Helpful to see another agency or municipality use of similar tool.
- Generate screening tool without bias is to establish critical crash rates and what locations exceed the critical crash rate for the Village with caveats for injury accidents or crashes involving pedestrians or bicyclists could be an effective filter.
- Prescreening versus prioritization tool (no petition should be eliminated)
- Possible issue are mid-block locations with speeding concerns where there are no pre-identifying metrics.
- How to decide prioritization of petitions (historic crash data, vehicle speed)
- Staff noted in proposed 2022 budget is additional four speed radar signs not super-accurate but may be good enough as a screening tool.
- Speed radar signs can be used for data collection when LED matrix is turned off (dark) and also as a calming tool when LED matrix is on.
- Staff recommended prescreening tool be used by staff so staff is not preparing agenda items that don't meet the criteria.

- Need metric that is defensible when petitions are rejected.
- One of the best metrics is critical crash rates with exceptions for pedestrian and bike crashes. Speed can be processed the same once a limit is set.
- Commission want to be informed of list of rejected petitions. Staff agreed.
- When could staff make recommendations on the crash and speed screening criteria?
Staff: 2 options – a) critical crash rate from 1997 Village-wide traffic study or b) recalculate critical crash rates throughout the entire Village, establish what current critical crash rate is and develop heat map intersection by intersection to that crash rate and accept/reject petitions based on that criteria.
- Commission preference is the August 10, 2021 version of the proposed scoring table with the lower minimum score
- Commission wants information on how the critical crash rate is calculated. Staff will provide it at the related Commission meeting.

Chair Burke asked staff bring to the Commission a recommendation on what the screening criteria will look like and some way to characterize or understand how many of the petitions will not exceed the critical crash rate and therefore likely be excluded based on established rates. Recommendation on vehicle speed criteria should be structured (initial screening criteria). Can this be done in October or November?

Village Engineer McKenna answered that staff could have this ready in November. He also added that staff could provide similar information presented in August to the Commission which is comparison of scoring tables to past applications.

Chair Burke responded that a sample of five to ten examples would be enough.

The Commission concurred.

7. RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD REVISED PRINCIPLES AND GOALS FOR THE VILLAGE'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM NETWORK (CONTINUATION FROM THE JUNE 8, JULY 13, AND AUGUST 10, 2021 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS)

Chair Burke gave a summary of previous discussions and recommended tabling this item until the next meeting to allow for the presence of more Commissioners.

Commissioners Peterson, Moses, Thompson and Katner agreed on tabling the matter.

Chair Burke reminded staff that they were to investigate to what extent if any Commissioners could submit via email comments or suggestions on the goals drafted and if that communication is allowable.

Village Engineer McKenna responded that he spoke with the Village Attorney Paul Stephanides asking at what level deliberations could move toward policy in relation to the Open Meeting Act. It is determined that Commissioners asking staff questions and getting an answer from staff is allowable but once there is more discussion, there

should not be an email dialogue beyond that point. As an example, a compilation of questions in one email is allowable but that next chain could possibly start into more deliberations which is not allowable.

Chair Burke asked if the other Commissioners could receive his draft, make revisions and then send feedback and ideas to staff with a later conversation at the actual meeting?

Village Engineer McKenna answered that it could be done as an inclusion into the agenda packet as a Commission submission to staff which would then facilitate a conversation for the Commission as a whole.

8. OTHER ENCLOSURES

These enclosures are informational.

9. Adjourn

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

The roll call on the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Moses, Peterson, Katner, Thompson, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 5 to 0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 PM.

Submitted by:

Shawnya Williams

Customer Service Representative II

Juliano, Jill

From: Bike Walk Oak Park [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 2:59 PM
To: Transportation
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Sept. 14th Commission Meeting Public Comment (Greenways Network and Vision Zero)

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Hi Commissioners!

Bike Walk Oak Park wanted to reach out to you and Village Staff as the Village Board begins discussions around the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) budget for 2022. Our goal is to ensure the continued funding for the Oak Park Greenways Network and the creation of a Vision Zero plan to improve the overall safety of our community.

We are advocating for the following:

- Vision Zero: BWOP has reviewed previous commission meeting notes and, as community advocates, we strongly discourage the use of the Oak Park Police Department for traffic enforcement as a tool to achieve Vision Zero. Historically, the use of police to calm speed and unsafe driving zones has resulted in temporary and short term results. Additionally, it has been documented that unfortunately our Oak Park Police Department is not immune to the conscious or unconscious practice of racial profiling. Utilizing police for this kind of enforcement can further traumatize our community's Black and Brown residents. There are numerous other successful solutions to achieve a Vision Zero Plan that are data driven, leverage community engagement, public education campaigns, and infrastructural investments. Please look through <https://visionzeronetwork.org/> for guidance.
- The CIP currently has the Bike Boulevard Improvements listed as Priority Code D, meaning "optional but beneficial to the Village in social, cultural or aesthetic ways." We are strongly advocating that this be upgraded to Priority Code A "essential and immediate need." Crash data from 2018 – 2020 show that every 4 to 5 days a pedestrian and/or cyclist gets hit by a car in Oak Park. These are numbers that no one should be comfortable with.
- A cost analysis of building out the Oak Park Greenways Network. The 2022 CIP draft budget illustrates that there is funding established for the greenways around the highschool and then funding for additional investments in 2023. Beyond that, there is nothing detailed in the 5 year CIP. It is clear that a comprehensive greenways network will take more than two years to construct. To ensure the construction of the entire network, an estimated and realistic cost breakdown across the next five years is necessary.
- Subsequent Greenways investments should be prioritized according to bike/ped safety impact and Safe Routes to Schools. This can be guided by the staff's current research on high-impact roads across the village.
- Future funding for the full build out of the Greenways Network should come from traditional capital improvement revenues, *not* the Sustainability Fund.

Finally, we are requesting an update to the name and description of *Bike Boulevard Improvements* in the Capital Improvement Plan to reflect the *Oak Park Greenways Network*. The Village Board approved the Oak Park Greenways Network in 2015, which details infrastructural safety investments for pedestrians *and* cyclists. These investments will help the Village achieve Vision Zero: the elimination of fatalities and severe injuries of pedestrians, cyclists and other non-motorized road users. The Capital Improvement Budget should fully reflect the goals of the Greenways Network, which includes using the correct terminology of what this investment entails.

Sincerely,

Bike Walk Oak Park Advocacy Team

(Doug Chien, Jenna Holzberg, Rachel Poretsky, Franny Ritchie and Sylvia Schweri)

<https://www.bikewalkoakpark.org/>

Follow Bike Walk Oak Park on [Facebook](#) and [Instagram](#)!