## VILLAGE OF OAK PARK TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING <br> MONDAY, JUNE 12, 2017-7:00 PM COUNCIL CHAMBERS - VILLAGE HALL <br> AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Non-agenda Public Comment - up to 15 minutes
3. Agenda Approval
4. Approval of Draft Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes
4.1 Draft May 10, 2017 Transportation Commission meeting minutes
5. PETITION TO UPGRADE TO ALL-WAY STOP SIGNS AT FOREST AND GREENFIELD
5.1 Staff Agenda Item Commentary and Background Information
5.2 Petition and Letter of Explanation
5.3 Submitted Written Public Testimony
5.4 Aerial View of the Intersection
5.5 Sketch of the Traffic Controls in the Area
5.6 Directional Speed and Volume Data for the 931 \& 1000 Blocks of Greenfield Street and the 1000 Block of Forest Avenue
5.7 Greenfield Street \& Forest Avenue Collision Diagram
5.8 Letter to Area Residents
6. CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRAFFIC CALMING TOOLBOX
6.1 Staff Agenda Item Commentary
6.2 Background Information
6.3 Update Scoring Table
6.4 Updated Table Of Traffic Calming Options
6.5 November 26, 2012 Draft Speed Table Policy
6.6 Updated Petition Form
7. CONFIRM FUTURE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING DATES
7.1 Staff Agenda Item Commentary
7.2 Transportation Commission Meeting Availability Poll Results
8. Adjourn

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

## Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Jack Chalabian called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM
Present: Jack Chalabian, Kyle Eichenberger, Joel Schoenmeyer, Michael Stewart and James Thomas. Roya Basirirad came in shortly after meeting began.

Staff: Mike Koperniak, Jill Velan, Bill McKenna, Dorothy Benson-Baker, Dave Jacobson, Peter Pilafis

Excused Absence: Craig Chesney

## CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRAFFIC CALMING TOOLBOX

Michael Koperniak gave a brief presentation on continued development of the traffic calming toolbox.
Chair Chalabian spoke about existing speed tables on Marion and Woodbine and what the negative impacts are.

Sergeant Jacobson explained that they are not major impacts for the Oak Park Police Department.
Deputy Fire Chief Pilafis expressed the issues are with humps. He explained there will be a slower response time for patient care in ambulances; emergency workers need to get to fires and patients as soon as possible. Next, he expressed that staff already has to deal with cul-de-sacs and one-way streets.

Chair Chalabian mentioned there are other communities with speed humps. He asked has anyone reached out to them.

DFC Pilafis explained that speed humps with axle gaps would work. He continued that the Village of Oak Park Fire Department tries to deal with them but does not want to set a precedent.

Bill McKenna spoke about how we tried the speed humps with axle gaps on East Avenue but did not see any positive impacts, so they were removed.

DFC Pilafis reiterated the Fire Department's views about the humps and how they slow response times.
Sgt. Jacobson commented how one or two speed humps in the Village does not affect their operations in cars. But if they proliferate, then it would start to cause problems. Perhaps we should cap the number of them in the Village.

Commissioner Eichenberger asked if the OP Police Dept. has run times and how they vary across the Village.

DFC Pilafis responded on behalf of the Fire Department that they do have data. But asked that we keep in mind that it only takes one time that it could have an impact. Fire currently works around the existing traffic calming measures. We have to get to an emergency scene as safe as possible in as short a time as possible.

Commissioner Schoenmeyer asked what the Toolbox should include and how many traffic calr | $0617-1$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.1 | measures have we done on adjacent streets.

Commissioner Stewart spoke on how we are trying to develop criteria so that we put them in only when they are needed. He added that staff often hears about speed situations and the lack of enforcement and there is a tradeoff between slowing traffic year-round versus the not common fire calls. We need to look at trade-off factors and should be able to use them if warranted.

Commissioner Thompson agreed with Commissioner Stewart. He added perhaps we should only put these traffic calming measures on residential streets and not on collectors or arterials.

Commissioner Stewart suggested these humps could be put mostly along streets near borders.
Bill McKenna added we need to look at the existing traffic calming measures on adjacent streets and how they affect.

There was a discussion about the locations of existing speed humps and tables.
Chair Chalabian asked Bill McKenna what are the Public Works challenges.
Bill McKenna explained most are minor impacts. There is only one major impact. Staff can clear streets, however, it adds challenges to leaf-pickup, snow removal and street cleaning.

Commissioner Basirirad questioned what distinguishes between minor or major impacts.
Bill McKenna explained that the Public Works Department looked at efficiencies of operations and how they are affected by the existing traffic calming measures.

Commissioner Basirirad continued questioning if there were a standard with an acceptable minimum number of speed humps.

Sgt. Jacobson stated that the expectation is that people will want them more and more speed bumps. This will start to affect operations. We have to balance response times versus if we should put a cap and move them around.

Dorothy Benson-Baker inputted that administration staff gets a volume of phone calls about speed bumps and if these are offered publicly, the residents will definitely ask for them more frequently.

Commissioner Thompson suggested we proceed incrementally and see what happens. We can always pull back when necessary.

Bill McKenna expounded further on how residents will be asking for them and how difficult it would be to limit their use.

Chair Chalabian spoke about the speed table policy and how it was implemented. He added we need to manage public expectations.

DFC Pilafis spoke on when staff worked at Linden and East, did we look along North Avenue to see how effective traffic calming measures have been or were we trying to push traffic to arterial streets.

There was a brief discussion about the Jackson and Kenilworth fire-the police and fire response timesand how it killed the Transportation Commission's recommendation at that time.

Chair Chalabian spoke about how the Commission does hear from the public about speeding and police response. But speed reduction is only temporary. Maybe we don't want to put in so many traffic calming measures that it affects operations, however, we need to balance the use of the traffic calming measures.

Bill McKenna responded that if the Transportation Commission wants to pursue not recommenter | $0617-1$ |
| :---: |
| 4.1 | measures, then staff will have to present its non-support when it goes to Village Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Eichenberger responded that in the end, the resident needs to know what their options are and they have to let the Trustees know.

Chair Chalabian explained that Transportation Commission is the Village Board of Trustee's sounding board. People want to live in area with a good quality of life. The Transportation Commission's role is to hear all residents' concerns but also has to consider staff's needs as well.

Sgt. Jacobson stated that fire trucks come from fixed locations, while police comes from random areas within the Village during emergency situations.

Bill McKenna explained that we can try to quantify minor negative impact effects to the Public Works Department. We can try to estimate numbers.

There was a brief discussion to review all the traffic calming measures.
For Level 1, it was noted, the Village uses all of these now.
Bill McKenna explained that Bott Dots are not used in cold climates due to snow plowing.
All traffic calming measures were reviewed.
There was a discussion about speed humps, bumps, tables and cushions.
Commissioner Eichenberger asked about the temporary speed cushions on East Ave.
Jill Juliano explained the history of them.
Commissioner Eichenberger inquired if there were temporary ones that could be moved around.
Bill McKenna explained our use and maintenance problems of temporary speed bumps.
There was a discussion about the use of speed trailers.
Mike Koperniak spoke about Level 3 and how the traffic calming measures should indicate which are not bike-friendly.

Then there was a discussion about not bike-friendly traffic calming measures and how to deal with them.
Bill McKenna expressed to the Commission the traffic calming measures that are not recommended by staff and the ones he thought the Transportation Commission should consider.

Chair Chalabian clarified that he supports speed bumps and tables. He mentioned that first responders should use arterials more. However, he agreed with DFC Pilafis that the existing North Avenue traffic calming measures can hinder first responders.

Next, there was a discussion about developing caps on level 3 and 4 traffic calming measures.
Chair Chalabian indicated that in 10 years of working on the Commission no cul-de-sac petitions have succeeded.

| $0617-1$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Commissioner Schoenmeyer spoke on how speed tables are used in other cities and towns. He | 4.1 | inquisitive about what is different about Oak Park. He wondered if there are objections to speed humps by officials in other localities.

Bill McKenna explained opinion most fire officials have is that there are problems with speed humps and tables

The Commission continued discussing speed humps and tables and how to set limitations and guidelines of use of level 3 and 4 measures.

Bill McKenna spoke about how staff will work on streamlining the process.
The Commission indicated that it wants to keep speed humps and tables in the traffic calming toolbox but make them hard to get.

There was a discussion about each of these traffic calming measures: Neckdown/Bulbout, Center Island, Two Lane Choke, One Lane Choke, Round About, Chicane and Lateral Shift.

Now on to level 4. This discussion was about full and partial closures.
Bill McKenna gave staff's perspective and why the staff is against them. Also, it has a fiscal impact to residents. Roosevelt and Madison Districts were trying to keep them off of these streets. If original need goes away, the cul-de-sac still remains.

There was a short discussion why diverters are not recommended by staff. Bill McKenna explained for the same reasons as cul-de-sacs.

There was discussion about keeping the cul-de-sacs and diverters.
Then we discussed about the criteria table. The Commissioners voted unanimously to keep it as is.

Finally, there was a discussion about how and when to implement level 3 and 4 traffic calming measures.
Chair Chalabian asked for the last 10 petitions to score and review them.

Staff will look at revising the petition form and also update the Menu.

Commissioner Eichenberger motioned to adjourn the meeting and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Schoenmeyer.

The voice vote was unanimous to adjourn the meeting.
The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 PM.
Respectively submitted
Dorothy Bensen-Baker
Dorothy Benson-Baker
Administrative Secretary

Village Of Oak Park | $0617-1$ |
| :---: |
| 5.1 |
| $1 / 5$ |

Transportation Commission Agenda Item

## Item Title: Petition To Upgrade To All-Way Stop Signs At The Intersection Of Greenfield Street And Forest Avenue

Review Date: June 12, 2017
Prepared By: Jill Juliano

Abstract (briefly describe the item being reviewed):
On October 19, 2016, the Village of Oak Park received petition to upgrade the Greenfield Street and Forest Avenue intersection from uncontrolled to all-way STOP signs.

At tonight's meeting, the Commission may recommend to approve the petition, recommend to deny the petition, or recommend an alternative solution to address the petitioner's concerns.

## Staff Recommendation(s):

Staff is recommending the installation of bump-outs on Greenfield Street at Forest Avenue crosswalks and the installation of continental crosswalk pavement markings on Greenfield Street for the crosswalks at Forest Avenue.

Supporting Documentation Is Attached

Date: June 9, 2017
To: The Transportation Commission
From: Jill Juliano, Transportation Engineer gg
Re: Background Information Related to the Petition to Install All-Way STOP Signs at the Intersection of Greenfield Street and Forest Avenue

On October 19, 2016, the Village of Oak Park received a petition to upgrade to all-way STOP signs at the intersection of Superior Street and Forest Avenue. Persons representing $67.7 \%$ of the street frontage on the petitioning blocks signed the petition. The petition was certified as a valid petition.

Reasons provided for the petition are: to slow the east-west traffic on Greenfield Street, especially during AM and PM peak hours, cars often pass a vehicle that is traveling at the marked 20 miles per hour (mph) speed limit; low visibility around Lindberg Park, bicyclists and pedestrians are forced into the intersection to see because of shrubs, trees and cars parked in the NO PARKING area, and confusion of traffic patterns along the park.

See Exhibit 5.2 for a copy of the petition and the original letter of explanation which accompanied the petition. See Exhibit 5.3 for copies of the written public testimony received by the Village for this item.

See Exhibit 5.4 for digital aerial photographs of the Greenfield Street and Forest Avenue intersection and the neighboring area. The intersection in question is at the southeast corner of Lindberg Park. It is also one block north and one-two blocks east of the Horace Mann Elementary School / Field Park area.

Exhibit 5.5 shows the traffic control devices on Greenfield Street between Harlem Avenue and Oak Park Avenue as well as the following other east-west streets: LeMoyne Parkway, Berkshire Street and Division Street. Presently, the Greenfield Street and Forest Avenue intersection is an uncontrolled intersection.

The organizer of the petition notified staff that issues with traffic primarily occur when Lindberg Park facilities are in use. Based on this information, the data collection for the traffic study was postponed until the spring of 2017 when the fields at Lindberg Park would be used by the various teams and leagues. The Village obtained the booking schedule for Lindberg Park's facilities from the Park District of Oak Park. The scheduling of the traffic studies were based on the provided Lindberg Park booking calendar.

Twenty-four hour traffic volume count and speed studies were conducted on Thursday, May 11, 2017 and Saturday, May 13, 2017 for the 931 and 1000 blocks of Greenfield

Street and the 1000 block of Forest Avenue. Please see Exhibit 5.6 for a summary of the traffic study results as well as the source data.

Reviewing the 24-hour volumes, the average daily traffic on the 1000 block of Forest Avenue was 373 and 395 vehicles for Thursday and Saturday, respectively. The average daily traffic on the 931 and 1000 blocks of Greenfield Street ranged between 1,399 vehicles and 1,632 vehicles for those same days studied. Volumes on Forest Avenue are below the 800 to 1,200 vehicle range for typical daily volumes on residential streets within the Village of Oak Park. While the vehicle volumes on the 931 and 1000 blocks of Greenfield Street exceeded the typical daily volumes on residential streets within the Village. The elevated volumes on the 931 and 1000 blocks of Greenfield Street are due in part to the traffic generated by people coming to Lindberg Park and the blocks proximity to Harlem Avenue.

Regarding vehicular speeds, it is an accepted traffic engineering practice to set the speed limit to the 5 mile per hour increment above or below the 85 th percentile speed. Village Staff holds the opinion that the majority of drivers will drive at or near the posted speed limit. In addition, it is an accepted fact that the speed indicated on speedometers can vary up to 2 percent above or below the actual speed of the vehicle.

By definition, the 85th percentile speed is the speed at which 85 percent of the vehicles are traveling at or less than. Conversely, 15 percent of the vehicles will be traveling faster than the 85th percentile speed. It has already been stated that speed limits are typically set to the 5 mile per hour increment above or below the 85th percentile speed. This implies that it is expected that approximately 15 percent of vehicles will be traveling faster than the speed limit, if the speed limit is the 5 mile per hour increment below the 85th percentile speed.

Looking at the 85th percentile speeds for the 1000 block of Forest Avenue, the directional speeds for the block for the two days studied ranged between 24 and 25 miles per hour (mph). The weekday data indicated the percentage of vehicles on the 1000 block of Forest Avenue that were traveling faster than the posted 25 mph speed limit ranged between $15.2 \%$ and $15.4 \%$ which is just above the expected $15 \%$ traveling above the speed limit. The weekend data revealed the percentage of vehicles on the 1000 block of Forest Avenue were traveling faster than the posted 25 mph speed limit ranged between $10.8 \%$ and $12.3 \%$ which is below the expected $15 \%$ traveling above the speed limit.

Looking at the 85th percentile speeds for the 931 and 1000 blocks of Greenfield Street, the directional speeds for the two blocks range between 28 mph and 30 mph . Note: this section of Greenfield Street has PARK ZONE 20 mph SPEED LIMIT WHEN CHILDREN ARE PRESENT signs posted on it. On Thursday, May 11, 2017, park facilities were scheduled to be used from $3: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ to $8: 00 \mathrm{pm}$. On Saturday, May 13, 2017, park facilities were scheduled to be used from 8:00am to 6:00pm.

The weekday survey showed that $40.1 \%$ of the eastbound vehicles and $38.2 \%$ of the westbound vehicles on the 931 block of Greenfield Street were traveling faster than the posted 25 mph speed limit. During that same day on the 1000 block of Greenfield Street, the percentage of vehicles traveling faster than the posted 25 mph speed limit was $44.7 \%$ for eastbound traffic and 45.2\% for westbound traffic.

The weekend survey showed that $32.9 \%$ of the eastbound vehicles and $30.1 \%$ of the westbound vehicles on the 931 block of Greenfield Street were traveling faster than the posted 25 mph speed limit. During that same day on the 1000 block of Greenfield Street, the percentage of vehicles traveling faster than the posted 25 mph speed limit was $40.5 \%$ for eastbound traffic and 35.8\% for westbound traffic.

Based on the results of the traffic study, it appears there may be a speeding issue on the 931 and 1000 blocks of Greenfield Street.

The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices lists that STOP signs should not be used for speed control. Studies have shown there is little or no effect on vehicle speeds on residential roads after the installation of STOP signs. Vehicle speeds are reduced within 150 feet of the intersection otherwise the effect of STOP signs on vehicle speeds is negligible. Additionally, some motorists increase their speed to make up for the "inconvenience" of stopping, or make a "rolling stop", or disregard the STOP signs altogether.

Next, thirty-six months of vehicle crash reports covering the period of May 2014 through April 2017 were reviewed for the Greenfield Street and Forest Avenue intersection. Please see Exhibit 6.8 for the collision diagram.

In 1997, the intersection was studied as part of the Village-wide traffic study. At that time, the number of reported crashes at the intersection in the 36 month period totaled zero, while the average daily traffic was 1,692 vehicles. The 1997 crash rate for the Greenfield Street and Forest Avenue intersection was calculated to be 0.00 accidents per million entering vehicles (Acc/MEV).

This crash rate is then compared to the critical crash rate for the particular section of the Village's area-wide traffic study. For the north section of the area-wide traffic study (Augusta Street to North Avenue and Harlem Avenue to Austin Boulevard), the critical crash rate was calculated to be $0.686 \mathrm{Acc} / \mathrm{MEV}$. If an actual accident rate exceeds the critical crash rate then it is highly probable that the accidents were caused by factors other than chance.

The number of reported crashes that occurred at the Greenfield Street and Forest Avenue intersection for the thirty-six months ended April 30, 2017 also totaled zero. The average daily traffic for the intersection as determined as part of this traffic study is 1,822 vehicles. From this data, the 2017 crash rate for the Greenfield Street and Forest Avenue intersection is calculated to be 0.000 Acc/MEV. This crash rate is lower than the critical crash as determined in the area-wide traffic study of 1997 (0.686 Acc/MEV). In conclusion,
there does not appear to be a problem with vehicle crashes at the Greenfield Street and Forest Avenue intersection.

Village Staff is recommending to deny the petition to install all-way STOP signs at the intersection of Greenfield Street and Forest Avenue based on the results of the crash analysis, traffic study and the fact that STOP signs should not be used for speed control.

Instead Village Staff recommends:

1. Installation of bump-outs on Greenfield Street at the Forest Avenue crosswalks to act as a traffic calming device.
2. Installation of continental crosswalk pavement markings on Greenfield Street at the Forest Avenue crosswalks for increased visibility of the crosswalks across Greenfield Street at this intersection.

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Transportation Commission to recommend to the Oak Park Board of Trustees that traffic regulations be established in the $\qquad$ 1000 N . block of Forest Ave. in the Village of Oak Park, illinois. We further petition the Commission to regulate traffic in this manner: 3. way stop sign with crosswalk marked at intersection of north forest Ave + Greenfield St.


This petition should be signed by residents representing-atleast $51 \%$ of the street frontage where the traffic regulations are being requested. Also, ATTACH A LETTER EXPLAINING WHY THIS PETITION IS BEING REQUESTED.

Return to: The Transportation Commission, Attention: Jill Juliano, The Village of Oak Park, Public Works Center, 201 South Boulevard, Oak Park, IL. 60302

The Transportation Commission is an advisory body to the Village Board of Trustees and meets on the fourth Monday of each month at 7:00 p.m. in Village Hall to discuss matters relating to parking and traffic. Upon receipt of your completed signed petition, the circulator will be advised as to when the Commission will meet to review this petition.

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Transportation Commission to recommend to the Oak Park Board of Trustees that traffic regulations be established in the $\qquad$ 1000 N . block of forest Ave in the Village of Oak Park, Illinois. We further petition the Commission to regulate traffic in this manner. 3. Way stop sigh with crosswalk marked at intersection of North forest Are + Greenfield St.

$$
\text { pg. } 2
$$

* = This petition is being circulated by: (list name, address and telephone number)


22. $\qquad$
23. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
04 $\qquad$
$\qquad$
25 $\qquad$
20 $\qquad$
24 $\qquad$
$\qquad$ 28 $\qquad$ 49 $\qquad$
$\qquad$
This petition should be signed by residents representing at least $51 \%$ of the street frontage where the traffic regulations are being requested. Also, ATTACH A LETTER EXPLAINUNG WHY THIS PETITION IS BENG REQUESTED.

Return to: The Transportation Commission, Attention: Jill Juliano, The Village of Oak Park, Public Works Center, 201 South Boulevard, Oak Park, IL 60302

The Transportation Commission is an advisory body to the Village Board of Trustees and meets on the fourth Monday of each month at 7:00 p.m. in Village Hall to discuss matters relating to parking and traffic. Upon receipt of your completed signed petition, the circulator will be advised as to when the Commission will meet to review this petition.

To whom it may concern:
This letter is written on behalf of the residents of 1000-1050 N. Forest Ave, together with 1046 N. Belleforte and 1047 N. Woodbine to request the placement of a 3-way stop sign and marked crosswalks at the intersection of Forest Ave and Greenfield St. in Oak Park, IL.

A stop sign is necessary to slow the east/west bound traffic on Greenfield St. Traffic moves above the posted speed limit, and especially during commute times, disregards the presence of children. It has become extremely dangerous, cars are often passing each other if someone does travel the marked 20 mph , further endangering anyone attempting to navigate the intersection.

Marked crosswalks are absolutely necessary to help pedestrians and cyclist safely cross onto the park's pathways. There is low visibility all around the park, but especially at these sloped areas. Bikers and pedestrians are forced to walk into the intersection because of the amount of shrubs and trees and cars parked in the no parking area.

We believe the stop signs are necessary to make clear there is an intersection at Forest and Greenfield. Cars are frequently parked or waiting in a no parking area to drop off kids, watch games etc....this blocks the view from the park path. Cyclists and children trying to cross are forced into the street seeking safe passage. A loading only zone further west on Greenfield St. would be an ideal solution to this, but not at the intersections with bike paths.

A stop sign is necessary on Forest Ave because of the confusion of traffic patterns along the park. People are often pulling in, going around, commuting too quickly. A clearly marked 3-way stop would help everyone arrive at their destinations safely.


First people ignore the no parking signs, and make visibility from path difficult.

Sometimes they pull up to drop off and just block the path.


On cold day or early evening they park in front of the path (part of the intersection) and watch the entire game.

As cars are busy pulling in and out of the always busy park....the street traffic is usually speeding and aggressively passing. It's a very dangerous combination.


Thank you for your time,

Elaine Spoerer
1047 Forest Ave
Oak Park, IL 60302

From:
nickas@wellsfargo.com

Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:

Monday, June 05, 2017 11:13 AM
Juliano, Jill
KNICKAS@travelers.com
Stop signs at Greenfield and Forest

Jill - I live at 1030 Forest Ave with my wife, Kristiana and two small children, Andrew and Abby. I would like to submit my support for adding the all-way stop signs at the corner of Greenfield and Forest. Greenfield is often used as a bypass to North and Division (East-West travel). Therefore, there are many drivers, especially during rush hour, going faster than the speed limit. Lindberg park is also very busy at nights and on weekends for sports leagues and games at the park, making it a very dangerous combination, especially for families with smaller children crossing the street. The stop sign on Forest would help too, to avoid confusion and people speeding down Forest and not looking both ways/not coming to a complete stop when turning left or right. Thanks for your consideration.

## Steven Nickas

Senior Vice President \& Credit Officer
Corporate Banking Group
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. | 10 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 1300 | Chicago, IL 60606
MAC N8405-222
Tel 312-762-9009 | Cell 312-498-5518
nickas@wellsfargo.com
Attention: This email may be an advertisement or solicitations for products and services: If you wish to unsubscribe from marketing emails from a Wells Fargo Commercial Banking representative, reply to this email and type "Unsubscribe" in the subject line. To be removed from marketing e-mails from other Wells Fargo subsidiaries, reply to this email and type "Remove" the subject line. Neither of these actions will affect delivery of important service messages regarding your accounts that we may need to send you or preferences you may have previously set for other e-mail services. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

[^0]https://www.wellsfargo.com/com/disclaimer/ged5

From:
Dan Browne [DBrowne@forestagency.com](mailto:DBrowne@forestagency.com)
Sent:
Monday, June 05, 2017 11:19 AM
To:
Juliano, Jill
Subject:
Stop sign at Forest and Greenfield

Hi ,
I would oppose a year round stop sign.
I would support a stop sign April through October (or whenever park sports use ends).
I would also support a slower speed - 20 vs. 25 mph .

Your letter did not mention the reason for the request- has there been accidents or people hurt?
Dan Browne, CIC, AAI, CPIA
Forest Agency Insurance, Since 1957
1038 Belleforte, OP
708-383-9000 or 689-8803 direct
www.forestagency.com
www.facebook.com/ForestAgencylnsurance
Chicago Magazine's 5 Star Top Home /Auto Professional Consistent Award Winner
I challenge you to find a more Insurance educated agency!

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Albert Iammartino [iammartino@ameritech.net](mailto:iammartino@ameritech.net)

Good Am, Ms Juliano
We are responding to request for comments regarding 3 way stop at Greenfield and Forest. Both my wife Joyce and I strongly support the 3 way stop.Cars and to some degree service vehicles regularly use westbound Greenfield as a raceway especially worse when there are only a few parked cars along the park.I personally walk that route daily at various times and witness this driving behavior all too often. Sadly, some of these drivers are local.
The situation has worsened since stop signs were placed on NS Woodbine at Greenfield as autos "gun it "as they turn $R$ (westward) onto Greenfield.
It is equally as dangerous when Greenfield, Forest , and Belleforte are parked-up during baseball and soccer games and cars esp SUV's,
"race" around a congested area looking for spaces and dropping and picking up players and spectators.
We are 35 year neighbors and appreciate the opportunity to make our views known.
As an aside, we hear the screeching of brakes regularly as cars also race Southward down Woodbine and meet eastwest Greenfield traffic..perthaps 4 way stop is needed here instead of just 2 way on Greenfield.
Thank you in advance for your consideration,
Al and Joyce lammartino
1104 Woodbine





Fish Transportation Group
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Fish Transportation Group
801 South Blvd Suite 5
Oak Park, IL 60302

1000 BLK Forest Avenue


| Start | 0 | 11 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | Total |
| 05/11/17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 01:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 07:00 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| 08:00 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 09:00 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 10:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 11:00 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 12 PM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 14:00 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 15:00 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 17:00 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 18:00 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 19:00 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 20:00 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 11 | 18 | 33 | 61 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 |
| Percent | 7.6\% | 12.4\% | 22.8\% | 42.1\% | 13.1\% | 1.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |
| Daily |  |  | centile : centile : centile : centile : | 13 M 20 M 25 M 28 M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean Spe 10 MPH Nu Pe | rage) : <br> Speed : <br> Pace : <br> Pace : | $\begin{array}{r} 20 \mathrm{M} \\ 16-25 \mathrm{M} \\ 65 . \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | of Vehicle of Vehicle | MPH : <br> MPH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |







0617-1



0617-1



| Start | 0 | 11 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | Total |
| 05/13/17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 07:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 09:00 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 10:00 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 11:00 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 12 PM | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 14:00 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 15:00 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 16:00 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 17:00 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 19:00 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 20:00 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 21:00 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 17 | 21 | 51 | 54 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 |
| Percent | 10.4\% | 12.9\% | 31.3\% | 33.1\% | 6.7\% | 5.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |
| Daily | 15th Percentile : |  |  | 12 M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 50th Percentile : |  |  | 19 M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 85th Percentile : |  |  | 24 M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 95th Percentile : |  |  | 30 M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean Speed(Average) : |  |  | 19 M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 10 MPH Pace Speed: |  |  | 16-25 M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Number in Pace : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percent in Pace : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Number of Vehicles > 25 MPH :Percent of Vehicles > 25 MPH : |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 12.3\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | $0617-1$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  | 5.8 |
|  |  | $1 / 1$ |
| The Village of Oak Park | 708.383 .6400 |  |
| Village Hall | Fax 708.383 .9584 |  |
| 123 Madison Street | TTY 708.383.0048 |  |
| Oak Park, Illinois 60302-4272 | village@vil.oak-park.il.us |  |

June 1, 2017
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { TO: } & \text { RESIDENTS OF THE } 1000 \text { BLOCK OF BELLEFORTE AVENUE } \\ & \text { RESIDENTS OF THE } 931 \& 1000 \text { BLOCKS OF BERKSHIRE STREET } \\ & \text { RESIDENTS OF THE } 1000 \text { BLOCK OF FOREST AVENUE } \\ & \text { RESIDENTS OF THE } 931 \& 1000 \text { BLOCKS OF GREENFIELD STREET } \\ & \text { RESIDENTS OF THE } 1000 \& 1100 \text { BLOCKS OF WOODBINE AVENUE }\end{array}$
RE: PETITION TO UPGRADE TO ALL-WAY STOP SIGNS AT THE INTERSECTION OF GREENFIELD STREET AND FOREST AVENUE

## Dear Resident:

The Village of Oak Park has received a petition to install all-way stop signs at the intersection of Greenfield Street and Forest Avenue.

The Transportation Commission is scheduled to review this petition at its upcoming public meeting being held at 7:00 PM on Monday, June 12, 2017, in the Council Chambers of Village Hall.

You are invited to attend this public meeting to give testimony. If you wish to comment but are unable to attend, you may submit your comments in writing to the undersigned by U.S. mail, by email at jjuliano@oak-park.us, or by fax to (708) 434-1600. All comments must be received by Wednesday, June 7, 2017 at 5:00pm for inclusion in the Commission's agenda.

A copy of the Transportation Commission's agenda will be posted on the Village of Oak Park's website (www.oak-park.us) on Friday, June 9th for public review and inspection.

Sincerely,
THE VILLAGE OF OAK PARK

## gill Guliano

Jill Juliano, P.E.
Transportation Engineer
Village of Oak Park
Public Works Center
201 South Boulevard
Oak Park, IL 60302

# Village Of Oak Park <br> 1 

Transportation Commission Agenda Item

| Item Title: Continued Development of the Traffic Calming Toolbox |
| :--- | :--- |
| Review Date: $\quad$ June 12, 2017 |
| Prepared By: $\quad$ Mike Koperniak |
| Abstract (briefly describe the item being reviewed): |
| Tonight's meeting is a continuation of the Transportation Commission's work plan item <br> to develop a traffic calming toolbox for use to more effectively address traffic calming <br> petitions that are brought before it. |
| Staff Recommendation(s): |
| For tonight's meeting, the Commission will conduct (1) will review and approve the |
| updated and revised Criteria Scoring Detail table, (2) will review and approve the |
| updated and revised table of available traffic calming measures, (3) review the draft |
| November 26, 2012 speed table policy, and (4) review and discuss the existing and |
| updated petition forms. |

# Memorandum 

Date: June 12, 2017

To: The Transportation Commission
From: Mike Koperniak, Staff Liaison M K
Re: $\quad$ Continuation in the Development of a Traffic Calming Toolbox

Included in this agenda item are several exhibits for review and consideration.

Exhibit 6.3 shows the revised draft criteria detail as approved by the Transportation Commission at its May 22, 2017 meeting. The Pedestrian Traffic Generators scoring criteria was modified to clarify the applicable score for generators more than one block away from the petition area. The Bike Routes / Non-Bike Routes scoring criteria types were modified to have the same wording as found in the Village's 2008 Bike Plan and 2015 Bike Plan Addendum.

Exhibit 6.4 shows the updated table of available traffic calming measures as approved by the Transportation Commission at its May 22, 2017 meeting. The use of flashing stop signs was added to the Level 1 - No Traffic Flow Changes traffic calming options. The use of Centerline Botts Dots / Raised Pavement Markers in the Level 2 Some Traffic Flow Changes traffic calming options was changed to "Not Recommended By Staff" due to their sustained use not being guaranteed due to the Village's snow plowing operations. The use of Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacons (RRFB) was added to Level 3 - Significant Traffic Flow Changes traffic calming options. The struckthroughs for the check marks in the columns were removed.

Exhibit 6.5 shows the draft speed table policy as approved by the Transportation Commission at its November 26, 2012 meeting. For various reasons unknown to this author, this draft speed table policy was never presented to the Village Board of Trustees. It is now being included here (and should be included in the traffic calming toolbox) because the Transportation Commission is recommending the inclusion of speed humps and speed tables as options in the traffic calming toolbox. The policy section entitled "How to request a speed table" should be revised to conform to the new process by which the Transportation Commission recommends the use of a speed table from the traffic calming toolbox. The existing policy section allows for the direct petitioning of speed tables.

## Memorandum

Exhibit 6.6 shows the existing, and soon to be retired, petition for traffic regulations and its replacement petition for traffic calming measures. Revisions to the petition include:

- The petition title has been changed from PETITION FOR TRAFFIC REGULATIONS to PETITION FOR TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES in order to indicate that the purpose of the petition is to request the implementation some type or types of traffic calming options to remedy traffic problems instead of requesting a specific traffic calming option.
- A field to enter the date when the petition was started has been added to the petition form.
- The section of the petition dealing with the location of where the traffic calming option(s) should be implemented has been expanded to explicitly indicate if the petition is for a street segment or for a street intersection.
- The section of the petition whereby the residents indicate to the Commission the specific manner by which traffic should be regulated has been removed. It was removed because the Transportation Commission will now be recommending the use of one or more traffic calming options as found in the traffic calming toolbox. The role of choosing of a specific traffic calming option has been transferred from the petitioners to the Transportation Commission.
- A section has been added to the petition whereby the petitioners can indicate the types of traffic problems the petition seeks to remedy. In addition, the petitioner is being requested to rank the traffic problems from most to least problematic. This will give the Commissioners a concise idea of the reason(s) why the petition has been submitted.

The replacement petition as shown should be signed by residents representing at least 51 percent of the street frontage where the traffic calming measures are being requested. The soon to be retired petition comes in two varieties, one requiring 51 percent signatures and another requiring 75 percent signatures.

The petition for 75 percent signatures has been used for traffic regulations that would fall under Level 3 - Significant Traffic Flow Changes or Level 4 - Street Closures traffic calming options. These are more severe and expensive traffic calming options.

## Memorandum

Questions that need to be discussed and answered include:

1. Now that the choice of traffic calming measures will be made by the Transportation Commission, what criteria should be used to determine if a petition should require 51 percent or 75 percent signatures? Or should only one percentage be used?
2. The November 26, 2012 draft speed table policy indicates that that installation of a speed table should be 100 percent taxpayer funded by the properties on the petitioning block. Should this requirement be kept for the traffic calming toolbox? If so, should the same requirement be used for other Level 3 and 4 traffic calming options. Or should some combination of public / private payment be used?
3. As an extension of the above question, staff is recommending that the Transportation Commission, as part of the development of the traffic calming toolbox, should discuss with the Village Board of Trustees and come to an agreement as to how level 3 and 4 traffic calming options should be paid for. Should they be 100 percent petitioner funded, or 100 percent Village funded, or some combination of the two. The outcome of this discussion can then be incorporated into the traffic calming toolbox.

This is to avoid the situation in which the Transportation Commission publically recommends to the Village Board an expensive traffic calming measure that potentially the Village Board cannot or does not want to pay for. And if the Village Board does want to expend money on the option it will then have to decide if it should be paid for from the current budget or added to next year's budget.


Traffic Calming Measures as reviewed and recommended by the Village of Oak Park's Fire, Police, and Public W Departments in March 2017 and reviewed by the Transportation Commission on May 10 and 22, 2017

| Types of Traffic Calming Measures that can be used by the Transportation Commission to address resident generated petitions for traffic calming / controls | No impacts |  |  | Minor negative impacts / can work around |  |  | Major negative impacts / opposed to |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fire | Police | Public Works | Fire | Police | Public Works | Fire | Police | Public Works |
| Level 1 - No Traffic Flow Changes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Targeted Speed Enforcement (Page 1) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Speed Radar Trailer (Page 1) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Speed Feedback Sign (Page 2) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Centerline / Edgeline Lane Striping (Page 2) | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| Optical Speed Bars / Speed Reduction Markings (Page 3) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Signage (Page 3) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Speed Limit Signage (Page 4) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| STOP / YIELD Signage (Page NA) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Flashing Stop Signs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Speed Legend (Page 5) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Speed Limit Pavement Markings (Page 6) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High Visibility Crosswalks (Page 7) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Educational Community Involvement (Page 8) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 2 - Some Traffic Flow Changes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sign Turn Restrictions/Turn Movement Restrictions (Page 9) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Angled Parking (Page 7) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Parking Strategies (Page 10) |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Textured Pavement (Page 11) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Rumble Strip (Page 11-12) | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| Centerline Botts Dots Raised Pavement Markers (Page 5) Not Recommended by Staff | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | V | , |  |  |  |
| Level 3 - Significant Traffic Flow Changes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Neckdown / Bulbout (Page 13) - NBF | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Center Island Narrowing / Pedestrian Refuge (Page 14) | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| One-Lane and Two-Lane Chokers (Page 15 and 16) - NBF | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacons (RRFB) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chicane (Page 19) | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Lateral Shift (Page 20) |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Realigned Intersection (Page 21) |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Medians \& Partial Medians (Page 22) |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Speed Hump Page 23) Min Numemmmended by Staff |  |  |  |  | , | V | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Speed Table Page 26) Now recmmended by Staff |  |  |  |  | V/ | , | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Raised Crosswalk Page 28) Not recommended by Staff |  |  |  |  | V | , | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Raised Intersection (Page 29) = Not recommended by Staft |  |  |  |  | Viz | V | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Level 4 - Street Closures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Barrier (Page 34) |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Forced Turn Island (Page 35) |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| One-Way and Two-Way Street Conversion (Page 36) |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| One-Way Couplet Conversions (Page 37) |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Full Closure (Page 30) Notrecommended by Staff |  |  |  |  |  | V | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Partial closure Page 31 ) Nourecommended by Staff |  |  |  | Viz | Kiz | , |  |  |  |
| reviewed by the three Village departments in March 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| reviewed by the Transportation Commission on May 10, 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| reviewed by the Transportation Commission on May 22, 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NBF = Not Bicycle Friendly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## How to Request a Speed Table

a. A petition request must be submitted and signed by the residents epresenting at least $51 \%$ or the street frontage on the block on which the sped table will be installed.
b. The "Speed Table Pollos" will only apply to local st eets as d of Oak Park's Comprehensive Plan.
c. Blocks having a limited number of pur es that are adjacent properties (parks, schools, etc.), wil're ire a letter of suppo representative of the non-resid thial propens for the petition
d. Petitioners will be notifi $\quad$ as to the estimated shand cost of installation of a spe a table. Cost for the installation or the s

This section needs to be revised to conform to the process by which the Transportation Commission recommends the use of a speed table from the Traffic Calming Toolbox. $100 \%$ taxpayer anded by the properties on the petitioning bock.
e. The Der artment of Public Works will solicit input from Police and Denutments for their recommendations regarding the petitioning bloc'(s).

The Department of Public Works will initiate the collection of traffic data after petition has been validated.

## Initial Collection of Traffic Data

a. Staff will perform traffic speed and volume studies which may take up to three (3) months to complete depending on weather conditions.
b. Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes must exceed 850 vehicles per 24 -hour period and the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile vehicle speed must exceed 27 miles per hour in order to qualify for speed tables.
c. If volume and speed criteria are not met, residents will be notified of the situation. The residents may petition for an alternative solution.
d. If the volume and speed criteria are met, Village staff will start the process of installing temporary speed tables on the petitioning block.

## Temporary Installation and Final Collection of Traffic Data

a. Temporary speed table(s) will be installed on the petitioning block(s).
b. Within six months of the temporary speed table installation, additional traffic data will be collected to evaluate the effectiveness of said device.

## Transportation Commission and Village Board Review

a. Traffic data results from before and after the temporary speed table installation will be presented to the Transportation Commission for their review and recommendation to the Village Board as to the installation of a permanent speed table.
b. The Village Board of Trustees will review the Transportation Commission recommendation and make a determination as to the installation of a permanent speed table.

## Permanent Installation

a. Staff will make a determination as to the design of the speed table on the petitioned block.
b. The installation of speed tables is subject to the availability of funding. Those blocks not meeting the above criteria will be considered for alternative measures where appropriate.
c. Permanent speed table will be installed on petitioned block(s).

## General Notes:

1. Due to resource constraints, no more than three (3) blocks during any year will be eligible for temporary speed tables.
2. Maintenance of speed tables will be funded through the Public Works Department.

| We, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Transportation Commission to recommend to t | $0617-1$ <br> 6.6 <br> Park Board of Trustees that traffic regulations be established in the |
| :--- | :---: | Park Board of Trustees that traffic regulations be established in the block of $\qquad$ in the Village of Oak Park, Illinois.

We further petition the Commission to regulate traffic in this manner: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

* = This petition is being circulated by: (list name, address and telephone number)

Name
Address and Phone No.

1. $\qquad$
2. 
3. 

Existing and soon to be
5. retired petition form
6.
7.
8. $\qquad$
9.
10. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.

This petition should be signed by residents representing at least $51 \%$ of the street frontage where the traffic regulations are being requested. Also, ATTACH A LETTER EXPLAINING WHY THIS PETITION IS BEING REQUESTED.

Return to: The Transportation Commission, Attention: Jill Juliano, The Village of Oak Park, Public Works Center, 201 South Boulevard, Oak Park, IL 60302

The Transportation Commission is an advisory body to the Village Board of Trustees and meets on the fourth Monday of each month at 7:00 p.m. in Village Hall to discuss matters relating to parking and traffic. Upon receipt of your completed signed petition, the circulator will be advised as to when the Commission will meet to review this petition.

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition the Transportation Commission to recommend to the Oak Park Board of Trustees that traffic calming measures be implemented:
$\qquad$ block of $\qquad$ or
at the intersection of $\qquad$ and $\qquad$ in the Village of Oak Park.

Traffic problems to be remedied by the use of traffic calming measures include:

- Excessive vehicle crashes
- Excessive vehicle speeds $\qquad$ ( rank these in order of importance with 1
- Excessive vehicle volumes $\qquad$ being most problematic and 5 being least
- Pedestrian/Bicyclist safety issues $\qquad$ problematic)
- Other $\qquad$
$\qquad$
* = This petition is being circulated by: (list name, address, and telephone number)


This petition should be signed by residents representing at least $51 \%$ of the street frontage where the traffic calming measures are being requested. Also, ATTACH A LETTER EXPLAINING WHY THIS PETITION IS BEING SUBMITTED.

Return to: The Transportation Commission, Attention: Jill Juliano, The Village of Oak Park, Public Works Center, 201 South Boulevard, Oak Park, IL 60302.

The Transportation Commission is an advisory body to the Village Board of Trustees and meets on the fourth Monday of each month at 7:00 p.m. in Village Hall to discuss matters relating to parking and traffic. Upon receipt of your completed signed petition, the circulator will be advised as to when the Commission will meet to review this petition.
$0617-1$
Village Of Oak Park

## Transportation Commission Agenda Item

| Item Title: Continued Development of the Traffic Calming Toolbox |
| :--- | :--- |
| Review Date: $\quad$ June 12, 2017 |
| Prepared By: $\quad$ Mike Koperniak |
| Abstract (briefly describe the item being reviewed): |
| The Transportation Commission members were recently polled about their availability <br> for future meetings during the months of June through October inclusive. The poll <br> inquired about meeting twice per month. All of the Commissioners have now responded <br> as to their availability for each meeting. The results of the poll are attached. |
| Staff Recommendation(s): <br> Review the poll results and confirm its accuracy at the June 12th meeting. After <br> confirmation, the poll results will be presented to the Village Board of Trustees for its <br> use. <br> Supporting Documentation Is Attached |

poll taken on 05/25/2017

| replied on |  | Mon | Mon | Mon | Mon | Mon | Mon | Mon | Mon | Mon |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Jun 12 | Jun 26 | Jul 24 | Jul 31 | Aug 28 | Sep 11 | Sep 25 | Oct 9 | Oct 23 |
| 05/31/17 | Chesney | ? | ? | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| $\begin{aligned} & 05 / 25 / 17 \\ & 05 / 25 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | Chalabian | n | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
|  | Eichenberger | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| 05/25/17 | Stewart | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | n | y |
| 05/29/17 | Schoenmeyer | y | n | y | n | y | y | y | n | y |
| 05/26/17 | Thompson | y | y | y | n | y | y | y | y | y |
| 05/25/17 | Basirirad | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
|  | is a quorum? | quorum | quorum | quorum | quorum | quorum | quorum | quorum | quorum | quorum |

$y=$ available
$\mathrm{n}=$ not available


[^0]:    This electronic communication is subject to a disclaimer, please click on the following link or cut and paste the link into the address bar of your browser.

