

APPROVED Meeting Minutes
Transportation Commission
Tuesday, February 8, 2022 – 7:00 PM
Remote Participation Meeting

1. Call to Order

Transportation Commission Chair Ron Burke called the remote participation meeting to order at 7:02 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, Brian Straw, James Thompson, Ron Burke

Absent: Meghann Moses, Aaron Stigger

Staff: Staff Liaison Jill Juliano

2. Agenda Approval

Commissioner Thompson made a motion to approve the agenda. It was seconded by Commissioner Straw.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Thompson, Straw, Fink, Katner, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 5 to 0.

3. Approval of the Draft January 11, 2022 Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Katner made a motion to approve the draft January 11, 2022 Transportation Commission meeting minutes. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Katner, Fink, Thompson, Burke

Nays: None

Abstain: Straw

The motion passed with a vote of 4 to 0, 1 abstention.

4. Non-Agenda Public Comment

None

5. New Business

Commissioner Fink asked if the study session for the Parking Pilot had already occurred or if anyone knew when it was scheduled as she had previously requested to sit in on it. Staff responded that they were unsure and could find out but thought that it would be soon because Parking hoped to bring it forward quickly.

6. Old Business

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

Chair Burke explained the reasoning behind this item as well as what progress had been made so far to ensure that the Commissioners were all on the same page. Staff Liaison Juliano provided additional background information on the item, including the proposed scoring table, before proceeding to a presentation of staff's recommended prescreening tool. The prescreening tool primarily focuses on crash rate and speed data. The crash rate for a location is determined using historic GIS crash data from IDOT and vehicle volumes, while the critical crash rate for a location comes from an area-wide traffic study done in the 1990s that divided the Village into four sections. The speed data would come from portable speed radar signs and would provide vehicle volumes as well as vehicle speeds. Staff Liaison Juliano also showed the prescreening tool applied to eight examples, as requested by the Commission at the previous meeting.

Following the presentation, the Commission asked questions regarding the item. Below is a summary of the questions and staff responses.

Q: The prescreen is if the answer is yes for rows 4, 5, or 8? A: Correct.

Q: Why do we see some petitions (such as Randolph St and Grove Ave) scoring high on the scoring table but being prescreened out here? A: We're looking at two sets of different data. For prescreening, that's all crashes whether correctible or not and the scoring table only looks at correctible crashes. Another reason is that we don't use vehicle volumes in the prescreening and they received a lot of points in that section of the scoring table.

Q: The 3 crashes (at Randolph St and Grove Ave) in the scoring table were from the 2014 era, but the data in the prescreening tool is from the last three years? A: The prescreening is from 2016-2020. I used five years worth of data.

Q: The rest of the examples scored lower for vehicle volume, correct? A: Yes. That is, in part, because that area of Randolph is not really considered residential.

Q: The critical crash rate calculation is based on data from 1995-1997? A: Depending on the area it was either 1995-1997 or 1996-1998.

Q: How much do we think the passage of 25 years and the changes made in infrastructure since then would impact these kinds of calculations? A: Despite all the improvements we've made safety wise, the amount of crash reports every year (except for recently with the pandemic) has stayed fairly consistent with between 2000 and 2200. We have looked at doing another area-wide traffic study, but it takes a lot of manpower and resources, so we continue to use this area-wide study from the 1990s.

Q: What will happen to petitions that don't make it through the process? A: We'd use the lower level calming measures to help mitigate the issues that concern residents.

The Commission discussed the following topics:

- Comparisons of the scoring table and prescreening tool to determine what each measure
- Concerns regarding the age of the traffic study
- If the updated process will provide data which might show which traffic calming measures are most effective
- The accuracy of the critical crash rate and if the confidence interval should be adjusted due to the age of the data
- The process should be tested over time to ensure that it's still effective
- If changes need to be made in the future, hopefully they'll be made faster because of the baseline that this updated process provides

Commissioner Straw made a motion to recommend to the Village Board approval of the staff recommendations for revisions to the Citizen Traffic Calming Petition Process, including the prescreening tool as well as revisions to the scoring criteria. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Thompson.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Straw, Thompson, Fink, Katner, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 5 to 0.

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

Staff Liaison Juliano provided background information on the item and then explained the various iterations of the document. The Commissioners decided to walk through the document to address the outstanding comments.

The Commission discussed the following topics:

- The meaning of micromobility and rewording the goal to “micromobility and active transportation”
- Rewording the safety goal to “especially people who walk, people who bicycle, and people with mobility challenges” in an effort to humanize and include all vulnerable users
- The elimination of items that were considered strategies and not goals
- How to make trade-offs between the goals when necessary
- Rewording “more efficiently” to “with appropriate efficiency” to leave room for interpretation
- How to best include the Village’s Neighborhood Greenways Plan and Complete Streets Policy in the document
- The importance of curbside infrastructure and adding “for all modes and users of transportation” to the end of the goal to allow for inclusivity and future advancements in transportation
- The importance of advancing transportation equity in Oak Park
- When ADA transitions occur in the Village and rewording the ADA Transition Plan goal from “Create an” to “Implement the Village’s”
- If community engagement is the responsibility of the Village or the residents and rewording the goal from “resident engagement in” to “engagement with residents around” for clarity
- The impact that this document will have on future decisions made by the Commission

Chair Burke asked staff to update the document to reflect these changes and present the final iteration at the next meeting.

Commissioner Thompson requested a briefing regarding what funding Oak Park will be receiving from the recently passed federal infrastructure bill and how the Village plans to use it. Chair Burke agreed that it would be helpful to hear what the Village’s plans are. Staff responded that they will reach out to Village management for additional information before the next meeting.

Commissioner Straw noted that the bill specifically mentions improvements to pedestrian and bicycle safety and wondered if grant money might be available through the bill to potentially advance the Neighborhood Greenways Plan.

7. Adjourn

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

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Fink, Straw, Katner, Thompson, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 5 to 0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:14 PM.

Submitted by:

Anna Muench

Customer Service Representative II