

APPROVED Meeting Minutes
Transportation Commission
Tuesday, October 11, 2022 – 7:00 PM
Remote Participation Meeting

1. Call to Order

Staff Liaison Jill Juliano called the remote participation meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

Staff Liaison 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 (left meeting at 8:56 PM), Brian Straw, Ron Burke

Absent: None

Staff: Parking & Mobility Services Manager Sean Keane, Parking Restrictions Coordinator (PRC) Takeshi Thompson, Sustainability Coordinator Marcella Bondie Keenan, Staff Liaison Jill Juliano

Staff Liaison Juliano noted that with all four Commissioners in attendance, there is a quorum.

2. Agenda Approval

Commissioner Katner made a motion to approve the agenda. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

Chair Burke asked if this agenda was different from the one for the September 27, 2022 meeting that was cancelled, and staff confirmed the changes.

Chair Burke asked if Item 6a should be prioritized in the agenda since it had been discussed at numerous meetings. Staff explained what their presentation would include and noted that the item will likely not go to the Village Board until early 2023 due to the Board's busy end-of-year schedule. Based on that feedback from staff, the Commissioners decided to keep the agenda as-is.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Katner, Fink, Straw, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

3. Approval of the Draft September 13, 2022 Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Fink made a motion to approve the draft September 13, 2022 Transportation Commission meeting minutes. It was seconded by Commissioner Katner.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Fink, Katner, Straw, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

4. Non-Agenda Public Comment

None

5. New Business

5a) REMOVAL OF DAYTIME PARKING RESTRICTIONS FOR ON-STREET PERMIT PARKING ON THE 500 BLOCK OF SOUTH MAPLE AVENUE ADJACENT TO RUSH OAK PARK HOSPITAL

Parking and Mobility Services Manager Sean Keane explained that the Village recently received a request from Rush Oak Park Hospital to remove parking restrictions on a portion of S Maple Ave that is adjacent to the hospital campus. The hospital is the sole land owner adjacent to this area. Staff did vehicle counts on two dates to see if the overnight permitted spaces were being utilized and there were no vehicles parked there on either date. Staff recommends granting the request to the hospital.

Chair Burke disclosed that he lives close to the hospital and the neighbors have had concerns over the years about the gradual expansion of the hospital campus into the neighborhood. He noted that he has recently kept out of the neighborhood discussions because of his involvement with the Transportation Commission.

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

Q: If the overnight permit parking is removed, then somebody could still park there with a purchased permit? A: It would be open public parking since it's a public street and parking

would be prohibited from 2:30 AM to 6 AM like every other street in the Village. Someone could get an overnight pass and park there, though.

Q: The 500 block of S Maple Ave goes from where to where, given that the cross-street has been taken over by a parking lot? A: It would be from Madison St to the cul-de-sac that is north of Adams St.

Q: Did the hospital consult with the neighbors on this request? A: There has been no public outreach from the hospital at this point. They reached out to the Village as their first step and this really is a staff action, but we wanted to bring it to the Commission.

Q: Does this just make it an extension of their parking lot? Should they really be managing their own parking and not using on-street parking as additional parking for their patients and staff? A: It would become unrestricted and there wouldn't be any daytime parking enforcement activities in the area.

Q: What is the general parking treatment on Madison St directly north of Rush Oak Park? A: It's pay-by-plate parking.

Q: Is there a time limit? A: No.

Q: After a certain length of time, it gets more expensive, right? A: Yes, after three hours it goes to \$3 an hour versus \$1 an hour. So, for a long-term session, it would be a lot more.

The Commissioners discussed the following items:

- Concerns about moving forward with this item without providing the opportunity for public comments
- The potential implications of removing the restrictions
- The possibility of removing the current restrictions and making the spaces metered like they would be in any other busy business district in the Village
- What should be included in the notification to allow for substantive public comments and to whom those notifications should be mailed

The Commissioners agreed to table the item to give staff the opportunity to notify those potentially impacted and allow for public comment.

5b) CLIMATE READY OAK PARK & 2023 WORKPLAN DEVELOPMENT

Sustainability Coordinator Marcella Bondie Keenan provided background information on the climate plan, Climate Ready Oak Park, that was adopted in August 2022. She explained that the plan is organized into eight different impact areas, each containing overarching goals as well as implementation actions. She focused her presentation on the Transportation Impact Area and shared additional data from the Climate Vulnerability

Index report, as well as feedback received from community engagement. She noted that during community engagement, there was an opportunity for residents to report what they viewed as hazards in the Village and most of them were related to Transportation. She relayed to the Commissioners that this type of data is useful because residents' perception of safety is important, especially when they're considering getting out of their cars and walking or biking instead. She shared the various community engagement partners that staff worked closely with in case the Commission is interested in also working with them, particularly during the development of the Vision Zero Plan.

Commissioner Straw noted that some of the information in the plan is somewhat contradictory, specifically around the urge to move toward electric vehicles (to which he is not opposed). The issue of equity is a concern because it seems that subsidizing that may take away from efforts to improve public transit. Staff responded that that is something that is still being worked out in the transportation space, particularly when it comes to multi-family access to charging that isn't in a paid area. Staff also noted that electrifying public transit would be a nice way to address both of those issues.

Commissioner Fink mentioned that the issue of public transit came up a lot in the presentation, but the Commission rarely addresses that, and she wondered if it could be added to the work plan, or if it will be part of the Vision Zero Plan. Chair Burke agreed and noted that it was flagged in the list of goals that the Commission provided to the Village Board.

Chair Burke asked staff how the Commission could be most helpful in implementing the plan and what the strategy is for implementing the plan. Staff responded that the Commission could start by focusing on the overarching goals of the plan. One of those is establishing emissions reduction goals for transportation systems, which is definitely a policy decision for which this Commission would be uniquely suited to provide input. Staff noted that being more involved in community engagement, collaborating with other organizations, and amplifying the voices and needs of community members who are struggling when weighing in on the Vision Zero Plan would also be helpful.

Commissioner Fink asked staff if the Commission can make recommendations to the Village Board about public transit related issues and then have the Board make a recommendation or request to the CTA (Chicago Transit Authority). Staff responded that the Commission can bring community priorities to the Village Board and that prior Transportation Commissions did work with the CTA to address some concerns. Some minor changes came from that work, but there wasn't a major shift in policy.

5c) DRAFT 2023 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION WORK PLAN

Staff Liaison Juliano went through the 2022 Work Plan with the Commission, explaining which items had been addressed already and which would need to be carried over to the 2023 Work Plan (Vision Zero, review of Madison St, and the backlog of Traffic Calming Petitions). There was a brief discussion regarding the item “Review the Oak Park Bicycle Plan and Neighborhood Greenways System Study to Evaluate Opportunities to Create Additional Dedicated or Protected Bike Lanes” as staff was awaiting feedback from the Commissioners, but Chair Burke thought that the Commission had already provided staff with sufficient input. Staff Liaison Juliano agreed to speak with Village Engineer Bill McKenna to determine what additional information, if any, was needed from the Commission in order to proceed. Because the items that are being carried over will require significant involvement from the Commission, staff recommends only adding a couple of other items to the 2023 Work Plan that can be addressed if time allows.

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

Q: Is it possible to commit to addressing a certain number of petitions each month? A: A consultant has not yet been brought on to help and even with a consultant, it still might not be possible to commit to that. Staff will discuss what we reasonably could commit to and bring that back to the Commission at a later date.

Q: Do you know when a consultant will be hired? A: I don't have any additional information at this point.

Q: Is there a plan to hire a consultant to help with the Vision Zero Plan? A: The Village received a preliminary notice that we've been awarded a federal grant to develop a Vision Zero Plan and there would be a consultant involved.

Q: When might that consultant come on board? As we think about our plan and our timing, are we launching the planning process in January or April? A: Remember, one of the items is to recommend processes to develop the framework of the Vision Zero Plan. We also just received the preliminary notice and still have to do a couple of things before being officially awarded the grant.

Q: I assume there's a local match requirement? A: Yes, an 80/20 match.

Q: Are you going to have to do an RFP (Request for Proposals) process? A: I believe so, but someone else on staff is handling that.

The Commissioners discussed the following items:

- The potential addition of an item that involves identifying barriers to the utilization of public transit in and around Oak Park and coming up with a plan to eliminate those barriers
- What the Commission could do to help the Village achieve the goals that they recommended to the Village Board
- The importance of giving priority to the backlog of petitions since residents have expressed growing frustration about the speed of the process
- The potential addition of an item to develop strategies and potential policies to reduce the number of vehicle miles travelled
- Whether or not to include the ongoing review of the implementation of the Neighborhood Greenways Plan
- Which groups the Commission could partner with to get feedback for some of the items to ensure that they understand the needs of the community
- Potential outcomes and time frames for the various items

Staff agreed to develop a draft 2023 Work Plan based on the feedback from the Commissioners and present it at the November meeting.

6. Old Business

6a) REVIEW OF RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO THE EXISTING OVERNIGHT ON-STREET PERMIT ZONES

Parking and Mobility services Manager Keane briefly introduced the item and noted that since the last meeting, staff has updated the zones to allow for more guest parking based on feedback from the Commission and residents. Parking Restrictions Coordinator (PRC) Takeshi Thompson went through each of the zones where changes are being proposed, explaining the differences between the current and proposed zones. She also shared a table indicating how many spaces would be created with the proposed changes.

Commissioner Fink asked for clarification about areas where permit parking is still being proposed on both sides of the street, which she thought was not going to be the case. Staff explained that they looked at areas on a case-by-case basis and in general, only added permit parking to one side of the street unless permit parking was already allowed on the other side of the street. They also considered areas where there were only multi-family buildings or where the need was significant when making their decisions.

Chair Burke asked if additional permit spaces should be considered in Zone Z1 since the need is high or if staff thinks what is proposed will meet the need. Staff responded that it's a good start and the biggest issue is the shared use because of the rush hour restrictions on S Austin Blvd.

Commissioner Straw noted that the Commissioners previously asked staff to consider day-lighting around alleys and intersections where permit parking was being added and asked if that had been addressed with these revisions. Staff responded that they took note of that in the last meeting and it would be considered as part of the signage installation. PRC Thompson will work closely with Staff Liaison Juliano and the other Engineering staff to create the necessary space to prevent any line-of-sight issues.

Staff Liaison Juliano shared that Commissioner Katner had to leave the meeting due to a power outage in his area.

Sarah Geinosky thanked the Commission for looking into this issue and hopes that it passes the Board.

Commissioner Straw made a motion to concur with staff's recommended revisions, as presented this evening, to the seven select overnight on-street permit zones. He also thanked staff for all of their hard work and for listening to the Commission and the community member input to arrive at a result that most people can support. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Straw, Fink, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 3 to 0.

Chair Burke echoed Commissioner Straw's comments about the hard work of staff to get to this point.

7. Adjourn

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

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Straw, Fink, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 3 to 0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 PM.

Submitted by:
Anna Muench
Administrative Assistant- Engineering