

APPROVED Meeting Minutes
Transportation Commission
Tuesday, September 13, 2022 – 7:00 PM
Remote Participation Meeting

1. Call to Order

Staff Liaison Jill Juliano called the remote participation meeting to order at 7:03 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 (7:12 PM), Ron Burke

Absent: None

Staff: Parking & Mobility Services Manager Sean Keane, Parking Restrictions Coordinator (PRC) Takeshi Thompson, Village Engineer Bill McKenna, Staff Liaison Jill Juliano

Staff Liaison Juliano noted that with three Commissioners, there is a quorum. She mentioned that Commissioner Straw planned to attend and may arrive later.

Chair Burke noted that the Commission is down to only four Commissioners but hope to fill those empty spots soon.

2. Agenda Approval

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

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Katner, Fink, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 3 to 0.

Commissioner Fink asked for clarification regarding the inclusion of emails in the agenda packet that appear to have been part of the previous meeting. Staff Liaison Juliano explained

that emails that come in after the agenda is uploaded are read aloud at the meeting and then included with the meeting minutes so that they are available to the public.

3. Approval of the Draft August 9, 2022 Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Chair Burke mentioned that his impression from the previous meeting was that staff would be returning to the Commission with recommendations or options for how to proceed with the implementation of the Greenways Plan and he didn't see that fully captured in the minutes. Village Engineer Bill McKenna responded that staff was requesting input from the Commissioners to meet the intent from the Village Board to review the Bike Boulevard System to see if there were opportunities for dedicated or protected bike lanes. The Commission, and I agree, didn't think there were any realistic opportunities to modify that system for dedicated or protected lanes because of the parking impacts associated with that. The Commission decided that the next priority for the Boulevard System should be the implementation of the remainder of the Scoville Ave section. We asked the Commission to make sure that they'd reviewed everything and that if they had any recommendations, we could come back with a more formal item. We do intend to come back to the Commission at an upcoming meeting to get final direction from the Commission on any proposed modifications for dedicated or protected bike lanes before making a recommendation to the Board. There wasn't anything falling back on staff to modify that system for those opportunities. Chair Burke agreed, but didn't see anything in the minutes about the opportunity to focus on Scoville Ave. Village Engineer McKenna responded that the Scoville Ave direction from the Commission was sufficient enough for staff to proceed.

Commissioner Katner made a motion to approve the draft August 9, 2022 Transportation Commission meeting minutes. 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.

4. Non-Agenda Public Comment

None

5. New Business

None

6. Old Business

6a) PETITION TO INSTALL A TRAFFIC CALMING DEVICE ON THE 500 BLOCK OF SOUTH HARVEY AVENUE

Staff Liaison Juliano provided background information on the item before presenting traffic calming options generated by staff based on direction from the Commission at the July 12, 2022 meeting. The options include a pinch point, either north or south of the east-west alley, and the option of “Do Not Enter” signs being used in conjunction with either location of the pinch point. Installing the pinch point south of the alley keeps it farther away from the existing congestion near the Dunkin’ Donuts. It also allows southbound traffic to use the alley system instead of being funneled onto the residential portion of the block. With a pinch point north of the alley, you will have even more congestion because of northbound vehicles trying to traverse that area. With congestion, drivers often become frustrated and are more likely to make aggressive movements, increasing the likelihood of crashes. If a “Do Not Enter” sign is also used, having the pinch point south of the alley allows traffic moving southbound to either make use of the alley system or turn around in the Dunkin’ Donut driveway, whereas if it is used on a pinch point north of the alley, drivers can only use the Dunkin’ Donuts driveway or make an illegal U-turn. Staff’s preferred option is to install the pinch point south of the alley and only put up “Do Not Enter” signs if the Commission believes there is a need for additional signage.

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

Q: Would people still make U-turns or go down the east-west alleys if a “Do Not Enter” sign was posted near the pinch point and they thought they couldn’t legally go south? A: Yes, they could still go down the alley. It’s preferred that we put the pinch point to the south so that when they see the “Do Not Enter” sign, they do have a place to turn and go through. If you had a sign posted and the pinch point to the north, the only legal movement would be to turn into Dunkin’ Donuts and turn around there before coming back out.

Q: Is this really addressing the congestion issue, other than in the area beyond the pinch point? A: Once people start to see the new mitigation factors, they will likely stop turning down S Harvey Ave off of Madison St.

Q: Are there examples of the pinch points elsewhere in the Village and if so, did they work well? A: They are used on the 1200 blocks of N Lombard Ave and N Taylor Ave and they have worked well.

Q: Is there a cul-de-sac at the Dunkin’ Donuts on Roosevelt Rd? A: Yes, there is a cul-de-sac on S Grove Ave, north of the Dunkin’ Donuts.

Q: Was that approach was considered by staff for this location? A: Cul-de-sacs and diverters are not approved measures for this. We did not have any traffic calming recommendations at the last meeting based on the traffic data and the accidents that we saw on that block. The traffic concerns were primarily up by the Dunkin’ Donuts, but they were happening without accidents. The Commission did ask staff to look at a couple

options to address the concerns of the residents and the Commissioners and that's what's being presented tonight. These are not recommendations from staff to address traffic concerns, it is information staff is providing that was requested by the Commissioners.

Q: Would it be a Commission recommendation presented in opposition to the staff recommendation if it were to move forward? A: It depends on what the Commission chooses to recommend. Staff generally prefers to go with the least restrictive option to address any concerns. If there are no traffic issues to address from staff's perspective, some of these options are excessive. The "Do Not Enter" sign creates issues for access and enforcement and the pinch point north of the alley creates actual safety concerns where there current aren't any. We certainly couldn't support anything north of the alley. A pinch point south of the alley as a standalone measure has limited negative impacts, mainly loss of parking spaces.

Q: With a pinch point, either north or south of the alley, would it be possible to have bicycle pass-throughs or a small bike lane along the curb so that bikes aren't being pushed into a single lane of traffic? A: There is not enough width to allow for that, even with a substandard 4 ft bike lane.

Q: Will this be costly to install? A: This is relatively expensive because it would include drainage work, which exponentially increases the cost. The standalone pinch point that was just approved by the Village Board on N Taylor Ave, just north of Chicago Ave, was \$6,000 because we didn't have to deal with drainage. An improvement like this will probably be \$20,000 plus. If this is what's recommended, we'll certainly refine the design to make sure that we get the most cost-effective design that still meets the intent. The Village does have funds in the 2022 budget and the 2023 proposed budget for traffic calming measures as recommended by the Commission.

Q: Is it possible to push the pinch point farther south to avoid the existing storm drains? A: It would still block flow from the south to the catch basin and a storm drain would still need to be added.

Miriam Armstrong shared her concern about additional cars using the alley as it is narrow, and her garage opens into the alley. She is concerned that additional traffic will make it unsafe for her to use her garage if the pinch point is south of the alley.

Melanie spoke about how her garage also faces the alley and because it is already a heavily trafficked alley, she faces difficulties getting in and out of her garage, speeding cars, and excessive litter. The volume of cars and speeding is so bad that they already have speed bumps in the east-west alley on the east side of S Harvey. She is concerned that the situation could be made even worse by these proposed changes.

Chair Burke asked Melanie if she has a sense of where all of the cars in the alley are coming from. She noted that many are coming from or going to Dunkin' Donuts or simply going through the alley to avoid traffic on Madison St.

Beth reiterated the concerns of her neighbors who previously spoke and mentioned that there is also commercial traffic in the alley from those avoiding Madison St. She appreciates that the options suggested did not include a cul-de-sac as she'd like to be able to access her home from different directions. She asked if the bump outs would be just concrete or landscaped and if landscaped, who would be responsible for maintaining it. Staff responded that depending on the proximity of any parkway trees and any conflicts that might cause, at a minimum the Village would install sod. It would be maintained by the homeowners, just like the rest of the parkway. If the Village chooses to landscape those bump outs, the landscaped part would fall on the Village's annual landscape maintenance contractor to maintain, but we wouldn't be mowing grass. Beth asked if the pinch point would cause any flooding issues in front of her home. Staff responded that these don't normally create any kind of sewer issues and the storm drain that would be added would grab the flow of water from along the curb line.

Nat supports both pinch point options, despite hoping for a cul-de-sac. He noted that delivery trucks for Dunkin' Donuts often park on S Harvey Ave to unload and just this week he saw one that parked blocking the alley. He believes that placing the pinch point north of the alley will help address this issue and while it may impact traffic, it will shift the burden of controlling traffic to the Dunkin' Donuts, who is responsible for it.

Jesse Gallagher expressed his gratitude to the Commissioners and staff for investing time and resources to come up with viable and sensible options and for listening to the concerns of the residents on the block.

Dave Lucas Kamm echoed the sentiments of Nat and Jesse. He did note that as the Commission moves forward, they consider the traffic diversion measures recently introduced on Wesley Ave near the American House Senior Living residences and on Chicago Ave near the Maple Place Apartments that divert traffic to the north.

Chair Burke asked staff if they'd considered using signage to make the alleys one-way to limit some of the cut-through traffic. Staff responded that they did not look at limiting alley directions of traffic with this. A portion of the alley west of S Harvey Ave is owned by the Park District of Oak Park (PDOP) and they will be using that for deliveries. There are concerns with creating one-way alleys for access for deliveries and commercial vehicles. The alley traffic wasn't something staff was trying to mitigate with this, so we didn't look at those options and we would likely not be supportive of that in this area.

Chair Burke noted that his recollection was that one of the goals flagged was to limit traffic through the alleys to get to and from Dunkin' Donuts, but he understands that that wasn't staff's focus. Staff responded that as the residents mentioned, there is a process

for seasonal speed bumps in alleys and they've taken advantage of that. Those are pretty aggressive and effective at slowing most vehicles down, but there are always going to be cars that choose to do what they want.

Commissioner Fink asked staff to explain again why the north option is not the ideal one, and if they chose that one would it address some of the access concerns from the neighbors on the corners. Staff responded that with having the pinch point south of the alley and having a "Do Not Enter" sign at the pinch point, it allows vehicles to turn into Dunkin' Donuts as a legal movement but also to go through the east-west alleys. If you have it north of the alley, vehicles have to go to Dunkin' Donuts, turn around at Dunkin' Donuts, or try to make a three-point turn. Also, having the pinch point so close to where it's normally congested would make it more difficult for northbound cars to maneuver through the portion north of the alley and exacerbate the congestion. In terms of alley access, if there is no "Do Not Enter" sign on the pinch points, vehicles can still proceed through the pinch point north of the alley and continue down the alley just like they could proceed southbound through the pinch point to the south of the alley.

Jan Arnold, from the PDOP, explained the considerations that were made when designing the Community Rec Center (CRC) to help prevent further issues on S Harvey Ave. They have tried to be a good neighbor by making the most of their footprint with parking on site, adjusting the exit on S Harvey Ave to turn toward Madison St, having an arm preventing people from entering the exit on S Harvey Ave, having an entrance and exit on Highland Ave, and encouraging walking and biking to the facility.

Addie Husbands shared that traffic into Dunkin' Donuts regularly extends in both directions.

The Commissioners discussed the following items:

- Whether cost should be a concern for the Commissioners to ensure that the recommendation they make is adopted by the Board
- The various trade-offs associated with all of the options presented
- If congestion will ease over time with the pinch point north of the alley as drivers realize it's no longer convenient to use as a thoroughfare
- The effectiveness and enforceability of "Local Traffic Only" or "No Through Traffic" to discourage driving through the alleys
- If the alley issues should be included as part of the recommendation
- The option of installing the pinch point north of the alley, but having the "Do Not Enter" signage on the south side of the pinch point to prevent cars travelling northbound
- If more traffic is moving northbound or southbound
- Potential exacerbation of congestion from the CRC

Commissioner Straw made a motion that the Commissioners accept the pinch point proposal south of the alley roughly as drawn on Exhibit C, but also 1) include “Do Not Enter” signage preventing southbound traffic from entering the local section of the 500 block of S Harvey Ave and 2) implement either “Local Traffic Only” or “No Through Traffic” signage going into the commercial alleys travelling east or west that are perpendicular to the 500 block of S Harvey Ave. It was seconded by Commissioner Fink.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Straw, Fink, Katner, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

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

Chair Burke provided background information regarding the Commission’s activity to date with this item, including the direction to staff at the July 12, 2022 to send out another notice to impacted residents that was more detailed and that allowed for sufficient time for the submittal of public comment.

Parking and Mobility Services Manager Sean Keane confirmed that staff customized the notices to each of the seven zones and also provided maps. He noted that staff received a lot more substantive public comment from the community this time.

PRC Takeshi Thompson presented the item to the Commission, including additional background information starting with the implementation of the Parking Pilot Program. She then went through all of the seven zones with proposed changes, showing maps that illustrate both the current boundaries of the zones and the proposed new boundaries. She then shared a table that breaks down the number of active permits, available permits, and number of additional spaces that are being proposed for each zone. She also noted that the proposed changes only increase the number of available overnight on-street permit parking spaces, not the number of permits that will be sold. The increase in parking spaces will help address the difficulties that some of the permit holders have when trying to find parking close to where they live.

Commissioner Straw asked if any changes were made to the maps since we last saw them. Staff responded that they didn’t modify the original recommendations that have been previously discussed but are open to revisions if that’s what the Commission decides. Compromises could be made, and staff understands that based on testimony, the recommendation will likely change tonight.

Parking and Mobility Services Manager Keane read the seven written public testimony aloud. The comments, in their entirety, are attached to these minutes.

Frank Acevedo understands the need for the expansion, but is opposed to it because the expansion, particularly in the zone where he lives, is significant. He noted that there are already a number of accidents in his neighborhood due to parked cars that lower visibility and is concerned that adding more parked cars to the area will exacerbate the issue.

Sarah Geinosky lives in a multi-family unit building and believes that multi-family units are important to the character and economy of Oak Park. Parking is very frustrating for her because of managing multiple permits, moving her car for street cleaning or snow removal, and not being able to park in front of where she lives. This also affects her neighbors, including those who have limited mobility, are coming home late at night, or have children. She strongly supports the proposed changes.

Lori supports the proposal of adding spaces to one side of the street instead of both in order to better accommodate everyone on the block. She uses the overnight guest passes for her elderly parents when they come to visit from out-of-state and it would be a burden to not have that option in the future. She also suggested that if additional spaces are needed beyond one side of the street, the Commission and staff look to other nearby streets to find those additional spaces.

Stephen spoke on behalf of his father Isaac Johnson, sharing that he chose to raise his family in Oak Park due to among other things, historic neighborhoods that are maintained with high standards. He is strongly opposed to the proposed increase of overnight on-street permit parking because he believes it will degrade the high standards that the neighborhoods are known for, will impact the suburban feel, and will decrease property values. The homeowners on his block are concerned that their guests will have nowhere to park and he is concerned that the interests of longtime homeowners are being displaced to accommodate renters who only live there temporarily.

Carla shared her opinion as someone who has both rented and owned in Oak Park. She is supportive of adding additional spaces on only one side of the street, particularly on side streets, to make spaces available for those with guests. She also believes it will make it easier for snow and leaf removal, which has been a concern before.

Following the presentation and public testimony, the Commissioners discussed the following topics:

- Allowing permit parking on only one side of the street
- Potential impacts to temporary overnight passholders
- Improving sightlines at intersections that may be impacted by additional parked cars
- How to balance the needs of everyone on the block (renters, homeowners, other community members who park on blocks for events or services)
- The potential redistribution of where permit holders will park
- The need to re-evaluate in the future to make sure that it is working as intended

- If permit parking is only allowed on one side of the street, how will the side be determined

Chair Burke asked staff to clarify that a relatively small number of cars will be moving to a different spot. Staff responded yes, and that was why they showed the maps where permit holders currently reside. The initial recommendation for both sides of the street was made under the assumption that passholders and permit holders be intermixed, but staff was unable to make that happen from an enforcement standpoint. Staff does support one side given that passholders have to be separate from permit holders.

Commissioner Straw suggested that the Commissioners and staff work through each zone to determine which side of which streets would have permit parking added and which would remain the same. The other Commissioners and staff agreed that this would be helpful but expressed concerns about addressing it at the late hour and without really taking the time to consider the best options. Commissioner Straw also expressed concerns about a decision on this item being further delayed. After some discussion amongst the Commissioners, the decision was made to table the item until the next meeting, at which point staff would provide additional information and an updated table to allow the Commissioners to continue the discussion.

7. Other Enclosures

7a) POSSIBLE SECOND MEETING IN SEPTEMBER TO DISCUSS THE DRAFT 2023 WORK PLAN

Staff Liaison Juliano noted that the Commission has a full docket already and suggested the possibility of having a second meeting on September 27, 2022 to draft the 2023 Work Plan without taking time away from a regular meeting. She also mentioned that Marcella from Sustainability would also like to come back and discuss the transportation-related items from the Climate Action Plan. She noted that this makes sense to do when drafting the work plan in case there are items that should be added based on that discussion.

Chair Burke asked if staff could be ready to discuss the overnight permit parking expansion at that meeting, if time allows. Parking and Mobility Services Manager Keane responded that they could be ready.

Commissioner Straw requested that Sustainability provide a written version of their presentation to the Commissioners ahead of time to help keep the presentation short and allow for discussion without taking too much time away from the other items that need to be addressed.

Staff agreed to convey that request.

7b) TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS REMAIN REMOTE

Staff Liaison Juliano confirmed that Commission meetings will remain remote until direction is received from the Village Board or other officials indicating otherwise. The Commission is not able to make this decision on its own.

7c) TRUSTEE WALKER-PEDDAKOTLA'S RESIGNATION

Staff Liaison Juliano confirmed the resignation of Trustee Walker-Peddakotla, who was the Trustee Liaison to the Transportation Commission. The search for a new trustee is underway and staff is expected to know who the new trustee is in early November. After that, the trustee will be appointed as the Trustee Liaison to the Transportation Commission.

Chair Burke commented that Meghann Moses stepped down from the Commission and noted that he appreciated her service.

8. Adjourn

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

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Straw, Fink, Katner, Burke

Nays: None

The motion passed unanimously 4 to 0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:47 PM.

Submitted by:

Anna Muench

Administrative Assistant- Engineering

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Transportation](#)
Subject: Permit parking on 300 S Lombard
Date: Friday, September 9, 2022 12:51:32 PM

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

Hello,

I live at [REDACTED] and have concerns about allowing additional parking on our block. Many people use Lombard as a through street and go very fast. It's also a narrow street and two cars cannot get by each other at the same time. If there are more parked cars on the street there will be nowhere to move over to let other cars by. I can see this leading to accidents because people who are not familiar with how narrow the street is tend not to pull over and don't reduce their speed.

I'm including my contact information below if you have any questions.

Sincerely, Amy Long

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Transportation](#)
Subject: RE: Overnight On-Street Permit Parking on 300 S Harvey
Date: Friday, September 9, 2022 12:55:17 PM

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

To Whom It May Concern

I do not agree with allowing permit parking on both sides of 300 S. Harvey Ave. I feel that this lowers our property value because residents or resident guests can rarely find available parking on the street; trash is left on our lawns; it is a danger to children on the block; it is difficult to get down the block with parking on both sides; and snow and leaf removal are difficult with parking on both sides. I also feel that permit/street parkers are not considerate of block residents. Besides leaving their trash on our lawns, they continue to stay parked on the street during our block parties even though it is only one day twice a year and they are given multiple days notice prior to the occurrence.

I urge the committee at the very least to only allow permit parking on ONE SIDE of the street. I also urge the committee to open up permit parking to one side of more streets to spread out the cars if not to ALL STREETS in Oak Park. No one in particular wants permit parking on their block. Since we are all in this mess together and previous condo/apartment builders were not made to ensure that they provided adequate parking for their residents, I feel that we should all have to deal with some of the street parking that is now needed instead of crowding a few streets in different areas. If permits are allowable for one side of all streets, all Oak Park residents are sharing in the solution to this problem and the property values will not be affected. In the future, I feel that all new or remodeled buildings that will be used for condos/apartments/senior living, etc. should be required to provide some form of parking structure for their residents rather than forcing the community to absorb their parking needs and crowding our streets. We have all chosen to live in a suburb and pay the taxes to live here. Please don't make our village like the City of Chicago with congested, dirty, unplowed streets.

Lastly, I would also like to urge better enforcement of parking restrictions.

Thank you,
Jacqueline Zdziarski-West

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Transportation](#)
Subject: Zone Z7 overnight street parking
Date: Friday, September 9, 2022 4:56:56 PM

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

Hello,

I'm emailing to voice my opposition to the proposed change in Z7 permit parking. My husband and I have lived at [REDACTED] since 2007. One of the reasons we chose Oak Park over Berwyn or remaining in Chicago when purchasing our home is the fact that parking is not permitted overnight on a permanent basis. Having cars parked up and down the street was something we were attempting to get away from when we left the city. It is for this reason that we didn't blink an eye at the fact that the house we wanted to purchase was on a block that included both single family and multi-unit homes.

The permit is for overnight, but the majority of cars parked for the overnight permit period remain there all day long many times for days at a time. This will make it difficult or sometimes impossible for a car to pull over to pick up or drop off children (and adults) living on Oak Park Ave. The traffic does not allow for a car to idle in middle of the street while waiting for someone to come out of a home or to watch to see that a person has safely entered, the way it can be done on a side street. The ability to be able to pull into a parking lane is necessary.

In addition if the zoning is expanded my neighbors and I lose the ability to have guests stay past eleven because their cars do not have a permit. On numerous weekends when we (both my home and my neighbors) have family in town we lose the ability to use an overnight parking pass because those cars don't have a Z7 permit. Why because we live on a busy street on a block that includes both single family and multi-unit homes is parking in front of our homes twenty four hours a day for potentially days at a time considered ok, when this is not the case for those living one street east or west of me?

It appears that the majority of permit holders reside between Fillmore and Roosevelt road. Why not allow for Z7 zoned parking around Euclid Park, where there aren't residents? Or along east-west streets that don't have people's front doors along them?

Lastly, the letter states that number of permits will not increase, only the area that the parking is allowed will be expanded. If this permit change passes, how is this going to be guaranteed? In three, five, or ten years when there is an increased demand for permits and the village is looking for additional revenue, what is going to keep the next group of elected officials from increasing the number available?

Sincerely,

Theresa Callero

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Transportation](#)
Subject: Proposed Overnight permit parking
Date: Sunday, September 11, 2022 9:33:12 AM

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

The proposed overnight permit parking along Randolph west of East avenue will have a negative impact on Good Shepherd Lutheran Church's activities. The current parking along Randolph has caused me to find a different location to park when going to the church. The proposed overnight permit requirement would make parking near the church more of a problem for more people.

Mitch Theys
Resident of Oak Park
Member of Good Shepherd Lutheran Church

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Transportation](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Permit parking proposal on Randolph
Date: Sunday, September 11, 2022 10:16:45 AM

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

My family and I have been members of Good Shepherd Lutheran Church since 1982. Members of, visitors to and event attendees would be disadvantaged by the proposed 9 pm parking restriction on Randolph Street. Services, concerts, meetings, and other events often last well beyond 9 pm. What a surprise would it be for a member or visitor to come out of a Christmas Eve service and find a ticket on their windshield. Given Oak Park's proclivity to ticket the unknowing or forgetful, the Village's assurance that warning signs would not be enforced on such an occasion would fall on these deaf ears.

What is the need for such a change? If local residents need permit parking, then put such signs on East Avenue and limit it to particular areas that take all people's interests into account. Or, have the permit parking area and its signs commence at 11 pm and not apply on Holidays. Good Shepherd members, visitors, attendees and guests should not be punished for parking next to the church on Randolph when events last beyond 9 pm.

Thank you.

Carl and Linda Fisher

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Transportation](#)
Subject: Overnight On-Street parking meeting Sept 13th 2022
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 8:32:57 AM

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

Statistically, more cars on the street increase crime opportunity. Additionally, more cars make passing difficult and snow removal erratic, because people do not move their cars. We reside near an already existing allowed parking area, the congestion on the corner of Iowa and Humphrey is unsightly, and congested. Often car alarms go off at night, and people park in the crosswalk.

If we have a vote, we vote no thank you. We appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Dr. Kim Habel

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Transportation](#)
Subject: for the record, transportation committee meeting Sept 13, 2022
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 6:23:16 PM
Attachments: [Sept 13 Transportation Committee.docx](#)

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

Please read the attached statement at tonight's meeting. Also below:

Since moving to [REDACTED] in the Spring of 2019, there has been constant disruption to the peaceful enjoyment of this neighborhood. Travel lanes on Madison were reduced for bike lanes. Parking displacement during multiple weeks of Fargo filming. Removal of buildings on both sides of Madison in the 400-500 block. Permanent closure of Euclid to South of Madison followed by a year and a half of construction on senior housing. Frequent displacement of parking for new utilities in preparation for Pete's Market, followed by the recent, permanent closure of Euclid Ave to the North of Madison.

Now residents of the 400 block of Euclid have another several years ahead with inconvenience, noise, dust, construction equipment, contractor parking and traffic during the build of the 4th grocery store within a 10 minute walk. There is already a Pete's Market on Lake Street, literally one mile away.

Adding insult to injury, we no longer have direct access to Madison Ave, by foot or by car. Adding Y5 parking does not help if one can not get to their home from the parking space. Why do we pay more to park on our own street than areas with less density? I pay nearly \$700 a year for the 'privilege' of parking near my home, overnight only. The cost of a permit should be reduced, or limited to people who live on the street in question if there is not enough room or no access to adjacent parking areas.

Adding Y5 parking to Madison does not help. Parking needs to be removed on Madison to expand dedicated turn lanes and reduce congestion. Bike lanes need to be removed for safety. The street is a main thoroughfare with traffic that will only increase with market patrons, staff and the many delivery trucks to stock the store.

I support the idea of streamlined rules and regulations, but we need to address the issue that there are simply too many regulations, conflicting or vague information and bizarre conditions.

- No parking on the east side Tues 8-10 am. No parking on the west side Wed 8-10 am. Why? The street is rarely, if ever cleaned.
- If there is 2" of snow, no parking on odd days on the odd side of the street. What if that conflicts with street cleaning above?

- Y5 overnight parking 10 pm to 6 am. What is or is not allowed from 6 am to 8 am?
- There are no signs that all parking is limited to those with city licenses, or you must have a guest permit. How does a non-resident of Oak Park know they are not allowed to park overnight in non-zoned areas?

Lastly, I beg that the parking regulations be adjusted for snow emergency parking. Of course our cars need to be removed to address the hazards of a storm, but why is it on the residents to pay additional fees and/or be further inconvenienced by parking still farther away in 50% fewer spaces.

Thank you.

Lynda Myers

