

APPROVED Meeting Minutes
Transportation Commission
Tuesday, June 14, 2022 – 7:00 PM
Remote Participation Meeting

1. Call to Order

Staff Liaison Jill Juliano called the remote participation meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

Staff Liaison 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, Brian Straw, Ron Burke

Absent: Meghann Moses

Staff: Parking & Mobility Services Manager Sean Keane, Parking Restrictions Coordinator (PRC) Takeshi Thompson, Commander Dave Jacobson, Staff Liaison Jill Juliano

Staff Liaison Juliano noted that with four Commissioners, there is a quorum.

2. Agenda Approval

Commissioner Katner made a motion to approve the agenda. It was seconded by Commissioner Straw.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Katner, Straw, Fink, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

3. Approval of the Draft April 12, 2022 Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Straw made a motion to approve the draft April 12, 2022 Transportation Commission meeting minutes. It was seconded by Commissioner Katner.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Straw, Katner, Fink, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

4. Non-Agenda Public Comment

None

5. New Business

5a) PETITION TO INSTALL TRAFFIC CALMING DEVICE ON THE 500 AND 600 BLOCKS OF NORTH TAYLOR AVENUE

Staff Liaison Juliano presented the item to the Commissioners and explained the circumstances that led to this petition being moved ahead of the other traffic calming petitions in the queue. The petition was submitted due to concerns about the volume and speed of vehicles, bypass traffic from Austin Blvd onto their blocks, traffic from the BP gas station at the northwest corner of N Taylor Ave and Chicago Ave, crashes, and concerns about gunshots that have occurred on the blocks that are believed to be (at least in part) due to the traffic coming from the BP gas station. Crash reports and other data were collected and then a scoring table was completed for each block. They both exceeded the minimum score necessary to be reviewed by the Transportation Commission. Staff Liaison Juliano explained the vehicle volume and speed data and noted that the findings were fairly consistent with what they'd expect overall, but there does appear to be a slight speeding issue on the 500 and 600 blocks of N Taylor Ave. Based on the findings, staff's recommendation is to deploy portable speed radar signs and speed radar signs that can be installed onto light poles on an intermittent basis to bring down the speeds along those blocks.

Commissioner Straw asked why no weekend data was collected, as that may have led to a specific traffic pattern that occurs on weekends being missed. Staff responded that they look at the letter of explanation when determining when data is collected and typically only collect data on weekends when it is indicated that the problem is specifically occurring on the weekends.

Diane Ratekin, a resident from the 600 block of N Taylor Ave, spoke about why the petition organizers brought their petition to the Village Board and why they believe that staff's recommendations do not adequately address the actual experience that they have on their blocks. She specifically mentioned that because of speeding cars and gunshots, residents are concerned about safety and quality of life on their blocks and that they believe that many of their concerns stem from the 24-HR BP gas station at Chicago Ave and N Taylor Ave. She also shared several alternative solutions that the residents feel would be more effective.

Kathleen Bokar, a resident of the 500 block of N Taylor Ave, spoke about her family's decision to move to Oak Park and the concerns they have regarding speeding cars that barely stop at stop signs. She asked that more attention be paid to the safety concerns on their street so that the safety of the neighborhood and her daughter is preserved.

John Gagliano, a resident of the 500 block of N Taylor Ave, also spoke about what led him to move to Oak Park and mentioned that safety was a primary concern for him. He noted that the concerns go beyond speeding and that non-resident traffic on N Taylor is the cause for their unsafe neighborhood. He does not believe that staff's recommendation is appropriate and requests that the recommendation be reconsidered and that a meaningful solution be provided to address the safety concerns before they escalate.

Karl Leonard, a resident of the 600 block of N Taylor Ave, mentioned that the violent crimes that are happening in their neighborhood (specifically around the BP gas station) have prompted conversations with his children about gun violence and have forced him to consider restricting the freedoms he allows his children. He mentioned that while he is concerned about speeding, the shootings and other violence are what prompted him to speak. He believes that a solution that curbs the traffic to the BP gas station will improve the safety of the neighborhood.

Carolyn Newberry-Schwartz, a resident of the 500 block of N Taylor Ave, mentioned that she shares the concerns of her neighbors who previously spoke. She mentioned that they have a sense of urgency around these issues of traffic and violence that have occurred over the past few years. They believe that a creative traffic calming measure that deters some of the traffic would be helpful and would be a more community-friendly way of approaching the problems than having an increased Police presence.

Following the presentation and public testimony, Chair Burke opened the item up for discussion.

Commissioner Straw asked Commander Jacobson what impact he believes that traffic calming measures can have on gun violence. Commander Jacobson responded that when we talk about traffic calming, there are several different measures that can be considered. I don't know that I would say that any one measure would definitively, completely eliminate the possibility of gun violence. In most of these incidents, they are random acts of violence, so to say that a specific type of traffic calming measure would completely eradicate that threat of gun violence- I don't know if we could say that. There could be a positive effect, depending on the type of traffic calming measure you took, but you'd have to go on a case-by-case basis with regards to the actual incidents themselves.

Commissioner Fink stated that while she understands how the petition ended up back with the Commission, she doesn't feel that it's the right place or that they would need to work with another Commission or other folks. Deciding about whether these traffic

calming measures are going to prevent violence isn't something that she feels she can speak to.

Chair Burke suggested that it seems reasonable that as the Transportation Commission, they focus on what makes sense to address the traffic concerns that have been raised, with the understanding that those measures may or may not have some impact on the violence that has also been flagged. There are limits to what the Commission can do in that regard.

Commissioner Katner expressed his frustration for the neighbors who came to the Commission looking for solutions after going to the Board. The Commission is only advisory and can only ask the Board to do things and they often don't take our advice or grant our requests. He stated that he is upset with the Board for forcing this issue on the Commission when they don't have the tools to deal with the shootings and the violence. He also agreed that the Commission should make a recommendation for this petition with the toolbox that they have regarding traffic calming. He suggested that the Commissioners add their voices to the neighbors' and demand that the Board consider a more comprehensive approach to the periphery of Oak Park or where major drags bisect Oak Park.

The Commissioners discussed the following topics:

- Diverting traffic away from these neighborhood streets back onto Chicago Ave, which is designed for heavier traffic volumes
- Looking at how speeds can be slowed on the 500 and 600 blocks of N Taylor Ave
- How the traffic concerns mentioned in this petition echo those of many across the Village and if a more comprehensive approach should ultimately be considered
- Potentially eliminating the curb-cut from the BP gas station onto N Taylor Ave
- Whether a temporary speed radar trailer will sufficiently slow traffic or just provide a short-term solution
- Whether a traffic solution will address the gun violence and other safety concerns and if this petition merits jumping the backlog of petitions since the primary concern is one that cannot be solved by the Transportation Commission

The Commissioners determined that it would be best to have two separate motions; one for this specific item (Part A recommendation) and one for their more general request to the Village Board (Part B recommendation).

Part A:

Commissioner Straw made a motion 1) to add to staff's recommendation of deploying portable speed wagons as well as speed radar signs that can be installed onto light poles on an intermittent basis to bring down the speeds along those blocks; 2) to eliminate the N Taylor Ave driveway into the BP gas station and; 3) install a rumble strip across N Taylor

Ave in the section between Chicago Ave and the east-west alley north of Chicago Ave. It was seconded by Commissioner Katner.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Straw, Katner, Fink, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

Part B:

Commissioner Straw made a motion that this petition reflects resident concerns the Transportation Commission has seen from across Oak Park and we recommend the Village Board direct staff to generate a systematic approach to slowing traffic and improving safety in the Village. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

Commissioner Katner made a motion to amend Commissioner Straw's motion to be prefaced by "Given recent concerns over traffic safety and public safety, especially around the periphery of Oak Park and along its busy arterial and collector lanes..." The motion was seconded by Commissioner Straw.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Katner, Straw, Fink, Burke

Nays: None

The motion to amend passed unanimously 4 to 0.

Part B, as amended:

Given recent concerns over traffic safety and public safety, especially around the periphery of Oak Park and along its busy arterial and collector lanes; this petition reflects resident concerns the Transportation Commission has seen from across Oak Park and we recommend the Village Board direct staff to generate a systematic approach to slowing traffic and improving safety in the Village.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Straw, Fink, Katner, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

Chair Burke asked for input from staff about whether the agenda should be amended due to the time. Staff recommended that agenda item 6a be discussed next as that item is scheduled to be discussed at the Board meeting on July 25, 2022. The Commissioners agreed.

6. Old Business

6a) REVIEW OF RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO THE EXISTING OVERNIGHT ON-STREET PERMIT ZONES

Parking Mobility Services Manager Keane introduced Takeshi Thompson, the new Parking Restrictions Coordinator (PRC), to the Commissioners. PRC Thompson read the two written public testimony aloud. The comments, in their entirety, are attached to these minutes.

Parking Mobility Services Manager Keane presented background information on the item, including some of the considerations taken by staff when deciding which zones to amend. He explained how the various maps included in the agenda packet show the changes reflected in the context of the entire Village, as was previously requested by the Commission, as well as in each individual zone. He also reiterated that staff is not recommending increasing the capacity of the zones, but rather just the street frontages where those permit holders could park. Staff's recommendation is to get a consensus from the Commissioners regarding the recommended changes so that notifications can be sent to affected residents, allowing for public testimony at the July Commission meeting. From there, the recommendation would tentatively go to the Village Board at their meeting on July 25, 2022.

Following the presentation, the Commission asked questions regarding the item. Below is a summary of the questions and staff responses.

Q: The blue is the old zone boundary, the orange is the new zone boundary, and the blue lines are where parking is proposed? A: Correct, it is a little confusing on the combined map, but I think it's a little clearer on the individual zone maps. Looking at Y5 for example, in this instance we are recommending eliminating some streets from the zone, with the idea that we'd be adding on-street parking to every street within that zone. The yellow hatched area indicates what the boundaries of the zone would be.

Q: Is there any indication on this map of what the new parking specifically is? A: We don't have a comparison of what's been added, but the blue shaded areas represent the areas that we're eliminating from the zones.

Q: In Y5 for example, there is a permit holder in the blue shaded area and not in the yellow shaded area. What happens to that permit holder? A: It's important to point out that we're not recommending eliminating any street frontages that are currently permit parking, so

there we're any streets in that area that previously had permit parking. If a permit holder did reside outside of the zone, staff would be able to issue a permit for a nearby zone. Usually, it's very few that fall outside the zone that need the on-street parking.

Q: Are we talking about overnight permit parking? A: Correct.

Q: I thought the direction we were going was to allow folks who had an overnight permit to park anywhere where overnight permit parkers are allowed to park. Are you saying that's not the case now? A: The idea would be that we're expanding the number of streets that are eligible to park overnight on. We're not combining all of the zones into one. That's not what staff's understanding was. It was just that we were looking zone by zone, at seven zones specifically, at changing them.

Q: So, you still have to park within the zone for which your permit is assigned? A: Correct.

Q: How did you get that little flag at the bottom? Where did that come from? A: Looking at Y5, previously it went all the way to Adams St, from East Ave to Oak Park Ave. Looking at this example, there is multi-family housing down here, as well as existing permit holders, so staff felt that rather than eliminating the entirety of the permit parking there, to just keep that flagged area down there.

Q: And the blue lines are what? A: That would be eliminated from the zone, so in theory, it would just be the yellow hatched area that would be the zone.

Q: The blue lines? A: The blue lines indicate where you can park.

Q: So, you can't park anywhere in the zone? Or you can? A: If you look at Y5 here, in theory every street within our new zone is eligible for overnight parking. We revised the boundaries so that the rule would be permit parking is allowed on every street within the new, revised boundaries. If we were to keep the boundaries as is, there isn't a demand for on-street overnight parking that we saw, and it also would prohibit passholders from parking.

Q: When you say that the blue area was eliminated from the Y5 zone, what does that mean? Are you saying that previously folks could park on those streets? A: No. The hatched area is really just what we use administratively to determine what zone you're assigned to based on your address.

Q: So, the blue shaded area is now part of a different zone? A: It's no longer part of a zone, but it's eligible for pass parking.

Q: You're saying that there really wasn't demand for these overnight permits in the areas that are shaded blue? A: Correct. When we looked at this we saw that there's no current active permits in this area, so why are we going to add on-street overnight parking to every block if it's not necessary and then we would prohibit passholders from parking there. At the last meeting, we discussed how Parking Enforcement couldn't intermingle passholders

with permit holders due to the permits usually beginning at 9 or 10PM, whereas the overnight parking ban begins at 2:30AM. The inability to combine those two different uses on the same street is part of why we shrunk a lot of the zones.

Q: Are you able to say that the permit holders in the Y5 zone, for example, previously had “x” parking spots available to them and now they have “y” and that’s a “z” percent increase? A: We could at least provide an estimate. The number of spaces is always determined by how people park, but we could get that for the next meeting.

Q: That is the case, right? With this proposal, overnight permit holders will have more parking spots available to them and the way you designed it is to try to make sure that those additional parking spots are relatively close to where they live. You’ve also eliminated those areas where we don’t really have any overnight permit holders so to put on-street parking there doesn’t make much sense. A: Correct.

Q: How else is this different than what we saw last time? A: From the last meeting, none of the recommended changes have changed. What we did do was this combination map because one of the concerns that was brought up was if zones are expanded or shrunk, how would that affect people seeking temporary overnight parking, including those in single-family homes. The Commission wanted a more comprehensive picture which is why we put this map together.

Q: With the public comment we got on this item, it was addressed specifically about the apartment complex at 730 Carpenter Ave, which is at Carpenter Ave and Jackson Blvd. Looking at google maps, there are also two multi-family buildings just south of Jackson Blvd at 808 and 812-814. I’m curious, with multi-family dwellings where people are expressing a need for overnight parking, how is that dealt with? What is the process for considering new zones? This obviously fits right between the Y9 zone and the Y3 zone. A: Historically, we’ve handled petitions for overnight parking on a case-by-case basis. I would say that that multi-family building is rather close to Y9, which is one of the zones that we’re recommending be expanded with parking on Van Buren St. That would offer that particular area, within approximately one block, some overnight on-street parking. If the Commission wanted to expand an adjacent zone or create a who new zone, that would be within their purview.

Q: Is it possible to follow up with those folks and see whether a Y9 permit would resolve their specific concerns? A: I spoke with one of them and she was pretty delighted that we were recommending those spaces in particular on Van Buren St. I can’t speak for everybody in the building, but I did speak with one of them.

Q: Is there a specific recommendation you’re making tonight? A: For the seven zones as presented, staff would provide the notice to residents on the affected streets for the July Commission meeting, with the understanding that we’d also try to bring back data on how

many spaces we'd be adding. From there, the public testimony would happen at the July meeting for consideration with the Village Board at the July 25, 2022 meeting.

Q: So, this doesn't need to go to the Village Board first? A: The idea would be that we would provide the notice for the testimony to happen at the Commission level and then from there it would go to the Village Board.

Commissioner Straw made a motion to direct staff to provide notification on the proposed revisions to the overnight on-street parking zones. It was seconded by Commissioner Katner.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Straw, Katner, Fink, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

Chair Burke recommended that the remaining two agenda items be moved to the next meeting due to the late hour, barring any objections. Parking Mobility Services Manager Keane mentioned that item 5b was administrative in nature and could be addressed quickly, but that it could wait until the July meeting if necessary. The Commissioners agreed to tackle item 5b and only push item 5c to the next meeting.

5. New Business

5b) RECOMMENDATION TO PERMANENTLY ESTABLISH THE PARKING RESTRICTION, "NO PARKING 7AM - 6PM SCHOOL DAYS" ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF JACKSON BOULEVARD, FROM EAST OF RIDGELAND AVENUE TO CUYLER AVENUE, AS TEMPORARILY APPROVED BY THE CHIEF OF POLICE ON DECEMBER 21, 2021 THROUGH JUNE 14, 2022

Parking Mobility Services Manager Keane presented background information on the item and explained that even though the restriction is good through June 14, 2022, because the signage is there, it won't just go away. Staff's recommendation is to make the restriction permanent and the school district is also in favor of making it permanent.

Commissioner Katner asked if this would still have to go to the Board even if the Commission approves it. Staff responded that it would still go to the Board for formal approval but would most likely be on the consent agenda at either the July 5, 2022 or July 18, 2022 meeting.

Commissioner Katner made a motion to recommend to the Village Board that this temporary restriction be made permanent. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Katner, Fink, Straw, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

Chair Burke suggested that due to the late hour, agenda item 5c be moved to the next meeting. Staff Liaison Juliano noted that in addition to this item, there will be at least two other items to discuss at the next meeting, so it will be a full agenda.

Commissioner Straw asked what the Commission's expectation should be regarding the pace of petitions that they'll start seeing as they work through the backlog. Staff responded that their intention is to bring one petition from the queue in July and that they are still trying to bring on consultants to assist, but there have been delays.

Commissioner Fink asked for clarification regarding current members of the Commission. Staff responded that Commissioner Thompson resigned because he moved out of the Village and that Commissioner Stigger's commission was up earlier in the year and he extended for a while, but that was a temporary measure. The Village Clerk is working to get additional people on the Commission.

7. Adjourn

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

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Fink, Straw, Katner, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:43 PM.

Submitted by:

Anna Muench

Administrative Assistant- Engineering

Juliano, Jill

From: Emily Dzugan [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 3:13 PM
To: Transportation
Subject: Oak Park Overnight Street Parking

WARNING- EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, do not click links/attachments. Never give out your user ID or password.

My name is Emily Dzugan and I am currently renting a unit in the [REDACTED] Carpenter Avenue apartment complex. As you can see in the image provided below of the apartment lease, there is no parking provided by the landlord through this complex. Therefore, options for parking are difficult, particularly with it being illegal to park overnight on all of the surrounding streets. To be able to park legally from my apartment, requires blocks of a walk that I fear making alone at night as a female by myself. All in all, this makes owning a car unfairly inaccessible for Oak Park residents who are renting. Therefore, I kindly ask that the council take into consideration the allowance of overnight parking on surrounding streets. Thank you for your time.

COOK COUNTY RESIDENCE LEASE Unfurnished	Consult an attorney prior to signing Copyright Pending Legal Document Management, Inc.
20. PARKING/NO LIABILITY: Should parking be provided by Lessor, the monthly rental shall include a monthly license for Lessee, only, to park one vehicle in each parking space described below, which license shall be restricted to the registered vehicles and for which a permit or sticker may be required to be displayed [CHECK ONE]:	
<input type="checkbox"/> One undesignated parking space in the exterior parking lot assigned to Lessee's Building	
<input type="checkbox"/> Parking space, No.(s) _____ in the exterior parking lot assigned to Lessee's Building	
<input type="checkbox"/> Parking garage space No. _____ Remote control <input type="checkbox"/> WILL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WILL NOT be provided	
<input type="checkbox"/> Driveway parking No. _____	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO PARKING IS PROVIDED	

Juliano, Jill

From: Kristen Woods [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2022 3:20 PM
To: Transportation
Subject: 6/14 meeting public comment

WARNING- EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, do not click links/attachments. Never give out your user ID or password.

Good evening,

I'm asking the transportation commission to adjust zoning to provide more accessible overnight parking accommodations for the residents of the multi-unit building at [REDACTED] Carpenter. Presently to park legally overnight it costs \$77 a month to park half a mile away. If you don't plan to amend this, I'd like to know how you find this acceptable. I'd appreciate not hearing red herring comments about renting a space from a neighbor or using public transit.

Thank you,
Kristen Woods

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]