

**CITY OF WOODSTOCK
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

Special Meeting

April 16, 2014

City Council Chambers

The regular meeting of the Woodstock Transportation Commission was called to order at 7:00 PM by Chairman Andrew Celentano on Wednesday, April 16, 2014 in Council Chambers at City Hall.

A roll call was taken.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Andrew Celentano, Susan Hudson, Jason Osborn, Caron Wenzel, Mark Indyke

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Assistant Director of Public Works Jeff Van Landuyt, City Engineer Al Wilson

OTHERS PRESENT: City Clerk Dianne Mitchell

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by J. Osborn, second by S. Hudson to accept the March 19, 2014 Regular Meeting minutes as presented. Ayes: Chairman A. Celentano, S. Hudson, J. Osborn, C. Wenzel. Nays: None. Absentees: None. Abstentions: M. Indyke. Motion carried.

FLOOR DISCUSSION:

Chairman Andrew Celentano mentioned that State Representative Barbara Wheeler and Prairie Ridge High School Students made a presentation to the McHenry County Board regarding the William G. Stratton Lock and Dam located in the Fox River in McHenry. His point was to provide yet another example of other people and other agencies getting students involved in real life projects.

TRANSMITTALS: (No discussion or action requested)

1. MCRide - Dial-A-Ride Transit Service in McHenry County
J. Osborn stated that it is for the general public in Woodstock, Crystal Lake and McHenry. He stated that in Greenwood Township, McHenry Township and Dorr Township it is just for seniors and individuals with disabilities. He advised that because of extended federal funding and senior grant funding, the County is making a pitch to all the communities in McHenry County to buy in for \$2 per capita for a year. He noted that for townships it is \$6,000 a year. He stated that they are trying to see who is interested and noted that if they can get Huntley, Algonquin, Lake in the Hills and other communities it means that everyone in the Woodstock area would have access to those communities as well.
2. McHenry Council of Mayors FY2014-2019 Proposed Multi-Modal TIP
3. MCDOT Construction Update Report
A. Celentano asked if a roundabout is going to be done in Woodstock. M. Indyke stated that it was supposed to be at Lake Avenue. J. Van Landuyt stated that it's still in the CIP but it's competing for TIF funds which are being used for the Courthouse. A. Celentano stated that there was supposed to be another one by Charles and Raffle. J. Osborn stated that the County now regularly investigates the use of roundabouts so it might be an intersection to be considered in the future.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Overview of 4/3/2014 meeting w/ Marian Central H.S. Students
M. Indyke stated that the students have come up with some exciting ideas and noted that their project is the bike path from north of the Square down through Lake Ave. towards Rt. 14. He advised that the majority of the discussion was on materials to build sidewalks. He provided information on a latex additive the students are investigating. He stated that the students discussed doing a sample

area and noted that he suggested that they contact the salesperson from the manufacturing plants to see if they would come and pour a sidewalk in Woodstock. He advised that the students will make their presentation at the next meeting. He reported that the City Manager had attended the meeting and there was a brief discussion about the ordinance on sidewalk snow removal.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Overview of proposed ADA Transition Plan by City Engineer Al Wilson

A. Celentano stated that the ADA Transition Plan works right into what S. Hudson is doing with the sidewalks. In response to A. Wilson's question, S. Hudson stated that she did an inventory of what was missing and noted that the Mayor wanted them to set forth some priorities. She stated that using an algorithm based on some criteria they are going to define some areas that they would like to target as higher priority for maintenance, repair, replacement, and construction of new sidewalk where none currently exists. A. Wilson stated that it will tie in well.

A. Wilson stated that the Transition Plan was something that was required when the ADA Act was approved in 1990. He stated that it is required of communities that have 50 or more employees and noted that it is a federal requirement. He reported that he has found that many communities have not even started putting this together so Woodstock is ahead of a lot of other communities. He reviewed the seven requirements that have to be in every ADA Transition Plan. He advised that they have designated the HR Director as the ADA Coordinator.

A. Wilson stated that they are trying to locate areas in the City right-of-way where sidewalk does not meet ADA requirements and then they will try to get a laundry list of locations, prioritize them and then look at how they will treat the areas to bring them into compliance. He reported that he looked at every intersection in town using Google Earth. He advised that they will need to eventually go out and look at each intersection more closely, measure and take notes, and then put it into the GIS. He stated that it will be a work in progress and as improvements are done on the intersections and the handicap access issues the plan will evolve from year to year. He stated that he indicated in the plan how he believes the intersections should be prioritized.

M. Indyke stated that this program is actually on the same page with what the Commission has been doing which is identifying non-contiguous sidewalks and identifying areas that aren't compliant with handicap access. A. Wilson stated that it would be wonderful to include that information. S. Hudson stated that in terms of the gaps, she used the same methodology and looked them up on Google Earth. She advised that she created polygons that were related to certain features for sidewalks. She stated that the Mayor is most concerned with commercial areas and she noted that at their last meeting the Commission discussed the importance of establishing corridors to be used for special events.

A. Wilson reported that when he looked at the missing sidewalk sections it was done from Google Earth, but he advised that they also have a list that was comprised from 1990 of every sidewalk in town at that point, which somebody had walked and located every piece of sidewalk that had separations and vertical displacements. He stated that ideally we could have something like that included as well and then we would know each year based on the budget the spots to pick and that information from year to year could be put into the GIS database. He stated that they would have a plan that continues and noted that they never had anything like this before where they look at, inventory it, prioritize it and then decide how much can be done each year. He stated that it is a wonderful thing but it will be a work in progress and advised that they would like the Commission's opinions and thoughts. He advised that his plan is to take it to City Council later this year.

S. Hudson stated that for the stuff she did on the sidewalks, there is a KML that could be put into a GIS and noted that J. Van Landuyt has it. She stated that she is working on finalizing an Excel spreadsheet which could be lined into the GIS as well.

In response to J. Osborn's question regarding crossing types, A. Wilson referenced page 3 of the document and reviewed the crossing types. He stated that there are a lot of different things out there from years past that don't always fit into the categories. He stated that the highlighted ones are ones that you know are a mess; they have been there for years and were not designed to consider handicap access. After reviewing the appendix, A. Wilson advised that they have identified 377 streets and 574 intersections, but noted that there could be more out there but this is the start.

A. Wilson stated that he looked at other communities and advised that their inventory is similar but noted that as they got into evaluating each intersection more closely they split it off. He stated that as we physically visit each of these intersections it will get broken down into a number of more categories but you will be able to see which ones are more compliant. He stated that if they were to start just with this list as it is right now, they would have enough for a few years without having to actually go out and look at all of them.

In response to C. Wenzel's question regarding curbs, gutters and drainage, A. Wilson advised that they didn't look at it to make improvements or changes to drainage structures. He stated that it is something they would pick up when they go to the intersection. He advised that it is something easier to pick up when you are physically out there versus a Google Earth view. He reviewed the examples of truncated domes in the document and stated that there is a mish mosh out there.

A. Celentano referenced the Ordinance Adopting the City of Woodstock Complete Streets Policy and stated that on Page 2, first bullet point, he would like to add "wider sidewalks at senior and medical facilities."

A. Celentano referenced the first WHEREAS on Page 2, first bullet point, and stated that "innovative" is too vague and might put the City in a bad position.

A. Celentano referenced Section One: Goals on Page 2 and suggested striking out "motorists" and put in "private and commercial vehicles."

A. Celentano referenced Section two: Applicability, subheading c) on Page 3 and stated that the phrase "documented absence of use" looks like you are proving a negative. He questioned how you can document the absence of something unless you never saw a pedestrian or a bicycle over some span time and if you do that during December you aren't going to get many bicyclists. S. Hudson questioned if it meant there is an absence of documentation.

J. Osborn asked for further description on why exceptions are listed under applicability. He stated that the sentence of "incorporating the elements of Complete Streets goals" is vague already so he questions why policy exceptions were put in to set parameters. He suggested saying "possible exceptions." He stated that it would be easier to document what areas the City wouldn't require it. He questioned if they are trying to set parameters so it doesn't become something that they don't intend it to be and A. Wilson stated that was the intent. J. Osborn stated that it doesn't commit you to which ideas you need to incorporate.

A. Wilson questioned if he is saying that he would rather not have a), b), c) and d) at all or just say "possible exceptions." J. Osborn stated that he doesn't think they are necessary and noted that they seem very cautionary. He advised that the statement before it says that you shall review the ideas. He stated that there are so many low cost things that can be done and he finds it hard that the only solution would be really expensive and odd to everybody.

A. Celentano referenced Section Three, subheading b) on Page 3 and questioned what would happen if there is a disagreement. A. Wilson stated that hopefully we would come to a mutual agreement. A. Celentano said there is a lot of overlap with jurisdictions. He suggested ending the sentence at "meet

the local community standards” and omit “regardless of jurisdiction.” A. Wilson agreed and stated that it doesn’t really add anything.

A. Celentano referenced Section Three, subheading c) on Page 3 and stated that “whenever possible” leaves too much leeway and suggested removing it. A. Wilson stated that it is leeway and noted that he looks at it as though there could be some situation that comes up that may not be able to incorporate it.

J. Osborn stated that “whenever possible” indicates that those reviewing it have the discretion to side with the developer but maybe it needs to go up to a different level like kicking it up to the City Engineer to make the determination. S. Hudson suggested “feasibility” versus “possible.” C. Wenzel suggested “according to existing ordinances.” J. Osborn suggested saying “incorporate guidelines and standards.” and “this policy foresees that a case could be made that it might not be possible or extremely difficult to implement and such cases would be the decision of the City Engineer.”

J. Osborn stated that it just needs to be made clear that if there is some difficulty expressed then there has to be someone that has to make the call. A. Celentano suggested adding “unless excepted.” S. Hudson questioned who would make the exception. C. Wenzel questioned if it would be a variance. A. Celentano suggested adding “unless excepted by variance.” J. Osborn advised that it gets into another realm of law which is bigger than this policy. S. Hudson stated that there should be a formalized procedure for having exception to the rule.

J. Osborn stated that reading the next sentence seems to take care of it. He stated that if you have a period at “standard” then Section 4 says “Standards” and defines what they are. He stated that he doesn’t think there is a need to say “whenever possible” because the next section defines standards and says that the intent is to have a certain measure of flexibility.

A. Celentano referenced Section 4: Standards on Page 3 and suggested changing “their own guidelines” to “its own guidelines.”

A. Celentano questioned if the Commission should meet with the coordinator once in a while to see if they can add anything to the process. J. Osborn stated that the position is typically within administration and is largely a communicative role so he doesn’t think it is necessary. S. Hudson stated that it would be interesting to see complaints periodically because it gives the Commission an idea in terms of establishing a voice for where the issues are. A. Wilson questioned if the Commission wants to see complaints and how they want to be notified. A. Celentano stated that he doesn’t want to micromanage what the ADA coordinator does and noted that his concern is when there some new information that the Commission should know about.

S. Hudson stated that their role is advisory but they are asked to establish priorities and if they know where complaints are it aids them in being able to establish priorities instead of working in a vacuum or based on their own experience particularly because there isn’t a disabled person on the Commission anymore. She stated that the Commission doesn’t necessarily have anybody disabled anymore so that would be input that might help in their advisory capacity.

J. Osborn questioned if what the Commission is doing from a prioritization standpoint will dovetail with it somehow. S. Hudson stated that they will continue with what they started and finish it off in June and then go from there. J. Osborn stated that the complaints would be the input that will help inform that process. S. Hudson stated that the Commission can make their initial recommendation.

M. Indyke questioned if someone with a grievance will have the wherewithal to try to resolve the grievance. S. Hudson stated that she thinks it is relative to the Commission and relevant just that it was made. M. Indyke stated that if somebody speaks to this person about a two inch gap in the sidewalk, the person will notify Public Work who would take it from there, so the person is a

coordinator; they receive the grievance and then try to resolve. He stated that if the grievance cannot be resolved then it would be something that the Commission would be interested in. S. Hudson stated that it would be interesting to see a spreadsheet a couple times of year.

J. Osborn stated that this process is to file a very specific requirement by law and if you don't have this in place then other things could happen. He suggested leaving it up to Public Works to decide the type of information that would be helpful for the Commission. He stated that if there are legal issues, how you communicate that becomes a different thing altogether. He advised that their desire for information and input from the community is one thing but then the City making its legal requirements is another. He advised that this is more of a legal mechanism which basically required because cities neglected these things for so long. He stated that it is very specific following federal law and there might be ways of gleaning input but this is more of a kind of adjudication type situation. He noted that the information coming from the City might not be readily available. S. Hudson stated that the Commission doesn't need a lot of detail and noted that she's more concerned with spatial distribution. J. Osborn stated that ideally we are ahead of the curve in terms of identifying these areas.

A. Celentano suggested that the ADA coordinator could periodically let the Commission know what she is seeing. S. Hudson suggested a general statement of trends. A. Celentano questioned A. Wilson if he has looked in grants for ADA and A. Wilson advised that they have not.

A. Celentano referenced Page 5, Goals and Objectives, "From a physical condition perspective" and suggested making b) first, c) second and a) third.

A. Celentano referenced Page 7 and suggested adding "require all new developments to be ADA compliant with particular attention to wider sidewalks at senior citizen housing and medical destinations and approaches medical facilities."

A. Celentano advised that former Commission member Martin Victory stated that he catches his wheelchair wheels on the truncated domes. A. Wilson stated that it happens if they aren't at the right angle. A. Celentano referred to M. Indyke's comment regarding noticing that the paint used to designate handicapped spaces is slippery. He recently experienced this condition because he had to be on crutches.

2. Overview of proposed Complete Streets Ordinance by City Engineer Al Wilson

3. Woodstock H.S. Feedback – Presentations December 2013

C. Wenzel thinks that as the Commission keeps doing these projects, they need to develop a formula or template for what they want the students to do. M. Indyke stated that they are developing that as they go along. He stated that he saw it at Marian and noted that A. Celentano was specific on what the students had to do, how to do it and the presentation. He thinks that the feedback helps with establishing the parameters.

J. Osborn stated that IDOT came up with a statewide plan for bicycles. He shared a handout regarding small scale bike sharing with the group. M. Indyke stated that the Marian students were investigating the bike sharing program and they found it wasn't feasible for the community. A. Celentano asked J. Van Landuyt to include the handout in the meeting packet for August.

A. Celentano suggested making the process with the high school kids a little more formalized. He stated it would include the deliverables, set up milestones and he then referenced critical path. C. Wenzel stated that the kids want deliverables, but the point was to try to get them to think. She stated that from what she read the students are saying give us homework and tell us what to do. She wants

to avoid that. A. Celentano stated that he understood C. Wenzel's comment but noted that the students were lost and they weren't getting enough guidance moving it forward.

C. Wenzel stated that the kids aren't taught to be creative thinkers and they are trying to shift the system to get them to think. S. Hudson stated that it could be standardized more and should include what the Commission wants in the end; a PowerPoint presentation, a financial spreadsheet, etc. She believes they should try to make the deliverables as standardized as they can in terms of the Commission's expectations.

C. Wenzel stated that you get kids that are just waiting for direction and she thinks a critical path sheet is perfect. S. Hudson suggested getting them to use Microsoft Project. M. Indyke stated that they need to know the criteria. J. Osborn stated that the Commission has had really good projects and suggested that there might be some things from their favorite projects that they liked about the approach that could help form what the Commission wants to see, but he noted that basically the Commission likes being surprised which is hard to communicate.

S. Hudson stated that the Commission expects an articulate presentation and they expect to be sold. She stated that the Commission needs to articulate their expectations. A. Celentano advised that he will draft something up. M. Indyke suggested looking at it after the next presentation. He stated that if the Commission shows what their level of expectation is but not exactly what they have to do then they can meet and possibly exceed the expectations.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

1. Continued Review of Transportation Plan – May 2014
2. Marian Central Student Presentations – May 2014
3. Improved access to PADS on Kishwaukee Valley Road – May 2014
4. IL Rt. 47 – improved pedestrian crossings – June 2014
5. Improved access to Social Security Office – June 2014
6. Prioritizing Sidewalks – June 2014
7. Event/ Party Bus – August 2014
8. Discussion on Frontage Roads along IL Rt. 47 Corridor – September 2014

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by M. Indyke, second by J. Osborn to adjourn the special meeting of the Woodstock Transportation Commission to the regular meeting May 21, 2014 @ 7:00 PM. Ayes: Chairman A. Celentano, S. Hudson, M. Indyke, J. Osborn, C. Wenzel. Nays: None. Absentees: None. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Dianne Mitchell - City Clerk