



Tuesday, July 18, 2023, Transportation Commission Minutes

ATTENDANCE

Call to Order: Call to order showed the following Transportation Committee Members in attendance:

Members present: Patrick McNamara, Brent Baker, Michael Breitbach, Colin Coad, Jeremy Coers, Brandon Lott, Bernie Goitein, Nada Naffakh - 8

Members absent: George Ghareeb, Patricia Dennis, Jada Hoerr – 3

ANNOUNCEMENTS, ETC.

McNamara mentioned the 7-million-dollar grant that was approved by Council. The grant from the State of Illinois will help to rehabilitate McArthur Ave.

MINUTES

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION JUNE 20, 2023, MINUTES

Coers requested some changes be made to the June 20, 2023, minutes. He requested that in items 2 and 5, the phrase, “no truck traffic rotation marks grid” be changed to “no truck traffic’ restrictions allowed.” Lott motioned to approve the minutes at corrected; seconded by Coers.

Approved with a unanimous verbal vote.

AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM NO. 1 Review and Approve Complete Streets Report to Submit to Council as a Request to Receive and File

McNamara opened discussion on comments or questions on the Complete streets report. Goitein mentioned the meeting agenda’s Item Number 2 attachment, which notes the Complete Streets Policy provides safety and convenience of all users. He said that traffic signals should be a topic of consideration when discussing safety and referenced number 6 of the CIP Projects list on the document, “Traffic Signals - Capital Maintenance.” Goitein suggested including traffic signal measurements to performance measures. McNamara responded, suggesting Goitein’s comment be part of the discussion for making changes to the Complete Streets Policy, and asked for it to be noted as a future agenda item. Goitein asked for clarification, and McNamara explained that the Complete Streets Report is different from the Complete Streets Policy as the policy is an ordinance that requires council approval. McNamara said it would be appropriate to provide a report of goals to council in the future and to make any changes to the policy at that time. Coers added to McNamara’s comment, explaining that since traffic signals are not a part of the current Complete Streets Policy, it is not appropriate to discuss them in the Complete Streets Report at this time. Referring to the report, Lott asked who reassesses performance measurements. McNamara answered, saying the commission and staff would have a role, and explained there are additional metrics or measurements to gather for the report. Lott explained the commission will submit the report to council, they will review and file it, and the next step will be to address

the existing policy and those goals to see if it needs sweeping. Goitein asked for clarification on the commission's function regarding Item Number 1 of the agenda. McNamara answered, saying the commission is preparing a report to the council for the policy's performance measurements relative to the goals that were established several years ago. McNamara explained that there are currently no measurements in the report regarding traffic signals, so the report does not need to reflect or respond to that issue concerning the budget. Goitein requested the language in the Complete Streets Report page 5, item number 2 be revised. Paola explained that any measurements that need to be added or adjusted in the report need to be handled in the future. Coers suggested any changes that need to be made be considered as an agenda item for a future meeting. Goitein said his comments on the report are as follows: it is important to understand safety and how traffic signals are involved in that; if concerned about the convenience of all users then it is important to look at measures of congestion on the roads. Naffakh asked if those comments are covered in the section that discusses future plans to reassess goals for performance measures where appropriate. Based on Goitein's comments, McNamara suggested the report be changed in a generic form that provides the opportunity to make a lot more changes to the policy rather than just the two Goitein has suggested. Goitein suggested the language be changed to say, "...and to include, as well, goals around safety, traffic signals, and convenience" because it would produce the performance measures they want in the report. Coers responded, saying increasing pedestrian safety generally involves decreasing running speed which increases congestion; reiterating that specific goals need to be discussed in a future meeting. Lott asked who is reporting from the Commission or from the City Engineer. McNamara answered, saying his name and the City Engineer's name is on the document. Lott asked if there are any details they have learned while creating this report that can make it easier in the future. Klopfenstein answered, explaining the data has been collected and reviewed. To clarify the amendments, Goitein suggested the language on page 5, item number 2 be changed to say, "Reassess goals for Performance Measurements where appropriate to include also considerations for traffic signals for safety and concerns for congestion." Coers countered, saying he is not comfortable adding specific goals without discussing them as an official agenda item. Lott motioned to submit the report to the council as amended per Goitein's suggestion; seconded by Breitbach. Objecting to the first motion, Coers motioned to approve the report as prepared previously. Breitbach asked if adding considerations for traffic signals would impede the report. Coers answered, saying it would show that the commission has a preference that has not been discussed as a commission. Coad agreed, saying it is strange to isolate that one issue while in previous discussion the commission has discussed other issues that need consideration. Because of the difference in opinion, McNamara suggested that the commission vote on the motion that was made by Lott and seconded by Breitbach; saying if the vote passes then Goitein's language will be included and if not, the commission will continue discussion. The commission's verbal vote failed. Coers motioned to approve the report as presented in the packet except for one change to the misspelling of the word "year" on page 2; seconded by Naffakh. Motion approved with a unanimous roll call vote.

ITEM NO. 2 Review and Approve Resolution Providing Input to the Bi-Annual Budget to Submit to Council as a Request to Receive and File

McNamara mentioned this agenda topic was briefly discussed in the last Transportation Commission meeting, but they decided to push the discussion into the July meeting. He said the Commission has tried to provide to council some budget input in the past with varying degrees of success. This resolution is an additional attempt generically share with the council the

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.

Transportation Commission's attempt to follow the ordinance that defines the Transportation Commission's requirements to provide input to the bi-annual budget process. He said the resolution mentions the support of the Complete Streets ordinance as part of the bi-annual budget input. He said he selected some existing CIP projects that included some sort of pedestrian bicycle or improvements in that regard except for the bicycle plan. He added if there was funding in either one of those two bi-annual years, the only project that didn't have funding was the bicycle plan. McNamara said the Commission understands that the budget does not have many more funds for additional projects, so this resolution is an attempt for the Commission to provide to the council the areas that the Commission feels are important to continue to fund and maybe leave some opportunity for additional changes; these projects would be the focus for any extra funds.

Lott asked if the attached resolution had changed since the last meeting. McNamara answered, saying it had not been changed.

Coers asked if McNamara was able to follow-up regarding an analysis for a potential conflict of interest in him approving as he is involved in one of the projects. Given there was a quorum at the meeting, Coers and the Commission agreed that he would abstain from voting until it is clearer whether there is a conflict of interest for him to approve via vote.

Goitein said it was good to see awareness of the question of capital maintenance and traffic signals, referring to item number 6 on the resolution.

Klopfenstein mentioned the date in the footer of the document should be changed to July 18, 2023.

Lott motioned to approve the resolution as amended with the corrected date, seconded by Coad. Approved with a unanimous verbal vote.

ITEM NO. 3 Colin Coad and Brent Baker to Report Back in June Regarding an Up to Date Bicycle Map for the City of Peoria (handouts attached to minutes)

Coad said that in 2016 the City of Peoria issued a Peoria Bicycle Master Plan. Coad referred to three maps he pulled from that plan. The first map, page 32 of the master plan, shows what was logged for the bicycle network. The second map was also an excerpt from the master plan and includes the bicycle network recommendations. The third map is classified by high need and low priority. He said the included packet was good foundational guidance for the Commission's discussion.

Coad said he attempted to make his own GIS map of what approximately exists in the city. He also assembled a tabulated spreadsheet list that shows the tabulated format of the proposed bicycle network recommendations from the 2016 master plan. Coad went on to describe the labels in the spreadsheet; explaining that the roadway is the road on which the facility is, the "from" and "to" columns are residential limits, roadway jurisdiction comes from the IDOT jurisdiction, roadway priority comes from the master plan map, and the recommended facility comes from another map previously discussed. The bicycle facility status column represents Coad's assessment of whether that has been installed or not. Green/yellow cells represent that some sort of bicycle facility has been installed on that proposed location. These are sorted by priority. Nada asked within the

highest priority categories if the categories are sorted by priority. Coad answered, saying the categories are not sorted.

Coad explained that the map at the end of the packet includes everything that is green (new developments) plus everything that is existing. He said the data was gathered by looking at previous GIS information and previous maps. Baker added that the original list of the master plan had 78 projects and since identified, there were 18 which means about 23% of the projects have been identified as now having some sort of facilities placed; most of which are on the recommended level of the typology facilities on the roadway. He said this could be a fruitful exercise for reassessing the policy and looking at the progress measurements. He said it could be a good tool for the future to move things around to challenge priorities based on knowledge of upcoming capital projects and understanding better how people have changed how they move around the city.

Coad referred to a map of what is currently in place in the City of Peoria, and explained the goal for the map itself is to understand where there are gaps in the network. McNamara asked if Coad and Baker have identified others in a list that should be added to the map. Coad answered, saying he does have another list of area that could eventually be added, and added that next steps to continue the effort include deciding what the commission's priorities are for the network. Coers asked if IDOT has indicated whether Charity's Path is still a part of the mall-to-mall project, or did it get taken out because Glen lost its path. Andrea responded, saying they have not heard anything from IDOT. Baker said there is a lot of infrastructure that people use which has created some connectivity.

Coers asked for confirmation on the projects, and asked if Coad and Baker have just shuffled the current projects or added any projects. Baker answered, saying all the projects are still the ones from the 2016 plan. Lott asked if any projects came off the list. Coad answered, saying only Glen has come off the list, but Klopfenstein said Glen could still be a part of the plan. Baker said connectivity up and down the city is still the Adams and Jefferson corridor especially with some connectivity across both bridges. He said adding to the Jefferson two-way conversion as it continues to roll out will play a large role in adding facilities to the list that do not exist today. McNamara asked if the original master plan had a distance defined for the various projects? Coad said he did not recall there being distances but said he would double-check.

Goitein emphasized the importance of having operating traffic signals as preventative maintenance for protection of cyclists. He asked to what extent traffic signals are reflected in the bicycle analysis. Naffakh clarified that the bicycle plan is more of a planning reference than an engineering reference as opposed to specific intersections and locations and designing them for safety. Baker added the designing will default to the Complete Streets Policy for engineering standards, the bicycle plan is just a recommendation based on the size of the road and the cross section of the road to determine what the best recommendation of routes is based on the grid of the city to connect facilities. He said the bicycle plan does not have any specific design recommendations for traffic or intersections.

ITEM NO. 4 Michael Breitbach to Report Back on Tri-County Regional Planning Commission "Grey Area" Study. <https://tricityrpc.org/?s=grey>

Breitbach opened the discussion, saying Tri-County observed mass transit, bicycle lanes, bicycle paths, and sidewalks. He added this helped them understand where the main draws are for people to get to their destination safely. Breitbach said the Grey Area study was great and talks about mass transit district services in three counties but there are some areas they do not service. He said Tri-County has discussions about adding routes and how it would affect transportation in the

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.

area and how to service people who are outside the network in grey areas. The study included information on demographics, density, vehicle versus No vehicle, employment status of people in those areas, and trip generators. Breitbach said one question the study asks is if there is a way to overlay some of the bus routes with bike lanes.

ITEM NO. 5 Review / Update Agenda Calendar

McNamara referred to the commission's calendar of future agenda items and asked to add some items to upcoming meetings. He requested an item titled, "Categorization and prioritization of bicycle facilities for the Commission's review" be added to the October Transportation Commission meeting. Nada asked if categorization meant "the proposed facility." Coad answered, saying it is more related to CIP categories for what is coming. He added, beyond that is which projects are high priority but not at the top of high priority, because there some areas have existing sidewalks that can be shared sufficiently between bikes and walkers. He mentioned another category could include areas where there is no good way to bike but there should be, and those would be higher priority areas.

McNamara referred to the August section of the commission's agenda calendar, asking if the commission had anything to add to the existing list of items. Goitein asked when the commission will discuss issues of performance measures regarding safety. McNamara answered, suggesting an item be added to the "Items with an Undefined Timeframe" section of the commission's agenda calendar titled, "Review of complete streets policy."

Goitein emphasized the importance of action items and asked which items on the commission's agenda calendar look like action items. McNamara answered, saying a lot of the items involve data gathering and information that the commission needs to discuss in preparation for making policy suggestions to the council or staff, or working with staff on assisting them in some of their requests for what the commission might need in terms of assistance to staff. He said most of the meeting agendas might have action items that the commission has to vote on; he emphasized that the commission, as defined by the ordinance, is required to provide guidance and discussion to city staff as well as council. Goitein responded, saying he recalls revising the ordinance language to state that a meeting would have an action item. McNamara said his view would be for there to be a meeting where changes would be discussed and input would be gathered from all members, and then a subsequent meeting would be held where items are voted to approve once all changes are incorporated into an updated draft. Goitein suggested having one meeting with a discussion and a vote instead of one meeting for discussion and one meeting for voting. McNamara said that approach can be considered based on the commission's preferences.

McNamara referred to the September section of the commission's calendar of future agenda items, and asked Coers if the item's language is correct for the item titled, "Discussion on new law regarding design vehicle for local streets." Coers answered, saying the language is correct.

McNamara mentioned the October section of the agenda items calendar, saying he has talked with CityLink about some changes they have made to their routes, and their plans to add more shelters. He suggested the commission invite them to a future meeting and said a person from CityLink used to attend the commission meetings regularly in the past. He emphasized the importance of discussing connectivity with mass transit as they are looking to broaden the sidewalk and bike path focus to determine how mass transit can fit into the commission's future work.

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.

McNamara mentioned the November section of the agenda items calendar, suggesting it would be beneficial to have someone from the Tri-County planning commission attend to discuss their efforts versus the commission's efforts.

Lott asked if it is the commission's role to review and adjust design policies. Klopfenstein answered, saying the design manual was decades old when they updated it and was difficult to get through council. She added that unless there is something that is very pertinent to the policy, she is not interested in attempting to make changes to the design policies. Coers said he is not sure if there is language in the city's guide that says it must be an IDOT policy. He said the concern is more about how it will be reported to IDOT for an appropriate truck route. Klopfenstein explained that adding information on truck routes and mapping are possible considerations; however, design guidelines that need to go to council are not.

Lott said he appreciated the traffic calming policy discussion at the last Transportation Commission meeting and would like to hear feedback about the new policy in September 2023 or February 2024. McNamara asked when the new policy will go live and Klopfenstein said it will go live after council adopts it tentatively in August.

Klopfenstein said Cloud Point is on board to help the Public Works' GIS manager with training and how to get through roadblocks and other internal processes, and they are also looking at asset management software; they are not being hired to take over the Public Works GIS manager.

Coers recalled a personal account of a driver not following traffic signal and crosswalk beacons, emphasizing the importance of education on the law. He suggested the commission discuss additional treatments to make safety for walkers and cyclists more prevalent. Coad mentioned the People for Bikes campaign and said the commission could discuss it at the next meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

CITIZENS' OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE

Anyone wishing to make a public comment can do so by sending those comments to Public Works, by **12:00 p.m.** on July 18, 2023. Public comments can be sent to the public works department, in writing, at **publicworks@peoriagov.org** or via fax at 309-494-8855. The email or fax should be labeled "public comment for July 18, 2023 Transportation Committee Meeting," and we ask that you include your name and address.

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.

NEXT MEETING

AUGUST 15, 2023, AT 3 PM

ADJOURNMENT

With no further discussion, Coad motioned to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Coers. The meeting was adjourned with a unanimous verbal vote at 4:24 pm.

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.