

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY
SEPTEMBER 28, 2011**

MINUTES

1. ROLL CALL

President DiCola called the meeting to order in the Library Meeting Room at 7:31 p.m. Trustees present: Eblen, Humphreys, Read, DiCola. Present by Conference Telephone: Trustee Loftus. Trustees absent: none. Also Present: Library Director Ashton.

2. WELCOME TO VISITORS

No visitors were present.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 14, 2011

Trustees reviewed the minutes of the regular meeting of September 12, 2011. It was moved by Read and seconded by Eblen **THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2011 BE APPROVED.** Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

4. PAYMENT OF INVOICES

Trustees reviewed the list of invoices submitted for payment. It was moved by Read and seconded by Greene **TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF OPERATING INVOICES FOR SEPTEMBER 28, 2011 TOTALING \$22,799.67 and JOURNAL ENTRY FOR \$2,000.00.** Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

5. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS

None.

6. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON OTHER BUSINESS

None.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

**8. NEW BUSINESS--APPROVAL OF PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS,
OCTOBER-DECEMBER 2011**

Trustees reviewed the proposed schedule of meetings for October through December 2011. It was moved by Humphreys and seconded by Eblen **TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS, OCTOBER-DECEMBER 2011.** Ayes: Eblen, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

9. REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR

Director Ashton presented the attached Draft Plan to Plan. After discussion, the Board gave Ashton general approval to proceed with the work as outlined.

10. TRUSTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

The Board discussed plans for a recognition gift for former Director Bowen and a recognition resolution honoring former Circulation Manager Nadine Walsh. Ashton agreed to prepare material for the Board's use on these matters at its next meeting.

11. ADJOURNMENT

President DiCola adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

Agenda Item 8b.

September 28, 2011

DRAFT PLAN TO PLAN

October 12 Report to Board on meetings with staff and staff work assignments

October 26 Report to Board on staff research findings and Board SWOT discussion

November 9 Report to Board on initial meetings with community leaders

December 14 Proposal to Board on external library visit plans for January

January Board and staff visits to 3 or 4 nearby libraries with focus on community connections, building use, library service organization, technology

February 8 Second report to Board on meetings with community leaders.

Proposal to Board on Ideas and Projects for public discussion.

February 22-March 28 Public discussion opportunities, testing Ideas and Projects.

April 11 Report to Board on refinement of Ideas and Projects following public discussion, financial analysis and projections.

April 25 Board adopts Plan covering April 2011-April 2013 time frame.

April 26 Implementation begins

APPROVED October 5, 2011

TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION

Minutes

July 13, 2011, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Co-Chairman Wendt called the July 13, 2011 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

The chairman led the commissioners and the public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Co-Chairman Wendt, Co-Chairman Gress, Members Mr. Cronin, Ms. Van Anne, Mr. Saricks, Mr. Schiller, Mr. Stuebner, Student Representative Robert Clark

Staff Present: Traffic Manager Dorin Fera; Police Sgt. Bormann

Visitors: Mr. David Wurster, 442 68th Street, Downers Grove; Mr. Kevin Glen, 502 68th Street, Downers Grove

Co-Chairman Wendt reviewed the protocol for the meeting, reminded the public that the commission was a recommending body to the Village Council, and stated that the minutes were being recorded on village-owned equipment for transcription purposes.

APPROVAL OF THE MAY 11, 2011 TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION MINUTES.

MR. SCHILLER MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MAY 11, 2011 MINUTES AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY MR. STUEBNER. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0.

PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

1. File #06-11. 2011-12 School Walking Route Map - Review and Approval. Traffic Manager Fera reported there were not many changes to the map except for a few around the Bel Aire School with four of the five segments under construction in the same area. In speaking with School District 58, to date, there are no changes to their walking maps. **Mr. Fera** proceeded to explain how the walking map was arranged, noting that the dash lines reflected the existing sidewalks in place. **Mr. Saricks** recommended that in future presentations of the map that staff reflect the arrows only on the one side of the street where the sidewalks are actually located. **Mr. Fera concurred.**

The meeting was opened to public comment. None followed. **Co-Chairman Wendt** entertained a motion to approve.

MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION THAT THE COMMISSIONERS FORWARD TO THE VILLAGE MANAGER A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE THE 2011-12 SCHOOL DISTRICT 58 WALKING ROUTE MAP. SECONDED BY MR. SCHILLER. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. GRESS, MR. WENDT, MR. SCHILLER, MR. STUEBNER, MR. SARICKS, MR. CRONIN, MS. VAN ANNE, MR. CLARK

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 8-0

2. File #07-11. 68th Street - Fairmont Avenue to Fairview Avenue - Preliminary Traffic Calming Review. **Mr. Fera** acknowledged that this was a presentation based on a neighborhood public hearing that was held prior, and, to **Co-Chairman Wendt's** question, there were no traffic counts attached with staff's report. However, he explained that traffic counts were previously done in early 2010. From Fairmont going east, **Mr. Fera** stated the 85th percentile speed limits in the first couple of segments were from 30 to 32 mph. Those segments between Briargate Dr. and Blackburn Pl. had lower recorded speeds for the neighborhood, probably due to the nearby school. Further east, he explained, the road tended to straighten out and the speeds increased toward Fairview Ave. The highest speeds recorded were from Osage Ave to Fairview Ave, ranging from 35 mph to 38 mph.

Since the neighborhood meeting, **Mr. Fera** reported that driver feedback radar speed limit devices were installed, restriping was added, police were asked to enforce the area periodically, and additional Speed Limit 25 signs were installed. The data from those trailers was not made available due to staff time spent on the recent storm. Staff felt the speeding was not reduced.

Tonight's presentation, **Mr. Fera** explained was to summarize the concerns from the May 2010 neighborhood meeting. Since that time, he stated, there was no budget available for traffic calming measures nor were there funds for this year. Asked if there was preliminary information about the effectiveness from the initial measures installed, **Mr. Fera** was expecting to find out from the radar units currently on the road. Dialog followed that nothing existed to prevent vehicles from speeding. Conversation followed by **Mr. Fera** that the traffic counts for the entire 24-hour period are considered, not just the rush hour. Responding to a question about the time of day the radar trailers record, **Sgt. Bormann** stated he can place a traffic unit out during a specific time of day.

Because the data was already considered old, **Co-Chairman Wendt** asked staff whether any changes were noticeable from 2010 that were brought to staff's attention, wherein **Mr. Fera** stated not in the area except for the striping wearing down. Commenting on alternatives, **Mr. Fera** discussed seeing serpentine striping used on a straight-away to calm traffic and/or alternating parking along the sides of a street. **Co-Chairman Wendt** proceeded to suggest to staff to provide its priority list of traffic calming projects every so often. Staff was asked to elaborate on how such proposals would occur, i.e., as directed in the village ordinance and as a formal process.

Commissioners proceeded to talk about how the commission could get traffic calming programs incorporated into the street programs, i.e., as street projects are being done, traffic calming additions could be installed. **Mr. Stuebner** believed a traffic calming project could be an add-on to a street project and incur minimal costs. **Mr. Fera** stated it would have to be included in the RFP process and would require discussion on how to package such a project. Asked if a commission recommendation was helpful for such an idea, **Mr. Fera** believed it was.

Returning to the agenda item, staff was asked how many notifications were sent to the residents and businesses regarding this matter, wherein **Mr. Fera** stated all addresses along 68th Street, between Fairview and Fairmont were notified as well as Blackburn Pl and Osage Ave.

Co-Chairman Wendt opened up the matter to public comment.

Mr. David Wurster, 442 68th Street, Downers Grove, stated it was important to note that 67th Street ended in a cul-de-sac which was the original through-street for the subdivision and he believed it was intended due to the large homes that were constructed there. **Mr. Wurster**

stated he has been working with **Mr. Fera** on this issue but knows the village does not have funds for traffic calming measures. His biggest concerns were the school, children's safety, and he resolving the issue before someone gets hurt. **Mr. Wurster** confirmed the road was used as a cut-through by everyone to get to Fairview. **Mr. Wurster** commented that some of the neighbors have also mentioned cost-sharing to help. The Commission suggested that **Mr. Wurster** and the neighbors attend the village council meetings during the budget time to voice their concerns.

Mr. Kevin Glen, 502 68th Street, asked the commission what options available to address the issues being raised, wherein **Co-Chairman Wendt** stated he personally believed physical changes needed to be made, as listed in staff's report. **Mr. Saricks** suggested that **Mr. Glen** visit Claremont Street to see its effective traffic calming measures. Asked if such raised median could work on Fairmount since it seemed fairly inexpensive, **Co-Chairman Wendt** surmised that the street was wide enough for such a measure. **Mr. Fera** stated the median could work, based on prior Village experience.

Mr. Glen proceeded to discuss the needed funding for the project, wherein the commissioners suggested that he attend the village council meetings to address the topic, given that there was no money budgeted at all for traffic calming. **Mr. Stuebner** also reminded **Mr. Glen** that he and his neighbors could approach the village about cost-sharing for a project. **Mr. Saricks** went on to discuss with **Mr. Glen**, that at a prior meeting the commission had requested some guidance from the village council about a mechanism that cost-sharing could be adopted. However, to date, there was no formal mechanism that existed, and that he emphasized that **Mr. Glen** continue to voice his opinion to make that possible. **Co-Chairman Wendt** even explained that the cost-sharing idea was being pursued by staff as a next option. He suggested that **Mr. Glen** contact **Mr. Fera** for up-to-date information and noted that 68th Street was on top of the traffic calming list.

Per **Ms. Van Anne's** question, **Mr. Fera** stated that the Claremont project cost approximately \$62,000 to \$68,000, with the main cost item being drainage issues. Originally, it was budgeted to be \$92,000 to \$95,000 but was redesigned to save costs, and during that effort became a learning process. Asked if staff was aware of any cost-sharing projects paid by residents, **Mr. Fera** stated he did not recall any during his tenure with the village. Others identified the brick street project near Prince Pond.

Dialog was raised on how the money gets budgeted and allocated for certain parts of a roadway. **Mr. Fera** stated that many projects were usually maintenance types consisting of replacement in-kind work. **Co-Chairman Wendt** asked **Mr. Fera** to find out whether or not a means existed to modify the project under discussion, wherein **Ms. Van Anne**, speaking from her experience, stated it could be done through grants or developing alternate options and breaking out the add-ons. Another Commissioner suggested presenting a side-by-side comparison of the project to the village council, reflecting the project as a stand-alone and as a part of a reconstruction, thereby reflecting the village's savings by constructing the project as part of a reconstruction.

Mr. Schiller suggested that the commission recommend to the Village Manager to review the ordinances and funding sources for village street repairs and to investigate and identify the savings and the feasibility of incorporating traffic calming features into street improvements on those streets where traffic issues have been identified as a regular problem.

Ms. Van Anne questioned whether some of the design firms being used by staff were not using good business practices, i.e., looking at a street and foreseeing some of the traffic problems that

could arise. **Mr. Mr. Schiller** responded that it was a matter of whether there was flexibility or not in a proposal.

Co-Chairman Gress suggested incorporating in the above recommendation that the prioritization of the previous projects defined by the Commission be considered. However, someone noted that while there was probably a priority list for street repairs, those same streets may need no traffic calming. Comments were made that if the residents' streets were not scheduled for any street repair it would not matter. Dialog also followed that two different projects were being discussed and a discussion between the two groups needed to take place. Concern was also raised that council needed to prioritize and consider the recommendations so that the commissioners could respond to the neighbors' concerns.

Co-Chairman Wendt suggested that staff return next month with a priority list of calming projects so that the commission could make a recommendation based on the list and send it to the village council. **Mr. Cronin**, however, pointed out that out of the number of notifications sent to the residents and businesses, only two individuals showed up tonight. He questioned the seriousness of the issue. Others, however, stated this matter was ongoing for years. **Mr. Cronin** suggested pursuing the sidewalk funds, even though there would be dissent, but he noted that many times many of the residents did not want them. Other Commission members concurred.

Co-Chairman Wendt suggested looking at using some of the sidewalk funds. A general conversation followed about the sidewalk program and the fact that most of the areas where sidewalks were installed were not high volume areas and, again, many of the residents did not want them. A suggestion was made to invite the village manager and/or the public works director to a TAP Commission meeting to discuss the issue at length.

MR. SCHILLER MADE A MOTION THAT THE TRAFFIC AND PARKING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE VILLAGE MANAGER REVIEW THE ORDINANCES AND FUNDING SOURCES FOR VILLAGE STREET REPAIRS AND INVESTIGATE AND IDENTIFY THE SAVINGS AND THE FEASIBILITY OF INCORPORATING TRAFFIC CALMING FEATURES INTO STREET IMPROVEMENTS ON THOSE STREETS WHERE TRAFFIC ISSUES HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AS A REGULAR PROBLEM. MR. SARICKS SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. GRESS, MR. WENDT, MR. SCHILLER, MR. STUEBNER, MR. SARICKS, MR. CRONIN, MS. VAN ANNE, MR. CLARK

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 8-0

Mr. Gress recommended that staff forward to the village Council a list of traffic calming projects to be reviewed and prioritized by the village council for budgetary consideration.

Further dialog followed that the village council did not receive the negative feedback that this commission received regarding the sidewalk program, citing previous meetings where residents voiced discontent over the last sidewalk matrix presented. **Co-Chairman Wendt**, for the record, stated he respected the opinions being voiced but did not necessarily agree that the village should not have sidewalks. He believed there had to be a way in which pedestrians were separated from traffic, and, to stop constructing sidewalks was not something he would recommend. **Co-Chairman Gress** clarified that he was not saying that sidewalks were not necessary; he was stating in many cases they were not necessary in certain areas of the village and agreed in certain areas they were a necessity and that the projects would continue to go

forward. **Mr. Saricks** recalled the commission was on record with a resolution a couple of years ago when the first budgetary project arose. He recalled that the commission's position was to not put the prioritization of the sidewalk program before other needs in the village.

Co-Chairman Gress also commented that this issue could possibly be addressed through reserve funds for emergency purposes. However, others disagreed with the idea.

Mr. Schiller stated that it was the long-term experience of this Commission that the public was very concerned about traffic calming and less concerned with continuing the sidewalk improvements.

MR. SCHILLER MADE A MOTION THAT THE COMMISSION RESPECTFULLY AND URGENTLY REQUEST TO THE VILLAGE MANAGER TO DELAY THE SIDEWALK PROGRAM AND POSSIBLY SHARE THE SIDEWALK FUNDS, USING PART OF THOSE MONIES TO FUND IDENTIFIED TRAFFIC CALMING PROJECTS. MR. STUEBNER SECONDED THE MOTION. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. GRESS, MR. WENDT, MR. SCHILLER, MR. STUEBNER, MR. SARICKS, MR. CRONIN, MS. VAN ANNE, MR. CLARK

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 8-0

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Schiller thanked **Mr. Fera** and staff for providing a copy of the parking study and he looked forward to tracking it as it moves forward. **Mr. Stuebner** noted that businesses north of Warren Street were not included in the survey. He also asked to see the legal requirements for handicap parking versus what was being recommended. **Mr. Fera** would research. A question followed on how to get no parking signage near a blind hill situation in a residential area.

Staff was asked to provide information from the last meeting regarding public/private funding, to which **Mr. Fera** stated the matter was on hold due to the amount of time spent on the project. It required village manager approval.

Mr. Fera announced the preliminary findings for the downtown traffic study will be presented next month to this commission and there may be heavy discussion on it. He is scheduled to attend a couple of neighborhood meetings to review intersection control issues. **Co-Chairman Gress** suggested that **Mr. Fera** remind the neighbors that no funding is available to pay for such projects. **Mr. Fera** stated that he does discuss various options first, such as trimming bushes to provide better sight lines, etc. Lastly, **Mr. Fera** announced that the budget items were being discussed. Details followed regarding its positives. Updates followed on the Maple/BNSF railroad crossing project.

COMMUNICATIONS - See attachment in staff's report.

ADJOURN

MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:50 P.M. MR. STUEBNER SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Celeste Weilandt,
Recording Secretary
(as transcribed by digital recording)

**TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION
Minutes**

August 10, 2011, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Co-Chairman Gress called to order the August 10, 2011 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission at 7:00 p.m.

The Chairman led the commissioners and the public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Co-Chairman Wendt, Co-Chairman Gress, Members Mr. Cronin, Mr. Saricks, Mr. Schiller, Mr. Stuebner, Student Representative Robert Clark

Absent: Ms. Van Anne

Staff Present: Public Works Dir. Nan Newlon, Traffic Manager Dorin Fera, Police Parking Enforcement Supervisor Timothy Sembach.

Visitors: Mr. Lucas Maxa, Lisle, IL; Mr. Greg Doody, 940 Warren, Downers Grove; Ms. Cookie Radeko, 940 Warren, Downers Grove; Mr. Graham Mosey, 4925 Forest Ave., Downers Grove; Ms. Bobby Bishop, 5151 Mochel Drive, Downers Grove; Ms. Linda Kunze, 933 Curtiss, Downers Grove; Mr. Mark Thoman, 1109 61st St., Downers Grove; Mr. Bill Wrobel, 7800 Queens Ct., Downers Grove; Dave and Marilyn Weiher, 935 Curtiss, #4, Downers Grove

Co-Chairman Gress reviewed the protocol for the meeting, reminded the public that the commission was a recommending body to the Village Council, and stated that the minutes were being recorded on village-owned equipment for transcription purposes.

APPROVAL OF THE JULY 13, 2011 TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION MINUTES. Deferred to next meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

1. File #08-11. Downtown Parking Study - Preliminary Report. Ms. Nan Newlon, Director of Public Works, summarized that tonight's presentation will provide preliminary data collected to date for the downtown parking study. From tonight's meeting, the consultant will take back feedback not only from this meeting but from the recent steering committee meeting, as well as from staff and then a draft of the recommendations will be provided in a final study which will be presented next month.

Messrs. Richard Rich and Dave Burr from Rich and Associates were introduced. **Mr. Burr** explained that much of the study was a status update of the field work that was completed back in June, which basically comprised of existing parking inventory, parking counts, on-line customer surveys of visitors, Metra commuters, downtown residents, and downtown business owners and employees. One item that will be forthcoming will be the calculation of the parking demand by land use and best practices will be reviewed as compared to other communities; parking allocation, etc. A description of the various survey data followed.

The on-line survey that was taken listed that one of the main purposes individuals traveled to the downtown was for work, followed by services, shopping, dining, and other (library,

appointments, entertainment). The major response to the on-line survey asking the question of why people avoid traveling to the downtown area, was due to difficult parking. As to the ease of locating an on-street parking space, many individuals disagreed with the statement. As to locating a general parking space, again, individuals disagreed and believed it was difficult to find a space. As to the directional signs for parking, individuals believed they were easy to follow. Time limits for on-street parking appeared to be reasonable. A review of the defined study area followed.

Discussing best practices, **Mr. Burr** reported that a benchmark used by a community to minimally control parking is about 50% percent. The village currently had 53% public parking available: on-street spaces, various commuter lots and the parking garage. However, the public parking north of the tracks was deficient at about 40-41%. Turnover counts, taken hourly on two different dates were also reviewed for the north and south sides of the BNSF RR. Of the 3,065 parking spaces analyzed, approximately 2200 were occupied during peak times (12:00 noon). Details followed regarding parking on the north and south sides of the tracks.

Peak hour occupancy did differ between north and south of the BNSF RR tracks. **Mr. Burr** reported that the areas in red were the areas that the parking occupancy during peak hour was in excess of 85% occupied, which was a perception. Individuals felt that there was a parking issue and that while there was parking available, perceptually, individuals felt they had to "hunt" for a parking space. The areas in yellow reflected a 70 - 84% occupancy and the areas of green and blue reflected 50% and lower. Those parking spaces with the highest occupancy achieved were also reviewed. Of the 921 commuter parking spaces, 850 spaces were peaked at 9:00 AM. One interesting item found was that commuters boarded the train by 8:15 AM, which was about 97% of all commuters.

Public parking and private parking figures were broken out, noting that private parking spaces were at surplus capacity. Out of the 1255 spaces, it was peaking just above 700 spaces which was understandable, given that a private business may own 10 spaces but only use 2 or 3 spaces. A review of the parking deck followed by each level. Overall, **Mr. Burr** explained that the parking garage was achieving about 90% occupancy. Turnover rates were explained and the fact that one of the misleading things about turnover was that a low turnover number could exist either because there were few vehicles using the space or because vehicles were staying in the space for an extended period of time. One thing that was identified with the turnover spaces were the spaces in violation (pink colored areas), wherein vehicles were identified as staying over their time limit. About 6% of the vehicles were in violation; the benchmark was no more than 5%.

Weekend parking figures were reviewed and noted to be lower than a weekday. Occupancy and turnover violations on Saturdays did increase slightly to 10%. **Mr. Burr** believed it was due to employees using the spaces because enforcement did not occur on Saturdays. Another observance was the fact that some employees were moving their vehicles every couple of hours. Other statistics followed for the Tivoli Theater parking lot. Parking signage was also reviewed, noting signage has to be in clear view, consistent, and easy to read and understand.

In closing, **Mr. Burr** reported that the public parking was stressed, more parking was available on the south side of the tracks versus the north, and enforcement was working well except for the two hour shuffle of vehicles, which needed to be eliminated. Comments received at previous meetings included providing 15 to 20 minute parking, improving the signage, having better clarification of valet parking, and encouraging commuters not to park at the Main Street station but instead use Fairmont or Belmont stations, thereby increasing the downtown parking spaces by 5% and opening up about 40 spaces. The time limits for parking spaces currently

seemed appropriate to accommodate patrons. Other summarizations followed, along with samples of consistent way-finding signage.

Additional recommendations from the study included better lighting of parking lots and providing better security by trimming the landscaping.

Mr. Burr closed by reviewing his next steps and asking for feedback tonight in order to formulate some recommendations for the next presentation.

Asked if the handicap spaces will be measured, **Mr. Burr** stated that those spaces were broken out separately and were identified and mapped out. To date, the ADA recently came out with newly recommended off-street handicap parking requirements, which information will be reviewed. **Co-Chairman Gress** inquired about revenue generation from the permit parking and the daily parking and whether any recommendations would be forthcoming to increase those fees. **Mr. Rich**, responded that the information was collected but was part of an overall package and a demand analysis would have to be completed for now and in the future. He explained that he preferred seeing a parking system finance the improvements that the village wanted and it was important to formulate the necessary recommendations and estimated costs for those recommendations/improvements and figure out how to pay for them, such as user fees. Another option he suggested included changing an individual's behavior by changing the parking rate in certain areas.

Because there was a limited parking capacity, **Mr. Saricks** asked if **Mr. Rich** planned to review the impact of increasing fees and whether losing customers would result. **Mr. Rich** stated that the population that would be affected would be the commuter or the employee. If the rate was going to be increased, he cautioned the village to be careful in doing so because those individuals needed a place to go. **Director Newlon** stated that there could be room to increase the permit fee since the maximum was being charged for the daily fee.

Mr. Schiller pointed out that the most desirable spaces were the spaces closest to the Metra train, and because prices were basically locked in due to the Metra contract, it limited the ability to modify pricing anywhere else other than the parking deck. In discussing the north side, large parking lot for the AT&T building, **Mr. Saricks** asked the traffic consultant whether it was fair to include the lot in the north side study, wherein **Mr. Burr** believed it probably was not fair, which was why he reiterated that this was the first go-around of the study. **Mr. Rich** added that these types of lots offered opportunities by having the village enter into an agreement with the owners of these lots.

Asked if the library could have limited parking, **Mr. Burr** stated one of the issues around the library was the additional enforcement needed. Overnight parking will be addressed also.

Co-Chairman Gress opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Graham Mosey, 4925 Forest Avenue, Downers Grove, believed the parking basically addressed convenience. He asked what kind of parking increase would be provided at the Belmont Station. **Ms. Newlon** believed it would be comparable to what was there initially. She would research it, however.

Asked if staff had discussed with Metra the shifting of some of the non-stop trains away from the downtown station, **Ms. Newlon** stated she did discuss it with them but the issue was a switch located between the Main Street station and the Fairview station.

Mr. Mosey stated it would be interesting to know what kind of parking was not being used at the Fairview station, since whomever was controlling the commuter spaces there had the ability to shift individuals where they would like to go based on a fee structure and allocating the spaces. He stated it would be interesting to know what type of revenue was generated from enforcement. As to signage, he supported a uniform system in the village, similar to the system used in Europe. He discussed the changing business cycles and the fact that more parking will be necessary at times while at other times it may not. As a suggestion, **Mr. Mosey** asked the consultant to look at private parking for the commuters.

The topic of the Park and Ride usage numbers came up and the fact that the information would be included in the consultant's presentation.

Ms. Marilyn Weiher, 935 Curtiss Street, said she owns a commercial property in downtown and voiced concern about moving some of the express trains out of downtown, since a couple of her tenants were doing the reverse commute to Chicago. She asked for consideration.

Ms. Linda Kunze, Downers Grove Downtown Management Corporation, suggested that when reviewing the time when the parking spaces open up to the employees, she encouraged to open up as early as nine o'clock because most of the village's employees started between 9:30 and 10:00 AM. Additionally, she was pleased to see consideration of moving the commuters to Belmont or Fairview Metra Stations. She also added that the S.B. Friedman study showed that commuters focus on getting to their cars and traveling to their homes. She appreciated the village having a plan. Asked if there was the possibility of negotiating with Metra to open up one of the parking areas closer to the train for general parking, a consultant responded that unless there was an exchange of something, Metra would probably not negotiate. **Ms. Newlon** described some previous negotiations with Metra and offered to look at other options.

Mr. Saricks asked whether the changes occurring at Belmont Metra Station, due to the underpass, were leading Metra to shift a few express trains to that location, wherein **Ms. Newlon** thought it would make for a good discussion with Metra's new head person. She believed it made sense since it was a good regional station and confirmed that Burlington representatives would be in the discussion.

In closing, **Director Newlon** stated that the presentation slides will be forwarded electronically to the commissioners and will also be posted on the village's web site.

OLD BUSINESS - None

COMMUNICATIONS - See attachment in staff's report, if any.

ADJOURN

MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:20 P.M. MR. WENDT SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Celeste Weilandt,
Recording Secretary
(as transcribed by digital recording)

**TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION
Minutes**

September 14, 2011, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Acting Chairman Schiller called to order the September 14, 2011 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission at 7:00 p.m.

The Acting Chairman led the commissioners and the public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

A review of the meeting's protocol followed. The chair reminded the public that the commission was a recommending body to the Village Council, and stated that the minutes were being recorded on village-owned equipment for transcription purposes.

Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Acting Chairman Schiller, Members Mr. Cronin, Ms. Van Anne, Mr. Wrobel, Student Representative Ms. Celeste Aguzino

Absent: Members Patricia Vlcek, David Stuebner, Chris Saricks

Staff Present: Public Works Dir. Nan Newlon, Traffic Manager Dorin Fera; Officer Tim Sembach, Downers Grove Police Dept.

Visitors: Mr. Willis Johnson, 603 Rogers Street, Downers Grove

APPROVAL OF MINUTES Deferred to next meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

1. File #08-11. Downtown Parking Study - Preliminary Report. Public Works Director Nan Newlon, announced that the consultants, Rich and Associates, were in attendance to make their second presentation of the downtown parking study and receive commissioner and public input. In October, an updated set of recommendations will be provided to the commissioners for final review and, hopefully, forwarded to the Village Council.

Messrs. Richard Rich and Dave Burr from Rich and Associates were introduced. **Mr. Burr** explained what exactly the presentation would cover and added that the calculation for the parking demand will be new to this presentation as well as best practices to make the parking work more efficiently. A recap of the initial scope of work and findings followed.

Mr. Rich explained that one of the best practices being recommended was the Shared Use Strategy, where parking spaces are shared between two businesses with different peak hours, i.e., one use may require more parking spaces in the AM and as the parking demand diminishes through the day, the other use will pick up those same spaces for its PM peak. In reviewing the various types of land uses for the parking demand, such as retail, restaurant, theater, office, medical office, etc., he pointed out that a peak time arises and coincides around the 12:00 Noon to 1:00 PM time period. Noting the Adjusted Observed Occupancy numbers, **Mr. Rich** explained that the theater demand was removed because it was not reflected in the spaces per use but was reflecting what the observed occupancy was.

After reviewing the various parking needs and the number of spaces generated, he noted how easy it was to see how it correlates to what was observed. A further clarification followed on how the parking generation rate was applied by the type of land use followed by the parking demand for a specific block. Those blocks that were depicted as green or blue in color, the total parking demand exceeded the total parking supply on the block. Blocks depicted in yellow reflected that the total calculated parking supply on the block was insufficient to support the total calculated demand on the block. The parking supply for the evening hours also reflected the use of the commuter spaces. Other scenarios were reviewed.

Deficiencies in the parking demand were reviewed by **Mr. Burr**, with him discussing that, overall, there was a 1,081 space surplus, while the demand was for 1,680 spaces, which assumed that the surplus private capacity was available, which it was not. Taking that into account, **Mr. Burr** then explained that the surplus private supply spaces were then removed and each block was reviewed for its parking demand and matched to the available private supply. If a surplus existed, those spaces were taken out of the equation. Under that calculation, the 1,081 surplus spaces were reduced to 368 surplus spaces for the entire downtown.

In the last portion of the calculation, **Mr. Burr** explained that not only were the surplus private spaces removed but the remote public spaces were removed, reducing the north side total spaces from 225 surplus spaces down to 11 surplus spaces during the daytime hours.

Mr. Burr stated that the above information confirms that there is a parking problem in the village's downtown area.

A review of the net available parking supply also followed with **Mr. Burr** stating that based on the parking generation factors, approximately 130,000 sq. feet of retail space could be developed, or, 69,500 sq. feet of dining space, or, 1900 theater seats created. Further examples of development followed, noting that if any new development were to occur, it would have to include additional parking.

In conclusion, **Mr. Burr** reported that the public supply of parking spaces was 85% occupied and the private supply was about 55% occupied at peak. Commuter parking was stressed and excluding the private surplus spaces and the remote public spaces north of the tracks, 97% was being occupied while the south was at 85% occupied.

As to best practices, **Mr. Burr** reported that a municipality should control at least 50% of the available parking through allocation, pricing, availability and use. Citing Downers Grove, **Mr. Burr** reported that only 45% was being controlled by the village. Rather than constructing more parking, he summarized that he reviewed the village's current parking and considered how it could be used more efficiently, recommending the village to reach out to the private land owners to supply them with parking spaces for commuters and/or employees, via permits. Additionally, another recommendation was to convert the prime commuter lots to shopper parking.

Reviewing handicap spaces, **Mr. Burr** reported the village was 10 spaces short and recommended adding them. Reviewing parking enforcement, **Mr. Burr** stated it was to change drivers' behaviors and not so much penalize them. It was recommended that a first time violator be issued a "courtesy ticket", basically, thanking a customer for visiting the Village but in the future to encourage them to park in the appropriate parking space/location, so as not to overstay their time limit. Additionally, he recommended that enforcement occur on random days and have the village enact an "anti-shuffling ordinance" for vehicles. Other recommendations included adding bike racks and provide better lighting, specifically in Lot D, and trimming back certain landscaping.

As for best practices for transportation terminals, **Mr. Burr** stated a “Kiss and Ride” was appropriate to drop off transit users outside of the permitted areas, add bike lockers, and address any other security concerns in order to make pedestrians and transit users feel safe; otherwise, he stated if they did not feel safe, they would park illegally somewhere else. Specifically, the recommendation he suggested was to use some spaces just outside of Lot B for short-term Kiss and Ride spaces until 8:00 AM, thereby leaving the spaces available for the longer term parking.

Other recommendations also included the village to consider a paving assessment of the various parking areas to review parking surfaces for potholes, cracks, and whether striping and lighting was adequate, etc. Regarding signage, **Mr. Burr** recommended that the village incorporate into its current signage program the introduction sign, the identification sign, and the directional sign. Pedestrian navigation signs and way-finding kiosks should also be incorporated where possible, near the parking area. **Mr. Burr** discussed that marketing materials and brochures should be designed to educate the public and businesses as to what is occurring in the downtown area. Lastly, he recommended that the village encourage businesses to provide links to the village parking website on their own business web site.

Regarding shopper/employee parking spaces, many of which were in commuter lots, **Mr. Burr** noted that during the day these spaces were really not available and the signage had to be very clear on what was being conveyed to the drivers. Valet spaces could be better marked also.

Addressing user fee best practices, **Mr. Rich** explained that striping and parking allocation were important and that it was the simplest way for the village to control parking and charge various fees based on convenience. Monthly parking fees charged from various surrounding communities were presented for comparison purposes and **Mr. Rich** recommended that the village adjust them based on convenience to the train station and institute a program of gradual rate increases to fund parking improvements. Lastly, he noted that the top floor of the parking deck has weekend free parking which could become a “dumping” ground for commuters traveling to downtown Chicago to avoid paying high parking fees or avoid paying parking fees at an airport. He stated the village had the capacity to charge for that parking.

Other recommendations included reviewing Lot F for pot holes; consider loading zones; consider the top level of the deck for part-time employees; consider short-term parking (15 min.) spaces for certain uses, i.e., dry cleaners, bakeries, take out restaurants, and position them at the beginning or end of the blocks with the clear signage. Short-term spaces could also be utilized by the library (30 to 90 minutes).

Mr. Burr closed by summarizing the recommendations as described above and again, asked for commissioner thoughts and feedback.

Acting Chairman Schiller opened up the discussion to the commissioners. **Mr. Cronin** asked for clarification on how the village would approach private property owners to make their parking spaces available to the public, wherein **Dir. Newlon** explained that at one time the village did have an agreement with AT&T to use parking on their site, but it lapsed. She reported that the village has had a history of doing these types of arrangements before. **Mr. Burr** explained that sometimes a municipality will offer to improve a private owner’s lot also and enforce the parking on it, with a long-term lease or agreement. And, if a private lot was being underutilized, he said sometimes it was enticing to an owner.

Responding to **Mr. Cronin’s** question again, **Dir. Newlon** recalled that commuters utilized the former AT&T parking lot, but sometimes it could be utilized by employees. **Mr. Rich** also added

that when approaching some of the churches who seem to be reluctant to release parking spaces, he suggested working with them to find out if their needs are for commuter or employee spaces. **Mr. Cronin** seemed to feel that private parking would have to be designated as either employees or commuters and nothing else.

As to the village being short 10 handicap spaces, **Acting Chairman Schiller** asked if the ADA had a specific requirement for spaces, wherein **Mr. Burr** explained that the ADA requirements were based on the number of lot spaces provided. Asked how much control does the village have on what it charges commuters and can the village vary its pricing based on proximity to the train station, **Dir. Newlon** explained that she, along with legal staff, have been reviewing all agreements with Metra and the BNSF to see what options exist to do that but one of the criteria was the total number of parking spaces in the downtown area are committed to providing for commuters. The other factor, she explained, was that the village could not charge more than \$3.00 for the daily fee. However, as she understood, there was no concrete number for what the village could charge for parking permits. **Dir. Newlon** expected to have more information for the commissioners before the final recommendations.

Mr. Wrobel commented he attended a prior library board meeting where the library purchased parking spots in either the parking deck or the commuter parking area for the library director and a few others on the payroll. He asked if there were other municipal or businesses purchasing permits to park in commuter parking spaces on a regular basis and, if so, he recommended that those individuals negotiate with a private lot. **Dir. Newlon**, however, presumed the library was probably purchasing a Level 2 parking permit, just as any other business could purchase, and it was a shared parking spot and not designated. She agreed with **Mr. Wrobel** that individuals could seek private owners for parking spaces and relieve the parking deck. Asked if the village was negotiating with any of the businesses, such as the theater, as to making some of their spaces available for commuter parking, **Dir. Newlon** clarified that the village was discussing the idea conceptually, but that it could be part of the formal recommendation.

Mr. Cronin asked if the village could control signage in private lots for consistency purposes.

Conversation followed on what happens when drivers park inappropriately on private lots and how do such lots get enforced if drivers park cars on lawns or behind a store.

Ms. Van Anne, understanding that employees were taking advantage of street parking on Saturdays, asked whether the employee parking at the deck was less utilized on Saturday. In response, **Mr. Rich** stated the deck was used due to the Farmer's Market taking place but clearly the peak on Saturday was in the morning and then a decline occurred throughout the day.

Acting Chairman Schiller supported having the shorter parking time limits but questioned police staff if it was difficult to enforce. In response, **Ofr. Sembach** indicated it was not.

Ms. Van Anne asked whether the pursuit of private parking spaces would just mean more commuter spaces and then transition current commuter parking to public parking, wherein **Mr. Rich** believed the village was already over-supplying the amount of commuter parking and the need was to take the prime commuter spaces and make them available for businesses.

Mr. Willis Johnson, 603 Rogers St., Downers Grove, stated he owns the Tivoli Building. He clarified that he is focusing on holding more daytime events, commenting that DeVry University will be holding its annual meeting in his building next week. **Mr. Johnson** noted that the bowling alley was also open during daytime hours, along with other businesses within the building, such as the residents of the hotel which utilize the parking lot. He did oppose the

recommended 10 to 15 minute parking spaces but asked how those spots would be calculated and allocated, i.e. by business or geographically disbursed throughout the area? In response, **Mr. Rich** stated they would be geographically disbursed, usually at each end of a block and then shared by the businesses of that block.

Asked if the village's recent technology could issue the courtesy ticket mentioned earlier, and when would it start, **Mr. Burr** responded that it would be up to the community to decide the parameter, but typically, it was six months. **Mr. Johnson** asked for more specifics on the recommendation to have commuter spaces available before 9:00 AM, which he supported. **Mr. Burr** followed up on the question but stated no specific time was decided upon. **Dir. Newlon** believed the time was tied to the enforcement practice. Regarding on-street shopper parking, **Mr. Johnson** asked what the consultant would recommend as a time limit, wherein **Mr. Burr** stated that two hours was appropriate, as it provided a turnover for the spaces. Longer time spaces would be located near the restaurants and shops.

Discussing user fees, **Mr. Johnson** assumed user fees would not be charged to shoppers. **Mr. Rich** concurred explaining that usually once meters are removed and then returned, business owners are not supportive of them. Lastly, **Mr. Johnson** hoped that if a private lot was to become a commuter lot, that it be used to reallocate commuter spaces and not to increase commuter spaces. In response to **Mr. Cronin's** question of why **Mr. Johnson** did not prefer the 10 to 15 minute parking spots, **Mr. Johnson** said they took up spaces that individuals could use for 2 or 3 hours and they were usually abused, but he understood why certain businesses wanted them though.

Dir. Newlon explained that this item is tentatively scheduled to be presented to Council, but that the best possible date would be the middle of October. To accomplish this, the next TAP Commission meeting would need to be moved up by one week, to occur on October 5th. She asked commissioners to check their calendars, and they would be contacted by staff to receive their responses regarding this date change.

OLD BUSINESS - None

COMMUNICATIONS - None

ADJOURN

ACTING CHAIRMAN SCHILLER MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:25 P.M. MR. WROBEL SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Celeste Weilandt,
Recording Secretary
(as transcribed by digital recording)