APPROVED June 22, 2020

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES
May 18, 2020

CALL TO ORDER:

Ch. Rickard called the May 18, 2020 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and provided an overview of the meeting format. Because of the state mandated requirements regarding social distancing, the meeting will be held electronically. Ch. Rickard provided an overview on how the public can participate via Zoom or through providing written comments to plancommission@downers.us. He then led the meeting in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Ch. Rickard
PRESENT (ELECTRONICALLY): Mr. Boyle, Mr. Dmytryszyn, Ms. Johnson, Ms. Majauskas, Mr. Maurer, Mr. Patel, Ms. Rollins, Mr. Toth
ABSENT: Ex. Officio Members Olczyk, Livorsi & Menninga

A quorum was established.

MOTION TO CONDUCT MEETING ELECTRONICALLY:

Mr. Maurer made a motion to conduct meeting electronically, as it is an essential meeting, seconded by Mr. Boyle.

AYES: Boyle, Dmytryszyn, Johnson, Majauskas, Maurer, Patel, Rollins, Toth, Ch. Rickard
NAYS: none

The Motion passed

STAFF: Stan Popovich, Community Development Director
Jason Zawila, Planning Manager
Gabby Baldassari, Development Planner
Flora Ramirez, Development Planner (Electronically)

VISITORS: Amy Tiberi, Wight & Co., 2500 N. Frontage Rd. (Electronically)
David Evans, Wight & Co., 2500 N. Frontage Rd. (Electronically)
Kelly Conolly, Sam Schwartz, 223 W. Jackson Blvd. (Electronically)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 2, 2020 meeting

Maurer made a motion, seconded by Johnson to approve the minutes from March 2, 2020.

APPROVED June 22, 2020

The Motion to approve the minutes passed by Voice Vote.

Ch. Rickard reviewed the procedures to be followed for the one scheduled public hearing, explaining that the Plan Commission is strictly a recommending body. The purpose of the meeting is to gather facts, information, and testimony of items on the Agenda. The Plan Commission's decision is not final but is strictly a recommendation to the Village Council for the Council's final decision. He said a report would be forwarded to the Council with a motion to recommend approval, recommend approval with refinements, or recommend denial of the petition. The Village Council makes all final decisions.

Ch. Rickard stated that the Petitioner will present its case to the Plan Commission, followed by questions to the Petitioner by Commission members. The Public will then have an opportunity to make comments before the Commission regarding the case under consideration. Ch. Rickard provided an overview of how the public can participate electronically during the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Following presentations by the Public, a member of the Community Development Department will present the Staff's report. Upon completion of presentations by the Staff and the Public, the Petitioner will have the opportunity to question statements made or provide a closing statement. The Chairman will then close the public hearing portion of the meeting, and the Commission will review the information provided and ask questions of the speakers. Upon completion of the Plan Commission's deliberation, a Motion will be made containing a recommendation to the Village Council regarding the case.

Ch. Rickard then asked everyone who intended to speak on the petition before the Commission to rise and be sworn in.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

20-PLC-0005: A petition seeking approval of an amendment to Institutional Master Plan for the Downers Grove South High School campus. The subject property is zoned INP-2 Campus-scale Institutional. The Downers Grove South High School campus is located at the southwest corner of Dunham Road and 63rd Street, commonly known as 1436 Norfolk Street, Downers Grove, IL (PINs 09-19-101-002 and 09-19-200-003). District 99, Petitioner and Owner.

<u>Petitioner's Presentation</u>:
Amy Tiberi, Wight and Company, speaking on behalf of Community High School District 99. Ms.Tiberi showed an aerial of the overall site from about a year ago. She noted that in 2015 the district petitioned for a rezoning to INP-2 and in 2019 they petitioned for several amendments to aid in the modernization plan. Ms. Tiberi showed a map indicating the INP-2 transitional areas zoning requirements. She directed attention to the focus area of this petition along 63rd Street and Dunham Road. In the next map, she highlighted Norfolk as the main entrance and noted the improvements that have been completed up to this date. Ms. Tiberi shared that in 2019 the Village partnered with the school district to

APPROVED June 22, 2020

conceive a pedestrian safety study that was informed by a traffic study conducted by Sam Schwartz. The district has used the study to review pick-up and drop-off along Norfolk Street.

Ms. Tiberi stated that in order to align with the traffic study and account for the recommendation in the pedestrian safety study the district is proposing a new off-street drop-off lane along Dunham Road. She explained that the design is a one-way counter clockwise semicircle drop-off drive. This will help alleviate congestion on Norfolk Street and Dunham Road for drop-off and pick-up during school hours. The proposed lane would allow for a maximum of eleven cars and it would be a right turn only heading south on Dunham Road. Ms. Tiberi concluded her presentation after sharing that the expected construction schedule was set for June of 2020 with the goal to have the lane opened by the fall of 2020.

Mr. Boyle noted that the presentation was a great response to some of the community's concerns. He asked if this proposal was part of the process where public input was provided. Ms. Tiberi confirmed that the proposal was a combination of input from board members, district administration, the superintendent, the Board of Education, and Sam Schwartz.

Mr. Boyle asked if there was any concern that residents heading north on Dunham Road would try to do a U-turn before they get to the light at 63rd Street. Or was there an expectation that people heading northbound on Dunham Road would turn into the southern parking lot. Ms. Tiberi explained that the design allowed for anyone heading northbound on Dunham Road to turn left into the circle drive but drivers can only turn right outbound.

Mr. Dmytryszyn asked if there were any traffic concerns along 63rd Street for the left turn lane being clogged up. Ms. Tiberi deferred to Kelly Conolly from Sam Schwartz. Ms. Conolly explained that the traffic study looked at traffic flow and capacity specifically at 63rd Street and Dunham Road. The study revealed that most of the traffic on Dunham Road was oriented to and from the south. This was one of the reasons, the left turn in was allowed into the circle drive because a lot of those parents are from the south. Ms. Conolly further noted that the predominant movement would be heading north on Dunham Road, turning left into the circle drive, turning right back on the Dunham Road, and finally heading south on Dunham Road.

Mr. Dmytryszyn asked if the proposal included a study that analyzed a change in traffic patterns. Specifically, where people currently on 63rd Street turn left onto Dunham Road would they now be heading north on Dunham Road to turn left onto the new circle drive. Ms. Conolly stated that because the proposal allowed inbound from both directions on Dunham Road they believe traffic circulation patterns would not change significantly.

Mr. Dmytryszyn asked for an explanation of the traffic counts in the study. Ms. Conolly explained that they study did not include any reassignment of traffic. Instead, the study

accounted for observed traffic before and after school. This information revealed that the vast majority of the traffic was coming from the south on Dunham Road.

Mr. Boyle asked about traffic patterns. If people used the circle drive and turned right onto Dunham Rd., heading south, would they start heading east on Norfolk Street towards the elementary school. He noted that this is part of the community concern due to the lack of stop lights around the elementary school. He asked if there was an expectation that people would continue to head southbound on Dunham Road. Ms. Conolly explained that the proposal would not likely affect traffic circulation patterns heading east on Norfolk Street. In, fact it might help alleviate congestion on Norfolk Street keeping more people on Dunham Road. Thus, reducing continuation east along Norfolk Street. The goal of this proposal was to allow for additional storage, separate from what is currently being provided on Norfolk Street to promote relief from Norfolk Street.

Mr. Dmytryszyn again noted that in the mornings there are a lot of people heading towards I-355 and he worried about the backed up traffic on 63rd Street.

Mr. Maurer expressed concerned over queuing issues northbound on Dunham Road. If this occurred he noted that perhaps people coming from the south would move north towards Springside Road, onto 63rd Street, and then turn right onto Dunham Road. There should not be a scenario where Dunham Road is being blocked up with people waiting to get into this circle drive. Ms. Conolly explained the recommendation for the inbound lane to be able to receive both right and left turns should alleviate this. She noted that currently left turn lanes are prohibited into the parking lot further south of the circle drive that is being proposed. Ms. Conolly also shared that planning staff commented previously that if there was back up traffic northbound on Dunham Road that the new drive would be restricted to right in only. Mr. Maurer appreciated the option to make this adjustment in the future.

Ms. Rollins referenced the traffic study and noted that she expected the numbers to be larger. Ms. Conolly provided more background on the traffic study. The study did not include all of the congestion that happened on the west side of the high school campus. During the morning there was not a lot happening on the west side of campus including in the existing drop-off area. In the evening there was less happening on Dunham Road and more happening on the west side of campus. During the morning more is happening along Dunham Road. The numbers in the report are focused on what is happening on the east side of campus. So the numbers might be misleading in terms of the overall load of the school.

Ms. Rollins noted that she was surprised with staff that in the recommendations we would wait until there were accidents to make adjustments. She noted that she found this counterintuitive. Ch. Rickard stated that staff would respond to that comment during the staff report.

APPROVED June 22, 2020

Ch. Rickard welcomed any additional questions from the Plan Commissioners before the petition moved to the public input portion of the meeting. Hearing none, he shifted to the public input portion of the meeting.

Public Comment:

Mr. Zawila stated that there were no comments received via email nor were any members of the public available on the call.

Mr. Maurer asked if notice was sent to residents for the requirements to attend the meeting. Ch. Rickard confirmed that notices with directions were sent to residents.

Mr. Zawila added that no comments were received via email. He mentioned that as noted in the staff report one resident did call to ask about the petition, but did not want to participate in the public meeting.

Ch. Rickard then asked staff to make a presentation.

Staff Presentation:

Gabby Baldassari, Development Planner, said she was presenting 20-PLC-0005 an institutional plan amendment for Downers Grove South High School located at 1436 Norfolk. Ms. Baldassari noted that the site was bordered by Springside Avenue on the west, 63rd Street on the north, Dunham Road on the east, and Norfolk Street on the south. She then provided a photo of both the public hearing notice sign and the existing conditions. The current parking lot access is via a single curb cut along Dunham and five curb cuts along Norfolk Street. She explained that the campus was completing these improvements as part of the 2019 Master Plan Amendments. With the 2019 approvals the curb cuts along Norfolk Street had been reduced from a total a six to five.

Ms. Baldassari highlighted an area in red noting that the proposed improvement for this petition was limited to this area. She explained that the proposed off-street drop-off area would consist of a one-way semi-circle route that would provide an additional point for student drop-off and pick-up. The drive aisle would create two curb cuts on Dunham Road. Both north and southbound traffic would enter at the northern curb cut and exit at the south curb cut. The inbound curb cut would be twenty-one feet wide and the outbound curb cut will be limited to fourteen feet. Ms. Baldassari explained that the area from the lot line to the street setback of 30 feet does not allow for parking. She noted that this would not affect the drop off area, but instead the parking during the peak drop-off times. As such, the petitioner would be required to put up no parking signs in these area. The other condition staff is implementing is related to queuing issues, which is addresses the second condition of approval on page four of the staff report. Finally, Ms. Baldassari listed the criteria for an institutional plan amendment. She noted that staff believed that the criteria had been met and if the Plan Commission agreed a draft motion was provided on page four of the staff report.

APPROVED June 22, 2020

Mr. Zawila addressed one of the previous questions from Ms. Rollins noting that condition number two was placed in the report after agreeing with the findings of the petitioner's consultant. He explained that this petition was to amend an institutional master plan and if there was ever an issue this option should be documented.

Ms. Rollins asked if staff anticipated accidents or is staff satisfied that the traffic will flow safely. Mr. Zawila stated that staff was satisfied with the findings provided in the traffic study.

Mr. Maurer added that he had not considered possible accidents. Instead his concern was limited to queuing issues on Dunham Road. Now he saw that there was a suggestion of possible collisions. Ms. Rollins referenced the recommendation in the staff report specifically condition number two.

Mr. Boyle reiterated his concern over the additional traffic added to southbound Dunham Road and new traffic heading east on Norfolk Street. He further explained that there is no stop sign at that intersection. Mr. Boyle then asked what considerations are made for the nearby elementary school. Mr. Zawila explained that study is limited to the high school area. The best staff can offer is that this is always an ongoing discussion looking at traffic control.

Mr. Boyle notes that special attention should be placed on this. He then asked who at the Village would likely provide oversight. Mr. Zawila explained that it was a combination of Community Development efforts and Public Works.

Mr. Dmytryszyn agreed with the proposal. However, he again expressed concern over queuing issues on 63rd Street. Mr. Zawila explained that the drop-off lane is just one of the improvements that is proposed for pedestrian safety. He then requested that the applicant talk more about additional improvements being made at the site.

Ms. Conolly gave some background on the previous pedestrian study that revealed a number of pedestrian improvement options. This proposal was on the list of improvements. They have specifically looked at internal circulation on the west side of campus. Discussions have occurred with DuPage County regarding additional access off of 63rd Street. Additionally, they have looked at improvements to the existing parking lot onto Norfolk Street. Lastly, they have reviewed Norfolk Street further to the east and have been in touch with Kingsley Elementary School as part of their community outreach process. Ms. Tiberi added that the district continues to monitor pedestrian improvements and as more funding becomes available the district will consider additional options for improvements.

Ms. Johnson asked about pedestrian traffic on Dunham Road and if this had been interfaced with vehicle traffic. Ms. Conolly stated that they observed that currently there was curbside pick-up and drop-off along Dunham Road both in the morning and in the evening. Their approach included the interface between the traffic lanes and sidewalk. For example the sidewalk would continue as a continuous sidewalk prioritizing the

pedestrian. Additionally the outbound lane was narrowed to minimize the exposure of the pedestrian by limiting the crossing distance.

Mr. Maurer suggested that no parking signs should be placed all along the circular drive. Ms. Baldassari explained that the red hashed area does not allow for cars to park due to the adjacent residential street setback. However, the petitioner wanted to offer an option for vehicles to sit in that area. She then asked the petitioner to speak to the purpose of this request. Ms. Tiberi explained that the intent was that the school would not allow for parking during pick-up and drop-off times. After school hours, if there were an event on campus the school would allow for parking in the non-hatched area.

Mr. Maurer appreciated an overview of all of the current improvements. He assumed that all of the work was reviewed as an aggregate. Mr. Zawila concurred that each improvement is being tracked with separate building permits and the overall master plan is always referenced.

Mr. Maurer thanked Ms. Rollins for directing his attention to the draft motion. He asked if the left turn in sign would be the responsibility of the Village or is the condition assuming that the school district will take responsibility. Mr. Zawila explained that it is a combination of traffic controls in the right-of-way, but changes would also need to occur on the private side.

Mr. Maurer asked why the inbound lane was not minimized for pedestrian safety considering this lane would receive traffic from both directions. Ms. Conolly explained that part of the decision was to maximize the number of cars that they could queue. Also, they considered that the inbound lane would function as a single lane because the left turn in would be waiting for the right turn in to complete the turn. It was most important to have the outbound narrowed, but if the Village would like the north inbound narrowed the design could be revised.

Mr. Maurer appreciated the response but still expressed concern that at the inbound lane considering kids have to watch for traffic from two different directions.

Ms. Rollins noted that she agreed with the proposal especially with the current Covid-19 environment she anticipated more parents looking to do drop-off.

Ch. Rickard did not have any questions for staff. He then asked if there was anyone that had any further questions for staff. Hearing none, he gave the petitioner the opportunity to make any closing remarks or comments.

Ms. Tiberi thanked everyone for their time.

Ch. Rickard closed the opportunity for public comment considering there was no public in attendance, the previous questions were submitted, and there were no additional email comments received. He then opened the meeting for deliberation.

APPROVED June 22, 2020

Mr. Boyle, agreed with the comments and believed the proposal would be an improvement. He recommended changing the words in condition number two to "…if any issues develop." He explained that he did not agree with something that states the Village would wait until a crash occurred.

Mr. Dmytryszyn agreed with the concept as an efficient way to add parking. However the traffic study did not convince him and he still worries about traffic on 63rd Street.

Ms. Johnson agreed with eliminating the word "crash" from the condition. Additionally, she noted she still had concerns with the left in turn and believed this would back up traffic on Dunham.

Ms. Majauskas supported the petition and she noted that this was a wait and see issue.

Mr. Maurer agreed with amending the second condition.

Mr. Patel supported the petition and agreed with the modification to condition number two.

Ms. Rollins supported the petition and agreed with the modification to condition number two.

Mr. Toth agreed with amending the second condition.

Ch. Rickard agreed with the adjustment to the second condition.

Plan Commission Recommendation:

Mr. Boyle made a motion stating based on the petitioner's submittal, the staff report, and the testimony presented, I find that the petitioner has met the standards of approval for an Institutional Master Plan Amendment for the Downers Grove South Campus as required by the Village of Downers Grove Zoning Ordinance and is in the public interest and therefore, I move that the Plan Commission recommend to the Village Council approval of 20-PLC-0005, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Institutional Master Plan shall substantially conform to the drawings prepared by Wight & Company dated February 21, 2020 and revised on March 26, 2020, April 23, 2020, and May 11, 2020, and attached to this staff report except as such plans may be modified to conform to Village Codes, Ordinances and Stormwater and Flood Plain Ordinance.

2. If queuing or any other issues develop related to the left-in entrance into the off-street drop-off lane, the Village may reassess the left-in entrance and require additional traffic safety measures to be implemented by School District 99, which may include eliminating the left-in option.

APPROVED June 22, 2020

3. The petitioner shall install 'no parking' signs adjacent to the off-street drop-off lane in the transitional area of the Master Plan.

Motion seconded by Dmytryszyn
AYES: Boyle, Dmytryszyn, Johnson, Majauskas, Maurer, Patel, Rollins, Toth, Ch. Rickard
NAYS: none

The Motion passed

Ch. Rickard asked if there were any announcements.

Mr. Zawila thanked the Plan Commissioners and the petitioner for participating in the new format. He reminded the Plan Commissioners that a quick meeting was required on June 1st to approve the minutes. Lastly, he shared that there was a quorum for the June 22nd meeting.

There being no further discussion, Ch. Rickard called for a Motion to adjourn.
Mr. Dmytryszyn moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Maurer.

The Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Community Development Staff
(Transcribed from mp3 recording)

DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOARD OF LIBRARY TRUSTEES
MAY 27, 2020, 7:30 P.M.
ONLINE VIA GOTO MEETING

MINUTES

1. **Call to Order**. President Graber called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m.

2. **Roll Call**. Members present: Trustee Carissa Dougherty, Trustee Swapna Gigani, Trustee David Humphreys, Trustee Barnali Khuntia, Trustee Kim Stapleton, President Jonathan Graber. Absent: None.

   Also present: Director Julie Milavec, Assistant Director Jen Ryjewski, Executive Assistant Katelyn Vabalaitis, Media Lab Coordinator Ed Bromiel, Kristin Purcell, Ed Pawlak.

3. **Welcome to Visitors**. President Graber welcomed visitors and thanked them for their interest in the library.

4. **Approval of Minutes**.
   a. April 22, 2020. It was moved by Dougherty and seconded by Khuntia THAT the Minutes of the April 22, 2020 Regular Monthly Meeting be approved as presented. Motion passed by voice vote.

5. **Financial Matters**.
   a. April 2020 Financial Report. Milavec presented the report. The library's revenue is low, as the first round of property tax disbursements do not usually come until very late May or early June. The library is 33% through the year and the budget is 28% spent, which is significantly below normal for this time of year. There are a number of expenses that are front-end loaded into the year, including database renewals and insurance renewals. Milavec noted that the Maintenance Supplies line is going up, as that is where most PPE purchases are charged. PPE is a significant unbudgeted cost and Assistant Director Jen Ryjewski is working on a FEMA grant, which will hopefully reimburse the library for some of that cost. Milavec also noted that three payments were made in May to Shales McNutt Construction for the capital replacement masonry project.

   b. May 2020 Invoices. It was moved by Humphreys and seconded by Dougherty THAT the payment of May 2020 capital replacement invoices totaling $181,207.40, the payment of May 2020 operating invoices totaling $67,120.35, and the ratification of April 2020 payrolls totaling $229,660.25 be

approved. Roll call: Ayes: Dougherty, Gigani, Humphreys, Khuntia, Stapleton, Graber. Nays: None. Abstentions: None.

6. **Public Comment on Agenda Items**. President Graber invited comment. There was none.

7. **Public Comment on Other Library Business**. President Graber invited comment. There was none.

8. **New Business**.
   a. COVID-19 Response and Reopening Phasing Plan Update. The library is now in Phase 2 Curbside Pickup. Staff have been amazing, coming together as a team and evolving the process every transaction. The library is serving over 100 cars a day with six hours of service. As of June 1, curbside hours will be expanding to 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. and 3:00 – 7:00 p.m. Split shifts will remain, to keep staff from co-mingling and to allow time for custodial staff to clean between shifts. Patrons have been wonderful by staying in their cars, unlatching their trunks, and trying to stay as socially distanced as possible. The library is getting new holds every day and staff have started putting together curated bundles when requested.

      The State of Illinois finally released their Phase 3 guidelines and plan to move to the new phase on May 29. The library falls into at least three of the categories listed. There is not a lot of direction specific to libraries, so DGPL has been working closely with other area libraries to develop best practices. The library is planning to move to its Phase 3, which includes limited service and limited hours, but is taking the planning process one step at a time to do it thoughtfully and with the health and safety of staff and the public in mind.

      Staff are currently working on a plan to best move patrons in and out of the library while dealing with capacity limits. There is discussion about removing all seating, asking patrons to limit the amount of time they are in the library, and asking patrons not to use materials in the library but rather grab their items and leave. Staff are focused on curbside service for the next two weeks and are investigating what other libraries are doing to help make plans moving forward.

      It was moved by Stapleton and seconded by Gigani THAT the Library Director continue to be authorized to make temporary policy changes in consultation with the Board President and within parameters of COVID-19 Response and Reopening Phasing Plan as presented. Roll call: Ayes: Dougherty, Gigani, Humphreys, Khuntia, Stapleton, Graber. Nays: None. Abstentions: None.

b. Paying Staff According to Personnel Policy, Section 3.28 Emergency Closings through June 30, 2020. Now that curbside has begun, in-library shifts are required for all staff in public-facing positions. There are still significant telecommuting opportunities for staff as well. As services evolve, the library will be requiring more in-library work from staff members. Milavec recommends continuing to pay staff according to the Emergency Closings Policy, and noted that the percentage of time staff are working in the library and through telecommuting is continuing to rise.

It was moved by Humphreys and seconded by Khuntia THAT library staff be paid according to Personnel Policy, Section 3.28 Emergency Closings through June 30, 2020. Roll call: Ayes: Dougherty, Gigani, Humphreys, Khuntia, Stapleton, Graber. Nays: None. Abstentions: None.

c. Development of Preliminary 2021 Budget. The Board discussed the direction of the 2021 Preliminary Budget. Milavec stressed that there are so many unknowns at this point, which makes it hard to plan ahead. The library's budget process always includes a bit of guesswork, as the budget has to be completed so far in advance for the next fiscal year. There are large budget items that staff do not know in time for the budget process, including health insurance renewals and liability insurance renewals. Merit increases are scheduled to be implemented this year for 2021. Up to 70% of the budget is staff salaries and benefits. Milavec noted the inverse relationship between the library's levy and the Equalized Assessed Valuation (EAV). The Board discussed the unknown future of the EAV due to the pandemic and the possible implications to the library's levy. Milavec will provide multiple versions of the budget for the next meeting.

9. **Unfinished Business**. There was none.

10. **Library Director's Report**. Milavec presented the report. In addition to the written report in the packet, Milavec gave a big thanks to some long-time employees who decided to retire. Ray Papacek, Maureen Karl, and Irene Strods have all been wonderful employees of the library and staff are very sorry to see them go. Milavec gave kudos to library staff, recognizing their amazing work on curbside service and virtual programming. The Kids Room is looking at providing make-and-take craft kits for curbside. The COVID memories program will begin in July/August and will go out in Discoveries. Summer Reading Club has 326 people registered as of this afternoon. Patrons are encouraged to go to the library's website to register for the online platform or to download sheets to track progress at home.

11. **Trustee Comments and Requests for Information**.
Trustee Gigani was excited to see Summer Reading Club launched in an online format. Staff have been doing a great job getting the phases rolled out. She would like to see more of a social media presence, especially regarding virtual programming.

Trustee Humphreys thanked library staff for everything they have been doing. He especially called out the IT staff for all they have been doing. He has been reading about libraries having crowds in their parking lot using their WiFi and asked if DGPL has had any demand. Milavec responded that the building itself, as a brick building with steel framing, makes it hard to get the WiFi too far out into the parking lot. There has not been a lot of crowds or complaints related to WiFi.

Trustee Stapleton received an email from College of DuPage about a program they are hosting that is very similar to the COVID memories program.

Trustee Khuntia asked how staff are going to handle minors in the library. Milavec responded that unattended children in the library are one of the biggest concerns of library staff. Staff are discussing raising the age of unattended children allowed in the building or requiring children have a parent or guardian with them.

President Graber noted that there is work needing to be done on the elevator and asked if this is something that could be done while the building is closed. Milavec noted the high price tag of the elevator project and that this project would have to go through a public bid process, which takes time.

12. **Adjournment**. President Graber adjourned the meeting at 8:56 p.m.