



SPECIAL REMOTE MEETING AGENDA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION – February 8, 2022 at 7:00p.m.

A Special Remote Meeting will be conducted with live audio and optional video of participants. The meeting will be available live at <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81401700437> and archived online for on-demand viewing at www.oak-park.us/commissiontv the following day. Remote meetings are authorized pursuant to Section 7(e) of the Illinois Open Meetings Act. The Village President has determined that an in-person meeting is not practical or prudent due to the COVID-19 outbreak during Governor J.B. Pritzker's current disaster proclamation. It is also not feasible to have persons present at the regular meeting location due to public safety concerns related to the COVID-19 outbreak.

- 1) Call to Order / Roll Call
- 2) Agenda Approval
- 3) Approval of the Draft Transportation Commission Remote Meeting Minutes
 - 3.1) January 11, 2022 Draft Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes
- 4) Non-Agenda Public Comment

Public statements of up to three minutes may be made in person or writing. Written comments will be read into the record at the meeting. To comment, email a request to transportation@oak-park.us, indicating an intent to speak at the meeting or including a statement to be read into the record. Requests must be received no later than 30 minutes prior to the start of the meeting. Written comments also may be placed in the Oak Park Payment Drop Box across from the south entrance to Village Hall, 123 Madison St., no later than the day prior to the meeting.

- 5) New Business
 - a) None
- 6) Old Business
 - a) Review Effectiveness of Existing Citizen Petition Process / System for Implementing Traffic Calming Measures and then Modifying or Replacing Them if Warranted – Work Plan item
 - b) Recommend to the Village Board Revised Principles and Goals for the Village's Transportation System Network – Work Plan item
- 7) Adjourn

If you require assistance to participate in any Village program or activity, contact the ADA Coordinator at 708.358.5430 or email ADACoordinator@oak-park.us at least 48 hours before the scheduled activity.

DRAFT Meeting Minutes
Transportation Commission
Tuesday, January 11, 2022 – 7:00 PM
Remote Participation Meeting

1. Call to Order

Transportation Commission Chair Ron Burke called the remote participation meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

Staff Liaison Jill Juliano read the following statement into the record:

"The Village President has determined that an in-person meeting is not practical or prudent due to the COVID-19 outbreak during Governor J.B. Pritzker's current disaster proclamation. It is also not feasible to have persons present at the regular meeting location due to public safety concerns related to the COVID-19 outbreak."

Roll Call

Present: Camille Fink, Garth Katner, Meghann Moses, Aaron Stigger, James Thompson, Ron Burke

Absent: None

Staff: Parking & Mobility Services Manager Sean Keane, Parking Restrictions Coordinator (PRC) Cinthya Redkva, Staff Liaison Jill Juliano

Ryan Peterson resigned from the Transportation Commission in December 2021 and the Citizen Involvement Commission is evaluating potential candidates for his replacement.

2. Agenda Approval

Chair Burke recommended that Agenda Item 6b be moved ahead of 6a as it is time sensitive.

Commissioner Stigger made a motion to approve the agenda as amended. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Stigger, Fink, Katner, Moses, Thompson, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

3. Approval of the Draft November 9, 2021 Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Thompson requested clarification regarding next steps for the 500 block of S Cuyler Ave since the Commission did not support staff's recommendation made at the last meeting. Staff replied that the motion still goes to the Village Board at the January 18 meeting as a Motion to Concur with the Transportation Commission to not add the parking to that block.

Commissioner Thompson made a motion to approve the draft November 9, 2021 Transportation Commission meeting minutes. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Thompson, Fink, Katner, Moses, Stigger, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

4. Non-Agenda Public Comment

None

5. New Business

5a) STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE PARKING PILOT PROGRAM

Parking & Mobility Services Manager Keane provided background information on the Parking Pilot Program before presenting the results of the Parking Pilot Survey. He detailed staff's three recommendations: 1) extend time and implement a dynamic fee structure for pay-by-plate parking, 2) simplify and standardize daytime restrictions, and 3) improve access to night permit parking. Questions from the Commissioners were answered by staff following the explanation of each recommendation and it was determined that the Commission would vote on each recommendation individually. Below is a summary of the questions and staff responses.

Recommendation 1:

Q: Why does staff think extending meters to 8pm is best? A: To promote higher turnover in front of businesses and encourage those parking for longer periods of time to park in parking garages.

Q: Why not create designated loading zones or 15-minute spaces in front of businesses?

A: We've received that feedback before and that would be a separate conversation. The goal of extending the meters is to prevent the monopolization of these prime spaces, particularly during the busiest times.

Q: What additional areas would be under this new regulation if approved? A: It would primarily affect future pay-by-plate parking areas because most of our meters are in areas where this was already implemented.

Q: Before this goes to the Board, should you try to get feedback from the Chamber of Commerce? A: We did send a separate survey to about 400 businesses, as well as the Chamber of Commerce and Downtown Oak Park but did not receive the level of feedback that we wanted. We are open to getting more feedback if that's what the Commission would like.

Q: What's your response to the people who say that extending the meters will stop them from going to these businesses? A: Perhaps having more feedback from the business community would help us respond to these comments. In general, Oak Park is bikeable and walkable, so people don't have to drive.

Q: What's your response to those who are concerned that this will push people to park on residential streets where they don't have to pay to park? A: That would need to be addressed on a case-by-case basis, but residents could petition to have resident permit parking only.

Q: Is \$1 enough to incentivize folks to turn over the parking, which is the stated goal? A: This is a good question to pose, but we focused on what was tested in the Pilot. There will be a discussion with the Village Board in February regarding Pilot Program and fees will be addressed.

Recommendation 2:

Q: For blocks that currently have no restrictions other than overnight parking, would it remain that way or would this restriction be added? A: Blocks that don't have it would remain with no restrictions.

Q: What is the Village's plan to educate residents about this exemption since people are obviously not aware of it? A: We have current email addresses for almost every vehicle license holder so as part of our annual renewal notices that go out, we would make a concerted effort to inform residents of this benefit. We could also do other education through social media and our website.

Q: The exemption only works on your own block, right? A: That's correct.

Q: Can this realistically be enforced and has Parking Enforcement weighed in on this? A: We are never going to be able to enforce every parking restriction, every hour of every day. It is more of a tactic for compliance. Parking Enforcement has weighed in on the Pilot Program as a whole.

Q: Will this be easier to enforce? A: It would be easier to monitor the 3-hour areas because the device that's used to scan the plate automatically shows if the person has a vehicle license. If they know right away, they can start chalking the plates.

Q: It doesn't tell you how long they've been parked, though. You need to chalk them to keep track of that? A: Yes, it's by plate so they need to chalk the plate, but then when they go back they can see if the car has moved from the previous address where they were parked.

Q: In terms of phasing, what about the North side of the Village? A: The North side of the Village would be covered in 2023 since it is the area with the fewest restrictions.

Q: You mentioned that this wouldn't apply to certain existing parking restrictions. Can you provide more detail? Are you saying that parking spots that are already reserved for schools or hospitals wouldn't change? A: Exactly, we have teacher parking for some of the schools, residential daytime permits in areas where there is a consistent problem with business parking-those would remain in place.

Q: What other types of areas would this not override? A: No parking here to corner and 15-minute parking are other examples. We're basically just changing the time restrictions, so any block that has no parking 8-10, 1-hour, or 2-hour parking would change to 3-hour to standardize the time.

Recommendation 3:

Q: How did you decide which areas were expanded? A: The zones are what is identified as being eligible to purchase the permit for overnight parking. We did not recommend any changes to the zones.

Q: What criteria make a street eligible for overnight parking permits? A: Currently, the street frontage must be within 750 feet of a property that's zoned R-7 multi-family. So, what this would be doing is adding it to all blocks that are already within these permitted zones.

Q: If I live in Y2 and have an overnight parking pass, under the new regulations I could park in Y4 or Y3 as well as Y2? A: We're proposing the zones remain the same, so if you fall within the Y2 boundary, you would be eligible to park on any street frontage within the current Y2 boundary. It wouldn't be a mix.

Q: We're still going to have gaps in the overall Village map of where people can park? A: Yes, but those blocks are primarily single-family areas.

Q: Why are some blocks that are also primarily, or even exclusively, single-family homes included in the zones while others aren't? A: The zones were designed with density in mind, so the areas that have increased density may be the areas where the zone is extended into single-family areas.

Q: How does this look for the whole Village? It depends on the zone, but the intention is to make it easier for those that already have a permit to park.

Q: Under this proposal, anyone who holds an overnight parking permit can park anywhere in their zone? A: That's correct, and it will create overnight parking spaces in front of single-family homes which is not current practice.

Q: Do staff have the resources to evaluate the zones or should that be a separate initiative that could be revisited? A: This would be a big undertaking, but the conversion will also take time. The Commission could recommend adding overnight permit parking on all streets within the zones and then separately request that the zones be changed.

Following the presentation, the Commission discussed the following topics:

- Concerns regarding expanding overnight permit parking to blocks that are solely single-family homes
- Evaluating the zones to ensure that they all accurately reflect the needs of the residents and that the criteria used to determine the zones is still relevant
- Offering free short-term parking to encourage turnover and pushing longer term parking to the garages
- How to best address the growing need for short-term parking
- Adding information to the 3-hour parking signs to help educate residents about the vehicle license exemption

Staff clarified the language for the first vote.

Commissioner Stigger made a motion to support staff's first recommendation with the caveat that staff look at strategies for short-term drop-off and pick-up parking. It was seconded by Commissioner Thompson.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Stigger, Thompson, Fink, Katner, Moses, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

Commissioner Katner made a motion to support staff's second recommendation. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Katner, Fink, Moses, Stigger, Thompson, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

Commissioner Thompson made a motion to support staff's third recommendation. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Thompson, Fink, Katner, Stigger, Burke

Nays: Moses

The motion passed 5 to 1.

6. Old Business

6b) REVIEW EFFECTIVENESS OF EXISTING CITIZEN PETITION PROCESS / SYSTEM FOR IMPLEMENTING TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES AND THEN MODIFYING OR REPLACING THEM IF WARRANTED- WORK PLAN ITEM

Staff Liaison Juliano presented a spreadsheet previously requested by the Commission that showed the proposed scoring table applied to eight petitions that were previously presented to the Commission. Based on the updated criteria, any new petitions would need to score 25 or more points to move forward and eventually be presented to the Commission. She explained how the critical crash rate for an intersection and portable radar signs could be used as pre-screening tools to help quickly determine which petitions should proceed to the scoring table.

Commissioner Moses requested confirmation that staff currently doesn't present petitions to the Commission that don't meet the minimum criteria. Staff responded that while that's correct, all petitions submitted so far have met the minimum criteria. The difference with the proposed scoring sheet is that the criteria are different. For instance, previously if your petition met the 51% bar it needed to even be looked at, you would automatically have 13 points out of the 25. That was a much lower bar than what is being proposed.

Staff suggested that the scoring table could also be used as a prioritization tool but cautioned that a plan should be in place to determine what would happen if a petition has been repeatedly pushed due to higher priority petitions.

Chair Burke requested that staff determine the appropriate pre-screening criteria (based on data availability and what makes sense) and apply it to the backlog of petitions that need to be dealt with regardless. That information would then be presented to the Commission to help evaluate the effectiveness of the pre-screening approach as it is difficult to do without examples.

Staff responded that the backlog of petitions would fall under the old system and need to be treated as such and that a consultant will be coming to help work through those petitions. However, the process could be applied to other petitions to help provide examples for the Commissioners to review at a future meeting. Staff also clarified that there will be some allowances made when petitions come in for adjacent streets. Those would be combined for efficiency even if they are at different stages in the process, so the process may not always be strictly followed.

6a) RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE BOARD REVISED PRINCIPLES AND GOALS FOR THE VILLAGE'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM NETWORK- WORK PLAN ITEM

The Commission decided to defer this item to the next meeting due to the late hour.

7. Adjourn

With no further business, Commissioner Stigger made a motion to adjourn the meeting. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Stigger, Fink, Katner, Moses, Thompson, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 6 to 0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:11 PM.

Submitted by:

Anna Muench

Customer Service Representative II

Village of Oak Park
Transportation Commission Agenda Item

Item Title: Review the Effectiveness of the Existing Citizen Petition Process / System for Implementing Traffic Calming Measures and Then Modifying or Replacing Them If Warranted
Review Date: <u> February 8, 2022 </u>
Prepared By: <u> Jill Juliano </u>
Abstract (briefly describe the item being reviewed): The approved 2021 Transportation Commission Work Plan includes an item entitled: <u>Review the effectiveness of the existing citizen petition process / system for implementing traffic calming measures and then modifying or replacing them if warranted.</u> This item was carried over from the approved 2021 Work Plan. This work plan item is scheduled to be completed by the 1st quarter of 2022. At its January 11, 2022 meeting, the Transportation Commission discussed the updated proposed scoring table and came to a general consensus this version would be part of their recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees on this matter. The Commission asked staff to come back prescreening criteria and apply it to submitted petitions. The presented information will help the Commission evaluate the effectiveness of the prescreening approach. Staff has provided the requested information and data for tonight's meeting.
Staff Recommendation(s): The Commission to review and deliberate the two prescreening tools as recommended by staff. Based on this discussion, either make a recommendation to be forwarded to the Village Board of Trustees or ask for more information from staff, if necessary.
Supporting Documentation Is Attached

Memorandum

0222-1
6a.1
2/3

Date: February 3, 2022

To: The Transportation Commission

From: Jill Juliano, Transportation Engineer JJ

Re: Background Information Related Review the Effectiveness of the Existing Citizen Petition Process/System for Implementing Traffic Calming Measures and Then Modifying or Replacing Them If Warranted

At the January 11th meeting, the Transportation Commission reviewed the most recent version of the updated scoring table and came to a general agreement that the January 11, 2022 version of the scoring table should be recommended to the Village Board of Trustees. See Exhibit 6a.2 for the proposed scoring table, the test case spreadsheet (detailing how eight previously submitted petitions would have scored under the revised system), and the current scoring table as approved by the Village Board on November 6, 2017.

Next, the Commission turned its attention to reviewing the prescreening aspect of the proposed traffic calming petition process. Although described in general terms, the Commission requested staff to provide recommendations for the prescreening tools as well as supply examples so they can see how the tools work for sample locations.

The two steps that staff propose for use in the prescreening process are: comparing the location's crash rate to that area's critical crash rate and reviewing collected vehicle speed data to the location's speed limit.

Regarding the crash component, staff receives crash data in GIS format with limited attributes for each crash/data point. Staff can gather the GIS information for crashes that occur at the location of interest. With the volume data collected from the portable speed radar signs, staff can calculate the crash rate for the particular location, an intersection for example. Staff will then compare that crash rate to the critical crash rate calculated as part of the 1997 - 1999 Village of Oak Park Area-Wide Traffic Studies. The significance of the critical crash rate is: if an actual crash rate exceeds the critical crash rate then there is a 99% chance that the accidents were caused by factors other than chance. Critical crash rate is a standard tool used in the traffic engineering discipline. Staff recommends any location with a crash rate that exceeds the critical crash rate for that area automatically continue onto the next phase, the scoring table, for further processing and consideration.

The second component is to collect vehicle speed and volume data via the Village's portable speed radar signs. The volume data is used to compute the crash rate for the location as previously mentioned. The speed data is used to determine the 85th percentile speed for vehicles traveling through the location of interest. It is an accepted traffic engineering practice to set the speed limit to the 5 mile per hour (mph) increment above or below the 85th percentile speed. And then compare the calculated 85th percentile speed for the location to the posted speed limit. If the 85th percentile speed is at least one mile per hour

Memorandum

0222-1
6a.1
3/3

above the posted speed limit, then the location should continue onto the next phase for processing and consideration.

The Commission has already discussed their desire to have the requirement of any petitioned location with a crash involving a pedestrian or bicyclist, or a crash with injuries, automatically continue to the next phase of the process.

Additionally, any petition that is screened out as part of the prescreening process, staff will review and implement appropriate low level traffic calming measures to help mitigate the traffic issues at that location.

Exhibit 6a.3 is a spreadsheet showing the results of the prescreening tools for the same eight test cases used for the proposed scoring table.

Exhibit 6a.4 is a table from one of the sections of the Village's Area-Wide Traffic Study (south middle section – from South Blvd to I-290). The table lists information for the intersections in that section including: traffic control type, date installed, number of crashes, average daily traffic and intersection crash rate. Interior and perimeter intersections are segregated. The critical crash (accident) rate calculation is shown on the page 8 of Exhibit 6a.4 and is only for the interior intersections. Madison St intersections are not included in the calculation but all other interior streets are. The Village used a k value of 2.576 or 99% level of confidence.

Measure	Maximum Number of Points	Proposed at 01-11-2022 Trans Com Meeting Criteria Detail	Minimum Possible Score
Crash History	25	1 correctible crash in a 3 year period = 5 points 2 correctible crashes in a 3 year period = 10 points 3 correctible crashes in a 3 year period = 15 points 4 correctible crashes in a 3 year period = 20 points 5 or more correctible crashes in a 3 year period = 25 points any correctible crash involving injury to a pedestrian/cyclist = 5 points	0 pts.
Vehicle Speed	25	85th percentile speed is less than 2 mph over the speed limit = 0 points 85th percentile speed is 2 mph over the speed limit = 5 points 85th percentile speed is 3 mph over the speed limit = 10 points 85th percentile speed is 4 mph over the speed limit = 15 points 85th percentile speed is 5 mph over the speed limit = 20 points 85th percentile speed is 6 mph or more over the speed limit = 25 points outlier excessive speeding = 5 points	0 pts.
Vehicle Volume	25	ADT < 1,000 = 0 points ADT = 1,001 - 1,500 = 5 points ADT = 1,501 - 2,000 = 10 points ADT = 2,001 - 2,500 = 15 points ADT = 2,501 - 3,000 = 20 points ADT > 3,000 = 25 points	0 pts.
Pedestrian Traffic Generators	15	Any school, park, library, church, transit station 1 block (660 ft.) or less away = 5 points Any school, park, library, church, transit station 1 to 2 blocks (1,320 ft.) away = 3 points Any school, park, library, church, transit station more than 2 blocks away = 0 points	0 pts.
Bike Routes / Non-Bike Routes	10	Not identified as a proposed Bike Route or Boulevard* = 0 points Identified as a Marked Shared Lane* = 6 points Identified as a Neighborhood Greenway, Dedicated Bike Lane or Bike Boulevard* = 10 points * Per the VOP Bike Plan 2008 and 2015 VOP Bike Plan Addendum	0 pts.
Maximum Score	100	Mininum score necessary to submit petition to the Transportation Commission for review and recommendation = 25 points (minimum required)	0 pts.

Applying Criteria to score reviewed items by the Transportation Commission

Measure	Maximum Number of Points	DRAFT Criteria recommended by Staff as of 01/11/2022	0116-1 & 0416-1 upgrade to all-way-stop signs at Thomas and Lombard		1114-1 upgrade to all-way stop signs at Randolph and Grove		1013-1 upgrade to all-way stop signs at Van Buren and Carpenter		0318-1 upgrade to all-way stop signs at Adams and Kenilworth		0318-1 upgrade to all-way stop signs at Iowa and Cuyler		0918-1 traffic calming on the 1200 block of N Taylor		0419-1 traffic calming at Lexington and Kenilworth		0121-1 traffic calming on the 800 block of N Cuyler	
			value	score	value	score	value	score	value	score	value	score	value	score	value	score	value	score
Crash History	25	1 correctible crashes in a 3 year period = 5 points 2 correctible crashes in a 3 year period = 10 points 3 correctible crashes in a 3 year period = 15 points 4 correctible crashes in a 3 year period = 20 points 5 or more correctible crashes in a 3 year period = 25 points any correctible crash involving injury to a pedestrian/cyclist = 5 points	1 ^a	5	3 ^a	15	5 ^a	25	0 ^a	0	0 ^a	0	0 ^{d,e}	0	0 ^a	0	0 ^{d,e,i}	0
Vehicle Speed	25	85th percentile speed is less than 2 mph over the speed limit = 0 points 85th percentile speed is 2 mph over the speed limit = 5 points 85th percentile speed is 3 mph over the speed limit = 10 points 85th percentile speed is 4 mph over the speed limit = 15 points 85th percentile speed is 5 mph over the speed limit = 20 points 85th percentile speed is 6 mph or more over the speed limit = 25 points outlier excessive speeding = 5 points	26 ^b	0	25.5 ^b	0	22.5 ^h	0	27.0 ^b	5	25.0 ^b	0	29.0 ^d	15	24.5 ^b	0	29.0 ^d	15
Vehicle Volume	25	ADT < 1,000 = 0 points ADT = 1,001 - 1,500 = 5 points ADT = 1,501 - 2,000 = 10 points ADT = 2,001 - 2,500 = 15 points ADT = 2,501 - 3,000 = 20 points ADT > 3,000 = 25 points	1799 ^c	10	3878 ^c	25	792 ^c	0	587 ^b	0	1380 ^b	5	689 ^d	0	1959 ^b	10	391 ^b	0
Pedestrian Traffic Generators	15	Any school, park, library, church, transit station 1 block (660 ft.) or less away = 5 points Any school, park, library, church, transit station 1 to 2 blocks (1,320 ft.) away = 3 points Any school, park, library, church, transit station more than 2 blocks away = 0 points	5+3+3	11	5+5+3	13	3+3+3	9	3+3+3	9	5+3+3	11	5	5	5+3+3+3	14	5+5+3+3	16
Bike Routes / Non-Bike Routes	10	Not identified as a proposed Bike Route or Boulevard* = 0 points Identified as a Marked Shared Lane* = 6 points Identified as a Neighborhood Greenway, Dedicated Bike Lane or Bike Boulevard* = 10 points * Per the VOP Bike Plan 2008 and 2015 VOP Bike Plan Addendum	neighborhood greenway	10	0	0	neighborhood greenway	10	neighborhood greenway	10	0	0	neighborhood greenway	10	0	0	neighborhood greenway	10
Maximum Score	100	Mininum score necessary to submit petition to the Transportation Commission for review and recommendation = 25 points (minimum required)		36		53		44		24		16		30		24		41

- Notes:
- a = crashes at intersections
 - b = 4-leg entering volumes and 85th percentile speeds
 - c = 4-leg entering volumes
 - d = 2-way midblock volumes, speeds, crashes
 - e = includes crashes at both intersections at the end of the road segment
 - f = 9 month crash history
 - g = 24 month crash history
 - h = 2-leg entering speeds
 - i = collector street

Measure	Maximum Number of Points	Criteria for assigning a numerical score to traffic problems to be corrected by the use of Traffic Calming Measures - as approved by the Village Board of Trustees on November 6, 2017 -	minimum possible score																																																																																														
Crash History	20	1-3 correctible crashes in a 3 year period = 5 points 4-10 correctible crashes in a 3 year period = 10 points more than 10 correctible crashes in a 3 year period = 15 points any correctible crash involving injury to a pedestrian/cyclist = 5 points	0 pts.																																																																																														
Vehicle Speed	20	85th percentile speed is not over the speed limit = 0 points 85th percentile speed is 1 mph over the speed limit = 4 points 85th percentile speed is 2 mph over the speed limit = 8 points 85th percentile speed is 3 mph over the speed limit = 12 points 85th percentile speed is 4 mph over the speed limit = 16 points 85th percentile speed is 5 mph or more over the speed limit = 20 points outlier excessive speeding = 5 points	0 pts.																																																																																														
Vehicle Volume	20	ADT < 750 = 0 points ADT = 751 - 1,350 = 5 points ADT = 1,351 - 1,950 = 10 points ADT = 1,951 - 2,550 = 15 points ADT > 2,550 = 20 points	0 pts.																																																																																														
Pedestrian Traffic Generators	15	Any school, park, library, church, CTA station 1 block (660 ft.) or less away = 5 points Any school, park, library, church, CTA station 1 to 2 blocks (1,320 ft.) away = 3 points Any school, park, library, church, CTA station more than 2 blocks away = 0 points	0 pts.																																																																																														
Bike Routes / Non-Bike Routes	10	Not identified as a proposed bike route/boulevard* = 3 points Identified as a Marked Shared Lane* = 6 points Identified as a Neighborhood Greenway, Dedicated Bike Lane, or Bike Boulevard* = 10 points * Per the VOP Bike Plan 2008 and 2015 VOP Bike Plan Addendum	3 pts.																																																																																														
Community Interest	15	<p>Final Score = Base Score (+10 to +15 points) minus External Negative Support Score (-1 to -5 points) Exteral Negative Score is from responses from outside of the affected petition zone.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="537 1310 1235 1541"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">51% petitions</th> <th colspan="4">75% petitions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>51%</td> <td>-</td> <td>59%</td> <td>= 10 points</td> <td>75%</td> <td>-</td> <td>78%</td> <td>= 10 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60%</td> <td>-</td> <td>68%</td> <td>= 11</td> <td>79%</td> <td>-</td> <td>82%</td> <td>= 11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69%</td> <td>-</td> <td>77%</td> <td>= 12</td> <td>83%</td> <td>-</td> <td>86%</td> <td>= 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>78%</td> <td>-</td> <td>86%</td> <td>= 13</td> <td>87%</td> <td>-</td> <td>90%</td> <td>= 13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>87%</td> <td>-</td> <td>95%</td> <td>= 14</td> <td>91%</td> <td>-</td> <td>94%</td> <td>= 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>96%</td> <td>-</td> <td>100%</td> <td>= 15</td> <td>95%</td> <td>-</td> <td>100%</td> <td>= 15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="667 1577 1105 1808"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2"></th> <th colspan="2">% of negative replies</th> <th colspan="2">Subtract</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2"></td> <td colspan="2">Less than 10 or 16 replies</td> <td>=</td> <td>- 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="5">If at least 10 or 16 replies are received, subtract points based upon the percentage of replies that are negative</td> <td>1%</td> <td>-</td> <td>20%</td> <td>=</td> <td>- 1 point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21%</td> <td>-</td> <td>40%</td> <td>=</td> <td>- 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>41%</td> <td>-</td> <td>60%</td> <td>=</td> <td>- 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>61%</td> <td>-</td> <td>80%</td> <td>=</td> <td>- 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>81%</td> <td>-</td> <td>100%</td> <td>=</td> <td>- 5 points</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	51% petitions				75% petitions				51%	-	59%	= 10 points	75%	-	78%	= 10 points	60%	-	68%	= 11	79%	-	82%	= 11	69%	-	77%	= 12	83%	-	86%	= 12	78%	-	86%	= 13	87%	-	90%	= 13	87%	-	95%	= 14	91%	-	94%	= 14	96%	-	100%	= 15	95%	-	100%	= 15			% of negative replies		Subtract				Less than 10 or 16 replies		=	- 0 points	If at least 10 or 16 replies are received, subtract points based upon the percentage of replies that are negative	1%	-	20%	=	- 1 point	21%	-	40%	=	- 2	41%	-	60%	=	- 3	61%	-	80%	=	- 4	81%	-	100%	=	- 5 points	10 pts. (5 pts. with minimum petition score + maximum external negative support)
51% petitions				75% petitions																																																																																													
51%	-	59%	= 10 points	75%	-	78%	= 10 points																																																																																										
60%	-	68%	= 11	79%	-	82%	= 11																																																																																										
69%	-	77%	= 12	83%	-	86%	= 12																																																																																										
78%	-	86%	= 13	87%	-	90%	= 13																																																																																										
87%	-	95%	= 14	91%	-	94%	= 14																																																																																										
96%	-	100%	= 15	95%	-	100%	= 15																																																																																										
		% of negative replies		Subtract																																																																																													
		Less than 10 or 16 replies		=	- 0 points																																																																																												
If at least 10 or 16 replies are received, subtract points based upon the percentage of replies that are negative	1%	-	20%	=	- 1 point																																																																																												
	21%	-	40%	=	- 2																																																																																												
	41%	-	60%	=	- 3																																																																																												
	61%	-	80%	=	- 4																																																																																												
	81%	-	100%	=	- 5 points																																																																																												
Maximum Score	100	Mininum score necessary to submit petition to the Transportation Commission for review and recommendation = 25 points (minimum required)	13 pts.																																																																																														

DRAFT Staff Recommended Prescreening Tools as of 02/08/2022		0116-1 & 0416-1 upgrade to all-way- stop signs at Thomas and Lombard	1114-1 upgrade to all-way stop signs at Randolph and Grove	1013-1 upgrade to all-way stop signs at Van Buren and Carpenter	0318-1 upgrade to all-way stop signs at Adams and Kenilworth	0318-1 upgrade to all-way stop signs at Iowa and Cuyler	0918-1 traffic calming on the 1200 block of N Taylor	0419-1 traffic calming at Lexington and Kenilworth	0121-1 traffic calming on the 800 block of N Cuyler
		intersection	intersection	intersection	intersection	intersection	road segment	intersection	road segment
1	Section of Area-Wide Traffic Study Location is Located in	North	South Middle	South Middle	South Middle	North Middle	North	South	North
2	Critical Crash Rate for Location	0.686 Acc/MEV	1.029 Acc/MEV	1.029 Acc/MEV	1.029 Acc/MEV	0.860 Acc/MEV	0.686 Acc/MEV	0.945 Acc/MEV	0.686 Acc/MEV
3	Crash Rate for Location (2016 - 2020)	0.351 Acc/MEV	0.283 Acc/MEV	0.000 Acc/MEV	1.870 Acc/MEV	0.794 Acc/MEV	0.761 Acc/MEV	0.559 Acc/MEV	2.192 Acc/MEV
4	Is Location Crash Rate Higher Than Critical Crash Rate?	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
5	Are There Any Crashes Involving Bicyclists or Pedestrians; or Crashes Causing Injuries?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
6	85th Percentile Vehicle Speeds for Location (Source: Scoring Table)	26 mph	25.5 mph	22.5 mph	27 mph	25.0 mph	29 mph	24.5 mph	29 mph
7	Posted Speed Limit At Location	25 mph	25 mph	25 mph	25 mph	25 mph	25 mph	25 mph	25 mph
8	Is Location Speed At Least 1 Mile Per Hour Higher Than Posted Speed Limit?	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
9	Is There a Yes In Rows 4, 5 or 8 for the Location?	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
10	If Yes in Row 9, Petition to Continue to Scoring Table. If No in Row 9, Petition is Prescreened Out	Continue to Scoring Table	Prescreened Out	Prescreened Out	Continue to Scoring Table	Prescreened Out	Continue to Scoring Table	Prescreened Out	Continue to Scoring Table

South Blvd. to I-290 Traffic Study

Crashes at Interior Intersections- No Pedestrians Involved

For the Study Period of Jan. 1995 - Dec. 1997

0222-1
6a.4
1/8

Intersection	Location	Traffic Controls	Date Controls Installed	Traffic Ratio	# of crashes	ADT	Acc Rate Acc./MEV
ADAMS and CLARENCE	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		E-W 1.60:1	6	1,367	4.01
VAN BUREN and CARPENTER	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		E-W 1.80:1	4	1,002	3.65
WASHINGTON and EUCLID	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 4.17:1	48	12,279	3.57
MONROE and CLINTON	Interior	E-W Stop	7/27/98	E-W 1.30:1	5	1,287	3.55
WASHINGTON and WISCONSIN	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 5.24:1	48	12,583	3.48
MONROE and WISCONSIN	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		E-W 1:1	3	792	3.46
ADAMS and LYMAN	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		E-W 1.01:1	5	1,328	3.44
VAN BUREN and HUMPHREY	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		N-S 2.71:1	5	1,573	2.90
VAN BUREN and WESLEY	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		E-W 3.79:1	8	2,534	2.88
ADAMS and WISCONSIN	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		E-W 1.66:1	6	1,911	2.87
SOUTH BLVD. and SCOVILLE	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 7.71:1	15	5,103	2.68
PLEASANT and ELMWOOD	Interior	N-S Yield	12/31/94	E-W 2.02:1	5	1,774	2.57
WASHINGTON and KENILWORTH	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 6.64:1	31	12,744	2.22
PLEASANT and TAYLOR	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		N-S 1.09:1	3	1,235	2.22
VAN BUREN and GUNDERSON	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		E-W 2.32:1	4	1,663	2.20
RANDOLPH and WESLEY	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		E-W 2.38:1	6	2,498	2.19
WASHINGTON and HARVEY	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 11.9:1	21	8,899	2.16
VAN BUREN and HARVEY	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		E-W 3.18:1	4	1,740	2.10
ADAMS and TAYLOR	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		N-S 1.15:1	4	1,747	2.09
WASHINGTON and HOME	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 3.56:1	29	13,532	1.96
ADAMS and WESLEY	Interior	N-S Yield	8/24/95	E-W 1.60:1	3	1,409	1.94
SOUTH BLVD. and HUMPHREY	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 4.13:1	11	5,248	1.91
HARRISON and RIDGELAND	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 2.49:1	50	25,221	1.81
MONROE and WENONAH	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		E-W 1.04:1	3	1,527	1.79
PLEASANT and MARION	Interior	E-W Stop	12/31/94	N-S 1.39:1	14	7,167	1.78
HARRISON and WESLEY	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 8.76:1	10	5,124	1.78
SOUTH BLVD. and RIDGELAND	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 4.49:1	47	24,450	1.76
SOUTH BLVD. and EUCLID	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 1.29:1	16	8,385	1.74
ADAMS and MAPLE	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	N-S 1.08:1	5	2,638	1.73
PLEASANT and GROVE	Interior	~ Uncontrolled		E-W 1.58:1	6	3,301	1.66
WASHINGTON and ELMWOOD	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 22.3:1	15	8,601	1.59
WASHINGTON and SCOVILLE	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 8.49:1	16	9,219	1.58
WASHINGTON and WESLEY	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 9.26:1	17	9,920	1.57
JACKSON and LOMBARD	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 3.63:1	21	12,360	1.55
JACKSON and RIDGELAND 35	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 1.65:1	49	28,908	1.55

South Blvd. to I-290 Traffic Study

Crashes at Interior Intersections- No Pedestrians Involved

For the Study Period of Jan. 1995 - Dec. 1997

0222-1
6a.4
2/8

Intersection	Location	Traffic Controls	Date Controls Installed	Traffic Ratio	# of crashes	ADT	Acc Rate Acc./MEV
SOUTH BLVD. and OAK PARK	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 3.94:1	41	24,450	1.53
PLEASANT and LOMBARD	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		N-S 1.05:1	3	1,813	1.51
WASHINGTON and OAK PARK	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 1.85:1	49	29,754	1.50
HARRISON and WISCONSIN	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 1.50:1	2	1,236	1.48
ADAMS and EAST	Interior	E-W Stop	12/31/94	N-S 6.91:1	10	6,334	1.44
WASHINGTON and LOMBARD	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	E-W 2.55:1	18	11,423	1.44
VAN BUREN and LYMAN	Interior	N-S Yield	11/5/96	E-W 1.40:1	2	1,348	1.35
WASHINGTON and MAPLE	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 5.03:1	18	12,666	1.30
WASHINGTON and RIDGELAND	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 2.43:1	40	28,215	1.29
WASHINGTON and EAST	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	E-W 1.24:1	21	14,937	1.28
RANDOLPH and ELMWOOD	Interior	N-S Yield	12/31/94	E-W 2.77:1	3	2,214	1.24
RANDOLPH and GROVE	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 4.46:1	7	5,211	1.23
ADAMS and SCOVILLE	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 1.08:1	2	1,518	1.20
VAN BUREN and EUCLID	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.68:1	4	3,042	1.20
PLEASANT and OAK PARK	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 10.2:1	28	21,407	1.19
SOUTH BLVD. and CLINTON	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 5.97:1	8	6,145	1.19
VAN BUREN and TAYLOR	Interior	N-S Yield	12/31/94	E-W 1.66:1	2	1,547	1.18
HARRISON and OAK PARK	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 4.74:1	27	20,946	1.18
RANDOLPH and HUMPHREY	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 1.04:1	1	781	1.17
HARRISON and GROVE	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 7.68:1	4	3,134	1.17
SOUTH BLVD. and HARVEY	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 3.63:1	7	5,580	1.15
HARRISON and LOMBARD	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.76:1	15	12,717	1.08
ADAMS and CARPENTER	Interior	N-S Yield	12/31/94	N-S 1.06:1	1	852	1.07
PLEASANT and RIDGELAND	Interior	E-W Stop	12/31/94	N-S 14.6:1	25	21,367	1.07
PLEASANT and KENILWORTH	Interior	E-W Stop	12/31/94	N-S 1.58:1	6	5,140	1.07
RANDOLPH and OAK PARK	Interior	E-W Stop	12/31/94	N-S 6.95:1	26	22,296	1.06
ADAMS and RIDGELAND	Interior	E-W Stop	12/31/94	N-S 16.5:1	22	19,092	1.05
HARRISON and EUCLID	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 5.55:1	6	5,232	1.05
VAN BUREN and EAST	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	N-S 3.45:1	8	7,049	1.04
PLEASANT and HOME	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		N-S 1.33:1	7	6,407	1.00
MONROE and KENILWORTH	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 3.16:1	1	925	0.99
RANDOLPH and EUCLID	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	N-S 1.61:1	5	4,695	0.97
JACKSON and GROVE ⁶⁰	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 40.0:1	7	6,583	0.97
WASHINGTON and TAYLOR	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 5.81:1	10	9,620	0.95
VAN BUREN and SCOVILLE	Interior	N-S Yield	4/18/96	E-W 2.49:1	2	1,925	0.95

CT
029

South Blvd. to I-290 Traffic Study
Crashes at Interior Intersections- No Pedestrians Involved
For the Study Period of Jan. 1995 - Dec. 1997

0222-1
6a.4
3/8

Intersection	Location	Traffic Controls	Date Controls Installed	Traffic Ratio	# of crashes	ADT	Acc Rate Acc./MEV
JACKSON and OAK PARK ⁷¹	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 1.87:1	27	26,574	0.93
JACKSON and MAPLE ⁷²	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 32.1:1	10	9,869	0.93
PLEASANT and MAPLE	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 1.77:1	5	5,069	0.90
HARRISON and CLINTON	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 5.03:1	2	2,106	0.87
VAN BUREN and RIDGELAND	Interior	E-W Stop	12/31/94	N-S 13.8:1	18	19,308	0.85
WASHINGTON and GROVE	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 12.4:1	11	11,861	0.85
JACKSON and EAST	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.21:1	16	17,625	0.83
RANDOLPH and RIDGELAND	Interior	E-W Stop	12/31/94	N-S 14.5:1	19	21,377	0.81
PLEASANT and WESLEY	Interior	N-S Yield	12/31/94	E-W 2.44:1	2	2,356	0.78
ADAMS and CLINTON	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 1.53:1	1	1,201	0.76
RANDOLPH and MAPLE	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 4.55:1	9	10,915	0.75
VAN BUREN and CLARENCE	Interior	N-S Stop	2/13/98	E-W 2.70:1	2	2,459	0.74
RANDOLPH and MARION	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.57:1	9	11,131	0.74
VAN BUREN and ELMWOOD	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 3.21:1	1	1,248	0.73
ADAMS and GUNDERSON	Interior	E-W Stop	12/31/94	E-W 1.54:1	1	1,256	0.73
SOUTH BLVD. and CUYLER	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 5.14:1	4	5,276	0.69
SOUTH BLVD. and MAPLE	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.95:1	5	6,964	0.66
WASHINGTON and HUMPHREY	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 54.7:1	6	8,357	0.66
HARRISON and TAYLOR	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 28.1:1	7	9,793	0.65
MONROE and MAPLE	Interior	EB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 1.43:1	3	4,199	0.65
HARRISON and SCOVILLE	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 10.1:1	4	5,604	0.65
SOUTH BLVD. and MARION	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 1.11:1	7	9,911	0.65
SOUTH BLVD. and LOMBARD	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W	3	4,325	0.63
RANDOLPH and HARVEY	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 2.85:1	1	1,468	0.62
JACKSON and LYMAN	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 15.9:1	7	10,300	0.62
ADAMS and HUMPHREY	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		N-S 3.12:1	1	1,473	0.62
HARRISON and HUMPHREY	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 13.4:1	7	10,412	0.61
RANDOLPH and EAST	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	N-S 3.36:1	5	7,471	0.61
JACKSON and WENONAH ⁹⁹	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 17.0:1	6	8,996	0.61
ADAMS and OAK PARK	Interior	E-W Stop	12/31/94	N-S 18.5:1	12	18,257	0.60
HARRISON and HIGHLAND	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 22.9:1	6	9,502	0.58
HARRISON and CLARENCE	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 7.05:1	3	4,765	0.57
ADAMS and WENONAH	Interior	N-S Yield	11/25/96	E-W 1.66:1	1	1,662	0.55
SOUTH BLVD. and TAYLOR	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 5.43:1	3	5,062	0.54
JACKSON and HOME ¹⁰⁵	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 9.56:1	5	8,593	0.53

South Blvd. to I-290 Traffic Study

Crashes at Interior Intersections- No Pedestrians Involved

For the Study Period of Jan. 1995 - Dec. 1997

0222-1 6a.4 4/8

Intersection	Location	Traffic Controls	Date Controls Installed	Traffic Ratio	# of crashes	ADT	Acc Rate Acc./MEV
HARRISON and EAST	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	N-S 1.10:1	6	10,379	0.53
ADAMS and HIGHLAND	Interior	E-W Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.49:1	1	1,745	0.52
SOUTH BLVD. and EAST	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 1.04:1	5	8,934	0.51
VAN BUREN and LOMBARD	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	N-S 2.17:1	2	3,626	0.50
RANDOLPH and CUYLER	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 1.49:1	1	1,815	0.50
JACKSON and KENILWORTH ¹¹⁷	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 20.2:1	4	7,264	0.50
ADAMS and EUCLID	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	N-S 1.05:1	1	1,824	0.50
SOUTH BLVD. and HOME	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 1.34:1	5	9,153	0.50
PLEASANT and HARVEY	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 1.75:1	1	1,860	0.49
RANDOLPH and KENILWORTH	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.25:1	4	7,508	0.49
VAN BUREN and OAK PARK	Interior	E-W Stop	12/31/94	N-S 10.9:1	10	18,877	0.48
JACKSON and CLINTON ¹¹⁷	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 18.6:1	4	7,645	0.48
HARRISON and HARVEY	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 22.2:1	5	9,638	0.47
RANDOLPH and SCOVILLE	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 6.30:1	1	1,935	0.47
ADAMS and CUYLER	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.17:1	1	2,028	0.45
SOUTH BLVD. and KENILWORTH	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 1.68:1	4	8,444	0.43
PLEASANT and EAST	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	N-S 3.21:1	3	6,352	0.43
WASHINGTON and CUYLER	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 12.0:1	4	8,892	0.41
WASHINGTON and CLINTON	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 15.1:1	5	11,447	0.40
HARRISON and CUYLER	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 32.7:1	4	9,262	0.39
RANDOLPH and HOME	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.26:1	4	10,208	0.36
JACKSON and CUYLER	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 15.1:1	4	10,329	0.35
ADAMS and LOMBARD	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	N-S 4.60:1	2	5,351	0.34
HARRISON and ELMWOOD	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 19.5:1	2	5,707	0.32
HARRISON and LYMAN	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 28.0:1	3	9,914	0.28
PLEASANT and CLINTON	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.56:1	1	3,487	0.26
JACKSON and HUMPHREY	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 8.56:1	3	10,822	0.25
RANDOLPH and CLINTON	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 5.23:1	2	7,307	0.25
JACKSON and ELMWOOD	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 36.3:1	3	12,460	0.22
SOUTH BLVD. and ELMWOOD	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 7.65:1	1	5,070	0.18
JACKSON and HIGHLAND	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 20.7:1	2	10,157	0.18
JACKSON and TAYLOR	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 12.8:1	2	10,448	0.17
PLEASANT and EUCLID	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	N-S 1.86:1	1	5,243	0.17
FLOURNOY and LOMBARD	Interior	EB Only Stop	12/31/94	N-S 13.6:1	1	5,494	0.17
JACKSON and CLARENCE	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 19.9:1	2	12,737	0.14

South Blvd. to I-290 Traffic Study
Crashes at Interior Intersections- No Pedestrians Involved
For the Study Period of Jan. 1995 - Dec. 1997

0222-1
6a.4
5/8

Intersection	Location	Traffic Controls	Date Controls Installed	Traffic Ratio	# of crashes	ADT	Acc Rate Acc./MEV
JACKSON and SCOVILLE	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 18.9:1	2	12,767	0.14
JACKSON and EUCLID	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 13.2:1	2	13,006	0.14
SOUTH BLVD. and GROVE	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 3.59:1	1	6,627	0.14
JACKSON and WISCONSIN ¹⁴⁴	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 16.2:1	1	9,781	0.09
JACKSON and GUNDERSON	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 24.4:1	1	12,624	0.07
MADISON and RIDGELAND	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	Unknown 1.44:1	0	46,385	0.00
MADISON and OAK PARK	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	E-W 1.48:1	0	45,222	0.00
MADISON and EAST	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	E-W 4.44:1	0	34,484	0.00
MADISON and LOMBARD	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	E-W 5.53:1	0	31,436	0.00
MADISON and EUCLID	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 18.3:1	0	29,682	0.00
MADISON and SCOVILLE	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 32.3:1	0	29,017	0.00
MADISON and WESLEY	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 32.9:1	0	28,999	0.00
MADISON and GUNDERSON	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 57.2:1	0	28,636	0.00
MADISON and CLARENCE	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 58.1:1	0	28,628	0.00
MADISON and ELMWOOD	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 72.5:1	0	28,532	0.00
MADISON and HOME	Interior	All Way Signal	12/31/94	E-W 10.6:1	0	28,248	0.00
MADISON and MAPLE	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 12.7:1	0	27,851	0.00
MADISON and TAYLOR	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 21.9:1	0	27,844	0.00
MADISON and HUMPHREY	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 24.1:1	0	27,732	0.00
MADISON and HARVEY	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 37.5:1	0	27,336	0.00
MADISON and LYMAN	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 38.8:1	0	27,311	0.00
MADISON and CUYLER	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 41.7:1	0	27,264	0.00
MADISON and WISCONSIN	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 17.9:1	0	27,253	0.00
MADISON and HIGHLAND	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 51.5:1	0	27,142	0.00
MADISON and KENILWORTH	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 19.8:1	0	27,117	0.00
MADISON and WENONAH	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 31.9:1	0	26,623	0.00
MADISON and GROVE	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 32.9:1	0	26,599	0.00
MADISON and CLINTON	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 43.0:1	0	26,414	0.00
MADISON and CARPENTER	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 51.8:1	0	26,312	0.00
JACKSON and WESLEY	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 22.6:1	0	12,662	0.00
JACKSON and HARVEY	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 23.2:1	0	10,106	0.00
JACKSON and CARPENTER ¹⁷²	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 16.6:1	0	6,987	0.00
HARRISON and GUNDERSON	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 10.5:1	0	5,765	0.00
SOUTH BLVD. and WESLEY	Interior	NB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 6.99:1	0	5,240	0.00
PLEASANT PL. and MARION	Interior	WB Only Stop	12/31/94	N-S 24.3:1	0	3,796	0.00

TARIFU 517

Printed on 01/25/99

South Blvd. to I-290 Traffic Study
Crashes at Interior Intersections- No Pedestrians Involved
For the Study Period of Jan. 1995 - Dec. 1997

0222-1
6a.4
6/8

Intersection	Location	Traffic Controls	Date Controls Installed	Traffic Ratio	# of crashes	ADT	Acc Rate Acc./MEV
RANDOLPH and LOMBARD	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	N-S 2.64:1	0	3,043	0.00
HARRISON and CARPENTER	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 7.20:1	0	2,773	0.00
HARRISON and KENILWORTH	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 5.85:1	0	2,454	0.00
MONROE and HOME	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	N-S 2.14:1	0	2,366	0.00
PLEASANT and CUYLER	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 1.81:1	0	2,295	0.00
ADAMS and HOME	Interior	E-W Stop	12/31/94	N-S 1.37:1	0	2,095	0.00
HARRISON and HOME	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.31:1	0	2,033	0.00
VAN BUREN and CUYLER	Interior	N-S Stop	8/20/96	E-W 5.61:1	0	1,981	0.00
VAN BUREN and HIGHLAND	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 3.46:1	0	1,937	0.00
PLEASANT and SCOVILLE	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.79:1	0	1,832	0.00
HARRISON and WENONAH	Interior	SB Only Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.46:1	0	1,518	0.00
ADAMS and HARVEY	Interior	N-S Stop	12/31/94	E-W 2.63:1	0	1,517	0.00
ADAMS (EAST LEG) and GROVE	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 2.00:1	0	1,455	0.00
MONROE and CARPENTER	Interior	All Way Stop	12/31/94	E-W 1.41:1	0	1,154	0.00
MONROE and GROVE	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 1.37:1	0	1,148	0.00
PLEASANT and HUMPHREY	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		N-S 2.77:1	0	1,115	0.00
ADAMS and ELMWOOD	Interior	N-S Stop	8/2/95	E-W 1.99:1	0	1,106	0.00
RANDOLPH and TAYLOR	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 2.17:1	0	1,036	0.00
VAN BUREN and GROVE	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 2.78:1	0	1,005	0.00
ADAMS and KENILWORTH	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 1.83:1	0	881	0.00
ADAMS (WEST LEG) and GROVE	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 1.28:1	0	598	0.00
HARRISON and MAPLE	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		E-W 1.05:1	0	584	0.00
FLOURNOY and HIGHLAND	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		Unknown 1.00:1	0	376	0.00
FLOURNOY and TAYLOR	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		N-S 1.24:1	0	165	0.00
FLOURNOY and LYMAN	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		Unknown 1.02:1	0	146	0.00
FLOURNOY and HUMPHREY	Interior	~ Uncontrolled (X)		N-S 1.99:1	0	144	0.00
Number of Intersections = 201			Total Crashes	1,321	Total ADT =	1,966,962	

ALL STREETS EXCEPT MADISON = 1,254,895
MADISON STREET = 712,067

TOTAL ADT = 1,966,962

ADT = AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC

TABLE 4 6/7

South Blvd. to I-290 Traffic Study
Crashes at Perimeter Intersections- No Pedestrians Involved
For the Study Period of Jan. 1995 - Dec. 1997

0222-1
6a.4
7/8

Intersection	Location	Traffic Controls	Date Controls Installed	Traffic Ratio	# of crashes	ADT	Acc Rate Acc./MEV
HARRISON and AUSTIN	Perimeter	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 2.67:1	75	35,748	1.92
JACKSON and HARLEM	Perimeter	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 3.13:1	70	39,570	1.62
WASHINGTON and AUSTIN	Perimeter	All Way Signal	12/31/94	E-W 3.17:1	50	34,207	1.33
JACKSON and AUSTIN	Perimeter	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 2.68:1	48	35,689	1.23
PLEASANT and HARLEM	Perimeter	WB Only Stop	12/31/94	N-S 8.93:1	37	33,360	1.01
SOUTH BLVD. and HARLEM	Perimeter	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 5.77:1	38	35,200	0.99
RANDOLPH and HARLEM	Perimeter	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 3.19:1	35	39,419	0.81
WASHINGTON and HARLEM	Perimeter	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 2.83:1	26	40,567	0.59
SOUTH BLVD. and AUSTIN	Perimeter	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 6.19:1	15	30,200	0.45
MONROE and HARLEM	Perimeter	WB Only Stop	12/31/94	N-S 12.1:1	16	32,471	0.45
ADAMS and AUSTIN	Perimeter	~ Uncontrolled		N-S	12	26,000	0.42
VAN BUREN and AUSTIN	Perimeter	~ Uncontrolled		N-S	10	26,000	0.35
RANDOLPH and AUSTIN	Perimeter	~ Uncontrolled		N-S	8	26,000	0.28
PLEASANT and AUSTIN	Perimeter	~ Uncontrolled		N-S	7	26,000	0.25
ADAMS and HARLEM	Perimeter	~ Uncontrolled		N-S	2	30,000	0.06
MADISON and HARLEM	Perimeter	All Way Signal	12/31/94	N-S 1.16:1	0	55,814	0.00
MADISON and AUSTIN	Perimeter	All Way Signal	12/31/94	E-W 1.02:1	0	52,625	0.00
Number of Intersections =		17	Total Crashes		449	Total ADT =	598,870

4.2

TABLE 4 7/7

Traffic Study For The Village Of Oak Park South Blvd. to I-290

Interior Intersections Accident Analysis

Study period is the 36 month period between January 1995 and December 1997

- Actual Accident Rate: The accident rate at an intersection in accidents per million entering vehicles

$$\text{Actual Accident Rate} = R_i = \frac{\text{No. of Acc.} \times 10^6}{\text{ADT} \times (3 \times 365 \text{ days})} \quad \text{Acc/MEV}$$

- Average Accident Rate: The average accident rate for the 201 interior intersections in the study area

$$\text{Average Accident Rate} = R_a = \frac{\sum \text{No. of Acc.} \times 10^6}{\sum \text{ADT} \times (3 \times 365 \text{ days})} \quad \text{Acc/MEV}$$

- Critical Accident Rate: If the actual accident rate exceeds the critical accident rate then there is a 99% chance that the accidents were caused by factors other than chance.

$k = 2.576$ for 99% level of confidence

M = vehicle exposure in millions of entering vehicles

$$\text{Critical Accident Rate} = R_{CI} = R_a + k(R_a \div M)^{1/2} - \frac{1}{2M} \quad \text{Acc/MEV}$$

Number of interior intersections = 201

Number of accidents at interior intersections = 1,321 (not including Madison St.)

Sum of ADTs for the 201 interior intersections = 1,254,895 (not including Madison St.)

$$\text{Average Accident Rate} = R_a = \frac{1,321 \times 10^6}{1,254,895 \times (3 \times 365)} = 0.961 \text{ Acc/MEV}$$

$$M = \frac{1,254,895 \times (3 \times 365)}{10^6} = 1,374.11 \text{ MEV}$$

$$\text{Critical Accident Rate} = R_{CI} = 0.961 + 2.576(0.961 \div 1,374.11)^{1/2} - \frac{1}{2 \times 1,374.11} = 1.029 \text{ Acc/MEV}$$

(not including Madison St.)

Village of Oak Park
Transportation Commission Agenda Item

Item Title: **Develop Mission Statement and/or Guiding Principles for the Transportation Commission and the Village's Transportation Network**

Review Date: February 8, 2022

Prepared By: Jill Juliano

Abstract (briefly describe the item being reviewed):

The 2022 Transportation Commission Work Plan includes an item entitled: Develop mission statement and/or guiding principles for the Transportation Commission and the Village's transportation system. This item was carried over from the approved 2021 Work Plan.

The one stated outcome for this topic is: Recommend to the Village Board revised principles and goals for the Village's transportation system network. This work plan item is scheduled to be completed by the 2nd quarter of 2022.

The Transportation Commission has been discussing and developing a document detailing revised goals for the Village of Oak Park's transportation system since its June 8th meeting. At the January 11th meeting, the Commission decided to defer the item to the next meeting due to the late hour.

Staff Recommendation(s):

It's anticipated the Commission will come to a consensus on what will be included in the document at tonight's meeting, staff will generate a clean copy of the document and the Commission will vote on the document at the next Commission meeting.

Supporting Documentation Is Attached

Memorandum

0222-1
6b.1
2/2

Date: February 2, 2022

To: The Transportation Commission

From: Jill Juliano, Transportation Engineer JJ

Re: Background Information on Develop Mission Statement and/or Guiding Principles for the Transportation Commission and the Village's Transportation Network

The Transportation Commission started to discuss this work plan item at its June 8, 2021 meeting. In the ensuing months, Chair Burke provided a draft set of proposed goals and the Commission provided input, changes and comments about the draft document.

There are three versions of the draft document included in this agenda. They are showing the evolution from the initial draft on August 10th through the most recent review with Commission comments from the November 9th meeting. Comments and revisions are shown in a quasi-track changes form and color coding based on the Commissioner providing the input. Attribution is provided as well.

Exhibit 6b.2 is the initial draft document provided by Chair Burke of proposed goals for the Village's transportation system with three additional possible goals submitted by other commissioners. It was initially viewed by the Transportation Commission at the August 10th meeting.

Exhibit 6b.3 is the draft document with input submitted by commissioners via email prior to the November 9, 2021 Transportation Commission meeting.

Exhibit 6b.4 is the most recent version of the draft document which includes revisions suggested and comments made by commissioners at the November 9, 2021 Transportation Commission meeting.

Below is the list of colors and which commissioner's comments/input/revisions it is associated with in the documents.

Medium blue - Commissioner Thompson
Purple - Commissioner Moses
Green - Commissioner Peterson
Sky blue - Commissioner Stigger
Red - Chair Burke & Commissioner Moses at the November 9th meeting.

It's anticipated the Commission will reach a consensus as to what should be included in the document indicating recommended goals for the Village's transportation system that will ultimately be submitted to the Village Board of Trustees for review and a decision.

Draft Oak Park Transportation Goals from Chair Burke

Note: This list of high-level goals doesn't include strategies to implement the goals nor performance measure to evaluate progress. Whether the Commission wants to incorporate these elements is a question to be discussed.

Safety

- Design, upgrade and regulate OP's streets to be safer for people using all transportation modes, with a long-term "Vision Zero" goal to significantly reduce crashes and injuries and eliminate fatalities.

Sustainability, Affordability, and Transportation Options

- Support Oak Park's climate goals, minimize roadway congestion, and reduce the expense of car ownership by making it safer, easier, and more affordable to walk, bicycle, use transit, and carpool, with a higher percentage of trips using these modes.

Transportation Operations and Infrastructure

- Operate transportation infrastructure more efficiently in order to limit congestion and improve reliability.
- Bring OP's transportation infrastructure into a state of good repair.
- Make more efficient use of the existing parking and curbside infrastructure to accommodate parking and pick-ups/drop-offs.

Transportation Equity

- Prioritize village investments and make decisions with a focus on improving outcomes for Oak Park residents that experience higher mobility and economic hardship.

Community Engagement

- Improve the quality and timeliness of resident engagement in transportation decisions, with a focus on increasing participation by residents living in multi-family housing.

Additional questions from fellow Commissioners:

- With the Transportation Commission meeting approximately 10 times per year, resulting in around 20 hours total of meeting time. What topics should be discussed during these 20 hours to most effectively utilize our time together? What topics have taken up too much time in the past?^(RPeterson)
- What are the best assets of our Village's transportation network? How can we enhance them? What are its shortcomings?^(RPeterson)
- In Oak Park, is the car king or the pedestrian/cyclist?^(Astigger)

Draft Oak Park Transportation Goals from Chair Burke

[comment: these goals are excellent but will become more meaningful when we identify the means by which to achieve them.](JThompson)

Note: This list of high-level goals doesn't include strategies to implement the goals nor performance measure to evaluate progress. Whether the Commission wants to incorporate these elements is a question to be discussed.

Safety

- Design, upgrade and regulate Oak Park's streets to be safer for people using all transportation modes especially pedestrians and cyclists(MMoses), with a long-term "Vision Zero" goal to significantly reduce crashes and injuries and eliminate fatalities.

Sustainability, Affordability, and Transportation Options

- Support Oak Park's climate goals, minimize roadway congestion, and reduce the expense of car ownership personal transportation(MMoses) by making it safer, easier, and more affordable to walk, bicycle, use transit, and carpool, with a higher percentage of trips using these modes.
- Incorporate micromobility options that enhance the quality of life for Oak Park residents, especially those who do not have access to an automobile.(RPeterson)
- Incentivize new developers, businesses, and stores to place bike parking, bike lanes, and/or bike commuting facilities, where appropriate, to reduce the capital expenses on the Village.(RPeterson)

Transportation Operations and Infrastructure

[comment: need to specifically include implementing Neighborhood Greenways & Complete Streets in this section.](MMoses)

- Operate transportation infrastructure more efficiently in order to limit congestion and improve reliability.
[comment: clarify context of "more efficiently". If for motorists, could mean fewer STOP signs, traffic signals which could be in conflict with the Safety goal.](JThompson)
- Work with partner agencies to assist in more efficient transit operation in order to limit congestion and improve reliability.(RPeterson)
- Bring Oak Park's current(RPeterson) transportation infrastructure into a state of good repair. Ensure that Oak Park has the capacity and resources to support all new infrastructure that's constructed or implemented.(RPeterson)
[comment: to implement this goal requires a set of metrics.](JThompson)
- Make more efficient use of the existing parking and curbside infrastructure to accommodate parking and pick-ups/drop-offs.
[comment: this could be interpreted that the Village should eliminate the overnight parking ban which has been justified on the basis of public safety. How do we prioritize efficient use of curb space versus public safety considerations?](JThompson)
- Utilize regularly scheduled roadway maintenance and rehabilitation to incorporate bicycle infrastructure, lessening expenditures by the Village.(RPeterson)

Transportation Equity

- Prioritize village investments and make decisions with a focus on improving outcomes for Oak Park residents that experience higher mobility and economic hardship.
[comment: possible implementation option is to eliminate overnight parking ban which disproportionately affects renters. How do we prioritize equity versus purported public safety benefits of the ban?](JThompson)
- Create an ADA Transition Plan to ensure that the Village is committed to creating accessible facilities.(RPeterson)
- Engage community organizations and educational institutions to create bicycle safety curriculum.(RPeterson)

Community Engagement

- Improve the quality and timeliness of resident engagement in transportation decisions, with a focus on increasing participation by residents living in multi-family housing.

Additional questions from fellow Commissioners:

- With the Transportation Commission meeting approximately 10 times per year, resulting in around 20 hours total of meeting time. What topics should be discussed during these 20 hours to most effectively utilize our time together? What topics have taken up too much time in the past?(RPeterson)
- What are the best assets of our Village's transportation network? How can we enhance them? What are its shortcomings?(RPeterson)
- In Oak Park, is the car king or the pedestrian/cyclist?(AStigger)

Draft Oak Park Transportation Goals from Chair Burke

[comment: these goals are excellent but will become more meaningful when we identify the means by which to achieve them.](JThompson)

Note: This list of high-level goals doesn't include strategies to implement the goals nor performance measure to evaluate progress. Whether the Commission wants to incorporate these elements is a question to be discussed.

Safety

- Design, upgrade and regulate Oak Park's streets to be safer for people using all transportation modes especially pedestrians and cyclists(MMoses), with a long-term "Vision Zero" goal to significantly reduce crashes and injuries and eliminate fatalities.

Sustainability, Affordability, and Transportation Options

- Support Oak Park's climate goals, minimize roadway congestion, and reduce the expense of car ownership personal transportation(MMoses) by making it safer, easier, and more affordable to walk, bicycle, use transit, and carpool, with a higher percentage of trips using these modes.
- Incorporate micromobility options that enhance the quality of life for Oak Park residents, especially those who do not have access to an automobile.(RPeterson)

[comment: don't like or understand the term "micromobility"- would rather use "bicyclist and pedestrian", if that's what that means](MMoses)

- Incentivize new developers, businesses, and stores to place bike parking, bike lanes, and/or bike commuting facilities, where appropriate, to reduce the capital expenses on the Village.(RPeterson)

[comments: not sure the Commission can do this, needs to be reworked.(MMoses) Both additions are strategies, not goals. Do we want to include strategies in this document or just goals?(RBurke) Agree that this should be a goals document and that these items would need to be reworked if kept in the document.(MMoses)]

Transportation Operations and Infrastructure

[comment: need to specifically include implementing Neighborhood Greenways & Complete Streets in this section.](MMoses)

- Operate transportation infrastructure more efficiently in order to limit congestion and improve reliability.

[comment: clarify context of "more efficiently". If for motorists, could mean fewer STOP signs, traffic signals which could be in conflict with the Safety goal.](JThompson) [agree that "more efficiently" needs to be better defined](MMoses)

- ~~Work with partner agencies to assist in more efficient transit operation in order to limit congestion and improve reliability.~~(RPeterson)

[comment: doesn't seem like a goal.(MMoses) I agree.(RBurke)]

- Bring Oak Park's current(RPeterson) transportation infrastructure into a state of good repair and when undertaking infrastructure projects implement Complete Streets policy.(MMoses) Ensure

that Oak Park has the capacity and resources to support all new infrastructure that's constructed or implemented.^(RPeterson)

[comment: to implement this goal requires a set of metrics.](JThompson)

[comments: makes sense and maybe this is where we can add complete streets.^(MMoses) That's a good idea. A goal for the Village should be to consistently and appropriately implement the Complete Streets policy. Our transportation system needs to work for all modes and I tried to capture that with this goal.^(RBurke)]

- Make more efficient use of the existing parking and curbside infrastructure to accommodate parking and pick-ups/drop-offs.

[comment: this could be interpreted that the Village should eliminate the overnight parking ban which has been justified on the basis of public safety. How do we prioritize efficient use of curb space versus public safety considerations?](JThompson)

[comment: we should use this to accommodate bicycles so I'd want that word added.^(MMoses) In my mind, "parking" includes bike parking as well.^(RBurke) I mean bike movement, protected bike lanes.^(MMoses)]

- ~~Utilize regularly scheduled roadway maintenance and rehabilitation to incorporate bicycle infrastructure, lessening expenditures by the Village.~~^(RPeterson)

[comment: this isn't needed because it's part of Complete Streets.^(MMoses) It is, yep.^(RBurke)]

Transportation Equity

- Prioritize village investments and make decisions with a focus on improving outcomes for Oak Park residents that experience higher mobility and economic hardship.

[comment: possible implementation option is to eliminate overnight parking ban which disproportionately affects renters. How do we prioritize equity versus purported public safety benefits of the ban?](JThompson)

- Create an ADA Transition Plan to ensure that the Village is committed to creating accessible facilities.^(RPeterson)

- ~~Engage community organizations and educational institutions to create bicycle safety curriculum.~~^(RPeterson)

[comments: doesn't seem like a goal.^(MMoses) Agreed. I support the concept but it's more of a strategy than a goal.^(RBurke)]

Community Engagement

- Improve the quality and timeliness of resident engagement in transportation decisions, with a focus on increasing participation by residents living in multi-family housing.

Additional questions from fellow Commissioners:

- With the Transportation Commission meeting approximately 10 times per year, resulting in around 20 hours total of meeting time. What topics should be discussed during these 20 hours to most effectively utilize our time together? What topics have taken up too much time in the past?^(RPeterson)

- What are the best assets of our Village's transportation network? How can we enhance them?
What are its shortcomings?^(RPeterson)
- In Oak Park, is the car king or the pedestrian/cyclist?^(ASTigger)