

APPROVED Meeting Minutes
Transportation Commission
Tuesday, January 11, 2022 – 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 Governor J.B. Pritzker's current disaster proclamation. It is also not feasible to have persons present at the regular meeting location due to public safety concerns related to the COVID-19 outbreak."

Roll Call

Present: Camille Fink, Garth Katner, Meghann Moses, Aaron Stigger, James Thompson, Ron Burke

Absent: None

Staff: Parking & Mobility Services Manager Sean Keane, Parking Restrictions Coordinator (PRC) Cinthya Redkva, Staff Liaison Jill Juliano

Ryan Peterson resigned from the Transportation Commission in December 2021 and the Citizen Involvement Commission is evaluating potential candidates for his replacement.

2. Agenda Approval

Chair Burke recommended that Agenda Item 6b be moved ahead of 6a as it is time sensitive.

Commissioner Stigger made a motion to approve the agenda as amended. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Stigger, Fink, Katner, Moses, Thompson, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

3. Approval of the Draft November 9, 2021 Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Thompson requested clarification regarding next steps for the 500 block of S Cuyler Ave since the Commission did not support staff's recommendation made at the last meeting. Staff replied that the motion still goes to the Village Board at the January 18 meeting as a Motion to Concur with the Transportation Commission to not add the parking to that block.

Commissioner Thompson made a motion to approve the draft November 9, 2021 Transportation Commission meeting minutes. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Thompson, Fink, Katner, Moses, Stigger, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

4. Non-Agenda Public Comment

None

5. New Business

5a) STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE PARKING PILOT PROGRAM

Parking & Mobility Services Manager Keane provided background information on the Parking Pilot Program before presenting the results of the Parking Pilot Survey. He detailed staff's three recommendations: 1) extend time and implement a dynamic fee structure for pay-by-plate parking, 2) simplify and standardize daytime restrictions, and 3) improve access to night permit parking. Questions from the Commissioners were answered by staff following the explanation of each recommendation and it was determined that the Commission would vote on each recommendation individually. Below is a summary of the questions and staff responses.

Recommendation 1:

Q: Why does staff think extending meters to 8pm is best? A: To promote higher turnover in front of businesses and encourage those parking for longer periods of time to park in parking garages.

Q: Why not create designated loading zones or 15-minute spaces in front of businesses?

A: We've received that feedback before and that would be a separate conversation. The goal of extending the meters is to prevent the monopolization of these prime spaces, particularly during the busiest times.

Q: What additional areas would be under this new regulation if approved? A: It would primarily affect future pay-by-plate parking areas because most of our meters are in areas where this was already implemented.

Q: Before this goes to the Board, should you try to get feedback from the Chamber of Commerce? A: We did send a separate survey to about 400 businesses, as well as the Chamber of Commerce and Downtown Oak Park but did not receive the level of feedback that we wanted. We are open to getting more feedback if that's what the Commission would like.

Q: What's your response to the people who say that extending the meters will stop them from going to these businesses? A: Perhaps having more feedback from the business community would help us respond to these comments. In general, Oak Park is bikeable and walkable, so people don't have to drive.

Q: What's your response to those who are concerned that this will push people to park on residential streets where they don't have to pay to park? A: That would need to be addressed on a case-by-case basis, but residents could petition to have resident permit parking only.

Q: Is \$1 enough to incentivize folks to turn over the parking, which is the stated goal? A: This is a good question to pose, but we focused on what was tested in the Pilot. There will be a discussion with the Village Board in February regarding Pilot Program and fees will be addressed.

Recommendation 2:

Q: For blocks that currently have no restrictions other than overnight parking, would it remain that way or would this restriction be added? A: Blocks that don't have it would remain with no restrictions.

Q: What is the Village's plan to educate residents about this exemption since people are obviously not aware of it? A: We have current email addresses for almost every vehicle license holder so as part of our annual renewal notices that go out, we would make a concerted effort to inform residents of this benefit. We could also do other education through social media and our website.

Q: The exemption only works on your own block, right? A: That's correct.

Q: Can this realistically be enforced and has Parking Enforcement weighed in on this? A: We are never going to be able to enforce every parking restriction, every hour of every day. It is more of a tactic for compliance. Parking Enforcement has weighed in on the Pilot Program as a whole.

Q: Will this be easier to enforce? A: It would be easier to monitor the 3-hour areas because the device that's used to scan the plate automatically shows if the person has a vehicle license. If they know right away, they can start chalking the plates.

Q: It doesn't tell you how long they've been parked, though. You need to chalk them to keep track of that? A: Yes, it's by plate so they need to chalk the plate, but then when they go back they can see if the car has moved from the previous address where they were parked.

Q: In terms of phasing, what about the North side of the Village? A: The North side of the Village would be covered in 2023 since it is the area with the fewest restrictions.

Q: You mentioned that this wouldn't apply to certain existing parking restrictions. Can you provide more detail? Are you saying that parking spots that are already reserved for schools or hospitals wouldn't change? A: Exactly, we have teacher parking for some of the schools, residential daytime permits in areas where there is a consistent problem with business parking-those would remain in place.

Q: What other types of areas would this not override? A: No parking here to corner and 15-minute parking are other examples. We're basically just changing the time restrictions, so any block that has no parking 8-10, 1-hour, or 2-hour parking would change to 3-hour to standardize the time.

Recommendation 3:

Q: How did you decide which areas were expanded? A: The zones are what is identified as being eligible to purchase the permit for overnight parking. We did not recommend any changes to the zones.

Q: What criteria make a street eligible for overnight parking permits? A: Currently, the street frontage must be within 750 feet of a property that's zoned R-7 multi-family. So, what this would be doing is adding it to all blocks that are already within these permitted zones.

Q: If I live in Y2 and have an overnight parking pass, under the new regulations I could park in Y4 or Y3 as well as Y2? A: We're proposing the zones remain the same, so if you fall within the Y2 boundary, you would be eligible to park on any street frontage within the current Y2 boundary. It wouldn't be a mix.

Q: We're still going to have gaps in the overall Village map of where people can park? A: Yes, but those blocks are primarily single-family areas.

Q: Why are some blocks that are also primarily, or even exclusively, single-family homes included in the zones while others aren't? A: The zones were designed with density in mind, so the areas that have increased density may be the areas where the zone is extended into single-family areas.

Q: How does this look for the whole Village? It depends on the zone, but the intention is to make it easier for those that already have a permit to park.

Q: Under this proposal, anyone who holds an overnight parking permit can park anywhere in their zone? A: That's correct, and it will create overnight parking spaces in front of single-family homes which is not current practice.

Q: Do staff have the resources to evaluate the zones or should that be a separate initiative that could be revisited? A: This would be a big undertaking, but the conversion will also take time. The Commission could recommend adding overnight permit parking on all streets within the zones and then separately request that the zones be changed.

Following the presentation, the Commission discussed the following topics:

- Concerns regarding expanding overnight permit parking to blocks that are solely single-family homes
- Evaluating the zones to ensure that they all accurately reflect the needs of the residents and that the criteria used to determine the zones is still relevant
- Offering free short-term parking to encourage turnover and pushing longer term parking to the garages
- How to best address the growing need for short-term parking
- Adding information to the 3-hour parking signs to help educate residents about the vehicle license exemption

Staff clarified the language for the first vote.

Commissioner Stigger made a motion to support staff's first recommendation with the caveat that staff look at strategies for short-term drop-off and pick-up parking. It was seconded by Commissioner Thompson.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Stigger, Thompson, Fink, Katner, Moses, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

Commissioner Katner made a motion to support staff's second recommendation. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Katner, Fink, Moses, Stigger, Thompson, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

Commissioner Thompson made a motion to support staff's third recommendation. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Thompson, Fink, Katner, Stigger, Burke

Nays: Moses

The motion passed 5 to 1.

6. Old Business

6b) REVIEW EFFECTIVENESS OF EXISTING CITIZEN PETITION PROCESS / SYSTEM FOR IMPLEMENTING TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES AND THEN MODIFYING OR REPLACING THEM IF WARRANTED- WORK PLAN ITEM

Staff Liaison Juliano presented a spreadsheet previously requested by the Commission that showed the proposed scoring table applied to eight petitions that were previously presented to the Commission. Based on the updated criteria, any new petitions would need to score 25 or more points to move forward and eventually be presented to the Commission. She explained how the critical crash rate for an intersection and portable radar signs could be used as pre-screening tools to help quickly determine which petitions should proceed to the scoring table.

Commissioner Moses requested confirmation that staff currently doesn't present petitions to the Commission that don't meet the minimum criteria. Staff responded that while that's correct, all petitions submitted so far have met the minimum criteria. The difference with the proposed scoring sheet is that the criteria are different. For instance, previously if your petition met the 51% bar it needed to even be looked at, you would automatically have 13 points out of the 25. That was a much lower bar than what is being proposed.

Staff suggested that the scoring table could also be used as a prioritization tool but cautioned that a plan should be in place to determine what would happen if a petition has been repeatedly pushed due to higher priority petitions.

Chair Burke requested that staff determine the appropriate pre-screening criteria (based on data availability and what makes sense) and apply it to the backlog of petitions that need to be dealt with regardless. That information would then be presented to the Commission to help evaluate the effectiveness of the pre-screening approach as it is difficult to do without examples.

Staff responded that the backlog of petitions would fall under the old system and need to be treated as such and that a consultant will be coming to help work through those petitions. However, the process could be applied to other petitions to help provide examples for the Commissioners to review at a future meeting. Staff also clarified that there will be some allowances made when petitions come in for adjacent streets. Those would be combined for efficiency even if they are at different stages in the process, so the process may not always be strictly followed.

6a) RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD REVISED PRINCIPLES AND GOALS FOR THE VILLAGE'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM NETWORK- WORK PLAN ITEM

The Commission decided to defer this item to the next meeting due to the late hour.

7. Adjourn

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

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Stigger, Fink, Katner, Moses, Thompson, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:11 PM.

Submitted by:

Anna Muench

Customer Service Representative II