



Meeting Minutes - Final

Transportation Advisory Board

Thursday, February 17, 2022

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

A. CALL TO ORDER:

B. ROLL CALL:

This was closed.

Present 5 - Scott Hurley, Michael Melaniphy, Inga Orolin, Matthew Seeberg, and James Webb

Absent 3 - Janet Blubaugh, Michael Brown, and Mary Howenstine

C. PUBLIC FORUM:

There were no speakers for public forum.

This was closed.

D. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Police Department Report

There was no police report

This was closed.

1. [Approve the minutes of the October 7, 2021 Transportation Advisory Board Meeting](#)

Attachments: [TAB Minutes October 7 2021](#)

A motion was made by Hurley, seconded by Webb, approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Hurley, Melaniphy, Orolin, Seeberg, and Webb

Absent: 3 - Blubaugh, Brown, and Howenstine

2. [Approve a recommendation to establish a "No Parking Zone" on the south side of Jefferson Avenue from a point 80 feet west of the centerline of Whispering Hills Drive to a point 165 west of the centerline of Whispering Hills Drive](#)

Attachments: [Jefferson Avenue No Parking Zone Draft Ordinance](#)
[Jefferson and Whispering Hills No Parking Zone Exhibit](#)

City Traffic Engineer Andy Hynes explains the need for additional parking

restriction on Jefferson Avenue southwest of the intersection with Whispering Hills because of sight distance concerns.

Hurley asks if parking is usually occurring on this section.

Hynes states that not many vehicles use the area to park.

Hurley asks if any resident had any concerns with the restriction.

Hynes states that there were no concerns.

A motion was made by Seeberg, seconded by Webb, approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Hurley, Melaniphy, Orolin, Seeberg, and Webb

Absent: 3 - Blubaugh, Brown, and Howenstine

3. [Approve a recommendation to establish a “No Parking Zone” on the east side of Webster Street from a point 80 feet south of the centerline of Van Buren Avenue to a point 105 feet south of the centerline of Van Buren Avenue](#)

Attachments: [Webster Street No Parking Zone Draft Ordinance](#)
[Webster Street No Parking Zone Exhibit](#)

Hynes explains the need for a removal of a parking spot on the east side of Webster Street south of Van Buren Avenue because of the need for access to electrical equipment that is in the right of way.

A motion was made by Hurley, seconded by Webb, approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Hurley, Melaniphy, Orolin, Seeberg, and Webb

Absent: 3 - Blubaugh, Brown, and Howenstine

4. [Approve a recommendation to establish a “No Parking, Stopping, or Standing Zone” on Honey Locust Drive from 600’ north of Winterberry Avenue to a point 100’ north of the centerline of Winterberry Avenue on school days from 8:45 AM - 9:15 AM and from 3:15 PM - 3:45 PM.](#)

Attachments: [Honey Locust Drive Parking Restrictions Map](#)
[Honey Locust Drive Survey](#)
[Honey Locust Drive Ordinance](#)

TED Project Manager Michael Prousa explains the need for restricting parking during the school drop off and pick up times on Honey Locust Drive to limit congestion.

Laura Bahardinkar states that she is in support of the restriction because of the congestion in the area and states that pedestrians are almost hit because of the dangerous driving. She also mentions that the sight distance near 103rd because of parked cars is causing issues.

Jennifer Tressler states that the parking is causing congestion and dangerous situations. She has reached out to the principle of the school and states that she is on board with the recommendation.

Rasheraj Godam states that people recklessly park close to the roundabout and stop in front of driveways. Drivers also drop their kids off on the opposite side of the street and let their kids cross at the midblock which creates a dangerous situation.

Hurley asks if these changes are communicated to the residents so that they are aware of the changes.

Prousa responds that the city has reached out to the school's principle about sending out a letter to the parents regarding when the changes will take place.

Seeberg appreciated the residents that have told their stories concerning the situation that they have been encountering.

Webb asks for confirmation if any of the parents are in a queue for the drop-off line.

Prousa confirms that they are not in any queue, and they are just dropping of students.

Melaniphy states that his is an area that is challenging to maneuver and thanks residents and staff for their comments on the issue.

A motion was made by Hurley, seconded by Seeberg, approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Hurley, Melaniphy, Orolin, Seeberg, and Webb

Absent: 3 - Blubaugh, Brown, and Howenstine

5. [Approve a recommendation to select Alternative #2 as the preferred alignment for the proposed improvements to 248th Avenue between 95th Street and 103rd Street](#)

Attachments: [Recommended Alternative 2 248th Avenue](#)

[Alternative 1 248th Avenue](#)

[Alternative 3 248th Avenue](#)

Project Engineer Ray Fano outlines the 248th Avenue project and introduces the consultants from CivilTech.

The consultants give a presentation on the 248th Avenue Project.

Tara McDonald asks what was actually improved for the ICN development concerning the north access to 248th.

TED Director Bill Novack states that the City approved a right in right out for the

north access and that the City will monitor the traffic and that the City reserves the right to make changes to the access if there are operation challenges.

Tara McDonald asks if that is indicated in the ordinance.

Novack states that he will find out from the Legal Department on details regarding the north access.

Tara McDonald asks if the PDR includes the ICN driveways.

CivilTech states that IDOT is aware of the north driveways.

Tara McDonald asks if the north access being full access would meet IDOT specifications for the north and south access points to be that close.

CivilTech states that this would be something that the City would have to look into in the future.

Tara McDonald asks why the signal warrant is not in the plans when it is warranted in the future.

Hynes explains that it could be warranted in the future but it is currently not warranted.

Tara McDonalds states that she has concerns that not everything that the City says will be warranted in the future is being considered in the current roadway design at the present.

Hynes states that the ICN development will have to come back to the City for each phase of the build out and traffic will be evaluated at that time.

Tara McDonald asks if the City has looked at stop times for vehicles that are coming out of ICN and then merging into traffic and then someone potentially crossing at the bike trail.

Novack states that ICN will have an advisory speed limit posted on their driveway for the vehicles leaving.

Tara McDonald asks if the southbound left being proposed at Honey Locust will have enough room for the traffic coming into the ICN.

CivilTech states that the taper is as close to the crossing as they can according to IDOT. And states that about 6 to 8 cars would be able to fit in the queue.

Tara McDonald asks whether every entity has been notified of the section 4 document for the trail.

CivilTech states that the Park District and Forest Preserve will be alerted of any

changes of the designs or area.

Tara McDonald asks what the timing is on this step.

CivilTech states that it would be after City Council approves of the alternative.

CivilTech states that the document would still get approved if the trail has to move to an alternative location.

Tara McDonald asks if it is a requirement to look at the hourly volumes throughout the day.

CivilTech states that the PM peak hour is the critical hour and the greatest hour in relation to traffic volume.

Tara McDonald asks if the peak hour takes into consideration the turning movements of the ICN.

CivilTech states that the midday is the highest ICN volume and during the midday the traffic on 248th is much less. The PM hour is still the highest total volume.

Steve Loman asks CivilTech when they were made aware of the ICN project.

CivilTech states that they were made aware of the ICN project early on and it was a mistake to not have it on the original drawings.

Steve Loman asks if we looked at a macro traffic report for this project.

Hynes states that they have to consider the 2050 CMAP numbers and they are required to use that information for IDOT procedures.

Steve Loman asks what the south entrance of the ICN property aligns with.

Hynes states that Honey Locust Drive is directly across the ICN property.

Steve Loman asks when the initial sound study was done for the 248th project.

CivilTech states that it was done prior to the 3rd public meeting, spring/summer of 2021.

Novack states the noise study does not take into account future development, only development that have a building permit.

Steve Loman asks if CMAP accounted for the ICN parcel and what would be going in to that parcel for their 2050 traffic projects.

Novack states the CMAP looks at a macro level for their numbers and that they had a residential development on the parcel. IDOT allowed the City to change the traffic projections to include the ICN development.

Steve Loman asks what the peak traffic flow is for the ICN development.

CivilTech states that the specific number is in the traffic report.

Steve Loman states that the peak traffic will be between the two services in the PM. He states 60 percent of the vehicles will be coming south on 248th. And that 60 percent of 580 vehicles will be heading south to a left turn that has a capacity of 8 vehicles. Steve Loman asks if the taper is decided by speed limit.

CivilTech states that speed is one of the criteria and the other criteria is volumes.

Steve Loman states that his biggest concern is cut through traffic through the neighborhood. He would like a comprehensive traffic study to be done before the project goes through.

Hurley asks about the safety of the offset of the trail and if there is any study that this is a safer alternative to any other crossing.

CivilTech states that the configuration is meant for bicyclists and pedestrians to make eye contact with vehicles. They also state that push buttons are also in the median. They state that there is more room with the offset for stacking than something that is straight across.

Webb asks if it would be possible to add a flashing beacon in the parking lot so that drivers leaving the ICN development would be able to know if people are crossing at the trail before leaving the parking lot.

CivilTech states that the RFB's are very regulated and are relatively new. Currently it would not be possible to have them situated on the side street.

Seeberg asks if there was ever consideration for another type of design for the bike crossing.

Novack states that the City looked into possibilities and the cost of doing any other options was not feasible.

Seeberg asks if in front of the unincorporated house there are other areas where the trail goes down to 8 feet.

CivilTech states that the other area would be from the crossing to Trumpet that would be 8 feet wide.

CivilTech states the resident was able to give feedback to staff on the changes around his property.

Seeberg asks what the course would be if TAB were not to approve this.

Novack states that a negative recommendation would still go to City Council.

Webb asks if once ICN traffic was added into the CMAP projections that the current alignment was still meeting IDOT requirements.

CivilTech states that the alignment still does.

Hurley asks if this alternative would sustain the traffic on 248th for the 2050 traffic.

CivilTech states that we are nowhere near the next step for capacity which would be a 6 lane highway.

Seeberg asks if there is enough right away to add a right turn lane for ICN.

Novack states that the City is looking into relocating utilities and investigating the need for a right turn lane.

Melaniphy asks if electric vehicles have been taken into account for the noise study.

CivilTech states that the noise model incorporates the average vehicle and that electric vehicles would be included into the model in the future.

Melaniphy states that the board thanks the public, staff, and consultants for all their input and expertise on this project.

Staff asks the board to also vote on whether the City should pursue federal funding for this project and the board voted unanimously for the City to do that.

A motion was made by Webb, seconded by Seeberg, approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Hurley, Melaniphy, Orolin, and Webb

Nay: 1 - Seeberg

Absent: 3 - Blubaugh, Brown, and Howenstine

E. OLD BUSINESS:

There was no old business discussed.

This was closed.

F. NEW BUSINESS:

Hynes states that there was a request from Naperville Environmental Sustainability Task Force who were looking for a couple members from TAB that would be interested in volunteering to engage with NEST.

Hurley and Seeberg volunteer.

This was closed.

G. ADJOURNMENT:

A motion was made by Webb, seconded by Seeberg, to adjourn the meeting at 9:13 p.m. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Hurley, Melaniphy, Orolin, Seeberg, and Webb

Absent: 3 - Blubaugh, Brown, and Howenstine