

1200 Wilmette Avenue Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

## NOTICE OF MEETING

The Transportation Commission of the Village of Wilmette will hold a meeting on Monday, June 23, 2014 at 7:00 p.m., in the Training Room, Second Floor, of the Wilmette Village Hall, 1200 Wilmette Avenue, Wilmette, Illinois.

At this meeting, the Transportation Commission will discuss the following:

- Parking and traffic concerns of area residents on the 100 block of Linden Avenue
- Traffic control at the intersection of Lake Avenue and $12^{\text {th }}$ Street
- Traffic control at the intersection of $15^{\text {th }}$ Street and Prairie Avenue / Spencer Avenue
- Update on the compliance analysis for the 'stop here for pedestrian' signs at the uncontrolled crosswalk at the intersection of Wilmette Avenue and $15^{\text {th }}$ Street
- Approval of 2014/2015 school crossing guard schedule.


## Transportation Commission

Pat Lilly, Chair
(847) 853-7660

Fax (847) 853-7701

MEETING AGENDA
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
June 23, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.
Second Floor Training Room
Wilmette Village Hall
I. Call to Order
II. Approval of minutes of the April 29, 2014 meeting
III. Discussion of Traffic Concerns of Area Residents on the 100 Block of Linden Avenue
IV. Discussion of Traffic Control at the Intersection of Lake Avenue and $12^{\text {th }}$ Street
V. Discussion of Traffic Control at the Intersection of $15^{\text {th }}$ Street and Prairie/Spencer Avenue
VI. Discussion of the Final Compliance Analysis of the Stop Here for Pedestrian Signs at the Intersection of Wilmette Avenue and $15^{\text {th }}$ Street
VII. Approval of the 2014/2015 School Crossing Guard Schedule
VIII. Old Business
IX. Adjournment

Transportation Commission
Pat Lilly, Chair

IF YOU ARE A PERSON WITH A DISABILITY AND NEED SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS TO PARTICIPATE IN AND/OR ATTEND A VILLAGE OF WILMETTE PUBLIC MEETING, PLEASE NOTIFY THE MANAGEMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT BY TELEPHONE AT (847) 251-2700 [TDD No. (847) 853-7634] AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.


MEETING MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 2014 7:00 P.M.
SECOND FLOOR TRAINING ROOM OF VILLAGE HALL

| Members Present: | Chairperson Cathy Albrecht <br> Commissioner Pat Lilly <br> Commissioner Brendan McCarthy <br> Commissioner Reinhardt Schneider <br> Commissioner Craig LeMoyne <br> Commissioner Michael Taylor |
| :--- | :--- |
| Members Absent: | Commissioner Steve Santacruz |
| Staff Present: | Brigitte Berger, P.E., Director of Engineering Services <br> Dan Manis, P.E., Civil Engineer II <br> Brian King, Police Chief |
| Guests Present: | George Hossfeld, 512 Romona Road <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Bernie Hossfeld, 512 Romona Road <br> John Hardt, 735 Romona Road <br> Sally Gold, 621 Romona Road <br> Stephen Tilley, 811 Romona Road <br> Richard Frank, 801 Romona Road |

## I. CALL TO ORDER.

Chairperson Albrecht called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

## II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES; TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING OF JANUARY 8, 2014.

Chairperson Albrecht directed the Commission's attention to the draft minutes of the Transportation Commission meeting of January 8, 2014. Commissioner McCarthy moved approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Schneider. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote. The motion passed.

## III. DISCUSSION OF TRAFFIC CONCERNS OF AREA RESIDENTS RELATED TO ROMONA ROAD BETWEEN WILMETTE AND LAKE AVENUES.

Dan Manis led the discussion. There have been numerous resident requests to study the area and determine if it met the warrants in the traffic calming policy. In general, the Village's traffic calming policy states that a perceived problem should be further studied if one of the following objective criteria are met:

- Traffic volume greater than 1,200 vehicles per day (VPD) on a local street; or
- $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed more than 7 miles per hour (mph) over the posted speed limit; or
- Excessive accident experience related to unreasonable volumes or speeds.
Note: $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed is the speed at or below $85 \%$ of the vehicles travel and is widely used in the field of traffic engineering to characterize reasonable and prudent driving behavior.

Dan Manis noted that:

- Traffic volume is between 1000 and 1200 vehicles per day and street is bounded by two collector streets on either end and therefore functions like a collector street.
- $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speeds range from 30 to 34 mph and are slightly higher on the north end of the block
- accident history is low (4 accidents over the past 5 years)

Residents requested traffic calming for this area to slow the speeds. Dan Manis highlighted two techniques the Village has used in the past including speed humps and pavement marking.

Summary: The traffic volumes and accident data suggest that there is not a cutthrough or inherent safety problem with the functionality of the street. The speed data, however, does exceed the 7 mph over the posted speed limit threshold warranting further study per the Village's Traffic Calming Policy. Currently, there are no funds in the 2014 Village budget allocated for traffic calming improvements. Since the economic downturn in 2008, revenue generated for infrastructure has been allocated toward road, alley and brick projects, sidewalk and curb repairs, and other maintenance initiatives. Given these competing
priorities, it is most likely that future traffic calming measures will be implemented as part of routine street resurfacing projects.

Commissioner Brendan McCarthy asked the dates of traffic study. Dan Manis responded the dates were April 8-11. He noted studies are conducted on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays. School was in session.

Resident Sally Gold, 621 Romona, stated she lives across from the playground near Regina commented that she has seen many dangerous things. First, cars are parked illegally for pick up and drop off of children preventing cars from passing through and preventing her from being able to get out of her driveway. She made a point that she visited her grand-daughters school where the rule is there is no parking allowed close to the school. That school also has incentive programs encouraging children to walk to school. Secondly, there are too many signs on the street and no one abides by them. Third, the one-way traffic rule/sign prohibiting traffic going north on Romona is very restricting and doesn't make sense especially when school is not in session. Staff will ask public works to remove the cover over "on school days". Lastly, Ms. Gold noted that larger vehicles are more of a hazard. For example, garbage pick-up day, the truck comes when the kindergarteners are dismissed from school. Someone could get hurt on the street.

Resident Steve Tilly, 811 Romona, wanted to add he is more concerned with speed. He is afraid to have his daughter walk to Romona School. On two occasions, he's seen cars drive over the curb just to get around other cars. He drives three blocks because he doesn't feel comfortable. This is a problem and noted there is a speed issue during school hours.

Resident John Hart, 735 Romona, echoes concern for the south end school traffic because Regina school also dumps out into Romona. There is a problem with speeding on the north all times of the day with volume being higher during school times. He notes the street is very straight and there are essentially two schools. Sidewalks are up against very shallow curbs. We have a lot of distracted drivers that don't mix well with a lot of pedestrian traffic. John Hart asked the Commission address these issues affecting safety and parking concerns.

Brigitte Berger said we could move the sidewalks back with a 66 foot of right of way and get about 16 feet of additional parkway. She also noted the state has a Safe Routes to School grant which this project could be a candidate for.

Resident Richard Frank, 801 Romona, a resident for 10 years, comments that the period in which traffic was measured follows the down turn of construction. When construction was booming truck traffic was using Romona as a cut-thru.

Resident George Hossfeld, 512 Romona, is an emergency physician and home during the day. When parents are picking up and dropping off children, it's an act of faith to get out of their driveway.

Commissioner Schneider asked if we've ever considered having people out there directing traffic.

Chairperson Cathy Albrecht stated yes. But notes, in the morning it's easier to keep traffic going during drop off, however, during pick up, you have to wait for your child to be picked up and traffic does not flow easily during that time.

Chief Brian King discussed enforcement. Notes the population at that school is higher than it has ever been. Also, the culture at Romona School is that children are so heavily scheduled that picking up their child to get them to their next after school activity is so predominant right now and brings about more traffic. To improve on traffic, Chief Brian King suggests the garbage hauler could change hours and public works could modify leaf collection during the times that makes more sense.

Resident George Hossfeld continues to add he does not witness any speed issues. The reason he is attending this meeting is he did not attend a meeting in the past and the result was a one-way street where people ended up parking in front of his driveway. The current situation is much worse for him and his wife than prior. He doesn't want any speed bumps. Mrs. Hossfeld states getting out of her driveway is a problem. People have no courtesy nor common sense. She says with regard to speeding, you'd almost have to put a speed bump every few feet.

Chair Albrecht mentioned speeding is more north. Both Chair Albrecht and Ms. Berger say speed bumps are not the best way to tackle this issue.

Commissioner Schneider asks if removing "on school days" from sign is sufficient for the Hossfelds to improve their situation or do they want the "right turn only" sign completely eliminated?

Resident George Hossfeld says he would take whatever. He just doesn't want to see it get more congested and states speed bumps would only make the situation worse.

Commissioner Craig LeMoyne asked if removing the restriction on Central and Romona (if you're heading south on Romona, you can't turn west on Central) would solve the problem. Residents said no.

Commissioner Craig LeMoyne asked what happens if cars are doing something illegal. Chief King stated every school gets heavy enforcement at least once. Any complaints typically come from principal which prompts them to give warning to parents first. Next, officers are placed on site to continue enforcement. And lastly tickets are given if not compliant.

Mr. Hossfeld stated some houses have no curb. He has a tiny curb. Due to small curbs, people park in front of his driveway repeatedly and say they did not know
it was a driveway. It is usually worse at pick up between 3:00pm and 3:25pm. And it's 4 pm before you can go around because of the signage.

Ms. Sally Gold also added congestion is also in the morning around 7:30am due to Regina kids. At times she has to wait 10 minutes before she could back out. When they are let out, it is a "free for all" and Regina drivers are inexperienced drivers.

Chair Albrecht mentioned it may be time for the Romona principal to send out a letter to improve this problem. Chief Brian King agrees to implement a "Be A Good Neighbor" program. Perhaps get some parent volunteers to discourage people from blocking driveways.

Resident Mr. Tilly mentioned he has received those letters in the past but also states people do not listen.

Resident Richard Frank made a comment to paint a yellow stripe on the driveway. If you make it consistent, perhaps it would improve the situation.

A resident asks if we've tried carpooling. Chair Albrecht stated it's an issue of compliance.

Consensus is we should ask the school to implement a "Be A Good Neighbor" program. Chief Brian King states we will meet with the school to initiate program and follow up with enforcement.

Commissioner Schneider asked all night parking on at least one side of the street would make a difference. Ms. Berger stated she doesn't think it would help especially with the daytime issue. There aren't two lanes available because the road is too narrow. You can't park and get two-way traffic through. There are lots of techniques we can do including curb extensions or pavement resurfacing, it just takes time and money.

Resident Sally Gold made a suggestion when walking a child. What if the pedestrians were to walk only on the EAST side of the street?

Resident George Hossfeld mentioned the large parking lot behind Romona School. He wanted to see if they can used that parking for parents picking up their children.

This was done in the past but created a different problem with school buses taking up to much room in the streets.

A resident mentioned there is no stop sign going eastbound on Washington.
Ms. Berger stated we can take care of that immediately. Ms. Berger also noted that we will not stop traffic on Romona because the traffic volumes on the side streets don't come close to meeting requirements for an all-way stop.

Ms. Berger mentioned that the Safe Routes to School Grant could help with sidewalk reconfiguration but probably not with the road work.

Commissioner Schneider drew the Commission's attention to page four of the recommendation packet asking what the Village plans on doing with the list of candidates for traffic calming measures; particularly on Elmwood, Chestnut and Greenwood (all between Hunter and Ridge).

Ms. Berger noted these streets had high speeds and/or high cut through volumes which means they technically met the traffic calming warrants for some form of traffic calming. On Elmwood, specifically, it's cut through and speed. However, nothing has been designed as of yet. The stop sign that is there is for right-ofway control only. Stop signs do not change the speed issue.

Chairperson Cathy Albrecht briefly summarized meeting:

- Traffic calming has to wait until there is money
- Look changing the signage by removing "on school days" and the hours to improve access so we're not prohibiting traffic for no reason
- Speaking to the garbage company so it does not pick up during heavy school times
- Speaking to the school to implement a "Be A Good Neighbor" program
- Public Works could do leaf collection at non-school times
- Any other school issues will have to be addressed at another meeting
- It is encouraged for residents to speak to the school directly


## IV. OLD BUSINESS.

Ms. Berger stated that a group called the Active Transportation Alliance in Wilmette came to the last Village Board meeting to inform the Village Board of their bike initiatives. They were directed to the Municipal Services Committee, but at some point they may be deferred to the Transportation Commission. This bike advocacy group wants the Village to adopt a "complete streets" ordinance which means any time you rehabilitate a street it should be built for cars, pedestrians and bikers as well.

Ms. Berger thanked Pat Lilly who will be the next chairman of the Commission.
Ms. Berger mentioned the Commission may also get information about a traffic circle that's proposed by the state and county at Illinois and Hibbard. It would be the first traffic circle in Wilmette. So far, the concept of a circle has not been embraced by the school at that location. IDOT still wants to have a public hearing and collect public comment. Residents are encouraged to attend. The number one concern about the traffic circle is that it's difficult for pedestrians to maneuver.

Ms. Berger also mentioned the reduction of signage campaign has started so residents may notice fewer signs in the Village.

Ms. Berger also thanked Chair Cathy Albrecht for eight productive years of service.

Commissioner Michael Taylor was introduced and welcomed to the committee. Michael has lived in Wilmette for four years and is originally from Washington D.C.

## V. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Brendan McCarthy motioned to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Reinhardt Schneider seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote. The motion carried. No further discussion occurred on the motion.

The meeting was thereafter adjourned.
Minutes Respectfully Prepared by Ms. Janet Guavita and Mr. Dan Manis.

Date: June 19, 2014
To: Transportation Commission
From: Brigitte Berger, P.E., Director of Engineering Services
Daniel Manis, P.E., Civil Engineer
Subject: Discussion of Traffic Concerns of Area Residents on the 100 Block of Linden Avenue

## Recommendation

Discussion of traffic concerns of area residents on the 100 block of Linden Avenue.

## Background

At the April 22, 2014 Village Board meeting, the Baha'i House of Worship received approval from Wilmette's Village Board to reconstruct their parking lot. During the approval process several neighbors expressed concern about parking and traffic hardships on Linden. Village President Bielinski asked the Baha'i House of Worship to work in good faith with the Transportation Commission and the residents of the neighborhood to address traffic and parking problems.

## Discussion

This meeting is a chance for the Linden residents to share concerns with the Commission. A representative from the Baha'i House of Worship will be in attendance to summarize parking changes. This meeting will be the first of several proposed meetings for the Commission to address any potential issues.

## Documents Attached:

1. Excerpt of minutes from $4 / 22 / 14$ Village Board meeting regarding Linden Avenue
6.16 Zoning Board of Appeals Report, Case \#2014-Z-13, 350 Ridge Road regarding a request for a special use for a limited service restaurant (Domino's) in accordance with the plans submitted. The use shall run with the use; adoption of Ordinance \#2014-O-19.

The request was handled with the Consent Agenda for a special use for a limited service restaurant (Domino's) in accordance with the plans submitted; the use shall run with the use. Ordinance \#2014-O-19 was adopted with the Consent Agenda authorizing the special use of this case.
6.17 Zoning Board of Appeals Report, Case \#2014-Z-14, 1323 Ashland Avenue regarding a request for a 141.66 square foot (1.61\%) total floor area variation to permit a two-story addition in accordance with the plans submitted; adoption of Ordinance \#2014-O-20.

The request was handled with the Consent Agenda for a 141.66 square foot (1.61\%) total floor area variation to permit a two-story addition in accordance with the plans submitted. Ordinance \#2014-O-20 was adopted with the Consent Agenda authorizing the variations of this case.
6.191 Zoning Board of Appeals Report, Case \#2014-Z-15, 100 Linden Avenue regarding a request for a 16.5' side yard ramp setback variation to permit the construction of a handicapped ramp and a 6 space parking variation to permit the reconstruction of the parking lot in accordance with the plans submitted.

Trustee Swanson moved adoption of Zoning Board of Appeals Report, Case \#2014-Z-15, 100 Linden Avenue regarding a request for a 16.5’ side yard ramp setback variation to permit the construction of a handicapped ramp and a 6 space parking variation to permit the reconstruction of the parking lot in accordance with the plans submitted, seconded by Trustee Wolf.

President Bielinski noted that the request received a negative recommendation from the Zoning Board of Appeals and would need five positive votes from the Village Board to overturn the recommendation.

Scott Conrad, project manager for the restoration project at the Baha'i House of Worship, said the restoration project has recently been completed. Also during the past few years their parking lot has been
closed due to construction by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (MWRD). The MWRD destroyed the parking lot to rebuild the canal, pump station, embankment and the retaining wall. The proposed new parking lot will have more handicap spaces, a handicap ramp and space for bus parking which is why they need a variation for six parking spaces. He noted that they have reduced their staff and the staff that is there now is only allowed to park at the lot across the street. Ninety-six percent of the people who visit the Baha'i House of Worship are not members of the Baha'i community. The house of worship does not charge admission and many buses with visitors come to visit. The buses are not encouraged to come, but no one will stop them from visiting and they are trying to accommodate the buses by having them drop off people in their parking lot rather than parking on Linden and dropping off people. Mr. Conrad noted that parking in the area is very congested due to the beach, yacht club and local residential area construction.

Trustee Wolf complimented Mr. Conrad on the whole restoration project.
Trustee Swanson asked if the parking lot will be the same size as it was previously.

Mr. Conrad said the size will be the same but the new parking lot has to meet the new guidelines for handicap parking and they also want to have an area for buses to be able to drop off visitors. They will have 57 parking spaces in the new lot.

Trustee Swanson said the proposed parking lot seems to have lost two spaces to the new ADA guidelines for the number of handicap spaces required. He asked if the parking on Linden Avenue could be addressed, such as permit parking on Linden for the residents. He asked if resident permit parking would be an issue for the Baha'i House of Worship.

Ron Gould, Baha'i National Property Manager, said he believes permit parking on Linden Avenue would significantly hinder their operation. They have many visitors and there are times where both their parking lots are full. He suggested putting time limits on parking on Linden Avenue, he did not really know what would work the best. He felt it was a positive getting the buses in their parking lot, off of Linden Avenue.

President Bielinski said if the Village Board approves the variations this evening, was it possible to have a commitment from the Baha'i House of Worship to meet with the Transportation Commission and work out a plan for parking with the neighbors. He said there is a parking issue in the neighborhood due to the beaches, yacht club, el train and the Baha'i House of Worship.

Mr. Gould said he would absolutely commit to that, he would like to sit down with everyone involved and discuss the parking situation in the area and work out what is best for everyone.

Trustee Ducommun asked why there are only 57 parking spots in the new parking lot design.

Mr. Conrad said the proposed parking lot design is the one that MWRD agreed to. They would love to have more parking spaces but MWRD has asked them to build a retaining wall also on the property. He noted that the property is all leased from MWRD.

Trustee Ducommun asked how many parking spaces there were in the lot across the street.

Mr. Conrad said the parking lot across the street has 52 spaces and that is where staff parks and contractors that are working at the Baha'i.

Mr. Gould said they do not police the lot so they do not know how many people are parking there from the beach and the yacht club. They use approximately 20 spaces in the lot during the day for staff and contractors.

Trustee Ducommun asked how people would know that there is extra parking across the street.

Mr. Gould said they have signage, maps and directions to the lot across the street.

Trustee Swanson asked who designed the new parking lot.
Mr. Conrad said a civil engineering company designed the parking lot with the MWRD. If the plans are not approved by the Village Board, they
would have to go back to MWRD to approve new plans and it would be a lengthy procedure.

President Bielinski asked if there were residents who would like to speak regarding the request.

Martin Dawson, 139 Linden, said he lives directly across the street from the Baha'i House of Worship. He has lived there for 19 years and the problem for him is the number of vehicles that park on Linden especially on weekends and the summertime. There used to be guards employed by the Baha'i to help with traffic and parking but they do not see them anymore. He said there are many buses and limousines that come to the gardens and obstruct traffic or take up parking. He does not want to lose the six parking spaces in the lot and would also like to see some restrictive parking for residents only.

President Bielinski said it sounds like due to the new ADA requirements, three parking spaces are going to be lost. The other three spaces will be used to get buses off the street. He asked Mr. Dawson if he would rather have three parking spaces in the street rather than in the parking lot to get the buses off the street.

Mr. Dawson said he would like to have some solution that holds down the number of cars that are parking on Linden Avenue and some guards that will direct traffic and help with parking.

John Rekenthaler, 147 Linden, said many neighbors on Linden Avenue have issues with people who park on Linden and block them in. His access is off an alley and if people park in the alley then he has no access to his home. He would like to see some parking restrictions to help residents.

Rovena Rekenthaler, 147 Linden, said she does not have a driveway as the Village did not allow driveways when her house was built. She constantly has trouble getting in and out of her alley as people park in the alley which blocks access. Linden Avenue rarely has parking available due to the Baha'i, beach, yacht club and construction traffic, and she believes it is a real problem for the neighborhood. She would like to see some type of parking enforcement on Linden Avenue.

Mr. Gould said he is very willing to work with the Village and the neighbors regarding parking on Linden Avenue. They have no control over visitor buses or wedding limousines that want to visit the Baha'i gardens for pictures, they do not even know they are coming to visit.

Trustee Swanson said he believes the issue is parking demand and not just the Baha'i House of Worship parking. He believes the only solution is to have a meeting and discuss parking and review enforcement. He will support the request with the understanding that the Baha'i House of Worship will meet with the neighbors, mediated through the Transportation Commission, to make the situation better for everyone on Linden Avenue.

Trustee Ducommun said all the stories from the neighbors regarding how inconvenienced they have been are very compelling. She will not support the request, as she believes all the parties need to come together to discuss the parking issues and figure out what the right solution is for everyone.

Trustee Wolf said she has sympathy for the neighborhood and believes there is a lot of parking overflow from the beaches, yacht club and el station. She believes the best solution is to work with the Transportation Commission and find some type of parking restrictions and bus regulations for the neighborhood.

Trustee McKenna said the proposal for the parking lot makes sense to him and he will support the application. He also supports the recommendation that the Transportation Commission find some solutions this year for parking.

Trustee Basil said he also believes the parking is a solvable problem. He has confidence that the Transportation Commission working with the neighbors and the Baha'i will solve the problem. He believes the application should be approved so the construction of the parking lot can be started and there will be 57 more parking spots available as soon as possible.

President Bielinski said he is confident that the Baha'i will work in good faith with the neighbors through the Transportation Commission. He does not believe the issue is about a few parking spaces, he believes the issue
is about all the traffic and parking issues in the neighborhood. He believes all the standards for variations have been met and he will support the application. President Bielinski said he hopes the changes are the first step towards better parking and traffic flow. The Baha'i House of Worship is one of the community's finest treasures and he would like to support their efforts. At the same time, he believes the Transportation Commission will work with the neighbors to find a better solution for the neighborhood.

Voting yes: Trustees Swanson, Wolf, McKenna, Basil and President Bielinski. Voting no: Trustee Ducommun. The motion carried.
6.18 Adoption of Ordinance \#2014-O-15 adding wireless telecommunication facilities as a special use in the R3 zoning district with the same limitations placed on locating antennas on institutional buildings.

Trustee Swanson moved adoption of Ordinance \#2014-O-15 adding wireless telecommunication facilities as a special use in the R3 zoning district with the same limitations placed on locating antennas on institutional buildings seconded by Trustee Basil.

President Bielinski said the request is before the Village Board this evening because the Village received a request from National Wireless Ventures, LLC to locate an antennae on the roof of a five story condominium building located at 420 Linden Avenue. Tonight the Village Board will consider whether such a use should be allowed as a special use within the R3 zoning district which is a zoning district within which that building stands. The Village Board is not voting to allow an antennae at 420 Linden Avenue or any other specific location tonight. If Ordinance \#2014-O-15 is approved tonight, the proposal for an antennae at 420 Linden Avenue will need to be reviewed by the Appearance Review Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals and the Village Board. Since the genesis of this ordinance is connected to the building at 420 Linden Avenue, President Bielinski feels compelled to disclose that his father-inlaw is a resident at 420 Linden Avenue and president of its condominium association. While he has been advised by Corporation Counsel that he does not have an actual conflict of interest, to avoid the perception of appearance of a conflict of interest, he will not be voting on the ordinance or participating in the discussion of the ordinance.
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Date: June 19, 2014
To: Transportation Commission
From: Brigitte Berger, P.E., Director of Engineering Services Daniel Manis, P.E., Civil Engineer

Subject: Discussion of Traffic Control at the Intersection of Lake Avenue and $12^{\text {th }}$ Street

## Recommendation

Discussion of traffic control at the intersection of Lake Avenue and $12^{\text {th }}$ Street.

## Background

The Village has received requests from area residents to consider changing the intersection of Lake Avenue and $12^{\text {th }}$ Street from a 2 -way stop to a 4 -way stop controlled intersection. Therefore, the Village collected traffic and accident data and retained the services to Traffic Analysis and Design, Inc. (TADI) to complete a traffic study for this intersection to determine if a 4-way stop is justified.

## Discussion

Section 2B. 07 of the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) outlines the procedures necessary to evaluate an intersection for multi-way stop control. The MUTCD is a federally regulated manual governing the placement of nationally standardized traffic control signs, traffic signal, pavement marking, etc. The enclosed technical memorandum prepared by TADI summarizes the MUTCD criteria and results of the traffic study.

## Summary

The data collected by the Village and TADI does not meet the conditions of the MUTCD to support placement of a 4-way stop at the intersection of Lake Avenue and $12^{\text {th }}$ Street.

## Documents Attached:

1. TADI Memorandum dated June 18, 2014

# MEMORANDUM 

To: Mr. Dan Manis, P.E.
Village of Wilmette
From: Peter Lemmon, P.E., PTOE
Tracy Shandor, P.E., PTOE
Date: June 18, 2014
RE: Traffic Control Evaluation
Lake Avenue/12th Street
Wilmette, Illinois

## INTRODUCTION

TADI was retained by the Village of Wilmette to evaluate traffic control options for the intersection of Lake Avenue/ $12^{\text {th }}$ Street located just north of the Village's downtown and Metra commuter rail station. Utilizing observations, pedestrian/bicycle count data collected by TADI, and vehicular count information provided by the Village, TADI performed a traffic control evaluation for applicable stop control and traffic signal warrant criteria published in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

This memorandum summarizes the data collection, methodology, and findings of the traffic control evaluation.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

The study area roadways include Lake Avenue and $12^{\text {th }}$ Street. Lake Avenue is an east-west roadway providing two travel lanes in each direction. $12^{\text {th }}$ Street is a north-south roadway providing one lane in each direction, and is under stop control at its intersection with Lake Avenue. Both Lake Avenue and $12^{\text {th }}$ Street are under the jurisdiction of the Village of Wilmette. The areas within the immediate vicinity of the intersection are residential in use. West of $12^{\text {th }}$ Street, Lake Avenue provides access to Green Bay Road and eventually I-94 (Edens Expressway). South of Lake Avenue, 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street provides access to downtown Wilmette and the Wilmette Metra Station.

## DATA COLLECTION

## Intersection Counts

Twelve-Hour pedestrian and bicycle counts were collected at the Lake Avenue/12th Street intersection on Thursday, June 5, 2014, from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM. This 12-hour time period coincides with the majority of daily traffic, morning and evening peak periods, and activity at adjacent vehicle and pedestrian generators, such as Downtown and the Metra Station. Pedestrians and bicycles traveling in a crosswalk were classified based upon which crosswalk was utilized and their direction of travel. Additionally, bicycles traveling on the road were classified separately based upon their direction of travel through the intersection.

Vehicular traffic counts were conducted by Village staff in April and June 2014 and provided for use in this analysis. The updated June 2014 counts supplement the data collected in June due to some erroneous data output resulting from the April effort. The hourly traffic counts include 24 hours of data organized by time of day and by travel lane for all four intersection approaches.

## Observations

Pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle activity was observed at the study intersection. During the observations, pedestrians did not appear to experience difficultly while crossing and/or attempting to cross Lake Avenue or $12^{\text {th }}$ Street. When higher volumes of traffic occur on Lake Avenue pedestrians were able to utilize gaps in traffic to comfortable cross the street. From a vehicle perspective, no significant delays were observed for vehicles turning left onto or crossing over Lake Avenue from 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street. Also, significant queues were not observed for traffic along Lake Avenue for turning vehicles. While some westbound queuing occurs on Lake Avenue when the at-grade railroad crossing gates are down for a train in the Metra train, it did not appear that these queues extend east to the intersection with $12^{\text {th }}$ Street.

## MULTI-WAY STOP CONTROL EVAULATION

The following outlines the criteria included in the MUTCD that should be considered when evaluating the need for multi-way stop control; identifies whether the criteria is applicable to the study intersection; and, if applicable, summarizes the evaluation based upon the respective criteria.

## Criteria

Per the MUTCD, the need for a multi-way stop shall be considered if one of the following conditions is met:

- Where traffic signals are justified, a multi-way stop can be installed prior to the installation of a signal.
- Five or more crashes occurred in a 12-month period that could be corrected by the installation of a multi-way stop (i.e. right-turn collisions, left-turn collisions, right-angle collisions).
- Minimum volumes:
- The total volume of traffic entering the intersection from the major street approaches averages at least 300 vehicles per hour for an 8 hours of an average day; and
- The combined vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle volume entering the intersections from the minor street approaches averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours, with an average delay to minor-street vehicular traffic of at least 30 seconds per vehicles during the highest hour; and
- If the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph , the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values provided in items 1 and 2.
- Where no single criterion is satisfied, but where the crash and first two minimum volumes criteria are all satisfied to 80 percent of the minimum values. The third minimum volumes criterion is excluded from this condition.


## Evaluation

At this time, it does not appear that a traffic signal is justified at this location; therefore, it is not necessary for an all-way stop to be temporarily installed at the intersection.

Based upon the crash data provided by the Village, less than ten crashes occurred at the intersection between July 11, 2009 and January 17, 2014, with a maximum of four crashes occurring within a one-year span. As such, the intersection does not meet the criteria for an all-way stop based upon the available crash history, or by satisfying the crash history and first two minimum volume criteria.

The vehicular count data provided by the Village and the pedestrian/bike data collected by TADI were utilized to evaluate the criteria for an all-way stop. The analysis for Lake Avenue/ $12^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is displayed in Table 1. Based upon the traffic data provided by the Village, the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speeds on the major street do not exceed 40 mph ; therefore, the minimum volumes should be evaluated at $100 \%$ of the stated criteria.

Table 1. Lake Avenue $/ 12^{\text {th }}$ Street - Minimum Volumes

| Time | Traffic Volume |  | Meets Criteria? |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Major Street <br> (Vehicular Volume) | Minor Street <br> (Vehicular, Ped, Bike) $^{2}$ | Major Street <br> $>300$ vehicles | Minor Street <br> $>200$ units | Overall |
| 7:00 AM | 699 | 95 | Yes | No | No |
| 8:00 AM | 878 | 139 | Yes | No | No |
| 9:00 AM | 643 | 97 | Yes | No | No |
| 10:00 AM | 574 | 98 | Yes | No | No |
| 11:00 AM | 590 | 104 | Yes | No | No |
| 12:00 PM | 625 | 106 | Yes | No | No |
| 1:00 PM | 595 | 103 | Yes | No | No |
| 2:00 PM | 634 | 118 | Yes | No | No |
| 3:00 PM | 747 | 144 | Yes | No | No |
| 4:00 PM | 726 | 142 | Yes | No | No |
| 5:00 PM | 787 | 164 | 145 | Yes | No |
| 6:00 PM | 698 | Yes | No |  |  |

1 - Eastbound Lake Avenue volumes obtained from count data provided by the Village collected in June of 2014. Westbound volumes obtained from count data provided by the Village collected in April of 2014.
2 - Northbound and Southbound vehicular volumes obtained from count data provided by the Village collected in April of 2014. Pedestrian and bicycle volumes obtained from count data collected by TADI in June of 2014.

Based upon observations of traffic conditions at the intersection in June 2014, vehicles on the northbound and southbound approaches of $12^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (the minor street), vehicular delay was generally low with vehicles having little issue turning onto Lake Avenue or just crossing the street and remaining on $12^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. Observations suggest that the average delay for the minor-street vehicular traffic does not meet or exceed 30 seconds per vehicle during the peak hour.

## Conclusion

As shown in Table 1 and highlighted in the discussion above, the criteria for an all-way stop is not satisfied.

## SIGNAL WARRANT EVAULATION

The following sections outline the nine signal warrants included in the MUTCD; identify whether the warrant is applicable to the study intersection; and, if applicable, summarize the warrant evaluation based upon the respective criteria.

## Warrant 1 - Eight-Hour Vehicular Warrant

This warrant can be met by meeting one or more of the following three conditions.

- Condition A, the Minimum Vehicular Volume: The primary reason to consider traffic signal installation is a large volume of intersecting traffic.
- Condition B, the Interruption of Continuous Traffic: Where Condition A is not satisfied, but the traffic volume on the major street causes excessive delay to minor street traffic when entering or crossing the major street.
- A combination of Condition A and Condition B, with defined criteria, should only be utilized to satisfy the warrant in the event that Condition A and Condition B are not exclusively met and other methods to reduce delay and inconvenience have been tested and determined as ineffective.


## Applicability

This warrant is applicable to the study intersection as the major street (Lake Avenue) and minor street ( $12^{\text {th }}$ Street) intersect and experience traffic volumes throughout the day.

## Criteria

Per the MUTCD, the need for a traffic signal shall be considered if one of the following conditions exists for each of any eight hours of an average day:

- The vehicles per hour given in both of the 100 percent columns of Condition A in Table 4C-1 of the MUTCD exist on the major-street and the higher-volume minor-street approaches, respectively, to the intersection; or
- The vehicles per hour given in both of the 100 percent columns of Condition B in Table $4 \mathrm{C}-1$ of the MUTCD exist on the major-street and the higher-volume minor-street approaches, respectively, to the intersection.
- In the event that the previous two conditions are not met, the need for a traffic control signal shall be considered if an engineering study finds that both of the following conditions exist for each of any eight hours of an average day:
- The vehicles per hour given in both of the 80 percent columns of Condition A in Table 4C-1 of the MUTCD exist on the major-street and the higher-volume minor-street approaches, respectively, to the intersection; and
- The vehicles per hour given in both of the 80 percent columns of Condition B in Table 4C-1 of the MUTCD exist on the major-street and the higher-volume minor-street approaches, respectively, to the intersection.

Given that Lake Avenue includes two east- and westbound travel lanes and the minor street approaches on $12^{\text {th }}$ Street include a single lane, the volume criteria for both Condition A (Minimum Vehicular Volume) and Condition B (Interruption of Continuous Traffic) of Warrant 1 are identified in Table 2.

Table 2. MUTCD Volume Criteria for Signal Warrant 1

| Warrant | Minimum Traffic Volume Requirements <br> Two-Lane Major Street at |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Major Street <br> (Total of Both Approaches) | Minor Street <br> (Higher-Volume Approach) |  |
| Condition A ${ }^{1}$ (at 100\%) | 600 | 150 |  |
| Condition B ${ }^{1}$ (at 100\%) | 900 | 75 |  |
| Combination |  |  |  |
| Condition A |  | 480 |  |
| Condition B |  |  |  |
| 1 | $-\quad 100$ percent column of MUTCD Table 4C-1 | 120 |  |
| 2 | -80 percent column of MUTCD Table 4C-1 | 720 |  |

## Evaluation

The vehicular count data provided by the Village was utilized to evaluate the criteria displayed in Table 2 for eight separate hours. Analysis for the Warrant 1 is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Lake Avenue/ $12^{\text {th }}$ Street - Warrant 1 Analysis

| Time | Traffic Volume |  | Meets Warrant? |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Major Street | Higher-Volume <br> Minor-Leg Approach | Condition A | Condition B | Combination |
| 7:00 AM | 699 | 50 | No | No | No |
| 8:00 AM | 878 | 79 | No | No | Yes |
| 9:00 AM | 643 | 61 | No | No | No |
| 10:00 AM | 574 | 49 | No | No | No |
| 11:00 AM | 590 | 70 | No | No | No |
| 12:00 PM | 625 | 71 | No | No | No |
| 1:00 PM | 595 | 65 | No | No | No |
| 2:00 PM | 634 | 74 | No | No | No |
| 3:00 PM | 747 | 77 | No | No | Yes |
| 4:00 PM | 726 | 85 | No | No | Yes |
| 5:00 PM | 787 | 101 | No | No | Yes |
| 6:00 PM | 698 | 86 | No | No | No |

## Conclusion

As shown in Table 3, traffic volumes at the study intersection satisfy the combination warrant for four hours between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM; however, in order to meet the criteria for Warrant 1, the condition must be met for eight consecutive hours. Thus, the criteria for Warrant 1 is not satisfied.

## Warrant 2 - Four-Hour Vehicular Warrant

The intended application of this warrant includes intersections where a traffic signal is primarily considered due to the volume of intersecting traffic.

## Applicability

Similar to Warrant 1, this warrant is applicable to the study intersection as the major street (Lake Avenue) and minor street ( $12^{\text {th }}$ Street) intersect and experience traffic volumes throughout the day.

## Criteria

Per the MUTCD, the need for a traffic control signal shall be considered if an engineering study finds that, for each of any four hours of an average day, the plotted points representing the vehicles per hour on the major street (total of both approaches) and the corresponding vehicles per hour on the higher-volume minor-street approach (one direction only) all fall above the applicable curve in MUTCD Figure 4C-1 for the existing combination of approach lanes. On the minor street, the higher volume shall not be required to be on the same approach during each of these four hours.

## Evaluation

Utilizing the vehicular count data provided by the Village, the intersection was evaluated based upon the Warrant 2 criteria. The hourly volumes are plotted in Figure 1 for the Lake Avenue/12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection.

Figure 1. Lake Avenue/12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street - Warrant 2 Analysis

MUTCD Figure 4C-1. Warrant 2, Four-Hour Vehicular Volume

*Note: 115 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 80 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

## Conclusion

Based upon the analysis shown in Figure 1, none of the hourly volumes at the Lake Avenue/12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection are beyond the applicable curve. Since the warrant requires at least four hours of the day to exceed the criteria defined by the applicable curve, the volumes at the study intersections do not satisfy the criteria for Warrant 2.

## Warrant 3 - Peak Hour

This warrant is intended for intersections where, on an average day, traffic conditions for at least one hour result in undue delay for traffic entering or crossing the major street from the minor street.

## Applicability

Similar to Warrants 2 and 3, this warrant is applicable as the major street (Lake Avenue) and minor street ( $12^{\text {th }}$ Street) intersect and experience traffic volumes throughout the day. Furthermore, the MUTCD also indicates that this warrant should be used at facilities that attract or discharge high volumes of traffic over short periods. Given the location of the intersection with respect to the Metra Station, located approximately 1,000 feet west of $12^{\text {th }}$ Street, the intersection may experience concentrated periods of trip generation as commuters travel to/from the Metra parking lots.

## Criteria

Per the MUTCD, the need for a traffic control signal shall be considered if either of the following two categories are met:

## Condition A

If all three of the following conditions exist for the same one hour (any four consecutive 15minute periods) of an average day:

- The total stopped time delay experienced by the traffic on one minor-street approach (one direction only) controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds: four vehicle-hours for a one-lane approach or 5 vehicle-hours for a two-lane approach; and
- The volume on the same minor-street approach (one direction only) equals or exceeds 100 vehicles per hour for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vehicles per hour for two moving lanes; and
- The total entering volume serviced during the hour equals or exceeds 650 vehicles per hour for intersections with three approaches or 800 vehicles per hour for intersections with four or more approaches.


## Condition B

The plotted point representing the vehicles per hour on the major street (total of both approaches) and the corresponding vehicles per hour on the higher-volume minor-street approach (one direction only) for one hour (any four consecutive 15-minute periods) of an average day falls above the applicable curve in MUTCD Figure 4C-3 for the existing combination of approach lanes.

## Evaluation

Utilizing the vehicular count data provided by the Village, the study intersection was evaluated based upon the Warrant 3 criteria. The analysis for the study intersection is displayed in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Lake Avenue/ $12^{\text {th }}$ Street - Warrant 3 Analysis


Based on observations conducted at the intersection, it was determined that the total sopped time delay experienced on the minor street is not likely to exceed four vehicle-hours.

## Conclusion

Based upon the analysis shown in Figure 2, none of the hourly volumes at the study intersection are beyond the applicable curve. Additionally, since the total stopped time delay was not observed to be in excess of four vehicle-hours, the study intersection does not satisfy the criteria for Warrant 3.

## Warrant 4 - Pedestrian Volume

This warrant is intended to be applied where heavy traffic volumes on a major street result in excessive delay for pedestrians attempting to cross the major street.

## Applicability

Although field observations at the study intersection suggest that pedestrians do not experience excessive delays (in general, pedestrians tend to cross with little delay and gaps in vehicular traffic are often available for vehicles to cross Lake Avenue), the warrant should be evaluated.

## Criteria

Per the MUTCD, the need for a traffic control signal shall be considered if any of the following criteria is met:

- For each of any four hours of an average day, the plotted points representing the vehicles per hour on the major street (total of both approaches) and the corresponding pedestrians per hour crossing the major street (total of all crossings) all fall above the curve in MUTCD Figure 4C-5; or
- For one hour (any four consecutive 15-minute periods) of an average day, the plotted point representing the vehicles per hour on the major street (total of both approaches) and the corresponding pedestrians per hour crossing the major street (total of all crossings) falls above the curve in MUTCD Figure 4C-7.


## Evaluation

Supplementing the vehicular count data provided by the Village with the pedestrian and bicycle data collected by TADI, the study intersection was evaluated based upon the Warrant 4 criteria. The hourly volumes utilized for the analysis of the Lake Avenue/12th Street intersection are summarized in Table 4, and plotted in Figure 3. Since the major street pedestrian volumes per hour do not exceed 100, the peak hour was not evaluated.

Table 4. Lake Avenue $/ 12^{\text {th }}$ Street - Warrant 4 Analysis

| Time | Total Major Street Traffic Volume |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Vehicular | Crossing Pedestrians |
| 7:00 AM | 699 | 23 |
| 8:00 AM | 878 | 23 |
| 9:00 AM | 643 | 6 |
| 10:00 AM | 574 | 14 |
| 11:00 AM | 590 | 11 |
| 12:00 PM | 625 | 11 |
| 1:00 PM | 595 | 22 |
| 2:00 PM | 634 | 23 |
| 3:00 PM | 747 | 26 |
| 4:00 PM | 726 | 16 |
| 5:00 PM | 787 | 45 |
| 6:00 PM | 698 | 12 |

Figure 3. Lake Avenue/12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street - Warrant 4 Analysis

## MUTCD Figure 4C-5. Warrant 4, Pedestrian Four-Hour Volume


*Note: 107 pph applies as the lower threshold volume.

## Conclusion

Based upon the analysis shown in Figure 3, none of the pedestrian volumes at the Lake Avenue/12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection are beyond the applicable curve, and all of the pedestrian volumes are less than 100 per hour. As such, the study intersection does not satisfy the criteria for Warrant 4.

## Warrant 5 - School Crossing

This warrant is applicable to intersections where the primary reason for considering traffic signal installation is to assist schoolchildren (elementary through high school students) cross the major street.

## Applicability

With no elementary through high school facility proximate to the study intersection and an apparent lack of schoolchildren crossing Lake Avenue and $12^{\text {th }}$ Street, this warrant is not applicable.

## Conclusion

This warrant was not evaluated as it is not applicable to the study intersection.

## Warrant 6 - Coordinated Signal System

This warrant is considered at intersections along coordinated traffic signal systems for no other purpose than to promote desired vehicle progression through a corridor.

## Applicability

Lake Avenue is not part of an coordinated signal system at this location; therefore, this warrant is not applicable to the study intersection at $12^{\text {th }}$ Street.

## Conclusion

This warrant was not evaluated as it is not applicable to the study intersection.

## Warrant 7 - Crash Experience

This warrant is intended for consideration to address crash severity and frequency correctable through installation of a traffic signal.

## Applicability

Although observations and knowledge of traffic conditions in the area suggest that this location does not have a high number of crashes or maintain any physical features that may be considered unsafe, this warrant should be evaluated to ensure the criteria for the warrant is not met for the study intersection.

## Criteria

Per the MUTCD, the traffic signal should be considered if all of the following criteria are met:

- Adequate trial of alternatives with satisfactory observance and enforcement has failed to reduce the crash frequency; and
- Five or more reported crashes, of types susceptible to correction by a traffic control signal, have occurred within a twelve-month period, each crash involving personal injury or property damage apparently exceeding the applicable requirements for a reportable crash; and
- For each of any eight hours of an average day, the vehicles per hour (vph) given in both of the 80 percent columns of Condition A in Table 4C-1 (see Section 4C.02), or the vph in both of the 80 percent columns of Condition B in Table 4C-1 exists on the major-street and the higher-volume minor-street approach, respectively, to the intersection, or the volume of pedestrian traffic is not less than 80 percent of the requirements specified in the Pedestrian Volume warrant. These major-street and minor-street volumes shall be for the same eight hours. On the minor street, the higher volume shall not be required to be on the same approach during each of the eight hours.


## Evaluation

Based upon the crash history data provided by the Village, the crashes at the study intersection were summarized from 2009-2014 and shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Summary of Crash Data - Lake Avenue/12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street

| Date of Crash | Type of Crash |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 / 17 / 2014$ | Side Impact |
| $8 / 26 / 2013$ | Side Impact |
| $7 / 15 / 2013$ | Side Impact |
| $6 / 12 / 2013$ | Side Impact |
| $7 / 25 / 2011$ | Rear End |
| $7 / 13 / 2011$ | Side Impact |
| $2 / 17 / 2011$ | Side Impact |
| $12 / 30 / 2010$ | Side Impact |
| $6 / 30 / 2010$ | Car vs. Cycle |
| $7 / 11 / 2009$ | Side Impact |

Since five or more crashes per year, susceptible to correction by a signal, are required to meet the Warrant 7 criteria, and less than five crashes occurred at the Lake Avenue/12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection, the crashes were not evaluated to determine if they could be corrected by a signal.

## Conclusion

Based upon the review of crash frequency and type/severity from 2009-2014, the warrant criteria is not met for the study intersection.

## Warrant 8 - Roadway Network

This warrant should be applied in situations where it may be justified to encourage the concentration and organization of traffic flow on a roadway network.

## Applicability

$12^{\text {th }}$ Street has not been identified as a primary route through Wilmette and does not significantly contribute to traffic operations within the area street system. Therefore, this warrant is not applicable to the study intersection.

## Conclusion

This warrant was not evaluated as it is not applicable to the study intersection.

## Warrant 9 - Intersection Near A Grade Crossing

When none of the previous eight warrants are satisfied, this warrant shall be considered at intersections with a Stop or Yield sign at an approach within close proximity of an at-grade railroad crossing.

## Applicability

Although an at-grade Metra Rail crossing is located on Lake Avenue, west of $12^{\text {th }}$ Street, the Lake Avenue approach is not controlled with a Stop or Yield sign. With no at-grade rail crossing located in the vicinity of the $12^{\text {th }}$ Street approaches of the intersection, this warrant is not applicable.

## Conclusion

This warrant was not evaluated as it is not applicable to the study intersection.

## SUMMARY

Based upon the data collection, observations, and evaluation of alternative traffic control devices, TADI does not recommend changing the traffic control at the Lake Avenue/ $12^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection from the current two-way stop control configuration (stop control on $12^{\text {th }}$ Street).

Analysis of applicable warrants indicate that volumes at the intersection do not satisfy MUTCD criteria for the installation of all-way stop-control or a traffic signal. In addition, observations of traffic conditions at the intersection do not suggest that motorists experience any significant delay, pedestrians seem very comfortable crossing the intersection, and bicyclists are able to easily travel through the intersection without any significant issues.
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Did Motor Carrier Safety Requlations (MCS) violation contibute to
the crash? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ inknown the crash? Yes $\square$ No $\square$ Unknown
Was a DriverNehicle Examin tion Report
a DriverNehicle Examingtion Report form completed?
HAZMAT $\square$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ Unk Out of Service? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No
MCS $\square$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ Unk Out of Service? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No ON $\square$ san $\square$ coinas jo mo yun $\square$ on/G sal $\square$ SOW SON IDOT PERMIT NO WIDE LOAD? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No TRAILER WIDTH(S). $0.96^{n} \quad 97-102^{\prime \prime}>102^{\prime \prime} \quad$ Yes $\square$ No $\begin{array}{cc}\text { 97-102" } & >102 \\ \square & \square\end{array}$ TRAILER LENGTH(S): 1 _in ft TRAILER 2
 NENG NO
 CARGO BODY TYPE LOAD TYPE
U10
*IF YES TO HAZMAT SPILL OR COM VEH, COMPLETE COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE AREA ON BACK.

COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE (CMV)
IF MORE THAN ONE CMV IS INVOLVED, USE SR 1050A
ADDITIONAL UNITS FORMS.
A CMV is defined as any motor vehicle used to transport
A CMV is defined as any motor vehicle used to transport
passengers or property and:
5. Has a weight rating of more than 10,000 pounds (examp)e. truck or truck/trailer combination); or
6. Is used or designed to transport more than 15 passenders,



vehicle or passenger car); or
7. Is used or designed to transport between 9 and 5 passengers, 4. Is used or designed to transport between 9 and 5 passengers,

for specific purpose); or
5 . Is any vehicle used to transport any hazard as material
(HAZMAT) that requires placarding (example: placards will be
displayed on the vehicle). displayed on the vehicle). CARRIER NAME ADDRESS

## CITY/STATE/ZIP

CITY/STATEIZIP
USDOT NO. Source of above info. $\square$ Side of Tryek $\square$ Papers $\square$ Driver $\square$ Log Book Were HAZMAT placards displaygta on the vehicle? $\quad \square$ Yes $\square$ No
If yes, name on placard A-digit UN no. Did HAZMAT spill from tre vehicle (do not consider fuel from the
vehicle's own tank)? Did HAZMAT Regulations violation contribute to the crash? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No Unknown
Did Motor Carrier fafety Regulations (MCS) violation contribute to
the crash? the crash? $\square$ Yes No Unknown
DriverNehifle Examination Report form completed?
HAZMAT Yes $\square$ No $\square$ Unk out of Service? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No
MCS
Form N
Yos $\square$ No $\square$ Unk Out of Service? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { IDOT PER AIT NO. } & \text { WIDE LOAD? } \square \text { Yes } \square \text { No } \\ \text { TRAILER/WIDTH(S): } 0-96^{\prime \prime} \quad 97-102^{\prime \prime}>102^{\prime \prime}\end{array}$ TRAIIER LENGTH(S): 1 ft TRAILER $2 \ldots \mathrm{ft}$ CRASH LOCATION: $\square$ CITY OF OR $\square$ NEAREST CITY ——MILES $N$ CIRCLE ONE OR CTY NAME
 CARGO BODY TYPE _LOAD TYPE

INDICATE NORTH
BY ARROW
U100219697 $\begin{aligned} & \text { A Diagram and Narrative are required on all Type } B \text { crashes, } \\ & \text { even if units have been moved prior to the officer's arrival. }\end{aligned}$ 127 T2 $12=\square$ , $\vdots \vdots$

## !....


NARRATIVE (Refer to vehicle by Unit No.)


CARRIER NAME
ADDRESS

## ADDRESS

 NARRATIVE (Refer to vehicle by Unit No.)
UNTH \# = DRIUER TOLD ME AFTER SIDPPING ATTTE STOPSIGN FOR N/B / 2 Th ST. AT $\angle A K E A V E$ SHE W/B LAKE AUE., AUS SRRUCK UNIT H2, WHCH WAS.S/B ON 12 永 $\delta T$ I CRESING LAKE AUENUE. DRIVER OF UNITH I ASMITESS UNITH2 HAD THR RIGHT OF WAAY. UNTT\#2 = SRIVES

$\qquad$ A CMV is defined as any motor vehicle used to transport
passengers or property and:

1. Has a weight rating of more than 10,000 pounds (example: truck
or truck/trailer combination); or
2. Is used or designed to transport more than 15 passengers,
including the driver (example: shuttle or charter bus), or
3. Is designed to carry 15 or fewer passengers and operated by a contract carrier transporting employees in the course of their
employment (example: employee transporter - usually a van-type vehicle or passenger car); or 4. Is used or designed to transport between 9 and 15 passengers,
including the driver, for direct compensation beyond 75 air miles
 5. Is any vehicle used to transport any hazardous material
(HAZMAT) that requires placarding (example: placards will be
displayed on the vehicle). CARRIER NAME ADDRESS CITY/STATE/ZIP

NARRATVE (Refer to vehicle by Unit No.)
IN CROSSWALK IN FRONT OF UNIT ( $W$ ) WITNASS



Sheet I of 1 Sheets

| $\begin{array}{r} \text { DRAC } \\ 1 \\ 41 \end{array}$ | $\frac{1}{42}$ | PEDV 99 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TRFD } \\ 2 \end{array}$ | TRFC 4 | WEAT 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | $\frac{1}{\mathrm{U} 2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADDRESS NO. |  |  |  | HIGHWAY or STREET NAME Lake Arenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eransion IL 6Q201 0 I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $(847)^{\text {TELEPHONE }} 905-0147$ |  |  |  |  | DRIVER LICENSE NO.$025467092318$ |  |  |  |  | STATE IL | CLASS <br> i) |
| TAKENTO |  |  |  |  |  |  | EMS AGENCY N/A |  |  |  |  |
| (LAST, FIRST, MI)$\square$ Jay PARKED - NO DRIVER$\square$ PED$\square$ , Thomas, $W$ PEDAL$\square$ Eques$\square$ NMV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { DATE OF BIRTH } \\ 10 / 29 \\ \text { mo } \\ \text { mo } \\ \text { day } \end{array}$ |  |
| 10646 Oxford Arenve |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { SEX } & \text { SAFT } & \text { AlR } \\ M & 2 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| CITY -   <br> Chicacju Ridge ILATE IL <br> 60415   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | INJURY EJECT <br> 0 1 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TELEP } \\ & (70 \end{aligned}$ |  | $7$ | $77$ |  | DRIVER |  |  |  |  | STATE IC | CLASS <br> D |
| TAKENTO |  |  |  |  |  |  | EMS AGENCY$N / 1$ |  |  |  |  |







## VEHICULAR TRAFFIC DATA

Traffic Count Summary


|  | otal |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Major Street |  |  | Minor Street |  |  |
|  | EB | WB | Total Both Approach | NB | SB | Total Both Approach |
| 7:00 AM | 381 | 341 | 722 | 56 | 40 | 95 |
| 8:00 AM | 542 | 363 | 905 | 87 | 53 | 139 |
| 9:00 AM | 410 | 243 | 653 | 64 | 33 | 97 |
| 10:00 AM | 335 | 254 | 589 | 57 | 41 | 98 |
| 11:00 AM | 338 | 264 | 602 | 70 | 34 | 104 |
| 12:00 PM | 359 | 277 | 636 | 72 | 35 | 106 |
| 1:00 PM | 387 | 230 | 617 | 70 | 33 | 103 |
| 2:00 PM | 369 | 294 | 663 | 89 | 29 | 118 |
| 3:00 PM | 418 | 357 | 775 | 97 | 47 | 144 |
| 4:00 PM | 426 | 316 | 742 | 89 | 53 | 142 |
| 5:00 PM | 496 | 336 | 832 | 105 | 59 | 164 |
| 6:00 PM | 430 | 282 | 711 | 86 | 59 | 145 |

Lake Avenue /12th Street Intersection
Wilmette, Illinois

## Traffic Count Summary

| 12th Street <br> SOUTHBOUND |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Hour | $4 / 15 / 2014$ | $4 / 16 / 2014$ | $4 / 17 / 2014$ | Average |
| 6:00 AM | 20 | 18 | 17 | 18 |
| 7:00 AM | 31 | 40 | 36 | 36 |
| 8:00 AM | 41 | 42 | 42 | 42 |
| 9:00 AM | 26 | 24 | 31 | 27 |
| 10:00 AM | 32 | 36 | 36 | 35 |
| 11:00 AM | 32 | 29 | 36 | 32 |
| 12:00 PM | 30 | 30 | 29 | 30 |
| 1:00 PM | 28 | 27 | 41 | 32 |
| 2:00 PM | 28 | 26 | 31 | 28 |
| 3:00 PM | 38 | 35 | 35 | 36 |
| 4:00 PM | 44 | 32 | 53 | 43 |
| 5:00 PM | 35 | 58 | 53 | 49 |
| 6:00 PM | 42 | 34 | 60 | 45 |
| 7:00 PM | 26 | 30 | 41 | 32 |
| TOTAL | 453 | 461 | 541 | 485 |


| Lake Avenue | Inside Lane |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EASTBOUND |  |  |  |  |
| Hour | 6/3/2014 | 6/4/2014 | 6/5/2014 | Average |
| 6:00 AM | 104 | 92 | 106 | 101 |
| 7:00 AM | 244 | 219 | 249 | 237 |
| 8:00 AM | 335 | 313 | 337 | 328 |
| 9:00 AM | 268 | 173 | 74 | 172 |
| 10:00 AM | 177 | 138 | 175 | 163 |
| 11:00 AM | 174 | 131 | 179 | 161 |
| 12:00 PM | 213 | 160 | 171 | 181 |
| 1:00 PM | 215 | 158 | 226 | 200 |
| 2:00 PM | 212 | 197 | 190 | 200 |
| 3:00 PM | 246 | 204 | 236 | 229 |
| 4:00 PM | 245 | 207 | 190 | 214 |
| 5:00 PM | 284 | 247 | 249 | 260 |
| 6:00 PM | 247 | 234 | 257 | 246 |
| 7:00 PM | 207 | 164 | 179 | 183 |
| TOTAL | 3171 | 2637 | 2818 | 2875 |

Lake Avenue
WESTBOUND

| Hour | $4 / 15 / 2014$ | $4 / 16 / 2014$ | Average |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| 6:00 AM | 103 | 113 | 108 |
| 7:00 AM | 284 | 310 | 297 |
| 8:00 AM | 290 | 317 | 304 |
| 9:00 AM | 178 | 202 | 190 |
| 10:00 AM | 199 | 212 | 206 |
| 11:00 AM | 174 | 224 | 199 |
| 12:00 PM | 239 | 209 | 224 |
| 1:00 PM | 191 | 167 | 179 |
| 2:00 PM | 224 | 236 | 230 |
| 3:00 PM | 255 | 262 | 259 |
| 4:00 PM | 257 | 235 | 246 |
| 5:00 PM | 242 | 267 | 255 |
| 6:00 PM | 214 | 224 | 219 |
| 7:00 PM | 146 | 135 | 141 |
| TOTAL | 2996 | 3113 | 3057 |

12th Street
NORTHBOUND

| Hour | $4 / 15 / 2014$ | $4 / 16 / 2014$ | $4 / 17 / 2014 \mid$ Average |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 6:00 AM | 11 | 18 | 14 | 14 |
| 7:00 AM | 54 | 46 | 49 | 50 |
| 8:00 AM | 76 | 77 | 83 | 79 |
| 9:00 AM | 60 | 60 | 63 | 61 |
| 10:00 AM | 43 | 54 | 51 | 49 |
| 11:00 AM | 73 | 64 | 72 | 70 |
| 12:00 PM | 73 | 67 | 72 | 71 |
| 1:00 PM | 60 | 66 | 69 | 65 |
| 2:00 PM | 71 | 87 | 64 | 74 |
| 3:00 PM | 91 | 63 | 77 | 77 |
| 4:00 PM | 101 | 66 | 89 | 85 |
| 5:00 PM | 109 | 78 | 116 | 101 |
| 6:00 PM | 87 | 81 | 89 | 86 |
| 7:00 PM | 46 | 41 | 51 | 46 |
| TOTAL | 955 | 868 | 959 | 928 |

Lake Avenue Curb Lane
EASTBOUND

| Hour | $6 / 3 / 2014$ | $6 / 4 / 2014$ | $6 / 5 / 2014$ | Average |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 6:00 AM | 71 | 69 | 77 | 72 |
| 7:00 AM | 144 | 124 | 132 | 133 |
| 8:00 AM | 193 | 180 | 220 | 198 |
| 9:00 AM | 199 | 177 | 331 | 236 |
| 10:00 AM | 162 | 140 | 185 | 162 |
| 11:00 AM | 163 | 185 | 164 | 171 |
| 12:00 PM | 175 | 175 | 168 | 173 |
| 1:00 PM | 188 | 143 | 173 | 168 |
| 2:00 PM | 159 | 154 | 159 | 157 |
| 3:00 PM | 162 | 169 | 198 | 176 |
| 4:00 PM | 191 | 174 | 260 | 208 |
| 5:00 PM | 201 | 211 | 216 | 209 |
| 6:00 PM | 185 | 156 | 192 | 178 |
| 7:00 PM | 141 | 110 | 130 | 127 |
| TOTAL | 2334 | 2167 | 2605 | 2368 |

Lake Avenue Curb Lane
WESTBOUND

| Hour | $4 / 16 / 2014$ | $4 / 17 / 2014$ Average |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 6:00 AM | 13 | 14 | 14 |
| 7:00 AM | 41 | 40 | 41 |
| 8:00 AM | 51 | 53 | 52 |
| 9:00 AM | 39 | 31 | 35 |
| 10:00 AM | 38 | 26 | 32 |
| 11:00 AM | 54 | 38 | 46 |
| 12:00 PM | 60 | 39 | 50 |
| 1:00 PM | 44 | 29 | 37 |
| 2:00 PM | 41 | 36 | 39 |
| 3:00 PM | 61 | 58 | 60 |
| 4:00 PM | 66 | 50 | 58 |
| 5:00 PM | 63 | 64 | 64 |
| 6:00 PM | 59 | 52 | 56 |
| 7:00 PM | 27 | 34 | 31 |
| TOTAL | 657 | 564 | 615 |

## PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE DATA



(847) 853-7660

Fax (847) 853-7701

Date: June 19, 2014
To: Transportation Commission
From: Brigitte Berger, P.E., Director of Engineering Services Daniel Manis, P.E., Civil Engineer

Subject: Discussion of Traffic Control at the Intersection of 15th Street and Prairie/Spencer Avenue

## Recommendation

Discussion of traffic control at the intersection of $15^{\text {th }}$ Street and Prairie/Spencer Avenue.

## Background

The Village has received requests from area residents to consider changing the intersection of $15^{\text {th }}$ Street and Prairie/Spencer Avenue from a 2-way stop to a 4-way stop controlled intersection. Therefore, the Village collected traffic and accident data and retained the services to Traffic Analysis and Design, Inc. (TADI) to complete a traffic study for this intersection to determine if a 4-way stop is justified.

## Discussion

Section 2B. 07 of the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) outlines the procedures necessary to evaluate an intersection for multi-way stop control. The MUTCD is a federally regulated manual governing the placement of nationally standardized traffic control signs, traffic signal, pavement marking, etc. The enclosed technical memorandum prepared by TADI summarizes the MUTCD criteria and results of the traffic study.

## Summary

The data collected by the Village and TADI does not meet the conditions of the MUTCD to support placement of a 4-way stop at the intersection of $15^{\text {th }}$ Street and Prairie/Spencer Avenue.

Documents Attached:

1. TADI Memorandum dated June 19, 2014

# MEMORANDUM 

To: Mr. Dan Manis, P.E.
Village of Wilmette
From: Peter Lemmon, P.E., PTOE
Tracy Shandor, P.E., PTOE
Date: June 19, 2014
RE: Traffic Control Evaluation
15th Street/Spencer Avenue-Prairie Avenue
Wilmette, Illinois

## INTRODUCTION

The Village of Wilmette engaged TADI to evaluate the intersection of 15 th Street at Spencer Avenue-Prairie Avenue and consider potential intersection and traffic control modifications. The intersection is located a couple blocks north of McKenzie Elementary School and is adjacent to the south end of Vattman Park. Based on review of traffic counts provided by the Village along with observations of traffic/pedestrian/bicycle conditions at the intersection, this memorandum summarizes the evaluation for appropriate potential changes to traffic control or other intersection features.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

The intersection of $15^{\text {th }}$ Street with Spencer Avenue-Prairie Avenue is currently under two-way stop control with Spencer Avenue on the west and Prairie Avenue on the east both requiring approaching traffic to stop. Each approach of the intersection maintains one travel lane in each direction. A 25 mph speed limit is posted on all three roadways. On-street parking is prohibited along the east side of $15^{\text {th }}$ Street, north side of Spencer Avenue, and north/east side of Prairie Avenue. Parking on the other sides of the streets is restricted Monday-Friday from 8:00-10:00 AM, except by permit. Sidewalks are maintained on both sides of each roadway with parallel crosswalks (concrete bands within the brick-paved streets) on all legs of the study intersection.

The adjacent land uses are primarily comprised of single-family residential homes. Vattman Park is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection. An opening in the fence surrounding the park is located on Prairie Avenue just east of the intersection. McKenzie Elementary School is located a couple blocks south of the intersection between $15^{\text {th }}$ Street and Prairie Avenue.

## DATA COLLECTION

## Traffic Counts

In November 2013 and May 2014, the Village conducted bi-directional 24-hour traffic counts for the intersection approaches. The Spencer Avenue and Prairie Avenue approaches were counted November 1214,2013 and the $15^{\text {th }}$ Street approaches were counted May 28-29, 2014. For purposes of this study and traffic control analysis, the hourly volumes for each count date are averaged together to develop the hourly traffic volume on each approach.

## Observations

To gain an understanding of key traffic and pedestrian/bicycle conditions in the immediate area, field observations were performed in early June during peak afternoon periods (generally 3:00-5:00 PM to coincide with school dismissal and the typical evening peak period). Observations focused on traffic flow through the intersection as well as pedestrian and bicycle movements through the area. The following summarizes key observations:

- Pedestrians (a mix of adults and children) do not have any issues crossing any of the intersection approaches. Pedestrians did not experience any noticeable delay or unreasonable inconvenience in waiting to cross $15^{\text {th }}$ Street.
- Traffic volumes and vehicle speeds are low, consistent with what is appropriate for a neighborhood street.
- While Prairie Avenue approaches the intersection at a skewed angle before curving to intersect $15^{\text {th }}$ Street at 90 degrees, no issues were observed related to lines of sight to/from Prairie Avenue.
- Pedestrian and bicycle activity is higher right after school is dismissed; however, the volumes are not very high. In approximately 30 minutes after school dismissal, 19 pedestrians and 6 bicycles passed through the intersection. A majority of the crossings ( 10 pedestrians and 5 bicycles) occurred using the east leg crosswalk.
- No pedestrians were observed using the unmarked crosswalk located on Prairie Avenue approximately 40 feet southeast of the east crosswalk.
- Pedestrian trips through the intersection appeared to be a mixture of children and adults walking home from school, walking to/from Vattman Park, or just walking through the neighborhood.


## INTERSECTION TRAFFIC CONTROL EVAULATION

The $15^{\text {th }}$ Street/Spencer Avenue-Prairie Avenue intersection currently operates as a two-way stop controlled intersection with Spencer Avenue and Prairie Avenue approaches providing stop signs. To consider whether the intersection satisfies minimum criteria for installation of all-way stop control on each approach, TADI referenced warrant guidelines outlined in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The following summarizes the applicable criteria and highlights the evaluation based upon the traffic count data collected by the Village.

## Criteria

Per the MUTCD, the need for a multi-way stop shall be considered if one of the following conditions is met:

- Where traffic signals are justified, a multi-way stop can be installed prior to the installation of a signal.
- Five (5) or more crashes occurred in a 12-month period that could be corrected by the installation of a multi-way stop (i.e. right-turn collisions, left-turn collisions, right-angle collisions).
- Minimum volumes:
- The total volume of traffic entering the intersection from the major street approaches averages at least 300 vehicles per hour for an 8 hours of an average day; and
- The combined vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle volume entering the intersections from the minor street approaches averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours, with an average delay to minor-street vehicular traffic of at least 30 seconds per vehicles during the highest hour; and
- If the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph , the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values provided in items 1 and 2 .
- Where no single criterion is satisfied, but where the crash and first two minimum volumes criteria are all satisfied to 80 percent of the minimum values. The third minimum volumes criterion is excluded from this condition.

It is important to note that an all-way stop should not be installed unless the warrant is satisfied. However, satisfaction of the criteria does not mandate that an all-way stop be installed. Additional engineering evaluation should be considered to determine whether installation of all-way stop control is recommended.

## Evaluation

Based on observations, installation of a traffic signal is unnecessary and is not otherwise planned; thus, allway stop control in anticipation of a traffic signal is not applicable at this location.

Crash data has not been collected for this intersection evaluation; however, based on observations of traffic conditions during the busiest travel periods, no obvious or significant safety issues that would be addressed
through installation of stop signs at the northbound and southbound approaches of $15^{\text {th }}$ Street were identified.

The vehicular count data provided by the Village is referenced to evaluate the volume criteria regarding an all-way stop controlled intersection. Table 1 presents the average hourly volumes for the major street ( $15^{\text {th }}$ Street) and minor street (Spencer Avenue and Prairie Avenue) approaches along with whether or not each hourly volume satisfies the warrant's minimum criteria. With posted speed limits of 25 mph , the minimum volumes should be evaluated at 100 percent of the stated criteria.

Table 1. $15^{\text {th }}$ Street/Spencer Avenue-Prairie Avenue - All-Way Stop Control Minimum Volume Criteria

| Time | Traffic Volume |  | Meets Criteria? |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Major Street } \\ \text { (Vehicular Volume) }^{1} \end{gathered}$ | Minor Street (Vehicular Volume) ${ }^{2}$ | Major Street <br> > 300 vehicles | Minor Street $>200$ units | Overall |
| 12:00 AM | 3 | 0 | No | No | No |
| 1:00 AM | 2 | 0 | No | No | No |
| 2:00 AM | 2 | 0 | No | No | No |
| 3:00 AM | 0 | 0 | No | No | No |
| 4:00 AM | 5 | 1 | No | No | No |
| 5:00 AM | 4 | 0 | No | No | No |
| 6:00 AM | 11 | 3 | No | No | No |
| 7:00 AM | 110 | 15 | No | No | No |
| 8:00 AM | 122 | 23 | No | No | No |
| 9:00 AM | 50 | 10 | No | No | No |
| 10:00 AM | 34 | 8 | No | No | No |
| 11:00 AM | 37 | 8 | No | No | No |
| 12:00 PM | 45 | 12 | No | No | No |
| 1:00 PM | 38 | 13 | No | No | No |
| 2:00 PM | 42 | 10 | No | No | No |
| 3:00 PM | 78 | 25 | No | No | No |
| 4:00 PM | 58 | 18 | No | No | No |
| 5:00 PM | 103 | 17 | No | No | No |
| 6:00 PM | 70 | 14 | No | No | No |
| 7:00 PM | 48 | 7 | No | No | No |
| 8:00 PM | 38 | 6 | No | No | No |
| 9:00 PM | 29 | 5 | No | No | No |
| 10:00 PM | 22 | 2 | No | No | No |
| 11:00 PM | 14 | 1 | No | No | No |

1 - Based on average of counts performed by Village of Wilmette May 28-30, 2014
2 - Based on average of counts performed by Village of Wilmette November 12-14, 2014
As shown in Table 1, the volumes for the major and/or minor street approaches do not satisfy the minimum hourly criteria for any hour of the day. Thus, the intersection clearly does not meet MUTCD warrants for an all-way stop.

Other considerations may be considered including, but not limited to, controlling critical vehicle turning movements (i.e., left-turns from the major street), conflicts with high pedestrian volumes, line of sight obstructions, or operational issues related to similar roadways and balanced volumes on all approaches that may be addressed through all-way stop control.

Review of the traffic volumes and observations at the intersection during the hours of peak activity indicate that these factors are not applicable to the $15^{\text {th }}$ Street/Spencer Avenue-Prairie Avenue intersection as outlined below:

- Vehicles on $15^{\text {th }}$ Street have no observed difficulty yielding to oncoming traffic and completing leftturn movements to either Spencer Avenue or Prairie Avenue.
- While McKenzie School and Vattman Park are pedestrian generators in the neighborhood, pedestrian volumes through the intersection are not significantly high. Pedestrians and bicyclists using the sidewalks do not appear to experience significant difficulty crossing the street due to high vehicular traffic volumes and speeds.
- While Prairie Avenue approaches the intersection from the southeast, the alignment curves to meet the intersection at 90 degrees and under stop control. Intersection alignment, landscaping, or other objects appear to obstruct sight lines to/from the Spencer Avenue or Prairie Avenue approaches.
- Finally, while both streets seems appropriate for the neighborhood setting and traffic volumes in all directions are generally low, $15^{\text {th }}$ Street does carry higher volumes that Spender Avenue and Prairie Avenue at this intersection. Thus, all of the intersection approaches are not balanced in terms of volumes or function.


## Conclusion

As shown in Table 1 and highlighted in the discussion above, the criteria for an all-way stop is not satisfied. Installation of an all-way stop at the $15^{\text {th }}$ Street/Spencer Avenue-Prairie Avenue intersection is not recommended.

## OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

In general, the intersection appears to function well in terms of serving vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles. Volumes for all modes are generally low and based on observations, no safety issues are readily apparent that would be addressed through installation of an all-way stop. However, during observations, no pedestrians were seen using the unmarked crosswalk and adjacent sidewalk ramps located on Prairie Avenue approximately 40 feet south east of the study intersection's east crosswalk (illustrated in Figure 1). This unmarked crosswalk appears to be intended for pedestrians walking to/from Vattman Park; however, it does not align directly with the fence opening and it is located at the east end of the roadway curve. Given its location near a horizontal curve and proximity to the $15^{\text {th }}$ Street/Spencer Avenue-Prairie Avenue intersection, the unmarked crosswalk is not highly visible and its location may not be consistent with driver expectations as the start to head southeast from $15^{\text {th }}$ Street.

Figure 1. Unmarked Crosswalk on Prairie Avenue


While TADI is not aware of any crash history at this crosswalk, the following considerations are offered to address potential issues:

- Remove the sidewalk ramps and curb depressions to effectively eliminate the crosswalk and conflict point. While some pedestrians may cross in this area, east of the marked crosswalks at the intersection, to access Vattman Park, the current configuration designates the unmarked crosswalk as an acceptable location to cross.
- Provide continental crosswalk striping and appropriate crosswalk signs (MUTCD Signs W11-2 (pedestrian crossing) and W16-7P (arrow placard)) to raise awareness of the crosswalk for oncoming motorists.


## SUMMARY

Based upon review of the traffic count data, an evaluation of all-way stop control warrant criteria, and observations during field visits, no changes to the current two-way stop control at the $15^{\text {th }}$ Street/Spencer Avenue-Prairie Avenue intersection are recommended at this time.

Due to its location at the end of curvature in Prairie Avenue's alignment and its proximity to the study intersection, consideration should be made to either eliminate the unmarked crosswalk located 40 feet southeast of the intersection or add highly visible crosswalk striping and appropriate pedestrian crossing signage.

TRAFFIC COUNT DATA

15th Street/Spencer Avenue/Prairie Avenue
Wilmette, Illinois

Traffic Count Summary

| Hour | Volume |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Major Street |  |  | Minor Street |  |  | Total |
|  | 15th Street ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Spencer Avenue ${ }^{2}$ | Prairie Avenue ${ }^{2}$ | Total |  |
|  | Northbound | Southbound | Total | Eastbound | Westbound |  |  |
| 12:00 AM | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 1:00 AM | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 2:00 AM | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 3:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:00 AM | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| 5:00 AM | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 6:00 AM | 4 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 25 |
| 7:00 AM | 24 | 86 | 110 | 8 | 7 | 15 | 235 |
| 8:00 AM | 37 | 85 | 122 | 18 | 5 | 23 | 267 |
| 9:00 AM | 24 | 26 | 50 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 110 |
| 10:00 AM | 18 | 16 | 34 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 76 |
| 11:00 AM | 16 | 21 | 37 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 82 |
| 12:00 PM | 24 | 21 | 45 | 10 | 2 | 12 | 102 |
| 1:00 PM | 18 | 20 | 38 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 89 |
| 2:00 PM | 15 | 27 | 42 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 94 |
| 3:00 PM | 37 | 41 | 78 | 15 | 10 | 25 | 181 |
| 4:00 PM | 33 | 25 | 58 | 13 | 5 | 18 | 134 |
| 5:00 PM | 55 | 48 | 103 | 12 | 5 | 17 | 223 |
| 6:00 PM | 43 | 27 | 70 | 9 | 5 | 14 | 154 |
| 7:00 PM | 26 | 22 | 48 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 103 |
| 8:00 PM | 16 | 22 | 38 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 82 |
| 9:00 PM | 14 | 15 | 29 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 63 |
| 10:00 PM | 11 | 11 | 22 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 46 |
| 11:00 PM | 9 | 5 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 29 |
| TOTAL | 430 | 535 | 965 | 136 | 62 | 198 | 2128 |

1 - Based on average of counts performed by Village of Wilmette May 28-30, 2014
2 - Based on average of counts performed by Village of Wilmette November 12-14, 2014

Traffic Count Summary

| Hour | 5/28/2014 | 5/29/2014 | 5/30/2014 Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:00 AM | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1:00 AM | 1 | 1 |  |
| 2:00 AM | 0 | 1 |  |
| 3:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:00 AM | 2 | 3 |  |
| 5:00 AM | 4 | 1 |  |
| 6:00 AM | 6 | 7 |  |
| 7:00 AM | 100 | 71 | 86 |
| 8:00 AM | 83 | 86 | 85 |
| 9:00 AM | 27 | 24 | 26 |
| 10:00 AM | 17 | 14 | 16 |
| 11:00 AM | 23 | 19 | 21 |
| 12:00 PM | 31 | 10 | 21 |
| 1:00 PM | 29 | 10 | 20 |
| 2:00 PM | 23 | 31 | 27 |
| 3:00 PM | 52 | 29 | 41 |
| 4:00 PM | 23 | 27 | 25 |
| 5:00 PM | 51 | 44 | 48 |
| 6:00 PM | 24 | 29 | 27 |
| 7:00 PM | 25 | 19 | 22 |
| 8:00 PM | 28 | 15 | 22 |
| 9:00 PM | 17 | 12 | 15 |
| 10:00 PM | 9 | 12 | 11 |
| 11:00 PM | 8 | 1 |  |
| TOTAL | 585 | 468 | 535 |

15th Street
NORTHBOU
Hour
12:00 AM
1:00 AM
2:00 AM
3:00 AM
4:00 AM
5:00 AM
6:00 AM
7:00 AM
8:00 AM
9:00 AM
10:00 AM
11:00 AM
12:00 PM
1:00 PM
2:00 PM
3:00 PM
4:00 PM
5:00 PM
6:00 PM
7:00 PM
8:00 PM
9:00 PM
10:00 PM
11:00 PM
TOTAL

| 5/28/2014 | 5/29/2014 | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 24 | 23 | 24 |
| 27 | 46 | 37 |
| 23 | 25 | 24 |
| 26 | 10 | 18 |
| 22 | 9 | 16 |
| 16 | 31 | 24 |
| 15 | 21 | 18 |
| 11 | 19 | 15 |
| 37 | 37 | 37 |
| 33 | 33 | 33 |
| 61 | 48 | 55 |
| 48 | 37 | 43 |
| 31 | 20 | 26 |
| 16 | 15 | 16 |
| 16 | 11 | 14 |
| 9 | 12 | 11 |
| 10 | 7 | 9 |

## Spencer Avenue EASTBOUND

Hour
12:00 AM
1:00 AM
2:00 AM
3:00 AM
4:00 AM
5:00 AM
6.00 AM
7:00 AM
8:00 AM
9:00 AM
10:00 AM
11:00 AM
12:00 PM
100 PM
2:00 PM
3:00 PM
4:00
5.00 PM
6:00 PM
7:00 PM
8:00 PM
9:00 PM
10:00 PM
11:00
1:00 PM
11/12/20 AM 3:00 AM

4:00 AM
6:00 AM
7:00 AM
8:00 AM
9:00 AM
10:00 AM
$11: 00$ AM 1:00 AM
1:00 PM
2:00 PM
3:00 PM
3:00 PM
4:00 PM
5:00 PM
7:00 PM
8:00 PM
9:00 PM
10:00 PM
1:00 PM
TOTAL

Prairie Avenue
WESTBOUND

| Hour | $11 / 12 / 2013$ | $11 / 13 / 2013$ | $11 / 14 / 2013$ | Average |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 12:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 2:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:00 AM | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 7:00 AM | 4 | 6 | 11 | 7 |
| 8:00 AM | 6 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| 9:00 AM | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 10:00 AM | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| 11:00 AM | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 12:0 PM | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1:00 PM | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 2:00 PM | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3:00 PM | 8 | 12 | 10 | 10 |
| 4:00 PM | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 |
| 5:00 PM | 6 | 7 | 3 | 5 |
| 6:00 PM | 6 | 8 | 2 | 5 |
| 7:00 PM | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 8:00 PM | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 9:00 PM | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 1000 PM | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 11:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 54 | 69 | 70 | 62 |

(847) 853-7660

Fax (847) 853-7701

Date: June 19, 2014
To: Transportation Commission
From: Brigitte Berger, P.E., Director of Engineering Services Daniel Manis, P.E., Civil Engineer

Subject: Discussion of the Final Compliance Analysis of the Stop Here for Pedestrian Signs at the Intersection of Wilmette Avenue and 15th Street

## Recommendation

Discussion of the final compliance analysis of the stop here for pedestrian signs at the intersection of Wilmette Avenue and $15^{\text {th }}$ Street.

## Background

In 2012, the Commission discussed pedestrian safety at unprotected crosswalks at several meetings and decided to complete a pilot study at the intersection of Wilmette Avenue and $15^{\text {th }}$ Street. The intent of the study was to determine the effectiveness of the roadside 'stop here for pedestrian' signs at uncontrolled intersections. These signs were installed along with curb extensions and additional pavement markings.

## Discussion

To evaluate the effectiveness of the safety enhancements, the Village retained Traffic Analysis and Design, Inc. (TADI) to inventory the number of vehicles yielding the right of way to pedestrians presenting themselves at the crosswalk. Data was collected in October 2012, May 2013, and May 2014, as summarized in the enclosed TADI report, and compliance was found to be $13 \%$, $25 \%$, and $38 \%$, respectively.

## Summary

The compliance rate has increased over time as area motorists become accustomed to the new signs and as driver culture evolves to become more aware of pedestrian mobility rights. Based on this, staff recommends proceeding with drafting a policy on where similar pedestrian signs may be useful.

Documents Attached:

1. TADI Report dated June 2014

## PEDESTRIAN + VEHICLE STOP COMPLIANCE COUNT Wilmette Avenue/ 15th Street

## Wilmette, Illinois

## June 2014

## Prepared for:

## Village of Wilmette

Prepared by:

## TADI

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 8400
Chicago, Illinois 60606
www.tadi-us.com

## INTRODUCTION

In 2012, the Village of Wilmette developed plans to improve pedestrian safety along the Wilmette Avenue corridor including the intersections at $15^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Prairie Avenue-Oak Circle. In particular, at the Wilmette Avenue/15 th Street intersection, the Village implemented a series of improvements in the Summer of 2012 that included curb extensions at each corner (to shorten the Wilmette Avenue crosswalks and increase pedestrian visibility) and posting of new crosswalk signage. These improvements are intended to inform motorists of the uncontrolled crosswalks, increase visibility and awareness for both pedestrians and motorists, and improve pedestrian safety at the intersection.

The Village retained TADI to assist in reviewing the improvement plans and collecting count data to benchmark and monitor pedestrian crossings and motorist stops for pedestrians in the crosswalks. The data collection consists of counting the number of pedestrians crossing Wilmette Avenue at 15th Street along with the number of vehicles that stop for pedestrians in the crosswalk as required in the State of Illinois.

Initial counts were performed at the Wilmette Avenue/15 th Street intersection in May 2012, prior to installation of improvements to establish data for the "before" condition and benchmark compliance. Subsequent to implementation in that Summer, the first "after" condition counts were performed in October 2012. Follow-up counts were conducted in May 2013. Based on a review of the data, a comparison with 2012 counts, and discussion with the Village Transportation Committee, an additional follow-up count was requested for May 2014.

This report presents the study methodology, documents the data collected for the most recent counts, and provides a comparison to data collected in 2012 and 2013.

## DATA COLLECTION

This section outlines the methodology and pedestrian count/motorist stop compliance data collected at the Wilmette Avenue/15th Street intersection.

## Methodology

State law (625 ILCS 5/11-1002) requires that in Illinois, vehicles must stop to yield the right-of-way to a pedestrian in the crosswalk when the "pedestrian is upon the half of the roadway upon which the vehicle is traveling, or when the pedestrian is approaching so closely from the opposite half of the roadway as to be in danger". However, observations and experience throughout the metropolitan area indicate that in most locations, pedestrians often wait off the crosswalk on the sidewalk ramp until they feel comfortable that an approaching motorist sees them and begins to stop. Thus, for purposes of this study and to consider the general intent of the requirement to stop for pedestrians in the crosswalk, compliance has been measured when a pedestrian approaches the crosswalk, is visible to oncoming motorists, and looks as though they intends to cross the street while and approaching motorists have a reasonable opportunity to safely stop for the pedestrian to cross.

This approach, further detailed below, is consistent with previous counts in May 2012, October 2012, and May 2013.

- The counts occur over a 12-hour period on a typical weekday when nearby McKenzie Elementary School is in session.
- The counts take place a favorable weather day with conditions that don't discourage pedestrian travel and visibility isn't impaired due to issues such as fog, darkness, or rain.
- Pedestrians are counted when using the east and west crosswalks (crossing Wilmette Avenue)
- The number of vehicles stopping or not stopping for pedestrians intending to cross are:
- Organized by direction
- Categorized as "near-side" or "far-side"
- Near-side represents vehicles approaching the pedestrian from the left
- Far-side represents vehicles approaching the pedestrian from the right
- Pedestrians volumes and corresponding vehicle stops along Wilmette Avenue are not counted with the assistance of the school crossing guard that is present during the morning arrival and afternoon dismissal periods at McKenzie Elementary School.
- Vehicles that significantly slow near the crosswalk, but did not come to a complete stop (yield), are considered as compliant. Although not technically compliant with State Law, from a practical stand point, these vehicles yield right-of-way to a crossing pedestrian.
- Vehicles that stopped behind the initial stopped vehicle are not counted.
- If pedestrians do not clearly indicate their intention to cross in a way (such as standing back from the crosswalk) that an approaching motorist could not reasonably determine their intention and be able to safely stop, passing vehicles were not counted as non-compliant.


## Pedestrian and Stop Compliance Counts

The most recent count data was collected on Thursday, May 29, 2014 from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM. This date and time period represent a typical weekday while nearby McKenzie Elementary School was session. The 12 -hour timeframe coincides with the large majority of daily pedestrian activity at the intersection. Table 1 summarizes the most recent pedestrian and vehicle stop compliance counts at the Wilmette Avenue/15 th Street intersection in May 2014.

## $\overline{\text { TADI) }}$

Table 1. Pedestrian and Stop Compliance Count Summary (Wilmette Avenue/15 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street) - May 2014

| Time | Pedestrians ${ }^{1}$ |  | Compliance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Non-Compliance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percent Compliance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Eastbou |  |  | Westbo |  |  | Combin |  |  | Eastbou |  |  | Westbou |  |  | Combin |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Combin |  |
|  | West Crosswalk | $\begin{gathered} \text { East } \\ \text { Crosswalk } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Near } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Far } \\ \text { Side } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Near } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Far } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Near } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Far } \\ \text { Side } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Near } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Far } \\ \text { Side } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Near } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Far } \\ \text { Side } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Near } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Far } \\ \text { Side } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{gathered} \text { Near } \\ \text { Side } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Far } \\ \text { Side } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{gathered} \text { Near } \\ \text { Side } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Far } \\ & \text { Side } \end{aligned}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Near } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Far } \\ \text { Side } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Subtotal |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| 7:15 AM | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 25\% | 0\% | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 0\% | 15\% |
| 7:30 AM | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 20 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 8\% | 8\% | 0\% | 8\% | 5\% |
| 7:45 AM | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 50\% | 50\% | 100\% | 50\% | 67\% |
| 8:00 AM | Crossing Guard |  | Crossing Guard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Crossing Guard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Crossing Guard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $8: 15$ AM <br> $8: 30 \mathrm{AM}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8:45 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 50\% | 100\% | 0\% | 50\% |
| 9:15 AM | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 67\% | 67\% | 100\% | 83\% |
| 9:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 9:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 10:00 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% |
| 10:15 AM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 33\% | 0\% | 33\% | 0\% | 50\% | 25\% | 20\% | 50\% | 29\% |
| 10:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 10:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| 11:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 11:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% |
| 11:30 AM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 0\% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 50\% |
| 11:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% |
| 12:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 12:15 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 12:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 12:45 PM | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 17\% | 50\% | 25\% | 33\% | 100\% | 50\% | 22\% | 67\% | 33\% |

1 - Does not include pedestrian or stop compliance counts when assisted by crossing guard before (8:13 to 9:00 AM) and after (3:18 to 4:00 PM) school

## TADi)

Table 1. Pedestrian and Stop Compliance Count Summary (Wilmette Avenue/15 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street) - May 2014 [cont.]

| Time | Pedes | rians ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  | omplia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -Comp | ance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ent Com | liance |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 俍 |  | Eastbo |  |  | Westbo |  |  | Combin |  |  | Eastbou |  |  | Westbo |  |  | Combin |  |  | Eastbou |  |  | Westbou |  |  | Combin |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { West } \\ \text { Crosswalk } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { East } \\ \text { Crosswalk } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Near } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Far } \\ & \text { Side } \end{aligned}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{gathered} \text { Near } \\ \text { Side } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Far } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Near } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Far } \\ \text { Side } \end{gathered}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Near } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Far } \\ & \text { Side } \end{aligned}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{gathered} \text { Near } \\ \text { Side } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Far } \\ & \text { Side } \end{aligned}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{gathered} \text { Near } \\ \text { Side } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Far } \\ & \text { Side } \end{aligned}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Near } \\ & \text { Side } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Far } \\ \text { Side } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Near } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Far } \\ \text { Side } \end{gathered}$ | Subtotal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Near } \\ & \text { Side } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Far } \\ \text { Side } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Subtotal |
| 1:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% |
| 1:15 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 1:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 1:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 2:00 PM | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 50\% | 0\% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% | 0\% | 50\% |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 2:45 PM | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 40\% | 40\% | 0\% | 40\% | 40\% |
| 3:00 PM | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 0\% | 50\% | 20\% | 100\% | 40\% | 50\% | 25\% | 43\% | 36\% |
| 3:15 PM | Crossing Guard |  | Crossing Guard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3:30 PM |  |  | Crossing Guard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Crossing Guard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3:45 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| 4:15 PM | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 100\% | 50\% | 67\% | 50\% | 0\% | 50\% | 60\% | 50\% | 57\% |
| 4:30 PM | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 67\% | 75\% |
| 4:45 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 5:00 PM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 100\% | 25\% | 40\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 20\% | 25\% | 22\% |
| 5:30 PM | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 6:00 PM | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 67\% | 75\% |
| 6:15 PM | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 29\% | 0\% | 29\% | 38\% | 100\% | 44\% |
| 6:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| 6:45 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 0\% | 67\% | 67\% | 17\% | 0\% | 17\% | 17\% | 67\% | 33\% |
| TOTAL | 32 | 57 | 17 | 15 | 32 | 11 | 12 | 23 | 28 | 27 | 55 | 31 | 8 | 39 | 22 | 30 | 52 | 53 | 38 | 91 | 35\% | 65\% | 45\% | 33\% | 29\% | 31\% | 35\% | 42\% | 38\% |

Does not include pedestrian or stop compliance counts when assisted by crossing guard before (8:13 to $9: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ ) and after (3:18 to 4:00 PM) school

As outlined in Table 1, a total of 146 vehicles $(55+91)$ approached the intersection during the count period when pedestrians intended to cross Wilmette Avenue without the assistance of the school crossing guard. Of the 146 approaching vehicles, 55 vehicles ( 38 percent) were considered compliant and stopped for pedestrians crossing either sidewalk spanning Wilmette Avenue at $15^{\text {th }}$ Street.

Table 2 summarizes a comparison of the pedestrian and vehicle stop compliance counts for all four dates including the "before" condition (May 2012) and three "after" conditions (October 2012, May 2013, and May 2014). Figure 1 illustrates that upward trend of compliance over time.

Table 2. "Before" and "After" Count Comparison (Wilmette Avenue $/ 15^{\text {th }}$ Street)

| Description | "Before" Condition <br> May 2012 | "After" Condition <br> October 2012 | "After" Condition <br> May 2013 | "After" Condition <br> May 2014 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Pedestrians ${ }^{1}$ | 46 | 84 | 75 | 89 |
| Total Conflicting Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | 149 | 197 | 153 | 146 |
| Compliant Vehicles $^{1}$ | 12 | 25 | 39 | 55 |
| Percent Compliance | $8 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $38 \%$ |

1 - Does not include counts during periods when school crossing guards are present
Figure 1. Year-to-Year Stop Compliance Comparison (Wilmette Avenue $/ 15^{\text {th }}$ Street)


Interesting trends and observations to note include:

- All three "after" counts include similar pedestrian volumes crossing Wilmette Avenue that also considerably higher, in relative terms, to the "before" condition. This suggests that the curb extensions and increased pedestrian crossing signs attract more pedestrians to cross at this intersection than potentially other nearby locations.
- Vehicle stop compliance continues to steadily increase. This may be due to a number of factors, including:
- Familiarity by motorists of the crosswalk location
- Familiarity with State Law requiring motorists to stop for pedestrians in the crosswalk
- Experience with uncontrolled pedestrian crossings in other communities and/or along Wilmette Avenue
- Pedestrians becoming more familiar and assertive to demonstrate intent to cross
- While bicyclists in the crosswalk were counted as pedestrians and bicyclists on the street operating with traffic were not counted, on multiple occasions, drivers stopped for bicyclists on the street to allow them to cross Wilmette Avenue.
- Three (3) of the non-compliant motorists were observed violating the official State Law.
- On one occasion, an eastbound vehicle stopped for a pedestrian looking to cross south in the east crosswalk; however, westbound vehicles were not stopping. Eventually, the eastbound vehicles continued east along Wilmette Avenue before the pedestrian crossed the street.
- One third $(1 / 3)$ of the non-compliant vehicles were observed between 7:15 and 7:45 AM


## CONCLUSION

The most recent pedestrian and stop compliance counts indicate that a greater number of motorists are stopping for pedestrians in the crosswalk when compared to previous years. Pedestrian volumes crossing Wilmette Avenue are consistently steady and higher in the years after the curb extensions and improved crossing signs were installed in Summer 2012. With similar pedestrian volumes, stop compliance has increased consistently by 12 to 13 percentage points on an annual basis. Thus, it seems that the pedestrianoriented improvements have facilitated greater use by pedestrians and that some combination of awareness of the crossing, experiences with other uncontrolled crosswalks nearby, and increased familiarity with the State Law may have contributed to the growing stop compliance rate.

# INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE 

## VILLAGE OF WILMETTE

WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091
TO: Village Of Wilmette Transportation Commission
DATE: May15th, 2014
FROM: Traffic Service Officer Ron Andrews
SUBJECT: 2013-2014 School Crossing Review

Each year the Wilmette Police Department conducts an annual assessment of crossing guard positions in the village. The purpose of the assessment is to determine if community needs are being met and to verify resources are being properly utilized.

## Current Status

The Wilmette Police Department manages sixteen school crossing locations staffed by sixteen fulltime adult school crossing guards. There are several starting and ending times which vary depending on which guards are crossing for specific schools. Generally, most crossing guards work two hours per day with a few exceptions of them working three hours per day. Each crossing guard is evaluated annually on performance. Recommendation: NO changes are recommended in the crossing locations.

## Crossing Guard Vacancies

Covering crossing locations with substitute guards is a priority for the department. During the year, one of our crossing guards, (Thomas Haltom of $15^{\text {th }}$ Lake Ave) passed away unexpectantly. Tom was with our department close to eight years and will be sorely missed. One of our part-time guards moved into Tom's place leaving us with one substitute guard. As the year progressed, the weather started to deteriorate, another was lost for the season due to a surgery. Coverage was stretched as our Parking Control units as well as Police Officers covered crossings. We are currently down to one substitute guard and will hopefully add another at the start of the school year.

## Safety Improvements at Crossings

A tool that works very well is the raised intersection with striping. This significantly slows traffic down as illustrated at the crossing at Hunter and Thornwood Ave.
Recommendation: If funding becomes available, placement of a new raised intersection with striping at various locations. Annually a list will be generated and forwarded to the Village Engineering Department for streets to be re-striped to increase visibility.

## Safety Improvements Traffic Flow- Central School

Central School has been very busy with a large volume of parents driving their children to school as well as the children who walk to school. Central School personnel continually do a tremendous job
both mornings and afternoons expediting traffic flow in front of the school. As always, at all schools, bad weather days do pose problems, and staff can only do their best in trying to cope with the situation.
Recommendation: School staff to continue to send out mailings advising parents who wish to drive, the rules which they need to abide by in order to keep conformity in and around the school pick-up and drop- off areas. Continue the use of traffic cones and informative barricades.

## Safety Improvements Traffic Flow- Highcrest Middle School

Unlike any other crossing we have, Highcrest stands alone as the most unique crossing we have. Over the years we have tried different approaches to assist with traffic flow, crossing of children safely and physical changes to the roadway. There has also been a significant impact on the usage of the south parking lot of the school. To help the afternoon congestion for southbound traffic on Hunter Rd., the I.D.O.T was contacted to extend the length of time for the green light at the intersection at Hunter Rd. and Wilmette Ave. After several discussions with the crossing guard, it seems this has made a significant impact. .Continuing efforts by the school to send out mailings are recommended.
Recommendation: Continue dialogue with school officials to explore any new proposals which may influence the current traffic patterns. Work with village engineers if any signs need to be added or changed. The installation of NO LEFT TURN signs posted for N/B traffic trying to enter the south parking lot. Have a cut-out in the south lot put in to disperse traffic much easier.

## Safety Improvements Traffic Flow- Romona School

We have noticed a significant increase in violations around the school pick up/ drop off areas. Our parking control units have been ticketing this area and will continue to do so in order to keep the area safe. There recently was a meeting with staff and residents regarding traffic issues around the school area.
Recommendation: Keep the traffic pattern the same and continue to monitor the area. At the start of school next year have staff continuously advise parents of the restrictions in the area, and like other schools, have staff on the street helping out at drop offl pick up. Also, contacting I.D.O.T. to see if the traffic signal at Wilmette Ave. and Skokie Blvd. can be extended for west/bound traffic on Wilmette Ave. This would only be for specific times of the day.

## Safety Improvements Traffic Flow- McKenzie School

This year traffic related issues were at a minimum. Since the implementation of new parking restrictions and traffic flow changes from last year, our department received minimal complaints. Traffic flow in front of the school is running smooth with the help from school personnel. On some days that congestion near the intersection of $15^{\text {th }}$ and Central Ave. can become quite troublesome, especially when children are trying to cross the street and there are vehicles parked illegally. This school now has the largest enrollment for a grade school in town.
Recommendation: Keep traffic the pattern the same and continue to monitor the area.

## Safety Improvements Traffic Flow-Harper School

Traffic flow near the school appears to be running well; no changes should be made at this time.

In conclusion, as an attachment are the Review of Adult Crossing Locations and the School Crossing Student Daily Average. With the exception of Lake \& Locust which changed in 2005, locations remain constant. As in many locations, weather does play a key role in attendance. With this in mind, I see no need for change in any of our current school crossing locations.

# WILMETTE POLICE DEPARTMENT Review of Adult School Crossings <br> 2013-2014 

## Location

9th \& Lake
9th \& Greenleaf
9th \& Central
Forest \&Wilmette

## Location

Wilmette \& Prairie
15th \& Lake
15th \& Wilmette
Highland \&Ridge

## Location

Illinois \& Iroquois
Thornwood \& Hunter
Hunter \& Lake

## Location

Wilmette \& Skokie
Romona \& Wilmette

Location
Illinois \& Hunter
Lake \& Locust

## Location

Lake \& Ridge

## Location

Lake \& Locust
Substitutes

Guards
Alec Childress
Sue Daniels
Dudley Fair
Herb Sheriff

Guards
Terrance Wright
Chuck Pettius
Larry Daniels
Gwendolyn Hall

Guards
Richard Terry
Conrad Wolski
Jean Bodkin

Guards
Betty Smith
James Wrzala

HIGHCREST MIDDLE SCHOOL
David Erck
Joe Childress

ST JOSEPH'S
Guards
Glyndean Lane

## WILMETTE JR. HIGH

Joe Childress

Joyce Childress

## Combined AM/PM Average Daily Child Count

| Location | $2013-2012-$ | $2011-$ | $2010-$ | $2009-$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Five } \\ \text { Year }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average |  |  |  |  |  |$]$


[^0]:    

