MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Locations:

- IDOT Headquarters, 2300 S. Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, IL 62764
- IDOT Office of Intermodal Project Implementation, 69 W. Washington Street, Suite 2100, Chicago, IL 60602
- Virtual Webex Meeting

Meeting Date and Time:

Tuesday, September 23, 2025
10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

Attendance:

**Asterisk indicates attendance in-person*

Task Force Members Present	Representing
Lieutenant Colonel Jason Bradley	Illinois State Police
Lindsay Braun	University of Illinois Urbana Champaign
Maggie (Melin) Czerwinski	Active Transportation Alliance
John Donovan*	Illinois Department of Transportation
Martha (Molly) Hart	AAA – The Auto Club Group
Jennifer Martin*	Illinois Department of Public Health
Yan Qi	Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
Christopher Rector*	Motorcycle Safety Group
Brian Tamblin	Illinois Secretary of State
Alexander Evencio Vallardes	Experimental Station's Blackstone Bicycle Works

Task Force Members Absent	Representing
Pennie McCoach	Amalgamated Transit Union Local 308
Michael Pubentz	City of Elgin
Nebiyou Tilahaun*	University of Illinois Chicago

Other Attendees Present	Representing
Kyle Armstrong*	Illinois Department of Transportation
Stephane Seck-Birhame*	Illinois Department of Transportation
Adam Gabany*	Illinois Department of Transportation
Matt McAnarney*	Illinois Department of Transportation
Juan Pava*	Illinois Department of Transportation
Victoria Barrett	Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
Hugo Coronado	Metropolitan Planning Council
Nick Jamusz	AAA – The Auto Club Group
Amy Rynell	Active Transportation Alliance
Berenice Alvarez	Morreale Communications
Mary McIlvain*	Morreale Communications
Ashni Pabley*	Morreale Communications

Overview of Meeting:

I. Welcome and Introductions

With 10 Task Force members present in-person at either the Chicago or Springfield Illinois Department of Transportation offices, and in the virtual meeting room, a quorum was met. Task Force Chairman John Donovan of the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) opened the meeting by welcoming both in-person and virtual attendees.

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Approval of the August meeting minutes will be conducted during the October Task Force meeting.

III. Discussion of Task Force Draft Bylaws

Chairman Donovan opened the discussion of the bylaws that were updated and circulated since the last meeting in August. With no comments on the bylaws, Chairman Donovan asked for a motion to approve the bylaws. A motion was given, and the Task Force bylaws were approved unanimously.

IV. Traffic Safety Study Presentation by AAA – The Auto Club Group

Chairman Donovan introduced Nick Jamusz of American Automobile Association – The Auto Club Group and his presentation reviewing two research briefs.

Traffic Fatalities on Urban Roads and Streets in Relation to Speed Limits and Speeding, United States, 2019-2019

The first research brief was titled Traffic Fatalities on Urban Roads and Streets in Relation to Speed Limits and Speeding, United States, 2019-2019. This study explored the relationship between speed, roadway types and traffic fatalities, focusing particularly on urban roadways. It found that a significant portion of traffic deaths involved speeding—either exceeding the posted speed limit, driving too fast for conditions or racing. From 2010 to 2019, fatalities on urban roads increased dramatically from about 11,000 to over 16,000—while fatalities on local streets declined. The share of U.S. traffic fatalities occurring on urban roads rose from 34% to 44% during this period. Although fatalities on local residential streets decreased, the number of deaths on urban collectors and arterials (larger roads with higher speed limits) rose sharply. Based on data presented during the meeting, total fatalities are highest on 40-45 mph roadways. But when looking only at speed-related fatalities, the plurality occurs on 30-35 mph roadways. It was also observed that a much greater proportion of speed-related fatalities occur on 25 mph or under roads than total fatalities, while we see the reverse on 50 mph or more roads.

Pedestrians and cyclists, referred to as vulnerable road users, accounted for roughly a third of all urban fatalities. Of these, 83% occurred on roads with speed limits of 45 mph or lower. Speeding was especially relevant in roadway departure crashes, contributing to nearly half of those deaths. Among speeding-related vehicle-to-vehicle collisions, 60% were angle collisions, 20% were front-to-rear, and 16% were front-to-front. In fatal front-to-rear crashes, about 40% involved speeding. Interestingly, only 8% of speeding-related deaths involved non-motorists, suggesting that pedestrians and cyclists were more often killed by drivers who were *not* speeding, which underscores a critical takeaway: current posted speed limits may still be too high to prevent fatal outcomes, even when drivers comply with them.

The study emphasized several countermeasures to reduce speed-related fatalities. Setting more appropriate speed limits is essential, particularly on urban roads where vehicles interact with pedestrians and cyclists. Enforcement and engineering interventions, such as mid-block curb extensions, speed feedback signs, separated bike lanes, and improved pedestrian crosswalk visibility, can significantly reduce risk. On high-speed roads where reducing the speed limit may not be feasible, separating vehicle and pedestrian space is critical. Improving intersection design, such as using roundabouts or installing dedicated turn lanes, can also reduce conflict points and fatal crashes.

A Multi-site Examination for the Impact of Changes in Posted Speed Limit on Traffic Safety

The second research brief reviewed was titled A Multi-site Examination for the Impact of Changes in Posted Speed Limit on Traffic Safety which evaluated real-world outcomes of speed limit changes on 12 roadway segments across the U.S. from 2014 to 2018—six where speed limits were raised and six where they were lowered. For the highways where limits were raised from 65 to 70 mph, crash frequency generally increased, although not always significantly. Mean and 85th percentile speeds rose, while speed limit violations decreased, likely due to the higher posted speeds. Travel times stayed roughly the same. On arterials where limits were raised by 5 mph, results were mixed: one saw more crashes, while the other saw fewer injury crashes. A minor arterial with an increased limit showed more fatal crashes, suggesting that increased speed may have turned survivable crashes into fatal ones.

For sites where speed limits were lowered, no interstates were included due to a lack of qualifying examples. Two primary arterials showed mixed results in crash counts and rates. In some cases, even after lowering speed limits, mean and 85th percentile speeds slightly increased, while speed limit violations went up. Travel times and traffic volumes were either unchanged or slightly reduced. The same trends appeared in minor arterials and collectors. One collector site saw improved safety outcomes, while another with a 10 mph reduction showed more crashes. Despite some variability, lower speed limits generally did not increase travel times, and in some cases even improved them.

In conclusion, the findings suggest that while lowering speed limits is not a universal solution, it has significant potential to reduce injuries and fatalities—especially when

paired with design and enforcement strategies. Importantly, fears that lowering speed limits will increase travel time may be unfounded, as many sites showed decreased or unchanged travel times after speed reductions. Thus, the data indicate that reducing speed limits, particularly in areas shared with non-motorists, offers meaningful safety benefits with minimal downside.

Chairman Donvan then opened for questions.

Task Force member Yan Qi expressed interest in the two tables Mr. Jarmusz included in the slides — one showing increased speed limits with crash summaries and the other showing the opposite. She inquired about a before-and-after comparison of those segments and if the change in crash numbers was solely due to the speed limit changes or if any other factors were involved.

Mr. Jamusz responded that he will look into her question further.

Task Force member Lindsay Braun of University of Illinois Urbana remarked that right turn lanes, roundabouts and split lanes aren't great for pedestrians and wondered if countermeasures to protect pedestrians that are not inside of vehicles were considered.

Mr. Jamusz remarked that some cities have looked deeply at roundabouts, but solutions are dependent on the uniqueness of each roadway.

Victoria Barrett from Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) thanked the group for raising the important point that safe speeds involve more than just complying with posted speed limits which also means questioning whether those limits are truly appropriate for the context. She appreciated the discussion around countermeasures and wanted to amplify one key idea: separating users in space. Building on that, she also encouraged the group to consider separating users in time.Ms. Barrett explained that intersections are the most common points of conflict and one effective time-based strategy is the use of leading pedestrian intervals (LPIs), which give pedestrians a head start to enter the crosswalk before vehicles get a green light. Another strategy is restricting right turns at intersections, which further reduces conflicts and increases pedestrian safety by protecting their time to cross from multiple directions. She expressed interest in discussing these ideas further with the group.

Ms. Barrett also shared insights from CMAP's Safety Action Plan process in Cook County, noting that many local agencies are now advocating for mid-block crossings.

Although these crossings have traditionally been discouraged by traffic engineers, due to the perceived risks of allowing pedestrians to cross without full traffic control, they are now being reconsidered. In many cases, mid-block crossings have shown traffic calming benefits and present fewer conflict points than busy intersections, which often involve multiple turning movements and decision-making challenges for drivers. She emphasized that this shift reflects a growing recognition of their potential safety benefits and encouraged further exploration of what strategies are truly working.

Task Force member Maggie Czerwinski from the Active Transportation Alliance found one piece of research especially striking: even when speed limits are obeyed, pedestrian and bicycle fatality rates are still much higher than expected. This suggests that default speed limits in urban areas may be too high. Ms. Czerwinski expressed interest in seeing studies of cities that have lowered their city-wide default speed limits (rather than individual roads) to determine how that affects fatality and safety data.

Mr. Jarmusz answered that some research on citywide speed limit reductions is underway, with more data now becoming available. They mentioned Madison, Wisconsin as an example through its Vision Zero plan, the city implemented the "20 is Plenty" initiative to reduce speeds on many city roads. With finalized data, more thorough analyses will soon be possible.

Mr. Jarmusz also emphasized the importance of cultural and educational aspects of traffic safety. Speed limits are maximum, not targets. In areas like rural subdivisions without sidewalks, drivers often choose to go below the limit when pedestrians are present. Reinforcing this mindset, especially in residential areas, can help reduce the severity of collisions and save lives.

Stephane Seck-Birhame of the Illinois Department of Transportation asked Mr. Jarmusz whether there was any public communication related to the research, either about conducting the research itself or sharing the findings.

Mr. Jarmusz clarified that the research team did not manage public input and that it would have been the responsibility of local agencies involved at each site. The researchers focused strictly on analyzing data and were not involved in implementing or communicating the changes.

Mr. Seck-Birhame explained that he asked because, in their own work, public communication and education are considered important factors in successfully lowering speed limits. He was curious whether the public had been informed about the changes in the study segments.

Mr. Jarmusz replied that he would need to look into this question further.

V. Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning Presentation

Mr. Donovan introduce Ms. Barrett and her presentation about the Safe Systems Approach.

The Safe Systems Approach emphasizes addressing all aspects of the transportation system to reduce the risk of severe crashes. A key component of this approach is managing kinetic energy, the force involved in collisions, by reducing vehicle speeds. Kinetic energy increases exponentially with speed, making even small reductions in speed critical to saving lives. Speeding remains one of the leading contributors to traffic fatalities, yet traditional police enforcement of speed limits is not as effective as it once was.

Even where enforcement exists, it does not work for all drivers. Research has shown that repeated speeding offenders are significantly more likely to be involved in fatal or severe injury crashes. For example, in New York City, vehicles with 20 or more speed camera violations were up to five times more likely to be in a fatal or serious crash. Additionally, a sizable percentage—up to 60%—of drivers with suspended or revoked licenses continue to drive, which further diminishes the deterrent effect of enforcement.

Automated enforcement, such as speed cameras, has been effective in changing behavior for most drivers. In New York City, more than 1.3 million vehicles received a single speeding ticket in a year, but the number of vehicles receiving multiple violations dropped sharply. This indicates that most drivers adjust their behavior after receiving a ticket. However, a small subset of high-risk drivers continues to speed repeatedly, contributing disproportionately to serious crashes. While media narratives sometimes frame a decline in camera-issued tickets as a failure, it is actually a sign of effectiveness—fewer violations mean better compliance.

To address the limitations of enforcement and better manage speeding, Illinois and other authorities are exploring Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA) technology. ISA, a modern speed tracker, prevents vehicles from exceeding posted speed limits. In the European Union, all new vehicles sold after July 2024 are required to include ISA as original equipment. These systems typically use cameras to detect speed limit signs or GPS-based mapping to determine speed limits, then restrict the vehicle's acceleration accordingly. Importantly, most ISA systems allow for override in emergency situations. In the U.S., post-manufacture ISA systems can be installed on vehicles regardless of age and operate similarly to alcohol ignition interlocks, which are already used for drivers with DUI convictions.

Pilot programs in the United States have shown promising results. In New York City, ISA was installed in city fleet vehicles, leading to a 64% reduction in speeding. The program included a wide range of vehicle types, from trucks to electric cars, and was expanded to high-risk drivers with similar success. Washington, DC recently completed a pilot program with ISA-equipped school fleet vehicles, and while full data analysis is still underway, early feedback suggests it was successful. Some jurisdictions are now considering ISA as a tool for managing high-risk populations like young or inexperienced drivers, who are overrepresented in speeding-related crashes.

Legislative interest in ISA is growing. Washington, DC passed the STEER Act in February 2024, allowing ISA to be installed in vehicles of repeat offenders as an alternative to license suspension. Similar bills have passed in Virginia, Washington State, and Georgia, with legislation introduced in New York and Maryland expected to advance in upcoming sessions. These laws aim to identify high-risk drivers based on data—such as receiving multiple automated enforcement tickets within a defined period—and offering ISA as an alternative sanction. This approach addresses equity concerns by allowing people to continue driving, when necessary, while ensuring their vehicles pose less danger to others on the road. As with interlock devices, the cost of

installing and maintaining ISA is typically paid by the violator, reducing financial burdens on the state.

In summary, as enforcement becomes less viable and speed remains a leading cause of severe crashes, technologies like ISA offer a promising, data-driven and equitable approach to improving road safety. It was noted that it may be beneficial to identify different performance periods to apply different measures of success. It's important for transparency to clearly define the goals and how they will be evaluated, including both short-term and long-term.

Mr. Seck-Birhame remarked that he first learned about Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA) last year through the GSA and is glad it's now being discussed more widely. He noted that ISA is similar to DUI ignition interlock systems, which have been in use since 2009. However, in Illinois, where participation in ISA is not mandatory, equity and socioeconomic concerns have become clear. Many eligible individuals choose not to enroll due cost burden. People have to pay for the device, its installation and ongoing maintenance. In some cases, drivers don't own or have vehicles registered to them, further complicating participation.

Mr. Seck-Birhame stated that ISA may have strong potential, especially if mandated at the federal level, which could lead to broader impact and accessibility. For now, he's interested in watching how early adopting states implement ISA and what participation rates look like.

Mr. Jarmusz mentioned that they recently did their annual Traffic Safety Survey and found that 66% of Illinois respondents favored the use of mandated speed checkers for chronic speed offenders.

Mr. Pava was interested in the data in Chicago. He wasn't aware there was data like this available outside of school zones and if it was coming from red light cameras or something else.

Ms. Barrett confirmed that the data is pulled from CDOT speed cameras in safety zones and that the numbers are coming from a student project that is potentially unpublished. She recommended following up with CDOT and asking for mor information.

Ms. Barrett emphasized that speed cameras are a valuable data source, as they collect detailed information on vehicle speeds and license plates. She also revisited topics from a previous discussion, noting how well they align with Nick's presentation. In particular, she highlighted that many speed-related crashes in the region are occurring on roads with 20 mph posted speed limits, underscoring the risks even at lower speeds. She pointed out that 20 states currently have urban district speed limits set at 20 mph, and while some places have specific residential speed limits, Illinois does not, which could be an area for further consideration.

Mr. Donovan asked for additional comments and questions on this topic.

Lieutenant Colonel Jason Bradley of the Illinois State Police remarked that he is a huge fan of implementing the ISA speed cameras. He questioned the procedural process for repeat offenders in New York.

Ms. Barrett believes that the cameras issue warnings for a period of time, such as two to three months, before a ticket is issued.

Mr. Bradley raised a question about the timeline for fully autonomous vehicles and whether we're still many years away from widespread adoption. In the meantime, he sees the implementation of Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA) as a progressive step, particularly in addressing habitual speeding. He drew a parallel to judicial driving programs that require breathalyzer ignition devices for DUI offenders—suggesting that ISA could serve a similar role for speed violators. Jason emphasized that, since a driver's license is a privilege, requiring individuals to install ISA in order to keep their license could be a reasonable legislative proposal.

Mr. Pava emphasized that speed safety cameras should be strictly safety-focused and not used as revenue-generating tools. He highlighted the importance of expanding these programs responsibly while recognizing that they are limited by existing legislation. As this group considers recommendations, Juan stressed that any programs must operate within legal boundaries and that potential unintended consequences of the laws must be carefully considered.

Ms. Barrett highlighted a popular recommendation for speed camera programs: offering educational alternatives to fines. Instead of paying a monetary ticket, drivers could opt to watch a short video and complete a quiz on the impacts of speeding. This approach helps decouple the program from being purely revenue-driven and provides positive educational benefits, while also reducing the financial burden on low-income drivers.

There is a pilot program occurring in the City of Seattle where you can watch an online educational course in lieu of or in addition to a reduced fine.

Amy Rynell of Active Transportation Alliance expressed gratitude for the presentations and believes they've outlined a clear, multifaceted blueprint for improving safety that will require legislative changes. She noted there are many concrete recommendations to consider for the next few years of work and thanked everyone for their efforts.

Ms. Barrett recommended more detailed analysis.

Mr. Seck-Birhame asked Mr. Donovan if there's interest in moving forward with ISA or related initiatives, it's important to involve the Secretary of State's office (SOS), since they handle the administrative side of implementation in Illinois. To ensure alignment with their priorities and proper follow-through, we should engage them early in the conversation before diving deeper into the discussion. Reaching out to SOS now would be a wise first step.

Mr. Donovan agreed and posed to the group who that person would be.

Brian Tamblin of the Illinois Secretary of State's Office recommended that the Assistant Chief of Staff, as a point of contact for administrative coordination, as well as the director

likely being involved. He offered to assist in getting the right representatives engaged if the group decides to move forward.

Mr. Tamblin acknowledged that there are complexities around ticketing, enforcement, and legislative mechanics, such as using number of violations or points on a license to identify high-risk drivers. He encouraged further thought on how these elements could be integrated and expressed a willingness to support those efforts with his expertise.

Mr. Tamblin shared that the presentations sparked legislative ideas around speed cameras and interlocking devices, emphasizing that any proposal should not be framed as a revenue enhancement. Instead, he supports incorporating education, such as requiring violators to watch a video to receive supervision, similar to the Seattle pilot program, which he's interested in reviewing further and possibly building on.

Mr. Donovan inquired about other questions and comments. With no direct comments regarding the presentations, he commented about next steps.

He noted the next Task Force meetings are on October 30, November 18 and December 17 and expressed the desire to come up with a list of recommendations on how to move forward at the next meeting.

Task Force Member Alex Vallardes at Experimental Station mentioned that they recently developed a program with a few Chicago Public Schools (CPS) and offered to share their work. They also volunteered to compile resources from other Chicago-based nonprofits doing similar work in schools. The goal is to create a concise, standardized lesson plan—a best-of compilation—for teachers, which could be presented in a brief five-minute overview to the group. This will be scheduled for the next meeting.

Ms. Barrett suggested producing an IDOT comprehensive report with coordinated safety recommendations, noting it could be especially impactful in the legislative process. Based on her experience serving on various committees in Springfield, she pointed out that different aspects of transportation safety, like automated enforcement, speed limits and education, are handled by different legislative committees. This fragmentation makes it harder for legislators to see the bigger picture.

Task Force Member Jennifer Martin from the Illinois Department of Public Health recommended compiling all the recommendations that have already been generated during these meetings and could serve as a solid starting point for next steps. She emphasized not missing the opportunity to include insights from an ongoing vehicle data linkage project that connects crash data with health data. This work is being done in partnership with IDOT, and their findings—particularly on the topics discussed in the meeting—could offer valuable additional insight.

VI. Public Comments

The meeting was opened to public comment. No public comments were made.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

VIII. Action Items

The following action items were identified:

- Reminder for the next meeting on October 30th.
- Alexander Vallardes will present on the educational piece.
- A preliminary list of recommendations will be discussed.