



## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

**TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 2023, AT 3:00 PM**

### ATTENDANCE

#### **Call to Order**

Call to order showed the following Transportation Committee Members in attendance and a quorum reached:

Members present: Brent Baker, Michael Breitbach, Colin Coad, Jeremy Coers, Patricia Dennis, George Ghareeb, Bernie Goitein, Patrick McNamara, Nada Naffakh, Andrea Klopfenstein, Paola Mendez

Members absent: Jada Hoerr, Brandon Lott, Cindy Loos

Others in Attendance:

### ANNOUNCEMENTS, ETC.

Klopfenstein reiterated that Covid declarations have “gone away” and the commission must meet in person and have quorum in the room in order for a meeting to proceed. She noted that the only remote attendance exception she is aware of is when a member is away on Commission related business.

McNamara asked for announcement on details for the upcoming Public Works Open House. Klopfenstein stated that the Open House will take place on Thursday, May 18, from 4 – 7 pm, and is an annual event returning after being on hiatus during Covid. She announced that there will be informational booths for Public Works divisions and other public services. She stated that the event is family friendly with refreshments, balloon animals, face painting, a bouncy house, children can climb on equipment. She stated it’s a free, fun event intended to acquaint Peoria residents on what Public Works does.

McNamara then announced the introduction of the new Transportation Commission member, Pat Dennis. McNamara asked each member to give a brief introduction of themselves to the new commissioner and their interest in the Transportation Commission. Each of the members did so and Commissioner Dennis then introduced herself and her background experience.

## MINUTES

### REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION FEBRUARY 21, 2023 MINUTES

McNamara recommended the Commission move to approve the February meeting minutes. Michael Breitbach made the motion to approve and Ghareeb seconded. The Chairman asked for comments. Goitein asked that where “see attached” or “attachment” is indicated in the text of minutes, that the attachments be included. The Administrative Specialist noted this and confirmed that she would make the adjustments. Coers asked for the removal of the wording “as the report may suggest” in Item No. 3, stating that the report doesn’t include data from the 2013-2014 traffic calming project and cannot suggest a negative impact from it. The Administrative Specialist made corrections to the draft minutes at that time and the motion passed with an amendment to accept the changes. Dennis abstained, citing the fact that she was not a Commission member during February.

## AGENDA ITEMS

### ITEM NO. 1

#### **1. Discuss Agenda Items for Transportation Commission for 2023 and Develop a Calendar for the Items**

McNamara opened discussion on Item No. 1, and per his request the attachment of notes from last meeting’s Item 2B was displayed onscreen for editing during discussion. Breitbach questioned if some of the items should stay in agenda item status because they may not be resolved or completed in the time allotted on the calendar. Pat said he agrees and intends for topics to be a projection for discussion points to start at defined times but allow for items w/ undefined timeline and use the document as a draft calendar.

A. McNamara asked for an update on the Commission proposed bicycle master plan, prior Item 2A. He asked Klopfenstein to expand on the details of adding of a data layer to the GIS map. Klopfenstein reported that Public Works is currently “working on a major effort to add more data into our GIS system and use the data in a more meaningful way for planning and day to day operations.” She stated that this year will be spent prepping and determining what software will be used with the new system. She stated that “right now we have the CSO consent decree deadlines that are legally mandated and so adding CSO assets and meeting these milestones are the current priorities. Klopfenstein stated that “it seems like it should be something easy” to create a GIS map layer but “the City has many different viewpoints to consider rather than just Engineering, which is one voice” among several who decide what information to include in a GIS asset. Klopfenstein reported that “we sat in this room with our fiscal people, our operations people, the PubWorks software people, and engineers,” and debated the components of what could be incorporated into GIS map layers. Klopfenstein said the City had IS (Information Systems) present to hear engineers analyze and detail one asset such as discussing “what’s an inlet vs. a catch basin” at length, and she reported that “the City got through two assets in a ninety-minute meeting and that’s just the structure of the information we need to collect”. She stated that city has hundreds

CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS AN ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA SHOULD CONTACT A COMMISSION MEMBER PRIOR TO THE MEETING. ALL OTHER PUBLIC INPUT WILL BE HEARD UNDER PUBLIC COMMENT NEAR THE END OF THE COMMITTEE MEETING.

NOTE: THE ORDER IN WHICH AGENDA ITEMS ARE CONSIDERED MAY BE MOVED FORWARD OR DELAYED BY AT LEAST 2/3 VOTE OF THE COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT.

of assets to work through this mapping process and they currently working on the Combined Sewer Overflow for stormwater and then “we will work our way out from there.”

Klopfenstein reported that the City does have the bicycle master plan in the GIS map but “what we don’t have is where our paths actually exist” currently “so we need to build that data so that we can overlap and identify the gaps.” Klopfenstein reported that the city uses the bicycle master plan when it does projects, citing the Wisconsin Ave reconstruction as an example where with analysis and public input the City decided to add a separated bike lane on that project. She stated that with very few exceptions like the Rock Island Roadway, we are “not doing special bike only projects.” Dennis asked how many layers or assets the City is looking to add to the map. Klopfenstein stated that “we are looking at having all the assets that we work on in our GIS system, and each of those assets has multiple layers” such as her example of curbs and gutters, with layers for type and location, which is “an easy one”, but an asset like inlets has twenty – thirty layers, and all that data needs collected. Klopfenstein stated “that’s just us saying we want that information, but then we still need to go and collect it, so it’s a lengthy process.” McNamara asked if “this is part of the County GIS map or a separate one for Peoria only”, and Klopfenstein replied that the County is responsible for parcel layers and owner information data, but the infrastructure assets such as storm sewers, or locations for curbs, gutters, ditches, streetlights, traffic signals are data that the City is responsible for. McNamara asked if there is anything that the Commission can include in the calendar agenda topics to support the City in gathering this data. Klopfenstein responded that the City is working on hiring staff to assist with the data collection and once they’re in place “we could report back on that.”

McNamara asked Coad if he had any supplemental input. Coad stated that the map data collection is an issue addressed in past years and there were “some people at one point who were helping to assemble that data, but they left the commission so it kind of just fizzled on that point.” Coad also stated that Klopfenstein gave a very good summary and embedded everything he would say in her response and that the map data will be a tool to identify gaps that need to be plugged in the system. Coad added that “we don’t have to do that with GIS” if it is something that is part of an undefined timeframe topics that the City is working on. He stated that it can be done “the old-fashioned way with a print and a map, in a couple of hours.” Coad stated that since it has been heard from several Commissioners that bicycling is a priority, maybe the task becomes doing the best job “we can with the data we have”. Coad suggested comparing the Peoria Bicycle Plan against the most current aerial imagery we have in Google street view and a highlighter” to see what stands out as significant gaps in the current system rather than “waiting around for an indeterminate timeframe for a GIS system that is really a visual tool that we could produce with a little elbow grease.”

Baker added that there is a certain level of pragmatic knowledge to that method that can triage to what’s currently in GIS to what’s actually on the street. Baker stated that understanding when the last update was done to the GIS bicycling assets would provide a point of origin to work backwards from or look forward from. Baker also stated that the Tri County Regional Planning Commission might be starting their Regional Bike Plan refresh soon and suggested that could another group “we could leverage” and he would report back on that. Per the Chairman’s

request, both Coad and Baker agreed to collaborate to formulate some kind of report. Baker suggesting using some of the Bike Peoria volunteers to spearhead the work. Coad suggested creating a shared PDF or Google Map for editing and markup. He stated the importance of defining the Commission's purposes on why "we are doing this on our own" in the interim until the GIS system can be generated. Coad stated that the hope is that "something would reveal itself to us" and that the Commission can find areas to emphasize. Coad stated that "at the end of the day" the Commission is just recommending certain routes to the City for prioritization of bike improvements. Baker feels that this updated resource would be helpful to the city engineers when "it comes time to start doing the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan)". Coad agreed and reiterated that it would be a tool for a future conversation and not an immediate answer to anything, just a steppingstone to get to a more educated discussion. Baker and Coad agreed to report back in June regarding the development of an updated bicycle map for the City of Peoria.

Dennis posed a question about whether or not plans for new/improved bicycle lanes and the quantity of each are included in the CIP, and if so, are there are defined goals for miles of improvement per year, or locations per year, etc. for purposes of bicycle master plan implementation and guidance to the Council for funding the improvements. McNamara stated "as far as CIP goes, we struggled with having specific CIP tasks for bicycle paths", that "by the time all the money gets allocated" bicycle improvements are "lesser funded or fall off the table." He also cited prior Engineering comments that "everytime they have any kind of design", the City looks for opportunities to "put bike amenities in" rather than solely trying to secure and allocate funding per mile or separately funded bike path projects.

Dennis asked if there is any regional funding from the County or any federal grant money available. Klopfenstein responded that grants can be applied for but they always have a cost match the City has a \$10,000,000 total for transportation funding, to allocate to all street improvements: traffic signals, street lights, roads, sidewalks, curb and gutter, bike paths, and cannot add new items that have a cost share because for the next three to five years "all of our money is already allocated to cost share matches." She stated that she has explained to the Public Works Director and City Manager both that there is no room to add anything in the next budget, even with the "bipartisan infrastructure law" because the funding is all cost share; that "there is no money with no strings to help us do anything." Dennis also inquired where to find the numbers on miles of bike path added or improved. Klopfenstein reported that the statistics are added once projects are completed, citing Western Ave as an example that was recently finished and that .9 miles of bike path improvements will be reported in the Complete Streets Data, with large projects containing more bike path miles are beginning soon on Wisconsin Ave and Adams/Jefferson.

Dennis asked about restriping and maintaining the path markings and how that is overseen, since repainting is an instantly noticeable improvement for citizens to see. Klopfenstein explained that is done in house at Public Works and the Streets Division has a schedule that includes crosswalks, street markings, parking lines, bike paths, and all striping areas. McNamara requested that appropriate Public Works personnel attend a meeting and present information on the painting schedule. Klopfenstein stated that she would obtain the information and bring it back to the Commission.

Goitein raised the question of as separated or improved bike lanes are being added, they are coming from lanes that “would otherwise be used for other traffic, primarily cars.” He suggested the Commission implement tracking the data and considering the implications of on driver usage of and reliance on transportation infrastructure as it is narrowed to accommodate bicycle amenities. McNamara confirmed that some major projects do use existing right of way width and are using the practice of “road dieting” where necessary. He stated that the vehicular traffic still has the same width roadway but less lanes, and that “typically where that’s occurred there’s not really been the congestion issue” that was anticipated. Mendez-Silvagnoli cited the example of new bicycle lane added on Forrest Hill recently. Goitein stated that traffic congestion should be an explicit aspect of the planning phases, not an issue addressed after the fact. Coers stated that the concerns should be reviewed but that he thought those considerations are “already taken into account by traffic command studies in a lot of cases” and “by projections, and in forecast demands.” He also noted that there “a lot of streets in Peoria that were built when the city was built differently”, and that some places no longer need six lanes, for example. Coers also stated that the City should continue to manage the issues involved with adding bike paths, and that City efforts should be characterized as currently addressing the concerns.

Goitein recognized that when the Commission discusses the traffic calming program manual as an agenda item, he had concern that there is “close to none” mention of congestion issues from lane reduction, and he would like the applicable data included. McNamara stated “not to jump too far ahead but that he thought “the manual does include the need for traffic studies for any type of traffic calming request” and that he thinks the concern will addressed by data collection to support “the notion that there is traffic calming needed” and if traffic calming implemented, there would be post data that would confirm the success or lack thereof” for the traffic calming measures.

- B. McNamara moved to prior Item 2B, sidewalk and pedestrian traffic patterns. McNamara mentioned the Tri County Regional Planning Commission’s “Gray Area” study and the City’s “Last Mile” study that Cindy Loos will review that data in a future meeting. McNamara asked if the Commission considers whether or not reports on these studies would make sense the body to review at a future meeting and identify needed projects in specific areas. Breitbart stated that was the genesis of his thoughts and it builds on Coad’s statement that this would be a tool to compare where we have bicycle and bus routes, large scale shopping, schools, “that kind of thing”. He stated that “you” draw your circles and area of influence” and review studies like the Last Mile Study and asked “are there holes out there?” Breitbart stated that his suggestion is similar to Coad’s idea of overlapping different types of data to “identify these places, make sure these kids have some place to walk,” and if there is a bus stop, that when people “get off the bus there and walk to a shopping center, that there’s good facilities for them.” Breitbart suggested an action item could be subsequently to Coad and Baker "creating the bicycle plan update, take that information and build it into bus stops and school zones and build some sort of project identification map. McNamara and Breitbart both stated an agenda item could be information from both studies being presented to the Commission. Coad announced a “quick Google search” pulls up a link to the “Grey Area Mobility Enhancement and Expansion Study” by the Tri Country Regional

Planning Commission; he stated he has not read it and cannot speak to the content but that it could be a reference for the committee. Breitbart stated that he would review it and present information in it to the Commission at the next meeting.

Dennis asked if the City has a transit department and Klopfenstein responded that the transit system is managed by CityLink is a separate entity. Dennis inquired whether bike path projects are coordinated with CityLink's knowledge of bus stop usage patterns and amenities such as busses equipped with bicycle racks, close to bike paths, etc. Klopfenstein stated that we do coordinate with bus routes on streets being redone; "we reach out to Citylink, and they manage/install the shelters, benches, garbage cans, and we provide the sidewalks and paths, so that is already happening."

Dennis asked how accountability is handled to ensure that CityLink provides the shelter and appropriate facilities. Klopfenstein stated that would involve the Citylink Board of Directors to oversee and implement that. McNamara reported that CityLink made a significant effort through a study one to two years ago, and they installed shelters and improvements in strategically identified locations. He stated he is not aware of any plans "do any more in that regard." Dennis commented that maybe the development standard needs to be revised and improved for coordination of transit services between the City and CityLink. Klopfenstein acknowledged the recommendation.

Goitein reiterated previously noted concerns about student pedestrian traffic in school zones, and also stated that private and parochial schools also need the sidewalk considerations applied to them; he asked about funding crossing guards, and whether or not schools or the City can pay for them, in the interest of improving safety. McNamara noted that Peoria Park District has crossing guards installed at some of the major intersections, and that District 150 provides crossing guards within proximity to public schools. Goitein suggested placing more crossing guards at other major intersections at a farther distance from the school, and that the measure "doesn't cost a whole lot."

- C. McNamara announced to prior Item 2C, which was the Main Street grant status update. Klopfenstein reported that Main Street has funding, but the State "hasn't rolled it out yet; we've been in a holding pattern for over a year." Klopfenstein stated she cannot project a rollout date, and when it is announced "it will be all over the news" and we will "not miss it." She stated that the City will want to promote it and facilitate "lots of public input". Coers asked if the Commission could define its goals for the Main Street project, and Klopfenstein responded "that is what the public input process is for." McNamara stated that he is "just looking for a holding place" on the agenda calendar for it but understands that is not currently possible with the funding release status.

McNamara asked if there were any other Main Street questions for discussion, and Coers stated he had nothing further about Main Street, but he stated he would like to have "a discussion sometime about whether or not Fulton Street would go forward." Klopfenstein explained that Fulton Plaza is on the CIP sheet, not in the current budget on the five-year CIP plan but deferred to an undefined placeholder as a future consideration (unfunded) project. Klopfenstein stated that when "the grant rolls through it will go onto the actual plan" and "if these big projects are defined enough to be on the CIP in the future, they would have to be pulled in for it to be a 'real' project" and would need to go through the budget process.

Klopfenstein stated that “engineering is slow.” She explained that budgeting would start in July, then design would come the following year, and bidding/construction the next year. Klopfenstein reported that Fulton Street has been around in talks for two decades, alternating between pushes to change it, and currently sentiment has moved back to not changing it. She explained that the CIP future placeholder status helps “non-engineering” staff understand how the “real costs of projects”, and that “if we move something in, something else has to be moved.” Klopfenstein added that the sheet is broken down in categories of Engineering, Construction, Land Acquisition, and Other. Klopfenstein also explained that sometimes projects on the list are moved to the placeholders to “focus attention” and target projects and keep spotlight on “the next need” and keep focus on the roads that need work “based on asset condition.” Coers asked if there is another project to propose to replace Fulton Plaza that better aligns with Complete Streets objectives and Commission goals. Klopfenstein responded that “it is higher than me that is keeping Fulton in” but there is no limit to the number of projects that can be added to the CIP sheet, but the idea is not to “be crazy” and that “it has to be a useful document.”

- D. McNamara moved to prior Item 2D, discussion of snow clearing from residential sidewalks. Naffakh stated there are many routes that “we could go” for an action item on this topic. She reported that starting an initiative was discussed, or a “survey to gauge people’s support for something like this.” Coad commented that “the dream for me, to keep the effort reasonable considering there is no budget to plow all of the city sidewalks,” is that to implement a public survey used to determine where the critical locations are for people “who are having trouble with this”, where there is a fundamental issue for residents to get to bus stops, or people in wheelchairs who need this done. Coad then suggested following up the survey with an Adopt a Sidewalk program that involves citizens nearby those areas take over the small communal clearing operations as they are identified. He stated that he is not suggesting that it is the Commission’s job to “get that through” but that the need is recognized. McNamara called for an action item to add to a future meeting’s agenda. Naffakh proposed creating a survey and “pushing that out” Coad suggested possibly adding the survey to the City of Peoria website, reviewing the data and then doing citizen outreach after. Ghareeb commented that he was leery about sending a survey out asking which sidewalk that isn’t being cleared is “most important”. He stated there is “always a liability issue” and that in his opinion “everybody is going to say the sidewalk in front of my house is very important for me to get to the bus station”; Ghareeb stated he “just playing Devil’s advocate”, not saying “not to do good.” Coad responded that maybe the approach is not sending a global survey but an announcement on the City website expressing a request for community members to help with clearing. Ghareeb questioned whether anyone would clear someone else’s sidewalk due to the liability concerns, and that few would participate. He stated that he wouldn’t unless neighbors knew each other well.

Naffakh stated that she feels “not everybody would feel equally (concerned) about their sidewalk because not all people are pedestrian commuters.” She suggested further discussion with apartment complexes because they are composed of “large groups of pedestrians with a single property owner in charge of the sidewalk in front of them” and achieve greater impact by enforcing clearing

in those areas. Goitein commented that he “liked that point of apartments” because communal residences and businesses already have liability requirements to clear and they know the regulations. Goitein stated that residents are walking neighborhoods for various reasons and “liability applies either way; if you don’t clear it and someone gets hurt” is also a concern. He cited the example of a neighborhood that addressed this issue by pooling funds and hired a company to clear the entire street, with fifteen houses cleared at once. Goitein stated they found this solution more efficient than each property owner “using individual snowblower or hiring a teenager to shovel.” Coad suggested that it be listed on the agenda calendar as a future discussion rather than as “report back” action item.

- E. McNamara announced he would “skip Item E (prior Item 2E) for now, tabling discussion until later in the meeting, under the listed agenda item.
- F. McNamara asked Ghareeb if he any comments to add to discussion for prior Item 2F, regarding electrical vehicle capacity. Ghareeb stated his previous inquiry was to determine whether the City has this issue “on the horizon” and that Klopfenstein had informed the Commission it does, that a consultant was “on board”. She reported an update: the mayor convened meeting with a group of stakeholders and the search for funding opportunities “turned into we’ll apply for this grant for this kind of thing for these locations.” Klopfenstein reported that a grant application for public electrical vehicle charging stations will be submitted at the end of May, for larger community population, even beyond Peoria. Klopfenstein recommended that she bring the issue back as an agenda item once the lengthy grant application process and approval is complete.
- G. McNamara asked the Commission to review the agenda calendar items he put forward in the onscreen document and requested the Commission’s input on the scheduling in appropriate months. Per Klopfenstein’s recommendation, the Commission’s budget items recommendations to Council be moved to the June meeting agenda, which is the Commission’s voice on projects vs the City’s through Engineering Staff, and she stated that the Commission’s recommendations carry more weight as the citizens’ representation. Dennis asked where she can review the existing CIP and Klopfenstein directed her to the City of Peoria website and to enter the search term “Budget” and “at the very back of that document” contains the CIP with a project sheet for each item. Agenda items were scheduled on the calendar for either a monthly meeting or under the “undefined” timeline.



## **ITEM NO. 2 Review Complete Streets Data Report**

- A. Mendez-Silvagnoli reported that her addition of the 2022 project data summary onto the prior report to show a comparison review to prior years included. McNamara reiterated the earlier mention of new/improved bicycle path miles statistics being added to the report as projects are completed. McNamara suggested a renaming of the report to the Complete Streets Ordinance Performance Metrics Data, since the ordinance is what drives the Complete Streets goals. He would like to use the report in summary when presenting the Commission's annual report to the Council. McNamara added the upcoming report as an agenda calendar item for June, and that he will bring in the list of goals set by the ordinance to review how it is being supported successfully so far. He noted a significant increase of new and improved sidewalks in the 2022 project data and asked if that increase would be continuing. Mendez-Silvagnoli explained a portion of the statistics were added from 2021 projects and the work overlaps into 2022 and that increases will continue under the ongoing Sidewalk and ADA projects. McNamara stated he had also observed the data reporting an in ADA ramps. Klopfenstein commented that data reporting is driven by project completion so significant statistical jumps will be seen as major projects are finished. McNamara asked if there is a "known number" of ADA ramps completed and/or added. Klopfenstein reported that "whenever we touch pavement, curbs, sidewalk – the law says we have to add ramps." She stated that is a data point the City needs to gather more information on for reporting. Coad made a celebratory comment about the developments and noted that some of the numbers were above average.

## **ITEM NO. 3 Review draft of Traffic Calming Manual**

- A. Klopfenstein reported that Public Works would like to make the calming policy that was submitted to Council into a program. She commented that the City removed "neighborhood" from the text, explaining that traffic calming is not something that only needs done on neighborhood roads but can happen everywhere. Klopfenstein stated that calming measures can involve "everything from striping to public education to fatality awareness", and that not all measures belong on every street, so restrictions were laid out to inform the public on why some would or would not work in some areas. Klopfenstein stated that the department "really tried to put levels and are trying to have people report a problem and tell us what is going on. We do the data and we come up with the best engineering solution." She explained this approach was developed so that people stop "saying I want a speed bump" and having residents get attached to their proposed solutions and then it is "harder" for the City to explain why a different measure is better for the calming needs of these various areas.

Dennis asked about differentiating between neighborhood streets as different from collectors and arterials; Klopfenstein responded that some residents think of their street as being right in front of their home, but the "collectors (streets) actually need to balance speed limits between residents and the citizens who access the road to travel through" from place to place, to include all voices. Klopfenstein cited Moss Ave as an example of this situation. She also gave an example of factors considered for a calming measure, citing the example of a contained neighborhood such as dead end, asking the questions "is it really an issue as a collective neighborhood, or just one resident's concern?" Klopfenstein stated that some residents just want enforcement of existing measures, and

some residents want “a build.” Klopfenstein reported that this was the reason the calming measures are now organized into levels by the manual, so that residents clearly understand the measures they are asking for and what they would get with a build vs enforcement measures. She stated a concern that some people are taking petitions around and people are not understanding what measures they’ve signed on for. Klopfenstein stated that Engineering incorporated Police Department input so that residents are not confused between traffic law violations and traffic calming measures that need implemented on a road. Klopfenstein requested that the Commission offer comments back to Engineering immediately because they are taking the program to Council in May and the Transportation Commission will not be meeting before then. Klopfenstein stated that the department wants to get the policy out to the public. McNamara noted that added restrictions were added to measures qualifying for speed bumps as an example. Klopfenstein explained that the retrofit versus redesign determines those outcomes. In areas where traffic studies have been done and full-scale engineering plans are implemented, redesign is the approach, not retrofit with small build measures such as speed bumps. McNamara asked if there is a timeframe allotted on neighborhoods to reevaluate and reverse what they asked for if the measure isn’t what they expected or asked for, or if it has adverse effects and they no longer want it. Klopfenstein there said no option for it, due to the cost, time, and manpower to remove measures; she stated that is why the manual has added levels of engineering requests, to vet the measures against intended outcomes. Dennis stated that the policy states that if a neighborhood wants a calming measure removed subsequently, it will be at the neighborhood’s cost.

#### **ITEM NO. 4 Project Updates**

- A. Klopfenstein reported that Glen construction from Knoxville to Sheridan should be “wrapping up this summer, and Glen from University to War Memorial started this year and will go into early next year, and that Glen will remain open to one lane of traffic each direction. She stated that Gale Ave Mill and Overlay with sidewalk improvements is scheduled this year, with reconfiguration of the five-point intersection at Nebraska and Gale included. Next, Klopfenstein said that Western should be wrapping up in next couple of months, and that “everyone crossing your fingers”, Adams and Jefferson should be going on the letting w/ Illinois Department of Transportation for a two-year project completion in 2025. Klopfenstein reported that Moss Ave, the Kickapoo Terrace stub street, and Deerbrook will become green streets, which means they will install permeable pavers for water infiltration into the ground instead of flooding the storm drainage system. Klopfenstein reported that two sections of Wisconsin are under design and go to bid late this year, with two-year construction timeline for each section. She then listed the Pioneer Parkway and University intersection as under design and going to bid at the end of this year, and the last piece of the Rock Island Greenway Phase 1 design is going into a two-year design/construction plan. Klopfenstein stated the Nebraska mill and overlay from University to I-74 bridge (overpass), and the reconstruction of Nebraska from the bridge to Sterling will start this year. She reported that an extension of the previous MacArthur project from Moss Ave to the bridge will go to design this and to build next year, and the City has a grant for MacArthur below the bridge to Jefferson, with the actual

scope of the project to be determined after hearing more about the grant details in two weeks so that possibly in two months some design work could begin. Coers requested that the contractor review the lane drops on Glen Ave construction on northbound Sterling crossing War Memorial; he reported that the lane droppage is too sudden and narrow and he's seen multiple drivers get trapped in the barrels as a result. Klopfenstein stated she will have the engineers reach out to the contractor.

#### UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

#### NEW BUSINESS

##### **Item No. 1 Vehicle Code**

- A. Coers reported that Springfield is on track to change the vehicle code for the state law that states it has to be possible for the largest semi to be able to physically pass through any intersection in the city whether it's a truck route or not. Coers stated that they are changing the law to say that it is only required for truck routes. Coers proposed that the Commission discuss which routes need it and which don't, to meet law's requirement that cities have to provide a list of streets indicating to truck drivers which streets they are allowed to drive and which they are not.

#### NEXT MEETING

**TUESDAY, MAY 16, 2023 3:00 PM**

#### ADJOURNMENT

McNamara called for a motion to adjourn. Goitein so moved; Coers seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.