

APPROVED Meeting Minutes  
Transportation Commission  
Tuesday, February 9, 2021 - 7:00 PM  
Remote Participation Meeting

1. Call to Order

Transportation Commission Chair Ron Burke called the remote participation meeting to order at 7:02 PM

Engineer 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, Aaron Stigger, James Thompson, Chair Ron Burke

Absent: none

Staff: Village Engineer Bill McKenna, Parking Restrictions Coordinator (PRC) Cinthya Calderon, Development Customer Service Budget and Revenue Analyst Sean Keane, Traffic/Transportation Engineer Jill Juliano

2. Non-Agenda Public Comment

None

Prior to the Agenda Approval, Chair Burke spoke about the status of the Transportation Commission's 2021 Work Plan and Village staff's position on certain items. Village Engineer McKenna provided additional detail.

3. Agenda Approval

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

Commissioner Katner seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was as follows:

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

Nays – None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

4. Approval of the draft January 12, 2021 Transportation Commission meeting minutes

Commissioner Thompson made a motion to approve the draft January 12, 2021 Transportation Commission meeting minutes as presented.

Commissioner Fink seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was as follows:

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

Nays – None

The motion passed unanimously 6 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

Engineer Juliano gave a short summary about the item. She mentioned:

This is an item from the Transportation Commission's current work plan; and a carryover from the 2020 work plan. The two stated outcomes for this item are: (1) implement a more efficient and effective process for addressing citizen traffic calming requests and (2) Develop an adopted vision for transportation in the Village of Oak Park. The item is scheduled to be completed by the third quarter of 2021.

Chair Burke spoke of the Transportation Commission's concern with limited resources for projects associated with the traffic calming toolbox and want to make sure the money is being used as effectively as possible. The Commission is wondering if there is another process to bring in good projects to recommend for implementation and funding that is different from the present petition process.

Commissioner Moses reiterated Chair Burke's comments on wanting to use the funds effectively as possible.

Commissioner Moses stated one possible option is to keep the petition process but have a due date to bring all submitted petitions before the Transportation Commission once or twice a year to compare and see which would have the most impact on traffic calming. And for staff to provide input where there are hot spots in the Village for the Commission to consider. Then the Commission can prioritize the funds for the projects with the most impact. Petitions not selected as a traffic calming project can be reviewed again in the following year.

Issues or topics discussed by the Commissioners included:

- Not all residents know there is funding for traffic calming.
- Locations where traffic calming is requested but not on resident's block (by schools, transit stops, parks, etc.); possible other process for these locations.
- Increase equity to advertise these funds for those not keyed into the Village's processes.
- If resident petitions remains in this process and doesn't get traffic calming toolbox funds, does the Transportation Commission still review them under a separate system and make a recommendation on them?
- The Transportation Commission doesn't have a good way to judge how STOP signs at an intersection affect the whole transportation network.
- Maybe a different process to evaluate petitions without expending as much staff resources, maybe a truncated approach.
- Possible initial screening process to make the first cut where limited staff resources are spent.

Commissioner Fink asked staff to explain 1) what petitions make it to the Transportation Commission, and 2) does the Village normally use the funding available each year?

Engineer Juliano explained the traffic calming petition process and what petitions (alley speed bump and Keep Kids Alive Drive 25 signs) are handled administratively.

Village Engineer McKenna stated once over the initial hurdle of verifying and determining the petition has the necessary signatures is when the Village starts spending money on data collection, etc. If getting away from petition process, it would be good to have something fill that space. He also provided information on the funding as well as vetting that Village staff already does on traffic calming issues that are submitted by residents.

Commissioner Moses asked if staff could look at crash hotspots. She also asked if the petition process is the best practice for traffic calming.

Village Engineer McKenna spoke of what staff already does as a starting point based on GIS crash data from the state and internal volume data. He stated the petition process is a way to give residents a voice and a process to work through the traffic concerns that they have.

Chair Burke questioned if there could be a hybrid of the petition process and a staff or Commission identified locations and engage residents near those locations.

Village Engineer McKenna provided background, what staff already does and what some possible options.

Commissioner Moses asked if there is an automatic review of a particularly bad crash.

Village Engineer McKenna responded there is no predefined process for severe crashes.

Chair Burke summarized that besides the petition process; there is an option of asking for staff input on hot spots. The Commission would review those areas and an additional option of putting out a call for petitions to the public and look at them biannually.

Commissioner Fink mentioned she thought it was to make the process more equitable and increase community engagement and not just the most effective use of funds.

Chair Burke responded he thought it was both.

A discussion took place on the following topics:

- How to get more engagement from residents living in multi-unit buildings.
- Have staff provide input on hot spots and the Commission may identify additional locations that need to be investigated and analyzed.
- The timing of the prioritized list of recommended locations for calming projects to be incorporated in the next year's budget and its effects.
- Residents may go through this process and there's no funding.

Commissioner Katner stated it's a balancing act between equity and efficiency. Given what he reads is the mood in the Village and nationally, he thinks we should err on the side of equity. He would love people living in apartments to see they can take control of the transportation needs on their block.

Chair Burke said if we were to get more petitions in maybe it sends a signal to the Village Board there is a lot of interest in this; and maybe that budget should be a little bit higher.

Commissioner Stigger mentioned one of the discrepancies he sees in the past from the Village Board is there's data which indicates it's okay and there's people who say it doesn't feel okay. He would like to see some actions to coming together on that. How do we address the fact that people don't feel safe to riding their bikes on their street? Regardless of the national standard says, maybe we need to set a higher standard and trickle down to

the traffic calming issues. There's also room for improvement on how to motivate or incentivize better driver behavior even if it's small.

Commissioner Thompson spoke about the suggested idea of asking Village staff to come up with a map of hot spots based on some pattern of accidents; but most of what we get are people complaining cars are going too fast down their blocks and asking for measures. That's not going to show up on a map of hot spots. Are we telling those people we are not going to address their concerns? It affects the enjoyment of their neighborhood. We would be telling the people we have other priorities.

A discussion occurred about whether or not the Commission is already doing that because when people come in for a solution, the Commission doesn't give them anything. It is also the case with the decisions that are made at the Village Board level as well. It was stated maybe if more people are invested in this, then maybe the Village Board won't make those kinds of decisions in the future.

Chair Burke suggested the Commissioners contemplate the items discussed as there was a good discussion and place this on the agenda for the next meeting. He would like to revisit this at the next meeting and have one or two options for the Commission to vote on.

## 6. ADJOURN

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

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Stigger, Fink, Katner, Thompson, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 PM.

Submitted by:

Jill Juliano

Traffic/Transportation Engineer