

Approved Meeting Minutes
Transportation Commission
Monday, April 22, 2013
Council Chambers - Village Hall

Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Jack Chalabian called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

Present: Andre Bonakdar, Jack Chalabian, Craig Chesney, Lee Lazar, Mark Patzloff,
Michael Stewart.

Excused: None

Staff: Jim Budrick, Mike Koperniak, Jill Juliano, Jill Velan, Tina Brown

Non-Agenda Item Public Comments

Commissioner Lazar mentioned that certain parking meters are non-operational. Vehicles are parking without having to pay and the Village is losing revenue at these locations.

Agenda Approval

Commissioner Lazar motioned to approve tonight's meeting agenda as presented and Commissioner Stewart seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote

Approval of the Draft February 25, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Patzloff motioned to approve the January 28, 2013 Transportation Commission meeting minutes and Commissioner Stewart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

PETITION TO INSTALL DAYTIME RESIDENT ONLY PERMIT PARKING IN FRONT OF 300-304 N GROVE AVE

Parking Restrictions Coordination Tina Brown gave a presentation regarding this petition. The presentation included: a summary of the parking survey results, an analysis of if the survey results met the daytime permit parking guidelines, and a summary of public testimony.

Commission members questioned staff about the types of permit/non-permit daytime/nighttime parking restrictions on the block and in the area.

The floor was opened to public testimony.

Michelle Belton of 300 N Grove Avenue supports the petition. She spoke about the parking restrictions on the block and explained how it changed from No Parking 8AM-10AM to 2 Hour Parking.

Tom Hall of 304 N Grove Avenue supports the petition. He spoke about the 2 Hour Parking restriction and the problems it has caused.

Thomas and Pauline Grippardo of 330 N Grove Avenue spoke about his narrow driveway and the challenges of getting his car out. The wife also claims the parking restriction change to 2 Hour Parking has caused problems.

Eva Braun of 326 N Grove Avenue concurred with Mrs. Grippardo and recommended that the daytime resident permit parking be extended to cover the entire 300 N Grove Avenue block.

Burton Anderson of 300 N Grove Avenue claimed that the petition should be for five parking spaces and not four.

Anna Cotto of 304 N Grove Avenue supports the petition and also spoke about the problems caused by the 2 Hour Parking restriction.

The floor was closed to public testimony.

Chair Chalabian asked Staff why the parking No Parking 8AM-10AM parking restriction was changed to a 2 Hour Parking restriction. Staff responded that it did not know the reasons for the change.

The Commission discussed: the pros and cons of the petition, recommending to remove the 2 Hour parking restriction, if there was a parking problem only in front of the condo building or for the entire block, if the item should be tabled until the history behind the parking restriction change was presented, and the history of the Oak Park Avenue/ Ontario Street area-wide parking study from several years ago.

During the discussion, Commissioner Patzloff questioned Staff as to why there was only one signature on the petition. Interim Parking Services Manager Jill Velan responded that the condominium association board signed for the entire building.

Commissioner Lazar made a motion to table the issue until the next meeting and have Staff report on the history of the parking restriction change from No Parking 8AM-10AM to 2 Hour Parking and/or to install daytime resident permit parking. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Stewart.

The vote was as follows:

AYES: Lazar, Stewart, Chalabian

NAYS: Bonakdar, Chesney, Patzloff

The motion failed in a 3 to 3 tie.

The Commission discussed the issue more.

Commissioner Chesney made a motion to table the issue until the next meeting and have Staff report on the history of the parking restriction change from No Parking 8AM-10AM to 2 Hour Parking and/or to install daytime resident permit parking. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Patzloff.

The vote was as follows:

AYES: Lazar, Stewart, Chalabian, Chesney, Patzloff

NAYS: Bonakdar

The motion passed 5 to 1.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED JACKSON BOULEVARD BICYCLE STRIPING PLAN (CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS)

Transportation Engineer Jill Juliano gave presentation about the proposed Jackson Boulevard bicycle striping plan. The presentation included an explanation of possible flat curb bump-outs and how they would work.

The Commission and Staff discussed the technical aspects of the flat curb bump-outs.

The floor was opened to public testimony.

Liz Lemke of 733 S Grove Avenue said she was familiar with the Harlem/Jackson curve, was in favor of bike lanes on Jackson, indicated that Jackson has a speeding problem, claimed that the Staff's proposed plan doesn't adequately address the speeding problem, and suggested that Jackson be turned into a one-way street with dedicated bike lanes.

Joe Lyons of 949 N Harvey Avenue indicated that he likes the bump outs and bike lanes.

Mike O'Malley of 800 Wisconsin asked Staff to identify other location where the flat curb bump-outs are used. Staff mentioned several locations and also indicated that colored pavement and bike lane markings would be used.

Brown, Tina

From: Pauline Grippando [grippand@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2013 9:10 AM
To: Brown, Tina
Cc: erbrown326@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Daytime parking permits

Dear Ms. Brown,

This mail regards the resident parking restriction at 300 - 304 N. Grove and elsewhere on the 300 N. Grove block.

I would like to request that the possibility to purchase resident daytime parking permits be extended to other residents of the 300 block.

Recently (within the last two years) the parking rules for the block were changed from no parking before 10 AM to two hour parking between 9 and 5. We did not get a Village notice that this was being considered and the person who requested the change did not notify the other residents.

We were informed that if two thirds of the families on the block agreed this could be changed. We tried but fell two votes short. The reason is that all but five houses have a private driveway. The owners can park in their driveway beyond the two hour maximum if they want to leave their car out. As far as the other houses are concerned one house has no driveway and no garage. Four houses share two driveways (326/330 and 327/331). I can speak for the situation at the former residences. The residents of both houses are retired. This means that the cars are frequently in use and it is not possible to park in the driveway because one might block access to the other's garage. The driveway is very narrow and, since we have to back out, it is not something you want to have to repeat several times a day. So what we end up doing is moving the car every two hours across the street and back again. It causes a problem for everybody. We have to remember where we parked last and your ticketers don't know if the car has been moved since they clocked it. I had one ticket vacated because I could show that I had gone shopping since they clocked it and had dated and timed receipts.

I am aware that we can park unlimited time on the 400 block. However, it is easy to forget that the car is out when it is out of your line of vision. We have had some narrow escapes from leaving it out overnight.

It would be a great help if we could purchase day time parking passes.

Thomas and Pauline Grippando
330 N. Grove (since 1987 and elsewhere in Oak Park since 1978)

4/18/2013

Brown, Tina

From: Gary Wilson [w12018@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2013 10:10 PM
To: Brown, Tina
Subject: Parking 300-304 North Grove

Ms. Brown,

This responds to the village's letter to the residents of 300-304 N. Grove.

The letter concerns a request that the residents be allowed to secure a parking permit that allows for unlimited parking in front of 300-304 N. Grove weekdays between 9-5. Residents are currently limited to two hours.

I strongly support the request and ask that the village approve it at the earliest possible time.

Most residents do not have on premise parking garages and are forced to street parking during the day. This means that they have to move their car multiple times during the course of a busy day. This includes mothers of young children who have more to consider than moving a car every two hours.

It is also my understanding that the current two hour limit was implemented based on multiple neighbors who do not want any cars parked on the street. Conveniently, they have drive ways and garages.

The current parking restriction lacks a certain logic.

Residents of 300-304 N. Grove have restrictions on parking in front of their own building at the request of neighbors who have unfettered parking in their driveways. That's simply about denying someone of something that you have.

It is incumbent on the village to take a fair and reasonable approach to Grove parking and that is why I ask that you approve the request of the residents to be able to secure an unlimited 9-5 permit.

Thanks for your consideration.

Gary Wilson
300 N. Grove 3A

708 267-5677

4/19/2013

Brown, Tina

From: MICHAEL O [michael4o@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2013 6:43 PM
To: Brown, Tina
Subject: Petition to Establish Resident Permit Parking 300-304 N. Grove Ave
The Village of Oak Park April 21, 2013

Tina R. Brown

Parking Restrictions Coordinator

Dear Transportation Commission Members;

My wife Patricia and I are forty (40) year residents of the 300 block of North Grove Avenue. We live just down the street from the Exclusive E E Roberts Condominium building; we live at 331 North Grove Avenue.

Patricia and I strongly object to the establishment of Restricted On Street Resident Permit Parking, in front of or adjacent to, the 300-304 North Grove Building.

The idea of resident only permit parking and associated parking fees is completely inappropriate, unnecessary, foreign and too restrictive for our open and welcoming neighborhood.

~~By some chance you approve this overly restrictive and costly petition, please limit the~~
exclusive and restricted parking spaces to the five (5) spaces directly in front of the 300-304 Building on the East side of Grove Avenue only.

Respectfully submitted;

Michael O. Leavy

Patricia Leavy

Brown, Tina

From: tiffanyhpl@gmail.com on behalf of Tiffany Verzani [paigeonaddison@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2013 9:58 PM
To: Brown, Tina
Subject: N. Grove Ave. Parking

Ms. Brown,

I am writing in response to the item before the village regarding parking for residents of 300-304 N. Grove Avenue.

Residents are currently limited to two hours in front of their building and would like the village to allow for unlimited parking in front of 300-304 N. Grove Avenue on weekdays between 9:00am-5:00pm

I am strongly in favor of this request and believe the village should pass it as soon as possible.

Current restrictions negatively impact the lives of residents of 300-304 N. Grove. Parents of young children, people with medical conditions, work from home business people, people relaxing on their day off, seniors - all have to interrupt their day, leave their small children or otherwise have to make a needless decision to move their car after 2 hours when they should have a permit and a right to parking the same as all other taxpayers on the block who have driveways and garages.

It is illogical and unfair that condominium owners are treated differently simply because neighbors do not want cars in front of their houses. However, the request before you is for 5 spaces in front of our own building. 5 spaces for 16 units is not much to ask - I would say the neighbors would see no negative impact, but our residents life, well-being and peace of mind would be greatly improved.

I ask that the village take a reasonable and responsible approach to this situation and approve the request of the residents for an unlimited 9-5 permit.

Having recently moved from Chicago's Wrigleyville neighborhood, I can attest to the success of broader all day residential parking permits. I would also point out that our newly elected Village President, Mr. Anan, mentioned parking as an issue in his election campaign - I certainly hope that he and the current board would take residents parking issues and restrictions just as seriously as those of the business community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely, Tiffany Verzani 300 N. Grove #2C

Brown, Tina

From: Matt Walters [bestcellar@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2013 10:15 PM

To: Brown, Tina

Cc: Cisco Cotto

Subject: Parking on 300-304 N. Grove

Dear Ms. Brown,

This is a response to the village letter regarding the parking on 300 n. grove.

It is an outrage that the residents of my building have been denied the ability to park in front of their own homes for several years.

It is an even bigger outrage that a very small handful of neighbors could dictate the terms for the parking conditions of an entire block.

Many other similar multi-unit residences in oak park are afforded permits; it seems only fair to grant this building the same consideration, without arbitrary discrimination.

All we want is for a handful of owners to be able to park their own cars on their own street - in front of the places they live.

In some cases, these homeowners have small children or infants.

Please kindly consider our request.

Thank you,

Matt Walters
Rachel Swain
304 N Grove #3b

Brown, Tina

From: Sarah Finnegan [Sarah_Finnegan@rush.edu]
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2013 7:37 AM
To: Brown, Tina
Subject: 300-304 N. Grove-parking permit

Ms. Brown,

I am a new resident of 304 N. Grove. I respectfully urge the board to allow residents of the Roberts Building to park directly in front of the building (300-304 N. Grove) during the day without restriction. Residents are currently limited to two hours.

There are only four parking spaces for 16 units in the building. For people with small children or older adults, having to park some distance from the building is a true burden. Resident permit only parking would address the previous concern of commuters using the spaces for their cars while they take public transportation to their jobs.

We believe that the Village will be fair and reasonable in their decision. Allowing residents to secure an unlimited 9-5 permit will help address a critical need while also respecting the presumed interest of single family homeowners in preventing commuters from parking in the area.

Thank you.

*Sarah and Terry Finnegan
304 N. Grove 2A*

Brown, Tina

From: Cisco Cotto [ciscocotto@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2013 11:45 AM
To: Brown, Tina
Subject: Parking at 300-304 N Grove

Ms. Brown,

For more than two years people in our building have been working with our neighbors to find common ground on our parking situation. Many of our neighbors are flexible. A few are not. These few keep us from reaching the 75% threshold necessary to get this petition extended to our entire block. So we are asking for this resident permit zone to be installed in front of our building.

Our building contains stay at home moms, people who work from home, and retirees. All of these people have the need to go back and forth throughout the day without having to worry about a two hour restriction. One of my friends got a ticket while visiting me. He was literally parked in front of our building for two hours and fifteen minutes.

If the commission accepts our petition the rest of our block will remain a 2 hour zone. This will keep cars moving on most of our block while allowing residents of our building and their visitors to park on our street without the worry of violating the two hour rule.

I wish I could be there in person to express this, but I am out of town for business. Please know I strongly support the creation of this permit zone and urge the commission to approve it.

Cisco Cotto
304 N Grove Ave
Apt 2B

Charlene Schwartz of 725 Wisconsin said that the existing curb bump-outs were installed to slow traffic, that the biggest problem is the volume of traffic, that the existing curb bump-outs prevent passing on the right, and that speeding is a problem.

David Germanski of 734 Wisconsin Avenue indicated that Jackson Boulevard is an alternate route to the I-290 expressway when the expressway is backed up.

Bill Sullivan of 825 Home Avenue said he concurs with the traffic problems and spoke about the cost and effort to install the existing curb bump-outs and how they have worked.

The floor was closed to public testimony.

Village Engineer Budrick indicated that the work on Jackson Boulevard would be performed in late summer or early fall.

The Commission discussed: the pros and cons of the existing curb bump-outs, the history of the proposed Jackson Boulevard bike lanes, discussed the pros and cons of the proposed flat curb bump-outs, the benefits of installing bike lanes on Jackson, the traffic conditions on Jackson, safety for the local residents, the financial impact of replacing one type of curb bump-out with another, vehicle / pedestrian / bicyclist priorities in the Comprehensive Plan, and the use of delineator markers in addition to the curb bump-outs.

Commissioner Stewart made a motion to approve the Staff plan and to add delineator markers where required. Commissioner Lazar seconded the motion.

There was discussion about: the effectiveness of using delineator markers, weekend parking, and fiscal responsibility.

The vote was as follows:

AYES: Lazar, Stewart, Chalabian

NAYS: Bonakdar, Chesney, Patzloff

The motion failed in a 3 to 3 tie.

Village Engineer Budrick indicated that the default plan is to install shared bike lanes as per the 2008 bicycle plan and to keep the existing curb bump-outs.

Commissioner Stewart made a motion to install dedicated bike lanes in between the curb bump-outs and to keep the existing curb bump-outs.

The vote was as follows:

AYES: Lazar, Stewart, Chalabian, Chesney, Patzloff

NAYS: Bonakdar

The motion passed 5 to 1.

REVIEW OF THE VILLAGE'S NO IDLING POLICY (WORK PLAN ITEM)

Transportation Engineer Juliano gave a presentation regarding the item including a short history of what actions have been taken by the Environment and Energy Commission.

Chair Chalabian mentioned the draft Anti-Idling ordinance did not go before the Village Board. He stated that he does not want to do the same work twice.

The Commission debated on whether to develop a policy or a draft ordinance for adoption. It was agreed that the Transportation Commission should work with the Environment and Energy Commission on the ordinance.

Commissioner Lazar believes combining forces with the other Commission is the best way and they can share best practices on the issue.

Commissioner Stewart supports the ordinance and provided his reasons why.

Commissioner Patzloff expressed his concern if there is an ordinance will be enforced.

Commissioner Bonakdar supports the anti-idling ordinance, if mandated then there is enforceability.

The Commission discussed how it can support the EEC draft ordinance and bring it before the Village Board of Trustees.

Chair Chalabian said he would reach out to the Environment and Energy Commission regarding the issue. There would be a brief update at the next Transportation Commission meeting.

DISCUSSION ABOUT RESCHEDULING THE MAY 27TH MEETING

It was agreed by the Commission, the next Transportation Commission meeting would be held on Monday, June 10, 2013.

There being no further business, Commissioner Chesney motioned to adjourn and Commissioner Patzloff seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Testimony Summary Sheet – April 22, 2013 Transportation Commission Meeting

| Jackson Boulevard Bike Lane | Support | Oppose | Comments |
|---|----------------|---------------|--|
| <u>April 22, 2013 Meeting</u> | | | |
| L Lemke 733 S Grove (W) | X | | Steps needed to mitigate traffic on Jackson. |
| M Bertucco 719 Wisconsin (W) | | X | |
| C White 800 Clinton (W) | X | | Conditional support with use of barriers (safety of children) |
| S Ranney 720 S Grove (W) | X | | Conditional support: parking prohibited, bumpouts removed, curves between Harlem and Oak Park Ave expanded to accommodate bikes and cars |
| J Gonzalez 931 Home (W) | X | | |
| M O'Malley 800 Wisconsin (W) | | | Commented on status of Jackson between Harlem & Oak Park Ave |
| <u>February 25, 2013 Meeting</u> | | | |
| L Perkovic 612 S Grove (W) | | X | Jackson is not good option. Traffic, speed & geometry are issues. Madison (road diet) is better alternative. |
| G Yanos 701 Wisconsin (W) | X | | Consider modifying curves at Harlem & Oak Park Ave |
| S Ranney 720 S Grove (W) | X | | Conditional support (see above) |
| J Katovich 733 Wenonah (W) | X | | |
| S McNulty 711 S Maple (W) | | X | |
| C Chesney 634 Clinton (W) | X | | Conditional opposition: dedicated bike lane that is protected could be solution |
| S Saraceno 725 S Kenilworth (S) | X | | Conditional support: not at expense of safety of children |
| K Vogt 733 S Kenilworth (S) | | X | |
| MP Sullivan 825 Home (S) | | X | |
| D Shinglman 734 Wisconsin (S) | | X | Supports bumpouts. |
| M O'Malley 800 Wisconsin (S) | | X | Conditional opposition: if means removing bumpouts. |

W – received in written format

S – spoke at Commission meeting

Juliano, Jill

From: LIZBETH J LEMKE [l-lemke@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 8:13 PM
To: Juliano, Jill
Subject: Comments re. bike lanes on Jackson Blvd.

Dear Jill,

I was unable to be at the transportation commission meeting last night, so I am sending this message to provide my comments, as a homeowner on Jackson Blvd., about the proposed bicycle lanes between Harlem and Oak Park Avenues. As someone who lives on Jackson between Harlem and Oak Park Avenues, I am very familiar with the street and don't believe you will find vehicle parking on Jackson to be an impediment to bike lanes. However, that is not to say there isn't a problem, it's just that the problem isn't parking -- it's too much vehicular traffic (which likely is a reason residents along Jackson seldom park their cars there).

The best thing the village could do to encourage residents to utilize bike lanes on Jackson, and make installing them a worthwhile project, would be to simultaneously take steps to divert vehicular traffic away from Jackson. You may not be aware that Jackson is routinely used by motorists to drive east or west across the village either en route to or en route from the Eisenhower expressway, rather than utilizing the expressway itself, or a more appropriate street like Madison, to drive from one side of the village to the other.

Jackson is entirely residential, with the exception of a few parks and schools, but the persistent vehicular traffic detracts from the residential character of the street and poses safety issues for bicycle riders.

During nice weather, I often sit on my front porch and have observed bicycle riders struggling with the traffic on Jackson. For example, last summer I observed a group of four bicycle riders stop before proceeding around the curve just west of Oak Park Avenue in order to let a stream of cars pass by before they continued. Clearly, they were concerned about getting hit by a car while they cycled around the curve. My children are older now, but if I was a parent of young children, I would not take them on a family bike ride on Jackson, as there is too much traffic.

Don't get me wrong -- I am in favor of bike lanes. However, I am not in favor of the village continuing to let Jackson be used for motor vehicle traffic it clearly was not designed to handle and which detracts from its residential character, negatively affecting home values. I believe the installation of the bike lanes gives the village an opportunity to develop and implement plans to divert traffic away from Jackson. Personally, I like the idea of closing off Jackson at Harlem, thereby preventing Jackson from being used as a route to or from the Harlem exit/entrance to the expressway. A park could be installed there, which would greatly enhance that section of Jackson, increase home values along Jackson, and facilitate the use of Jackson for bicycle riding. (And whatever the village does, please remove or replace the ugly yellow-pole median divider on the curve just east of Harlem -- it is an eyesore and a blight on the neighborhood.)

In summary, I think bike lanes on Jackson are a fine idea, and parking shouldn't be a problem. However, taking steps to reduce traffic on Jackson probably is an essential ingredient in making the project worthwhile. I encourage the village to take steps in conjunction with installing the bike lanes to reduce motor vehicle traffic on Jackson. Doing so will enhance residents' use and enjoyment of their properties along Jackson and help increase home values, in addition to facilitating the use of Jackson as a bicycle route.

Thank you,

Liz Lemke
733 S. Grove Ave., O.P.
708-386-9330 or

773-330-1604 (cell)

Margaret Bertuccio

3/10/2013

Dear Ms. Juliano,

Regarding Jackson Blvd. as a bike route, I feel this is a poor choice. I am a bicyclist as well as a nearby resident.

First, you need to look at the traffic / at 5 pm on a weekday. Cars are backed up from Harlem to Home Avenue.

The gridlock at Harlem + Jackson is treacherous for cyclists.

The bump-outs along Jackson Blvd. would further impede safe cycling. Driving is also made more dangerous by these protrusions because turning right necessitates (in most cases) the car to migrate over the center line into opposing

Margaret Bertuccio

lane. We have long waits until traffic clears.

I suspect that traffic surveys are initiated flat times of low traffic - such as Sunday morning.

Unless parkways are paved for bicycle lanes, I believe Jackson Blvd. would be too dangerous.

Harrison St. or Adams St. are low traffic alternatives.

Please plan bicycle routes that provide safer and less-trafficked streets.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly
Margaret Bertuccio

Juliano, Jill

From: Colleen White [colleen_white@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, April 20, 2013 7:09 PM
To: Juliano, Jill
Cc: terry_white@comcast.net
Subject: Proposal to install bike lanes along Jackson Blvd.

Dear Ms. Juliano,

The streets along Jackson Boulevard from Harlem Avenue to Oak Park Avenue are heavily used by children traveling to and from school, whether they attend Lincoln, Brooks, or Ascension.

As homeowners, who have lived on the corner of Jackson and Clinton for the last 14 years, we have witnessed children nearly getting hit by vehicles traveling at speeds above the posted speed limit. We have witnessed near miss accidents, and actual accidents, due to various moving violations including, vehicles passing on the right, while vehicles were making left turns.

The bulbouts were installed at the corners along Jackson to slow traffic, and to prevent the types of accidents that we have witnessed, and they have been successful. In addition, we frequently park our vehicles on Jackson to help slow the traffic.

We are not opposed to removing the bulbouts, and restricting parking along Jackson, in order to install designated bike lanes, as long as the lanes include the use of barriers. If the bike lanes are only designated with painted white lines and without barriers, Jackson will again be unsafe for the children in this neighborhood. We trust that the village will not put the children of this neighborhood at risk.

Thank you,

Colleen and Terry White
800 Clinton Avenue

4/22/2013

Juliano, Jill

From: Stevan Ranney [stevan@ranney.ws]
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2013 3:44 PM
To: Juliano, Jill
Cc: himself@vincebray.com
Subject: Bike Lane on Jackson between OP Ave and Harlem Ave

Let me reiterate my position on bike lanes.

My opinion is that bike lanes on Jackson are viable under these conditions:

1. Parking is prohibited on Jackson
2. The sidewalk curbs at the intersections are cropped to be in line with the rest of the street
3. The four curves between OP Ave and Harlem are expanded to accommodate bikers and cars turning at the same time

Thank you for your consideration.

Stevan Ranney
720 S Grove Ave
Oak Park, IL 60304
h: 708 524 0704

4/22/2013

Juliano, Jill

From: Joan Gonzalez [jvgonzalez_1@yahoo.com]

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2013 8:35 AM

To: Juliano, Jill

Subject: Dedicated Bike Lanes on Jackson

Dear Jill:

I understand that the Village is considering construction of dedicated bike lanes on Jackson Avenue. I support this recommendation.

Oak Park residents would benefit from a safe network of dedicated bike lanes to help travel around the Village of Oak Park. My middle school and high school children travel on their bikes to get to school. I always worry about them because the Village says they cannot ride their bikes on the sidewalks due to their age and that there is a fear that walkers will be injured. Yet, the Village has made no safe dedicated bike lanes for them to use so the bikers will not get hurt by vehicles which I believe has an even higher probability of serious injuries.

Jackson Blvd would be a perfect road to travel across Oak Park from the east and west. The north part of Oak Park has the dedicated bike lanes and we would like to also have safe bike lanes on the south side of Oak Park as well.

Thank you for considering making these much needed improvements to Jackson Blvd. Improvements that will be able to be used by many tax payers in Oak Park.

Sincerely,

Joan Gonzalez
931 Home Ave.
Oak Park, Illinois 60304

4/22/2013

Juliano, Jill

From: Michael [michaeloms@covad.net]

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2013 2:06 PM

To: Juliano, Jill

Jill Juliano – Transportation Engineer
& Oak Park Transportation Commission

Re: Jackson Blvd bike path
Transportation Committee meeting, April 22, 2013

Dear All,

I attended the Trans. Commission meeting in February to speak re: the Jackson Bike path and the removal of the bump-outs to accommodate bike traffic.

I was struck by the commission's seeming lack of familiarity with Jackson between Oak Park and Harlem – they seemed unaware of the volume and speed of the traffic on that section of Jackson.

As I am writing this - Saturday 4/20 around 2:00 pm, west bound traffic on Jackson is backed up from the light at Harlem to the midway point between Wisconsin and Wenonah. That's almost three blocks. When traffic isn't jammed speeding is a frequent occurrence. The posted limit is 25 mph but 35 and 40 mph is not unusual. There is only one stop sign on that half- mile stretch of Jackson, and in my eight years in this neighborhood I have not seen one traffic stop by an Oak Park police officer.

Jackson is a completely residential street and would make a terrific site for a bike lane. Unfortunately the Village, for whatever reason, has allowed Jackson to become a thruway. To restrict parking (which on the weekends is helpful in calming traffic) and remove the bump outs (which were placed to mitigate speeding and passing on Jackson) would seriously jeopardize pedestrian safety and the safety of bicyclists.

Sincerely

Michael O'Malley
800 Wisconsin Ave
Oak Park

Trading instructions sent via e-mail may not be honored. Please contact our office at 773-202-0050 or Securities America, Inc. at 800-747-6111 for all buy/sell orders. Please be advised that communications regarding trades in your account are for informational purposes only. You should continue to rely on confirmations and statements received from the custodian(s) of your assets. The text of this communication is confidential, and use by any person who is not the intended recipient is prohibited. Any person who receives this communication in error is requested to immediately destroy the text of this communication without copying or further dissemination. Your cooperation is appreciated. Securities offered through Securities America, Inc. Advisory services offered through Blyth & Associates Financial Services. Securities America, Inc. and Blyth & Associates are separate entities.

4/22/2013

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 PM.

Respectively submitted

Jill Juliano, Transportation Engineer