1. Call to Order / Declaration of Quorum
2. Citizen Comments
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes of January 23, 2019
4. Central Business District Parking Permit – For Action
5. Overnight Restrictions in Downtown - For Action
6. Commercial Loading Zone Policy - For Action
7. No Parking Anytime on Pitner Alley - For Action
8. Parklet Policy - Action
10. Updates – Transportation
11. ADJOURNMENT

Next Meeting: March 20, 2019 at 6:00pm
TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 23, 2019
6:00 P.M. – 7:30 P.M.
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center
Room 2404, Evanston, IL 60201


MEMBERS ABSENT: B. J. Miller

STAFF PRESENT: Assistant City Manager Erika Storlie, Capital Planning and Engineering Bureau Chief Laura Biggs, Parking Manager Jill Velan, Transportation and Mobility Coordinator Jessica Hyink

PRESIDING MEMBER: Ald. Revelle

1. Call to Order / Declaration of Quorum
   Chairman Ald. Revelle declared a quorum at 6:04 P.M.

2. Citizen Comments
   Mr. Sammi talked about being looking to start a scooter share company here in Evanston with some Northwestern students and wanted to find out the process and help the city come up with a plan for scooter share companies going forward.

   Transportation and Mobility Coordinator Jessica Hyink stated that she is currently working with Northwestern University and the current top concern is how the electric scooters would be charged. Jessica also mentions how she is looking to work with the city of Chicago in coming up with a city code.

   Dan Joseph talked about a few different issues, starting with talking about adding bus shelter at Dodge and Crain. He also talked about how CTA signage is lacking especially when compared to signage at Pace bus stops. Finally he talked about how he believes that the suggested Pulse bus routes will start too late in the day for people with early flights and asks that earlier start times should be looked at.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes of November 28, 2018
   Item 1
   Motion to approve made by Alderman Wynne and seconded by T. Dubin
   A vote was called and taken. Motion passed unanimously (6-0).

4. Downtown Overnight Parking Restrictions - Discussion
   Parking Manager Jill Velan talked about how reviewing the area has taken longer than expected. She also talked about how discussions with Public Works has generated some concerns about being able to complete work during shortened times. She also talked about how the recent poor
weather has given some fresh data in terms of work that needs to be completed overnight and that she plans on bringing this item back to the next meeting in February.

5.  717 Howard Lot - Update
Assistant City Manager Erika Storlie talked about the financing options for development of the lot. The Howard Street TIF was previously mentioned as how the lot development would be funded however the TIF is not currently producing enough to cover the development. The current recommendation from staff is for the Parking Fund to fully fund the development of the lot.

The questions about this course of action centered on if the TIF would be able to pay back the parking fund as this was something that wasn’t originally the funding plan. It was also asked if a TIF fund has been used to pay back a city fund for development.

Erika Storlie stated that there were no recent examples but that TIF’s had repaid funds in the past. A couple options being looked at are to extend the TIF’s boundaries. Another potential option would be to try variable pricing in the lot to recoup development costs. Erika also talked about how the city is looking to rebuild the parking fund over the next couple of years.

The committee then directed staff to bring a report of the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) 5 year plan as well as the current Parking Fund projections to the April meeting.

Alderman Fleming went over various reasons that she didn’t approve this plan. She talked about how this wasn’t an effective way to use the parking fund and that we should be looking at a more comprehensive plan. She also talked about how this was not part of the current plan and that given our current financials are that we should stick to the current plan in place.

Erika Storlie talked about the current bidding process for already planned developments and how it would help reduce cost if this lot was added into this process as opposed to being done separately later this year.

Capital Planning and Engineering Bureau Chief Laura Biggs talked about how this lot has been on the radar for a while and an actual timeline to develop was not ready when the CIP was set for 2019, however, the new businesses in the area has caused the need to relook at the needs in the area.

Jill Velan talks about how new businesses in the area have increased the need for parking and that we could also look at using this lot for valet parking on the weekend, which would increase the number of vehicles that could fit in the lot and could reduce stress in the area.

Item 2
Motion to recommend using the Parking Fund to fund development of the 717 Howard Lot with the option for the Howard TIF to pay back the Parking fund if it is expanded or increased made by Alderman Wynne and seconded by L. Young
A vote was called and taken. Motion passed 4-2 (Yea – Ald. Revelle, Ald. Wynne, T. Dubin, L. Young / Nay- Anon, Ald. Fleming)
6. Complete & Green Streets Policy (CGS)
Transportation and Mobility Coordinator Jessica Hyink talked about the five main metrics that are required based on the current policy but she indicated that there is additional information that she would like to present to the committee at a later time. The data was all presented in the packet but here are some of the talking points.

Mode Share -
The data is based on information given by residents through a survey and this can cause some issues specially when dealing with some newer travel options (such as Uber and Lyft). The data represents how an individual classifies this type of transportation in the Lyft case an individual could classify a Lyft ride as a carpool, as public transportation, or even as a taxicab. So there are additional steps needed to try to get better data from everyone involved. Jessica indicated that she was looking for direction as she feels that the current report/policy may not be capturing the data that the city needs in the best way.

Jessica went over the Livability checklist and talked about the difficulties in gathering data from various sources (residents, IDOT, running manned surveys, etc) and how the city needs to continue to work to find efficient ways to gather this data and make use of the information gleamed.

Alderman Fleming talks about how our policy doesn’t include the entire street like other cities as we exclude sidewalks from the policy here in Evanston. She references the 50/50 policy for sidewalk repairs and how she feels this is unfair and not robust enough. She wonders when streets are being repaired why the upgrades/fixes to the sidewalks aren’t made. Or when we plow a snow from a street why are we taking into consideration the sidewalks. It’s as if the city is not truly considering pedestrian traffic and mainly only considering vehicular traffic and to a lesser degree bicycle traffic.

Alex Añón spoke about how he felt there hasn’t been much traction with the CGS policy in the ten years since it was first discussed and then passed in 2017. He talked about the city not really have a true bike network and how improvements needed to be made. He also asked for clarification about exemptions given to projects since the adoption of the CGS policy and what qualifies as an “approved exemption” since according to the memo provided to council no projects have received an approved exemption.

Capital Planning and Engineering Bureau Chief Laura Biggs spoke about how all projects that were planned took into consideration the CGS policy but individual projects may have been unable to incorporate certain aspects of the CGS, using the width of the street on Main Street as an example. The standard that the CGS policy sets is that all projects would be reviewed and there would be no approved exemptions from the review process. After being reviewed if an exemption was then given, the reasons would be clearly documented.

Jessica talked about refining the questions in the checklist as there are too many open ended questions also we have questions too many questions that are too specific and maybe do not need to be asked to everyone. She is looking to bring additional information that is not covered by the scope of the policy to future meetings throughout the year as she feels this data is pertinent and important for the committee to be informed about.
7. **Parklet Policy Introduction**
Transportation and Mobility Coordinator Jessica Hyink talked about the recent pilot program that ended and that the city needs to come up with a permanent solution. There has been occasional interest from some businesses about obtaining a parklet however if the city wants to look to expand this policy then some guidelines need to be established. This introduction is just to come up with a policy not to seek out new companies or look to expand how many parklets are in Evanston. Staff is looking for direction into how to create the application and review process for companies that may look to get a parklet in the future.

Alderman Wynne talked about how she felt the pilot at Hewn was successful and could really help some businesses thrive.

Alderman Fleming asked that when developing the policy that staff look at how to handle blocks where there are multiple restaurants. Her concern was that if a parklet was approved then a second business on the same block applies how would that work.

Jessica talked about how like the pilot at Hewn that she was looking at making parklets public spaces not for an individual restaurant, also not a sidewalk café with it being an area where food would not be sold, just additional seating for patrons of the area. We also have to consider parking that would be lost and work with the various departments involved.

8. **Commercial Loading Zone Policy - Discussion**
Parking Manager Jill Velan stated that staff still needed time to review and recommended policy and will bring this item back to the February meeting. She mentioned that we do have some outstanding request and wanted the committees’ thoughts on whether she should bring the policy with all the outstanding requests or if she should be the policy to the next meeting then follow up the following month (March) with the requests using the new policy on those requests. The committee agreed that we should do the latter so the policy would be brought to the next meeting in February.

9. **ParkEvanston App Wallet Incentive - Discussion**
Parking Manager Jill Velan talked about the ParkEvanston app that the city has been using for about a year. One of the options that people have is the option to load money onto the wallet instead of doing individual transactions. Regardless of the type of transaction (wallet or individual) there is a $.35 convenience fee charged to the patron unless they park for the maximum time allowed (during the same parking session). There is a savings to the city if a person loads funds into the wallet as opposed to paying for individual transactions so the city is looking to incentivize patrons into using the wallet by offering a $5 credit when $20 is loaded. This incentive is also looking to be timed with the new meter rates that go into effect on March 1st, 2019. This credit comes would cover the convenience fee for approximately 13, one hour parking sessions.

**Item 3**
Motion to recommend an incentive of a 5 dollar credit when 20 dollars are loaded onto the ParkEvanston mobile app (in a single transaction) during a 90 day promotional period was made
by Alderman Revelle and seconded by Alderman Wynne, A vote was called and taken. Motion passed unanimously (6-0).

10. Street Cleaning Restrictions / Enforcement – Discussion
Alderman Fleming led the discussion stating that this issue came up because one of her residents received a parking ticket for parking on a street after the street was cleaned but before the restricted time limit was up on their block.

Alderman Wynne stated that she thought that the current policy that once a street was cleaned that parking enforcement would no longer ticket that block.

Jill Velan spoke about how the street cleaning process has evolved. Currently we have reduced the window where someone can’t park due to a restriction to one 4 hour window once a month (some areas are twice a month).

Alderman Fleming asked if Parking Enforcement Officers (PEO’s) were the street cleaners were or if they coordinated with street sweepers.

Parking Operations Coordinator Marcos Classen spoke about how PEO’s were schedule and described that PEO’s were scheduled to an area independent of where Public Works staff was.

A. Añón asked if technology could be used by parking enforcement to see if Public Works had already cleaned an area.

Jill stated if we went that route then vehicle that never moved would not be ticketed, but ultimately that the restriction is for the full four hour window so even if someone parks after the street is swept they are in violation.

11. Parking Updates
Transportation and Mobility Coordinator Jessica Hyink talked about the CTA Red/Purple line Modernization Program that was recently reported in the Evanston Round Table however this report was based on old data from back in 2010 and does not represent any current CTA plans and the CTA does not currently have any plans to consolidate and CTA train stops.

Jessica also talked about the Pace Bus Stop Program and how Pace is looking to install bus shelters at no cost to the city. The shelters will have ads but those ads will meet certain city requirements.

Jessica also talked about Pace’s plant to only service posted Bus stops. Flagged stops can be difficult for bus providers as every block isn’t necessarily ADA complaint also it causes busses to fall behind schedule staff is collecting additional information so Jessica plans on bringing additional information from Pace at the next meeting in February.

12. Adjournment
A Motion to adjourn was made by Alderman Wynne at 8:33 P.M. A vote was called and then taken. Motion passed unanimously (6-0).

The next Committee Meeting is February 27, 2019.
Memorandum

To: Alderman Eleanor Revelle, Chairman
    Members of the Transportation/Parking Committee

From: Jill Velan, Parking Division Manager

Subject: Central Business District – Parking Permit (Pilot Program)

Date: February 25, 2019

Recommended Action:
This item is presented for action to recommend a Parking Permit Pilot Program to the City Council.

Summary:
In November 2018 the Committee decided to include the Central Business District as part of a pilot for the day-time on-street employee parking permits. However, this item was delayed to determine cost of the permit.

At this time Staff is recommending that the cost be $115 per year which will be the same as a non-registered resident vehicle starting in 2020.
To: Alderman Eleanor Revelle, Chairman
    Members of the Transportation/Parking Committee

From: Jill Velan, Parking Division Manager

Subject: Section 10-11-9 Schedule IX; Parking Prohibited at Certain Times

Date: February 25, 2019

Recommended Action:
This item is presented for discussion and/or action on the City’s current overnight parking restrictions in the downtown area.

Summary:
For various operational needs the City Prohibits parking throughout the City at certain times of the day/night. City Staff has received a complaint from Spenga, 1026 Davis Street a downtown business that opens at 5:00 am but has a parking restriction until 6:00 am on the block adjacent to their front entrance.

Staff has completed a review of overnight parking in the downtown area. Because of important operational needs Staff cannot make a recommendation for a uniform change to the overnight parking restrictions as the three hour window of 3:00 – 6:00 am is the minimum needed to complete street related activities.

As part of the review it was discovered that the 900 block of Davis Street and 1600 block of Oak Avenue are not part of the parking restriction and allow parking 24 hours a day (except snow emergencies and street cleaning). This unrestricted parking is less than a half a block away from Spenga, which is located at 1026 Davis Street.

Edgar Cano, Public Services Bureau Chief will be at the meeting to answer questions related to operational needs in the downtown area.
To:          Alderman Eleanor Revelle, Chairman  
              Members of the Transportation/Parking Committee 

From:       Jill Velan, Parking Division Manager  

Subject:    Commercial Loading Zone Policy  

Date:       February 25, 2019  

Recommended Action:  
This item is presented for action on recommendations to the City Council for guidelines related to a Commercial Loading Zone Policy. 

Summary:    
The number of loading zone requests has increased exponentially over the last twelve months. As discussed a previous Committee meetings, Staff is bringing forward recommended guidelines for Business District Loading Zones. 

Initially, Staff has been evaluating deliveries, passenger pick-up/drop-off, and short-term parking to understand what efficiencies can be made in the most congested areas. Basic guidelines being recommended for the business districts are: 

- Change the loading zone approval to an Administrative Process.  
- All loading zones are shared use.  
- Maximum of one loading zone per block face.  
- No loading zones allowed if access to off-street parking or alley/driveway is available.  
- All loading zones are located at the end of a block or alley/driveway depending on Location.  
- Use of Flashers while in the loading zone required.  
- Current loading zone times are 3 minutes for passenger pick-up/drop-off and maximum of 30 minutes for deliveries.  
- All loading zones within the parking meter areas would be required to pay the meter/paystation. 

Staff will present examples of the current loading zone requests on Wednesday night to demonstrate how the new Policy will look in practice.
To: Alderman Eleanor Revelle, Chairman  
   Members of the Transportation/Parking Committee  

From: Jill Velan, Parking Division Manager  

Subject: No Parking Anytime on Pitner Alley  

Date: February 25, 2019  

Recommended Action:  
This item was requested to be placed on the Agenda by the 9th Ward Alderman  

Summary:  
A request has been made by the Alderman of the 9th Ward to consider making Pitner Alley “No Parking Anytime (Tow Away Zone)”.  

Currently there is no overnight parking allowed and an inordinate amount of Staff time is taken up with violators of the regulation. Because of the high non-compliance rate the street is not well maintained.  

A review of the area shows that the vehicles that are being parked on this dead-end street belong to the adjacent businesses, who are using the street for storage. Employees in the area seem to be parking in the neighborhood.  

Staff will provide an aerial photo during discussion at the meeting.
Memorandum

To: Alderman Eleanor Revelle, Chairman
   Members of the Transportation & Parking Committee

From: Jessica Hyink, Transportation & Mobility Coordinator

Subject: Parklet Policy Update

Date: February 25, 2019

Summary:

At the January Transportation and Parking Committee, staff received direction to proceed with the development of a Parklet Policy for the City of Evanston. The first draft of this policy is attached as Appendix A for review. After receiving comments to this policy, a final draft will be presented with permitting costs and an ordinance at a later meeting. The Law Department is reviewing a separate extension with Hewn until adoption of the Parklet Policy is considered.

Background:

A parklet is a structure constructed for a permanent or seasonal period of time that extends the public sidewalk/domain into one or multiple public parking spaces. Parklets are designed to foster unique placemaking in business districts. One or two businesses in the immediate vicinity of the parklet often manage the parklet. However, the parklet is meant to be a public space shared by all.

In July 2014, the owners of Hewn presented their plan of creating and managing a public parklet in the 800 block of Dempster Street in a joint meeting of the Parking & Transportation Committee and the Economic Development Committee. The direction from the Committees was for Hewn to move forward and develop a parklet and report back to the Parking & Transportation Committee on the progress and utilization of the parklet. An agreement was entered into with Hewn that the Committee would make a recommendation to City Council on whether the City Council should approve permission for future utilization of the parking spaces for the parklet.

In April 2015, the Transportation and Parking Committee approved Hewn to continue to operate its parklet under a four-year parklet pilot program. This program allowed Hewn to install the parklet from April 15 through November 1. In 2018, the parklet pilot program expired.
Community Development, Public Works, and Parking Division staff met in January to discuss the creation of a formal policy to allow other entities to apply to host a parklet. Staff reviewed existing parklet policies. Many municipalities reference the City of San Francisco Parklet Manual, which encourages other municipalities to use the policy as a resource. San Francisco was the first U.S. city to introduce parklets in parking stalls and actually coined the term parklet. The San Francisco parklet policy can be found online at:


Although the City and San Francisco vary in many aspects, City staff recommends using the San Francisco parklet policy as a guide, due to its comprehensive nature. Topics covered in the guide include site selection, design and engineering standards, required accessibility features, proof of community consent and neighborhood outreach, City approval process, inspection and installation process, pricing, upkeep and maintenance, insurance, and permit renewal.
Appendix A

Parklet Guide

City of Evanston
Parklet Purpose

Parklets are an innovative way to transform a car-oriented streetscape to a human centered environment. They are a seasonal expansion of the existing sidewalk and are located on the parking lane adjacent to the curb. The parking spot is transformed into a community space where people are encouraged to converse, relax, and engage positively with the urban streetscape. Parklets are on platforms constructed on the pavement and generally feature amenities such plantings, tables, rest areas, bike parking, and public art.

This guide explains the multi-faceted importance of parklets, including guidelines for design and construction, explanations of the permitting processes, and helpful community resources. It should act as a toolkit for those in the Evanston community who wish to create a parklet in the public right of way. Understanding the process before proceeding with the project can reduce time necessary to approve and permit the parklet.

Public Benefits

Parklets aim to boost street life, improve the pedestrian friendliness of streets, and encourage people’s engagement with the urban environment. They foster community and neighborhood development by providing a space for conversation and meetings. By creating a unique destination near shops and providing much needed extra seating for eateries, parklets support local business development. They reimagine the public realm and inspire action to build a more sustainable urban environment.

Eligible Applicants

- Business Improvement Districts and similar organizations
- Nonprofit institutions, community organizations, and schools
- Storefront business owners and tenants
- Property owners, commercial or residential
- Other applicants on a case by case basis
Site Selection

Site Recommendations

A parklet should be...

- In a Commercial or Downtown area as identified in the City of Evanston zoning plan.
- In close proximity to at least one in-and-out style store, e.g. coffee shop, take-out sandwich shop, ice cream shop, bookstore, etc.
- Within two miles of the winter storage facility.

Site Requirements

A parklet must be...

- Open to the public.
- At least 1 parking spot, approximately 20 feet, from any intersection or corner.
- At least 5 feet from any bus stop, pedestrian crosswalk, outdoor service counters, or taxi stands.
- At least 15 feet from the nearest fire hydrant.
- Set back 4 feet from adjacent parking spots.
- On a street with a speed limit of 25 MPH or less.
- Spaced at least 1 foot from the bicycle or parking lane.
- On a street without tow-away zones during peak hours.
- On a street with a slope less than 5%.
- Must be installed after April 1\textsuperscript{st} and removed before November 1\textsuperscript{st}.
Minimum Design Requirements

The City recommends working with a design professional or contractor to ensure the stability and durability of the parklet. Parklets must meet the following minimum design requirements:

**Location Site Plan**

1. Location of Parklet – Must be approved by City of Evanston
   a. Parallel Parking
      i. Only the length of one or two spots
      ii. Must have 4 foot inner buffer between parklet and adjacent spot
   b. Perpendicular and Diagonal Parking
      i. Typically 3 spaces
      ii. Must have 3 foot inner buffer between parklet and adjacent spot
   c. Areas without marked parking spaces
      i. Location must be coordinated with the City of Evanston
      ii. Cannot leave a parking spot less than 20 feet
   d. Corner Locations
      i. Parklets must be at least one parking space away from an intersection or street corner
      ii. Parklets must be at least 10 feet from an alley

2. Location Restrictions
   a. Utilities
      i. Must not be constructed over utility access panels, manhole covers, storm drains, or fire hydrant shut-off valves.
      ii. Parklet sponsors must provide access to the City or public utility company. This may require temporary removal of the parklet or a portion there of.
   b. Speed limit must be posted at 25 or less
   c. Restricted Parking Areas (parklet not permitted)
      i. bus stops
      ii. handicap stalls
      iii. loading zones
      iv. any other restricted parking location
   d. City Construction Project
      i. Any location that may be a part of an upcoming City project may be rejected.
Parklet Design

1. All Parklet Design Must meet the following standards
   a. City of Evanston Code
   b. Illinois Accessibility Code
   c. 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design

2. Platform Threshold
   a. Max gap between parklet platform and curb is $\frac{1}{2}”$ and max vertical separation is $\frac{1}{4}”$
   b. A threshold will be required to span any gap that exceeds the above requirements
   c. No gaps capable of passing a $\frac{1}{2}”$ sphere

3. Connection of Parklet
   a. Bolting into the street or penetrating the surface of the road in any way is not permitted
   b. Parklets may be bolted to existing curb but only with a restoration plan approved by the City.
   c. Bolts may only penetrate the face of the curb or the joint between the curb and sidewalk. Depth may not exceed 4”.

4. Drainage
   a. Parklets cannot impede the flow of curb and gutter drainage.
      i. Flow must be maintained from the center of the road to the curb as well as flow in the direction of travel
   b. A 6” by 6” clear gutter space must be provided along the entire length of the parklet.
   c. Openings at either end of the parklet may be covered with a screen to prevent debris buildup beneath the deck and in the gutter.
   d. It is the parklet owner’s responsibility to keep the gutter space clear and to periodically clean any debris that may impede water flow
   e. Parklets must be designed to allow for access under the platform for maintenance

5. Wheel Stops
   a. Wheel stops must be located on either end of the parklet
   b. Must be 3 feet long
   c. Installed 1 foot from the curb and four feet from the outside ends of the parklet
   d. Wheel stop product type must be submitted and approved by the City before installation.

6. Enclosure
   a. Edge Buffers
i. The parklet should have an edge as a buffer from the street. No access to or from the street may be permissible. All access to parklets must be from the sidewalk.

ii. The height and scale must be approved by the City of Evanston.

iii. If cable railings are used, spacing cannot exceed 5 inches between cables.

b. Overhead structures
   i. Must have stamped drawings by a licensed Illinois Structural Engineer.
   ii. Must not obstruct motorists’ visibility

Accessibility Guidelines

See Attachment – Accessibility Elements for Parklets (San Francisco)
Application Process

As parklets are in the public right of way, the permitting process can be lengthy. With the right preparation, the process can move more quickly. The applicant should arrive to meetings with all necessary materials as outlined in this guide.

Parklet Proposal Submission

1. Contact and Site Information
   a. Proposed Site Location
   b. Sponsoring Business/Organization/Person
   c. Fronting Property Owner (if different from Sponsor)
   d. Parklet Designer
   e. Parking Information
2. Project Narrative, 800 words or less
   a. Neighborhood Benefit
   b. Community Participation
   c. Activation and Programming of Parklet
3. Parklet Maintenance Strategy
4. Site Plan
   a. Existing Sidewalk Widths
   b. Existing Curb Cuts and Driveways
   c. Adjacent Bicycle Lane or Auto Traffic Lane
   d. Existing Parking Spaces with Dimensions
   e. Existing Parking Meters
   f. Other Existing Sidewalk Features (e.g. fire hydrants, street lights, planters, bicycle racks, etc.)
   g. Existing Utility Valves and Panels
   h. Existing Street Trees and Tree Pits
   i. Proposed Parklet Footprint and Dimensions
   j. Parklet Setback Dimensions
   k. Images, Drawings, Designs of Parklet
5. Letters of Consent
   a. Building or property owner, if Sponsor is tenant
   b. Adjacent businesses or residences
6. Letters of Support
   a. Neighborhood Organizations
   b. Business Association
   c. Local Institutions
   d. Residents
   e. Other Business Owners
Design Review & Permitting

1. Design and Project Review
   a. If the parklet proposal submission is complete, the parklet will be reviewed by the Design and Project Review Committee.
2. Submit Permit Forms and Pay Fee
3. Permit Issuance

Fabrication & Installation

1. Pre-Installation Inspection
   a. Schedule a pre-installation site inspection at least 10 days before beginning any site work.
   b. Schedule notice of parking removal at least 7 days before beginning any site work.
   c. Bring a copy of the permit and final design drawings and site plan to the pre-installation inspection meeting.
   d. Schedule post-installation inspection.
2. Parklet Installation
   a. If stalled meter parking, ensure meters are bagged 48 hours prior to installation. If paybox metered parking, ensure temporary no stopping signs placed 48 hours prior to installation.
   b. Ensure parklet installation at 4 feet from Public Works installed wheel stops at outside ends of parklet.
   c. Ensure installation of soft-hit posts at each end of parklet at 7 feet from the curb and in line with wheel stops.
   d. Fabricate and install 2 “Public Parklet” signs and install at visible locations. Signs must conform to the design, format, and material specified by the City.
   e. Complete installation within 30 days of permit issuance.
   f. Keep sidewalk, bicycle lane, road lane, and adjacent parking free and clear of obstructions.
3. Post-Installation Inspection
   a. Notify City of installation completion within 2 days of the end of construction to schedule a post-construction site inspection.
   b. Bring a copy of the permit and final design drawings and site plan to the post-installation inspection meeting.
Host Responsibilities

The host of the parklet agrees to:

- Keep the parklet free and open to all members of the public. No member of the public may be asked to leave to make place for a customer of the host.
- Keep the parklet well maintained and in good repair.
- Keep the parklet free of litter, grime, and graffiti.
- Keep all plants and landscaping in good health.
- Sweep the area surrounding the parklet, as street sweepers are unable to reach the curb line immediately adjacent to the parklet.
- Rinse out and clean debris from the area under the parklet at least once a week. The Health Department may require the provision of pest abatement beneath the parklet platform.
- Remove any movable items, e.g. tables and chairs, when the parklet is not in use.
- Provide evidence of liability insurance.
- Notify the City in the event of removal prior to the end of the parklet season.
- Remove the parklet for work related but not limited to street repaving, utility work, streetscape design, etc. The cost of removing, storing, and re-installing the parklet is the responsibility of the host. In the event of an emergency, the City may remove the parklet with little or no notice, in the event of a threat to public safety, such as a gas leak. The host is responsible for restoring any damage due to City removal in the event of an emergency.

If the host fails to operate and maintain the parklet according to the responsibilities outlined in this guide, then the City may revoke the parklet permit at any time. The City reserves the right to amend these guidelines, permit requirements, evaluation criteria, and fees at any time.
Accessibility Elements for Parklets

The City and County of San Francisco seeks to make its public realm accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. This goal extends to Parklets, which become an extension of public sidewalks and pedestrian open space. All accessibility elements of the proposed Parklet shall be designed, constructed and/or conform to the applicable provisions, rules, regulations and guidelines of the: San Francisco Building Code (SFBC), Americans with Disabilities Act 2010 Standard’s accessibility requirements (ADAAG), and other design criteria included in Public Works Order No. 183,392 for Temporary Sidewalk Extensions (Parklets). The required standards and guidelines on the following pages are intended to supplement and expand upon the accessibility requirements in Section 2: Accessibility on pages 35-37.

A. REQUIRED ACCESSIBILITY FEATURES

Sidewalk Condition and Maintenance. The sidewalk abutting the Parklet shall be in a state of good repair and maintenance, with a grade of no more than 5% running slope at the Parklet Entry. Sidewalk flags or cracks shall not exceed ½ inches in vertical change of elevation or in horizontal separation. Vertical changes between ¼" and ½" high shall be beveled. Tree well areas shall be filled level to the sidewalk surface.

S.20 Parklet Path. A Parklet Path is an accessible route that connects the sidewalk to the Parklet Entry, Deck Surface, Wheelchair Turning Space and Wheelchair Resting Space.

The Parklet Path shall be 48 inches wide minimum on the sidewalk and not pass over tree wells. Once on the parklet’s Deck Surface, the Parklet Path shall be 36 inches wide minimum.

The cross slope along any portion of the Path shall not exceed 1:48 (2%).

S.21 Parklet Entry and Deck Surface. The Parklet Entry is where the Parklet Path joins the parklet’s Deck Surface. An ideal Parklet Entry should be located in an unobstructed area where there is the least amount of running slope along the sidewalk and curb.

Any openings between the sidewalk and the Deck Surface shall be flush, without a horizontal or vertical separation that would allow the passage of a 1/2 inch sphere.

Where the curb or a portion of the curb is damaged, has settled lower than the deck surface, or has a separation greater than 1/2 inches, a continuous threshold unit shall span from the deck to the sidewalk surface over the curb. Changes in level from the top surface of the threshold material and the deck or the sidewalk shall not exceed 1/2 inches maximum. Vertical changes in level of 1/2 inches high maximum are permitted, and changes in level between 1/4 inches and 1/2 inches shall be beveled with a slope not steeper than 1:4 (25%).
Where the Deck Surface edge abuts existing driveways or curb ramps, the driveway area or curb ramp shall be temporarily filled-in for the duration of the Parklet’s installation.

Changes in level of 1/2 inches high maximum may be vertical. Changes in level 1/4 inches to 1/2 inches high maximum shall be beveled with a slope not steeper than 1.4 (25%).

5.22 **Deck Surface.** The Parklet’s Deck Surface shall be firm, stable, and slip resistant.

The Deck Surface’s maximum cross slope shall be no greater than 1:48 (2%) measured perpendicular to the sidewalk or curb.

The Deck Surface’s maximum running slope (parallel to the curb) is 1:48 (2%) for the Wheelchair Turning Space, the Wheelchair Resting Space and the routes that connect them. For other Deck Surfaces, the running slope may not exceed 1:20 (5%) unless otherwise permitted through one of the Exceptions discussed in a Public Works Request for Determination of Technical Infeasibility. The Deck Surface materials shall be installed with no gaps larger than would permit the passage of a 1/2 inch sphere. Elongated openings shall be placed so that the long dimensions are perpendicular to the dominant direction of travel.

The Deck Surface shall be one single level unless the change in level is served by a ramp, additional Parklet Entries, or otherwise permitted on a case by case basis. When stairs or ramps are permitted, they must meet all building code requirements for rise, run, width, handrails, and contrasting stair striping for the visually impaired.

5.23 **Wheelchair Turning Space.** A Wheelchair Turning Space is a circular area 60” minimum in diameter for use by a person with mobility aid to make a 360 degree turn. This space shall be located entirely within the Parklet, unless otherwise approved. The maximum encroachment shall be 12 inches over the curb and sidewalk unless otherwise permitted on a case by case basis. Within this space there shall be no cross slope in any direction that is greater than 1:48 (2%). Alternatively a “T” shaped Turning Space is permitted.

5.24 **Wheelchair Resting Space.** A Wheelchair Resting Space has a 30 inch wide by 48 inch deep clear floor area. The space shall be located entirely on the Parklet deck. Within this space, there shall be no cross slope in any direction that is greater than 1:48 (2%). The Wheelchair Resting Space is permitted to overlap the Wheelchair Turning Space by 24 inch maximum in any orientation to one another. With the exception of knee clearance at tables and counters (see A.9), horizontal protrusions are not permitted at Wheelchair Resting Spaces.

**Head Height Clearance.** An 84 inch minimum head height clearance is required for the Parklet Path, Parklet Entry, and Wheelchair Turning Space.

**Parklet’s Positive Edge at Perimeter of Deck Surface.** Parklets need a Positive Edge along the open sides the Deck Surface that is parallel to the vehicular traffic lane, to inhibit people who, while lingering, may inadvertently wander into vehicular traffic. Positive Edges serve to reduce potential tripping hazards at drop-offs along open sides of the Deck Surface.

a. A Positive Edge along vehicular traffic lanes may be achieved by providing a railing 36 to 42 inches in height with openings of no more than 4 inches, or by other means as described in the next paragraph. All railings must be able to withstand a 250 lb. force anywhere and in any direction along the top of the rail from within the parklet. When using a horizontal cable rail or similar flexible design, the barrier shall have a solid cap rail at the top of the barrier, and a solid curb or barrier that is a minimum of 5 inch high at the bottom of the barrier to provide warning to the visually impaired. Top rail assemblies shall be designed to resist a load of 50 plf (0.73kN/m) applied in any direction at the top and to transfer this load through the supports to the structure.

b. Other means for achieving this Positive Edge can include raised planters no less than 17 inches high and 12 inches deep, built-in seating or other
built-in furnishings no less than 17 inches high and no less than 12 inches deep, dense plantings that visually enclose the space and discourage pass through, bicycle parking arrangements that act to provide a Positive Edge, or some other such similar means. In some instances, such as residential streets, alleys, shared public ways or other non-arterial streets, other barriers may be considered on a case-by-case basis.

c. Other means for achieving the Positive Edge may considered on a case-by-case basis. This may include a tactile warning strip at the deck edge, level with the deck. The warning strip must provide sufficient color contrast with the adjacent decking material and roadbed material. Materials and profiles for the tactile warning strip will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

d. At other areas, for example where the edge is perpendicular to the vehicle traffic lane, where any portion of the Deck Surface’s perimeter is 1/2 inch or more above the street, curb, or sidewalk level, the edge shall be positively marked by a vertical element or barrier that is 17 inches minimum in height. These vertical elements shall have visual contrast with the Deck Surface material: either light on dark or dark on light.

e. On streets of 30 mph or greater, streets with four or more auto lanes, or when parklets are installed along a city truck route, or the MUNI Rapid Network, the parklet edge of deck may necessitate a design intervention that exceeds the minimal thresholds cited above.

f. In instances where a parklet houses bicycle-racks, gardens, or other such spaces where people are unlikely to linger, the elements described may not be needed. This and other unique conditions will be determined on a case by case basis.

5.26 **Tables, Counters and Drink Rails and Benches.**

Where tables, counters, drink rails, or benches are provided, at least one of each feature shall be accessible.

a. The top surface height of wheelchair accessible tables, counters and or drink rails shall be 28 inches to 34 inches above the Deck Surface or ground. A Wheelchair Resting Area shall be provided adjacent to the accessible tables, counters and drink rails, and the Wheelchair Resting Area shall be accessible by a Parklet Path and a Wheelchair Turning Space.

b. Wheelchair accessible tables, counters, or drink rails shall be approachable from the front and provide an unobstructed knee clearance that is at least 27 inches high, 19 inches deep, and 30 inches wide. When movable tables, chairs, counters or drink rails are provided in lieu of fixed, at least one of the movable fixtures must also be accessible.

c. A minimum of 36 inches clearance shall be provided between the edge of a table and another vertical obstruction, so that a wheelchair user can maneuver into the knee space.

d. Where fixed counters are provided, a 60 inches long portion of a fixed counter shall provide the unobstructed knee clearance as listed in Paragraph 9b.

e. Where drink rails are provided, a 60 inches long portion of a drink rail shall have 36 inches wide and level space adjacent to it for a side-approach by a wheelchair user.

f. At fixed benches, a Wheelchair Resting Space shall be provided for a shoulder alignment adjacent to one side of the bench.
To: Alderman Eleanor Revelle, Chairman
Members of the Transportation & Parking Committee

From: Jessica Hyink, Transportation & Mobility Coordinator

Subject: Complete and Green Streets Policy Update

Date: February 25, 2019

Summary:

The Complete and Green Streets (CGS) Policy includes a Livability Checklist for evaluating planned developments through the Design and Project Review committee and Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) through Public Works. This Livability Checklist consists of a Scoping Level Analysis and a Project Design Level Analysis. The Scoping Level Analysis predicts future work, while the Project Design Level Analysis records completed work. These checklists are not required for annual reporting in the CGS Policy. However, staff recommends reviewing the available data for the Livability Checklist to evaluate how to improve upon the outcomes of the CGS Policy.

The data for the Project Design Level Analysis for the CIP was completed by Public Works staff and is presented as a spreadsheet in Appendix A. This spreadsheet lists the completed metrics of the CIP by project in 2018. Staff will continue to provide data from the Livability Checklist metrics at following meetings.

Background:

The City Council passed the first Complete Streets policy on January 27, 2014. In order to measure the successes of Complete Street improvements in Evanston, the policy was revised to include metrics. These metrics are intended to be applied to private planned developments and the City’s Capital Improvement Projects. As part of the revision, green streets measures were also incorporated. The revised Complete and Green Streets Policy was adopted on June 5, 2017 and is available online at the following link: https://www.cityofevanston.org/home/showdocument?id=25057.

The CGS Policy requires measuring and reporting on the following five metrics on an annual basis. Staff presented the data available for these metrics at the Transportation and Parking Committee meeting on January 23, 2019.

- Mode-share for healthy, active modes of transportation
- Measured by: U.S. Census American Community Survey Commute to Work for mode shares including Public Transit, Walking, Carpooling, Bicycling, and Taxi; and annual Divvy Evanston membership and trips

- Air Quality
  - Measured by: The City’s Livability Goal for Greenhouse Gas Emissions reduction, including the percentage of metric tons of carbon dioxide reduced from the City’s 2005 baseline as reported annually in the City’s Sustainability Annual Report

- Public Way User Safety
  - Measured by: Rates of Citywide injuries and fatalities within the Public Way by mode on an annual basis

- Equitable access to healthy, active modes of transportation
  - Measured by:
    - Total households within ¼ mile of a bus stop, ¼ mile of a bicycle route/bicycle lane/shared-use path, ¼ mile of a Divvy station, or ½ mile to a rail stop
    - Percentage of total households that are of low to moderate income and minority status within defined transportation access areas

- Approved exceptions from the Complete and Green Streets policy
  - Measured by: the number of projects that received approved exceptions from this policy
## Livability Project Metrics Checklist - Project Design Level Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Main</th>
<th>MFT</th>
<th>Alley and Street Improvements Project</th>
<th>Traffic Calming, Ped &amp; Bike Improvements</th>
<th>Fountain Square</th>
<th>Sheridan Road</th>
<th>MGNWC Meter Vault</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>1 and 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Complete and Green Streets

#### Walkability

| Length of sidewalks improved (ft) | 692 | 1869 | 203 | 6239 | 2242 | 4774 | 0 |
| Length of sidewalks added (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Length of sidewalks removed (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of crosswalks added | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of crosswalks improved | 0 | 3 | 12 | 6 | 23 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of signalized intersections with pedestrian countdowns added | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

#### Bikeability

<p>| Length of bicycle lanes improved (centerlane miles) | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Length of bicycle lanes added (centerlane miles) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.23 | 0 | 0 |
| Length of separated bicycle lanes improved (centerlane miles) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Length of separated bicycle lanes added (centerlane miles) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Length of protected bicycle lanes improved (centerlane miles) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livability Project Metrics Checklist - Project Design Level Analysis</th>
<th>Water Main</th>
<th>MFT</th>
<th>Alley and Street Improvements Project</th>
<th>Traffic Calming, Ped &amp; Bike Improvements</th>
<th>Fountain Square</th>
<th>Sheridan Road</th>
<th>MGNWC Meter Vault</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of protected bicycle lanes added (centerlane miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of bicycle routes improved (centerlane miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of bicycle routes added (centerlane miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of cycle-tracks improved (centerlane miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of cycle-tracks added (centerlane miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of parallel shared-use paths improved (centerlane miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of parallel shared-use paths added (centerlane miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of bike infrastructure removed and not replaced (centerlane miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bicycle parking locations improved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bicycle parking locations added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bicycle parking locations removed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bicycle parking spaces improved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bicycle parking spaces added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bicycle parking spaces removed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livability Project Metrics Checklist - Project Design Level Analysis</td>
<td>Water Main</td>
<td>MFT</td>
<td>Alley and Street Improvements Project</td>
<td>Traffic Calming, Ped &amp; Bike Improvements</td>
<td>Fountain Square</td>
<td>Sheridan Road</td>
<td>MGNWC Meter Vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bus stops added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bus stops improved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bus stops with amenities added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bus shelters added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bus shelters improved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bus shelters with amenities added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Divvy stations added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of truncated domes installed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of truncated domes improved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of signalized intersections with audible detectors installed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of signalized intersections with audible detectors improved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of roadway patched (square ft)</td>
<td>18828</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of roadway resurfaced (lane miles)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of roadway crack-sealed (lane miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livability Project Metrics</td>
<td>Water Main</td>
<td>MFT</td>
<td>Alley and Street Improvements Project</td>
<td>Traffic Calming, Ped &amp; Bike Improvements</td>
<td>Fountain Square</td>
<td>Sheridan Road</td>
<td>MGNWC Meter Vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of porous pavement added (square ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9490</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of porous pavement repaired (square ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of porous pavement removed (square ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of rain garden/bioswale added (square ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of rain garden/bioswale repaired (square ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of rain garden/bioswale removed (square ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of green roof added (square ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of green roof repaired (square ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of green roof removed (square ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of area draining to green infrastructure (square ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equitable Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households of low to moderate income or minority status within 1/4 mile of walking infrastructure within the project's boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livability Project Metrics Checklist - Project Design Level Analysis</td>
<td>Water Main</td>
<td>MFT</td>
<td>Alley and Street Improvements Project</td>
<td>Traffic Calming, Ped &amp; Bike Improvements</td>
<td>Fountain Square</td>
<td>Sheridan Road</td>
<td>MGNWC Meter Vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households of low to moderate income or minority status within 1/2 mile of bicycling infrastructure within the project's boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households of low to moderate income or minority status within 1/2 mile of transit infrastructure within the project's boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households of low to moderate income or minority status within 1/2 mile of green infrastructure within the project's boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project proximity to human services programs (housing, mental health services, transportation, food, and child/elderly protective services) (distance in sq miles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other City Initiatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Parks and Forest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of trees planted</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,150 paid to City in lieu of tree replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of trees removed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (most trees not in good condition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livability Project Metrics Checklist - Project Design Level Analysis</td>
<td>Water Main</td>
<td>MFT</td>
<td>Alley and Street Improvements Project</td>
<td>Traffic Calming, Ped &amp; Bike Improvements</td>
<td>Fountain Square</td>
<td>Sheridan Road</td>
<td>MGNWC Meter Vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of greenspace for public access added (sq ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of greenspace for public access improved (sq ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of greenspace for public access removed (sq ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of native-habitat areas added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of native-habitat areas improved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of native-habitat areas removed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of age-related and/or mobility complaints addressed by this project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of local businesses (design/construction/maintenance) contracted on the project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of local residents employed (during design/construction)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (LEP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount spent on public art</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (in square feet) of improved safety</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Main</td>
<td>MFT</td>
<td>Alley and Street Improvements Project</td>
<td>Traffic Calming, Ped &amp; Bike Improvements</td>
<td>Fountain Square</td>
<td>Sheridan Road</td>
<td>MGNWC Meter Vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual estimated kwh savings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(take number of lights removed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and upgrades)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated impact to annual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(change in hours/personnel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maintenance to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of amenities added to</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none added but</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the public space (non-roadway)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improved - fountain,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>memorial wall, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>public square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in public space (increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- decrease) (sq ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Resiliency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of project elements used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that reduce greenhouse gas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of low impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development techniques used</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of waste generated by</td>
<td>150 CY</td>
<td>164 CY</td>
<td>696 CY</td>
<td></td>
<td>479 CY</td>
<td>12,000 CY</td>
<td>40 ft of 36&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects (lb or CY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PCCP (5 pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of native species</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>segments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>removed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of native species added</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(also works for pollinator Q)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of invasive species</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>removed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of non-native species</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>added</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livability Project Metrics Checklist - Project Design Level Analysis</td>
<td>Water Main</td>
<td>MFT</td>
<td>Alley and Street Improvements Project</td>
<td>Traffic Calming, Ped &amp; Bike Improvements</td>
<td>Fountain Square</td>
<td>Sheridan Road</td>
<td>MGNWC Meter Vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours of community outreach/approval</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>380 (Design 140, Construction (2 years) 240)</td>
<td>2 (council mtgs and arboretium)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Wellness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of project elements used to promote healthy, active lifestyles (recreational and commuting)</td>
<td>5 drinking fountains</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Bike Path</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of households within 1/4 mile of walking infrastructure or 1/2 mile of bicycling or transit facilities or green infrastructure within the project's boundaries</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of project that is accessible to emergency apparatuses</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project proximity to sources for fresh healthful foods (distance in sq miles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of emergency evacuation route improved (ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of project elements used that address violence or crime generation concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Alderman Eleanor Revelle, Chairman
Members of the Transportation & Parking Committee

From: Jessica Hyink, Transportation & Mobility Coordinator

Subject: Transportation & Mobility Updates

Date: February 25, 2019

Summary:

This memorandum provides a brief update on items related to the work conducted by the Transportation & Mobility Coordinator.

Transit Updates:

a) **New:** Metra and Capital Bill Resolution of Support
   - Metra is reaching out to municipal partners to seek support for a Capital Bill to fund transportation and infrastructure projects.
   - Metra asks the City to consider placing a resolution in an upcoming City Council meeting agenda for consideration and approval.
   - If considered and approved by City Council, the approved resolution will be sent to the Governor, legislative leaders, local legislators, and Metra.

b) **Update:** Pace Posted Stops Only
   - Pace announced all flagged stops will be converted to posted stops only.
     - Route 208 will be converted on March 3, 2019.
     - Route 213 will be converted on April 7, 2019.
     - Route 215 does not yet have a conversion date.
     - Route 250 was converted on May 13, 2012.
   - ETHS has been notified of the changes.
   - Staff is reviewing each stop to ensure walkable coverage and accessibility. Pace has already adjusted some stops.
   - Link to news story on City of Evanston website:
     - [https://www.cityofevanston.org/Home/Components/News/News/3279/17](https://www.cityofevanston.org/Home/Components/News/News/3279/17)

c) **Reminder:** Pace Bus Stop Program:
   - Pace will install bus shelters at no cost to the City, including excavation and concrete work for the placement of the shelter as needed.
   - Maintenance, cleaning, and repair of all shelters is managed by Pace.
   - The program is funded through advertising revenue.
• Pace will pay the City a percentage of the advertising revenue.
• The City may stipulate no ads with alcohol.
  o To participate, the City must waive the cost of construction permit application fees and fast-track the permitting and inspection process.
  o The bus shelter design is limited to six styles selected by Pace.
  o More information can be found online: