



## MANAGER'S MEMO ITEM

---

**ITEM:** Village Sidewalk Program Modifications

**WORKSHOP DATE:** April 26, 2005

**PREPARED BY:** David Barber, P.E. Director of Public Works  
Dorin Fera, AICP, Traffic Manager

**PURPOSE:** To transmit a recommendation for modifying the Village's sidewalk program and presentation of the proposed 2005 Sidewalk Matrix.

### **BACKGROUND:**

---

Since May 2004 the Village's Parking and Traffic Commission has held several discussions on various aspects of the Village's Sidewalk Program. This communication is intended to transmit to the Village Council the recommendations approved by the Parking & Traffic Commission and recommended for Village Council approval. The initial discussion was focused around a staff memo dated May 5, 2004 which outlined several issues related to the current sidewalk programs and suggested areas for future discussion. The Village currently has four separate programs that address sidewalk contraction activities and they include:

- Sidewalk Repair & Replacement Program
- Gap Sidewalk Program
- New Sidewalks (Matrix) Program
- Cost Share Sidewalk Program

The Commission was advised about the previous levels of funding for these programs and informed that the Village spent about \$121,500 annually for the Sidewalk Repair & Replacement Program from 1996 to 2003, about \$230,000 annually for "New" sidewalks under the Gap and Matrix programs from 1996 to 2003 and about \$700 annually under the Cost Share Program from 1996 to 2003.

Over the course of several meetings starting with the May meeting and ending at the December meeting the Parking & Traffic Commission addressed several areas of the Villages programs. The issues discussed and the recommendations of the Parking & Traffic Commission are summarized herein. The Parking & Traffic Commission endorsed most of the recommendations for changes to the programs throughout the year and again approved the items discussed in this communication at their February 2005 meeting.

Based on the final recommendations from the Parking & Traffic Commission staff has reviewed the current policy titled Sidewalk Construction and Replacement, Priority Schedule that is posted on the Internet and was approved in October 1992. Staff has also reviewed Section 19.14.1 of the Village Code that pertains to sidewalk construction activities. Staff is also proposing changes to these two documents and the language adjustments are discussed subsequently in this communication.

A summary of the items considered by the Parking & Traffic Commission is included in this communication.

### Conflicting Goals of the Gap and Matrix Program

Staff identified that the Gap Program was based on completing sidewalk on both sides of Village streets where “gaps” existed while the Matrix Program was addressing a goal of providing sidewalks along one side of Village streets where no sidewalks existed. The Gap Program list was reviewed and about twelve segments remained when screened to meet the goal of walks along one side of all streets. These walks were included in the 2004 Sidewalk Improvement Program and completed. A few walks on the “Gap” list were moved to the Sidewalk Matrix and the remaining walks that already had walk along one side of the street were dropped from the list. Since the twelve segments on the gap list that were true “gaps” are now complete the Gap Program is no longer necessary and should be dropped. The Commission supported this recommendation and the 2005-10 Capital Improvement Plan for the Village of Downers Grove no longer includes a separate Gap Sidewalk Program.

### Amend Sidewalk Matrix to Remove State and County Roadway Segments

Staff suggested that the segments of sidewalk included on the Village’s Sidewalk Matrix that represented sidewalk work on State and County roadways be removed and tracked on a separate list. In this way, Village staff can continue to maintain these areas for reference and also work to secure separate funding from the County and State for these segments without placing these segments in “competition” with other sidewalk needs in the Village. Three segments on State routes were removed, five segments on County routes were removed and two segments to be completed by private development were removed and all were included on a new list for reference in the future. The Parking & Traffic Commission supported removing these segments from the Sidewalk Matrix and tracking these projects separately.

### Collection of Fees for New Development

Staff identified a situation resulting from the wording in the Village Code whereby no fees would be required in areas once the Village installed new sidewalks. The Village Code only required fees if no sidewalk existed on the block and then required either the walk be installed or a fee be collected. The result of the wording in the Code meant that as properties redevelop in areas where we have installed the walk no fees were being collected. The change to the Village Code was presented to Village Council in 2004 and the Village Code was amended to eliminate this “loop hole” so that all properties that redevelop that have no existing walk or existing walk installed at Village cost will either install new walk or pay a fee to the Village.

### Collection of Fees for Annexations

The Commission discussed the need to consider the possible requirement for the collection of fees for new sidewalks from properties that annex to the Village that are not being annexed through a new subdivision or development for which sidewalks are being constructed. The possibility of township areas annexing to the Village and then placing high on the Matrix would mean areas newly annexed might actually place higher than areas of the Village that have been waiting for years for new sidewalks. The Commission supported the concept of collecting fees for new sidewalks as a part of annexation requests that are periodically presented to the Village Council.

### Development of GIS Sidewalk Database

Staff has estimated that the Village currently has in excess of 5.1 million square feet of sidewalk in place throughout the Village. With the availability of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to provide a means for monitoring this Village asset estimated to have a value in excess of \$30.6

million, staff suggested the need to develop a layer in the Village's GIS addressing our sidewalks. This system would show where walks exist, the condition of walks, identify areas in need of improvement and show more clearly where sidewalks do not exist. Staff suggested the data collection through the use of summer interns to perform this data gathering while keeping costs relatively low. The Commission supported this recommendation and staff has included a request for two seasonal employees in the Engineering Division Budget for FY2005/06 to perform this work.

#### Eliminate the Cost Share Program

This program has generated little interest over time but can be useful when trying to address some citizen requests. Funds allocated annually for this Program were set at about \$5,000 and only about \$700 was being spent each year. New capital project guidelines establish a capital project threshold of \$25,000, which this program fails to meet. Staff's suggestion was to eliminate this program as a separately funded program in the Capital Improvement Program but continue to address these requests as they arise periodically through the funding provided for new Sidewalk

#### Review of the Scoring Factors on the Sidewalk Matrix

This task was the most complicated and required the most review time by the Parking & Traffic Commission. The Matrix for many years has involved a series of factors to rate each segment of sidewalk included on the list. Scores were provided based on the rating criteria and a total number was determined for each segment. Segments are used on the Matrix rather than individual blocks. Segments can be as small as one block but most segments consist of several blocks. For example the projects completed in 2004 on Earlston Road and Glendenning Road included their entire length from Ogden Avenue to 39<sup>th</sup> Street. Each of these segments included three blocks. The work on 40<sup>th</sup> Street from Earlston Road to Fairview Avenue included four blocks.

The Matrix includes six Major factors (up to 10 points) and six Minor factors (up to 4 points). Staff has recommended that two of Major factors be eliminated, two of the Minor factors be combined and one Minor factor be eliminated, and one new factor be added. Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a summary of the current twelve factors and Exhibit 2 is a summary of the proposed nine factors to be used for the development of the Sidewalk Matrix. The Parking & Traffic Commission endorsed these changes in the scoring of the segments on the Sidewalk Matrix. The reasoning behind the changes in the factors is included below:

Pedestrian Volume Factor – On the surface this factor seems to make sense but in reality all the scores are all based on estimates and not on actual counts. Without real numbers the value of this factor is meaningless. Since there are other factors that relate to pedestrian volumes using nearness to pedestrian generators in the scoring this factor is not very helpful in the overall scoring. (Proposal: Remove as a factor)

Existing Sidewalk Factor – Since all work on the Sidewalk Matrix is for areas where sidewalks do not exist all project segments receive the same score. Giving all segments the same score does not differentiate any of the sidewalk segments. The factor provides no value to the process. (Proposal: Remove as a factor)

Roadway Lighting Factor – As most of the streets remaining on the Sidewalk Matrix are street segments that are not improved with curbs and gutters and have street lights at intersections, most of the remaining segments will be receiving the same score, so this factor does not help differentiate the projects. Staff understands the importance of street lighting to improve pedestrian safety but this factor does not address the need to prioritize new sidewalk construction as all segments are scored the same. (Proposal: Remove as a factor)

Roadside Sight Obstruction and Blind Hill Signs Posted Factors – In looking at the areas where this factor has been applied it appears to be provided where the vegetation is adjacent to the roadway and makes it difficult for pedestrians to walk off of the pavement should a car approach. The Blind Hill Signs Posted Factor also addresses a few specific locations where visibility is impaired and staff suggests it might be appropriate to combine these factors into one factor called Sight Distance. Combining these two factors would still only provide a score for about fifteen segments on the Sidewalk Matrix. (Proposal: Combine the two factors)

State Hazard Busing Factor – This factor was added a few years ago and is currently used by schools to seek funding for adding routes to bus students where these factors exist to eliminate potential safety concerns. This factor seems to be applied to address areas where students have to cross State Hazards, like train tracks and major roadways and does not correlate well with the Village's program for adding new sidewalks. Our review of this factor shows that we are applying this factor differently than the schools. We have discussed this matter with school staff and there may be a few specific areas where the installation of new sidewalk may in fact help the district reduce their need for busing. When we receive this information we will determine how this information may be applied to determine the priority of these few segments. We understand this may only apply to a small number of areas. The P&T Commission will review this additional information when it is received. (Proposal: Remove as a factor)

Continuity Factor (NEW) - One of the problems with the Sidewalk Matrix is that the actual configuration of the sidewalk system is not factored into the results, whereas, proximity to pedestrian generators is weighted several times. Staff suggests that there should be a Continuity Factor for segments that provide a connection to existing segments and link existing segments. A factor of 5 points would be awarded for those segments that provide a link to the "network" at one end and 10 points for those segments that complete a "network". We would also suggest that sidewalks on cul-de-sacs or dead-end streets that provide no link to other areas but only a dead to a sidewalk system be downgraded in value to promote the sidewalk "network" over the ends of the system. These cul-de-sac and dead-end segments would receive a negative point value of 5 points, which would reduce their value on the Sidewalk Matrix. This new factor would help eliminate the construction of segments that do not connect to other existing sidewalk as occurred in 2004 with the work on Janes Avenue and Chase Avenue where we installed three block of new sidewalk on each of these streets which connect to no other sidewalk. (Proposal: Add new Continuity Factor)

### Vehicular Data Collection

Staff proposed the need to collect updated data of vehicular traffic volume on the segments of the Matrix to be sure data was current and reliable. The suggestion was to update vehicular data for about 25% of the segments annually so that all data being used on the Matrix was no more than four years old. Two of the Major factors use traffic data (Average Daily Traffic volume and 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed). The Commission supported this request to gather more current data annually.

### 2005 Proposed Sidewalk Matrix

Based on the changes suggested above and approved by the Parking & Traffic Commission at the proposed Sidewalk Matrix for 2005 is included with this communication. This 2005 Sidewalk Matrix includes 130 Sidewalk Segments on the overall program listing. The listing of State and County Projects as well as the projects completed in the 2004 Sidewalk Program is included as a supplement to the 2005 Sidewalk Matrix. Based on the allocation included in the Proposed Capital Improvement Plan of \$360,000 for New Sidewalks staff would suggest the following projects be included for construction in 2005.

- Gilbert Avenue from Lee Street to Gilbert Park – Staff has developed plans to move a section of Gilbert slightly to the north which would allow room for the new sidewalk to be installed without the need for bridging or other major support systems and the revised costs is reduced from \$700,000 to between \$275,000 and \$300,000. This work includes a paved asphalt section through the wooded area adjacent to the parking lot at Gilbert Park and connects to the existing asphalt path on the south side of the ball diamond that connects to Gilbert Avenue at Jacqueline Drive. This new segment will connect Lee Street with the downtown area. Staff is working with the Forest Preserve and Park District to make final arrangements for this connection.
- Palmer from Saratoga to Main – This is the second project on the proposed 2005 Sidewalk Matrix and is currently estimated at about \$43,000.
- Sterling from 39<sup>th</sup> to Ogden – This last segment includes three blocks and is currently estimated at about \$90,300. If the prices bid for all three are lower than estimated it might be possible to complete all three projects in FY2005/06. Having bids in hand will allow Council to decide if additional funds should be spent to complete these three segments in FY2005/05.

### Creation of List of “Unique” Segments

Staff was asked by the Parking & Traffic Commission to look at the projects on the Matrix to see if there was any way to determine if any projects were “unique” or presented any special problems for consideration. Staff provided a response that identified thirteen segments that presented unique problems with construction and suggested these segments be removed from the Matrix and added to the supplemental list until the special issues on each of these segments was addressed. The Commission voted to keep these projects on the current list and address each of these as they move to the top. The thirteen project segments are included in the proposed 2005 Sidewalk Matrix as requested by the Parking & Traffic Commission.

### **SIDEWALK POLICY AND CODE CHANGES:**

---

Included on the Internet is a copy of the current Official Village Policy approved by Village Council regarding Sidewalk Construction and Replacement, Priority Schedule dated October 19, 1992. A copy is included with this communication for information. It appears many of the items contained in this policy are either already included in the Village Code or are out of date. Staff

has reviewed this policy and has incorporated appropriate sections of the policy into the attached proposed Ordinance Amending Provisions Concerning Sidewalk Improvements along with the changes being recommended by the Parking & Traffic Commission. Staff has included an additional change that would eliminate the “Quadrant Fund” included in Section 19.14.1.d and would just have all fees collected for sidewalks deposited into the Capital Projects Fund. Staff believes this will be less complicated and will enable Council to view the activity in this area each year along with the review of the full Capital Improvements Plan as this income will show up as a line item of income to this fund (Fund 220). Staff is recommending that the Village Council Policy be deleted and the Ordinance Amending Provisions Concerning Sidewalk Improvements be approved.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

---

- Exhibit 1 – Current Sidewalk Matrix Factors
- Exhibit 2 – Proposed Sidewalk Matrix Factors
- Proposed 2005 Sidewalk Matrix
- Proposed Supplemental Listing of State, County and Completed Projects
- Summary of Parking & Traffic Commission action on February 9, 2005
- Village Council Policy on Sidewalk Construction and Replacement, Priority Schedule (To be repealed)
- Proposed Ordinance Amending Provisions Concerning Sidewalk Improvements

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the discussions held between May 5, 2004 and February 9, 2005 by the Parking & Traffic Commission, staff understands the Commission supports the following changes to the Village's Sidewalk Program.

- Consider the Gap Sidewalk Program as complete and close this program.
- Remove sidewalk projects on State and County highways from the Village's Matrix.
- Support consideration for collection of sidewalk fees during annexation of properties to the Village.
- Support adding summer seasonal employees to develop GIS sidewalk database.
- Support annual vehicular traffic data for 25% of the segments on the Matrix.
- Eliminate the Sidewalk Cost Share Program as a separately funded program but continue to offer this cooperation through existing sidewalk construction programs.
- Amend the Sidewalk Matrix to eliminate two major factors (Pedestrian Volume and Existing Sidewalk), eliminate one minor factor (Street Lights), combine two minor factors into one factor (Roadside Sight Obstruction and Blind Hill Signs) and add one new factor (Continuity).
- Approve the updated 2005 Sidewalk Matrix, which now includes 130 project segments.

In addition to the above recommendations staff is also recommending the following:

- Repeal the Village Council Policy on Sidewalk Construction and Replacement, Priority Schedule.
- Adoption the proposed Ordinance Amending Provisions Concerning Sidewalk Improvements.

**REQUESTED COURSE OF ACTION:**

Place this item on the May 3, 2005 Active Agenda for approval including repealing the current Village Policy and adoption of the proposed Ordinance.

**Sidewalk Matrix Scoring Factors**

**Major Conditions:**

1) **ADT (Average Daily Traffic Volume)** - The most recent count date was used. If not available, it was estimated by using the nearest traffic count data.

<u>Point Range:</u>	<u>ADT</u>	<u>Points</u>
	Over 7,000	10
	=3,000 but < 7,000	9
	=1,250 but < 2,999	8
	= 750 but < 1,249	6
	= 500 but < 749	4
	= 250 but < 499	2
	Under 250	0

2) **Pedestrian Clearance** - This was calculated by using the approved equation (Roadway Width – [# of lanes x 12]). In instances where multiple lanes occur for a given sidewalk stretch, the highest pedestrian clearance value was recorded. Roadway width was taken as the face curb measurement on curb streets or the edge of pavement on unimproved streets.

<u>Point Range:</u>	<u>Feet</u>	<u>Points</u>
	Less than 1	10*
	= 1	9
	= 2	8
	= 3 but < 5	6
	= 5 but < 9	3
	More than 9	1

\*Pavement width less than 25 feet

3) **Pedestrian Volume** - All new volumes were estimated. Previous values were copied verbatim from the existing sidewalk priority matrix.

<u>Point Range:</u>	<u>Volume</u>	<u>Points</u>
	More than 50	10
	= 30 but < 49	8
	= 15 but < 29	6
	Less than 15	2

- 4) **Proximity to Grade (K - 6) School** - Distances are taken as the shortest walking route, per the approved Village School Walking Route Map. These distances are measured from the closest edge of the proposed sidewalk to the Grade School associated with the sidewalk segment. This factor was modified in 2000 to expand walking distance to 1 ½ miles to reflect changes made to the School District' bus policy.

<u>Point Range:</u>	<u>Distance</u>	<u>Points</u>
	Under 1,000'	10
	= 1,000 but < 2,000'	8
	= 2,000 but < 3,000'	6
	= 3,000 but < 5,000'	4
	= 5,000 but < 8,000'	2
	Over 8,000'	0

- 5) **85<sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed** - Existing historical traffic count data, in tandem with new traffic count investigation, is used to arrive at the proposed scores for the Sidewalk Matrix. Observation has solidified the common sense approach that 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds will be lower on cul-de-sac and dead end street segments, which when measured yielded results no greater than 20 mph. Similarly on arterials, such as 55<sup>th</sup>, Butterfield, and Ogden, where the posted speed limit is 35 mph or greater, the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed can be generalized as being greater than 40 mph. With these assumptions in mind, Staff can reduce by 25% - 33% the necessary traffic count investigation.

<u>Point Range:</u>	<u>Speed</u>	<u>Points</u>
	> 40 mph	10
	= 37 but < 40 mph	8
	= 34 but < 37 mph	6
	= 31 but < 34 mph	4
	= 28 but < 31 mph	3
	= 25 but < 28 mph	2
	= 20 but < 25 mph	1
	< 20 mph	0

6) Existing Sidewalk

<u>Points Range:</u>	<u>Points</u>
None	10
Walk on Opposite Side	0

Minor Conditions:

1) Proximity to Pedestrian Generator (Non-Park)- Distances are measured from the closest edge of the proposed sidewalk to the closest pedestrian generator. A pedestrian generator is defined as:

- All business areas as defined by Village zoning
- All three train depots
- Both high schools
- Middle Schools

<u>Point Range:</u>	<u>Distance</u>	<u>Points</u>
	Under 500'	4
	= 500' but < 1,000'	3
	= 1,000' but < 2,500'	2
	Over 2,500'	0

2) Proximity to Parks - This was previously considered part of the Proximity to Pedestrian Generator Condition. In creating a new minor condition for Parks, the list of parks was expanded from just two major parks to now include the ten highest used parks within the Village plus the YMCA. With help from the Park District, Staff has identified the following 10 parks as the most highly used:

- |                     |                                |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1.) McCollum Park   | 6.) Patriots Park (Barth Pond) |
| 2.) Doerhoefer Park | 7.) 59 <sup>th</sup> & Main    |
| 3.) Whitlock Park   | 8.) O'Brien Park               |
| 4.) Hummer Park     | 9.) D.G. Golf Course           |
| 5.) Gilbert Park    | 10.) Fishel Park               |

\*The YMCA is considered as a major pedestrian generating facility.

(Proximity to Parks - Continued)

The scoring for a major park is based on the distance from the major park as shown below with a point range up to a maximum score of 4 points. The scoring for a minor park is based on the distance from the minor park as shown below with score of 2 for distances less than 1,000 feet.

<u>Points Range:</u>	<u>Type &amp; Distance</u>	<u>Points</u>
	Major Parks	
	Less than 1,000'	4
	= 1000' but < 2,500'	2
	= 2,500' but < 5,000'	1
	Over 5,000'	0
	Minor Parks	
	Less than 1,000'	2
	1,000' or More	0

- 3) **Roadway Lighting** - Most new subdivisions that have sidewalks also have street lighting. It stands to reason that most areas without sidewalk will have street lighting available only at intersections.

<u>Point Range:</u>		<u>Points</u>
	None	4
	Intersection Only	3
	Uniform/Inadequate	2
	Uniform & Inadequate	0

- 4) **Roadside Sight Obstruction** - A roadside sight obstruction is defined as the distance that a sight obstruction exists from the edge of the roadway. This sight obstruction will often be in the form of vegetation and overgrowth.

5)

<u>Point Range:</u>	<u>Distance*</u>	<u>Points</u>
	Less than 3'	4
	= 3' but < 6'	3
	More than 6'	2

\*Distance from edge of road edge to obstruction

6) **Blind Hill Signs Posted**

<u>Point Range:</u>		<u>Points</u>
	Signs Present & Posted	2
	No Signs	0

7) **State Hazard Bussing Present**

<u>Point Range:</u>		<u>Points</u>
	Hazard Present	2
	No Hazard	0

Note:

The Original List by Petition factor was dropped from the Matrix in 2000.

**Sidewalk Matrix Scoring Factors (Proposed – 2005)**

**Major Conditions:**

- 1) **ADT (Average Daily Traffic Volume)** - The most recent count date was used. If not available, it was estimated by using the nearest traffic count data.

<u>Point Range:</u>	<u>ADT</u>	<u>Points</u>
	Over 7,000	10
	=3,000 but < 7,000	9
	=1,250 but < 2,999	8
	= 750 but < 1,249	6
	= 500 but < 749	4
	= 250 but < 499	2
	Under 250	0

- 2) **Pedestrian Clearance** - This was calculated by using the approved equation (Roadway Width – [# of lanes x 12]). In instances where multiple lanes occur for a given sidewalk stretch, the highest pedestrian clearance value was recorded. Roadway width was taken as the face curb measurement on curb streets or the edge of pavement on unimproved streets.

<u>Point Range:</u>	<u>Feet</u>	<u>Points</u>
	Less than 1	10*
	= 1	9
	= 2	8
	= 3 but < 5	6
	= 5 but < 9	3
	More than 9	1

\*Pavement width less than 25 feet

- 3) **Proximity to Grade (K - 6) School** - Distances are taken as the shortest walking route, per the approved Village School Walking Route Map. These distances are measured from the closest edge of the proposed sidewalk to the Grade School associated with the sidewalk segment. **This factor will be scored as 0 if busing is provided and school children are not walking to school in the area being scored.**

<u>Point Range:</u>	<u>Distance</u>	<u>Points</u>
	Under 1,000'	10
	= 1,000 but < 2,000'	8
	= 2,000 but < 3,000'	6
	= 3,000 but < 5,000'	4
	= 5,000 but < 8,000'	2
	Over 8,000'	0

- 4) **85<sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed** - Existing historical traffic count data, in tandem with new traffic count investigation, is used to arrive at the proposed scores for the Sidewalk Matrix. Observation has solidified the common sense approach that 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds will be lower on cul-de-sac and dead end street segments, which when measured yielded results no greater than 20 mph. Similarly on arterials, such as 55<sup>th</sup>, Butterfield, and Ogden, where the posted speed limit is 35 mph or greater, the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed can be generalized as being greater than 40 mph. With these assumptions in mind, Staff can reduce by 25% - 33% the necessary traffic count investigation.

<u>Point Range:</u>	<u>Speed</u>	<u>Points</u>
	> 40 mph	10
	= 37 but < 40 mph	8
	= 34 but < 37 mph	6
	= 31 but < 34 mph	4
	= 28 but < 31 mph	3
	= 25 but < 28 mph	2
	= 20 but < 25 mph	1
	< 20 mph	0

- 5) **Continuity Factor** - Continuity of new sidewalks with existing sidewalks is desirable to provide a continuous path for pedestrians and thus improve the value of the new walks in the overall Village sidewalk network. Construction of new walks as extensions of existing walks is

desirable and supported through the application of this factor in the Sidewalk Matrix. Scoring is provided as follows:

- New walk connects to existing walk at one end            5 points
- New walk connects to existing walk at both ends        10 points
- New walk does not connect to existing walk            -5 points

**Minor Conditions:**

1) **Proximity to Pedestrian Generator (Non-Park)**- Distances are measured from the closest edge of the proposed sidewalk to the closest pedestrian generator. A pedestrian generator is defined as:

- All business areas as defined by Village zoning
- All three train depots
- Both high schools
- Middle Schools

<u>Point Range:</u>	<u>Distance</u>	<u>Points</u>
	Under 500'	4
	= 500' but < 1,000'	3
	= 1,000' but < 2,500'	2
	Over 2,500'	0

2) **Proximity to Parks** - This was previously considered part of the Proximity to Pedestrian Generator Condition. In creating a new minor condition for Parks, the list of parks was expanded from just two major parks to now include the ten highest used parks within the Village plus the YMCA. With help from the Park District, Staff has identified the following 10 parks as the most highly used:

- 1.) McCollum Park
- 2.) Doerhoefer Park
- 3.) Whitlock Park
- 4.) Hummer Park
- 5.) Gilbert Park
- 6.) Patriots Park (Barth Pond)
- 7.) 59<sup>th</sup> & Main
- 8.) O'Brien Park
- 9.) D.G. Golf Course
- 10.) Fishel Park

\*The YMCA is considered as a major pedestrian generating facility.

## Exhibit 2

The scoring for a major park is based on the distance from the major park as shown below with a point range up to a maximum score of 4 points. The scoring for a minor park is based on the distance from the minor park as shown below with score of 2 for distances less than 1,000 feet.

<u>Points Range:</u>	<u>Type &amp; Distance</u>	<u>Points</u>
	Major Parks	
	Less than 1,000'	4
	= 1000' but < 2,500'	2
	= 2,500' but < 5,000'	1
	Over 5,000'	0
	Minor Parks	
	Less than 1,000'	2
	1,000' or More	0

- 3) **Sight Obstruction** - A roadside sight obstruction is defined as the distance that a sight obstruction exists from the edge of the roadway. This sight obstruction will often be in the form of vegetation and overgrowth. In addition a score of 2 points is added to any segment where Blind Hill signs are posted.

<u>Point Range:</u>	<u>Distance*</u>	<u>Points</u>
	Less than 3'	4
	= 3' but < 6'	3
	More than 6'	2

\*Distance from edge of road edge to obstruction

# PROPOSED SIDEWALK PRIORITY EVALUATION MATRIX

## VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

### REMAINING VILLAGE MATRIX LOCATIONS

Rank on 2004 List	NEW RANK	LOCATION			Total Score	Major Factors										Minor Factors					Project Information			
		Street Segment	From	To		ADT	Street Width	Width - Lanes x 12	Ped. Clear.	Grade School	Continuity	85% Speed	Speed Count Date	Speed Factor	Ped. Generator	Sight Obstruction	Park Proximity	Closest Park	Park Factor	Distance ( feet )	RNFT Est. Cost	Total Cost (est)	Quadrant Location	
																								Distance ( feet )
2	1	GILBERT	Cornell	Jacqueline	44	8	23	-1	10	4	5	34	06/13/01	6	3	4	-	Gilbert	4	2,700	\$259	\$700,000	S.W.	
10	2	PALMER	Saratoga	Main	44	4	20	-4	10	10	10	32	04/12/02	4	2	0	800	McCollum	4	1,220	\$35	\$42,700	S.W.	
15	3	STERLING	39th	Ogden	42	4	20	-4	10	6	10	35.57	10/11/99	6	4	0	1,250	Whitlock	2	2,580	\$35	\$90,300	N.E.	
38	4	STONEWALL	Ogden	Grant	41	4	20	-4	10	4	10	34	07/09/01	6	4	2	3,277	Doerhoeft	1	1,120	\$40	\$44,800	N.W.	
39	5	OSAGE	60th	61st	41	2	25	1	9	10	10	32.22	06/14/93	4	2	0	847	YMCA	4	650	\$35	\$22,750	S.E.	
21	6	ADELIA	Saratoga	Main	41	2	20	-4	10	10	10	30	02/28/02	3	4	0	2,300	McCollum	2	1,220	\$30	\$36,600	S.W.	
26	7	DOUGLASS	39th	Ogden	40	2	20	-4	10	6	10	33.2	07/19/99	4	4	0	500	Whitlock	4	2,580	\$35	\$90,300	N.E.	
34	8	CAROL	Saratoga	Main	40	2	20	-4	10	10	10	28	04/19/02	3	3	0	2,000	McCollum	2	1,220	\$40	\$48,800	S.W.	
28	9	FLORENCE	Otis	Ogden	39	4	20	-4	10	6	10	32	07/11/00	4	3	0	1,200	Hummer	2	1,440	\$35	\$50,400	N.E.	
48	10	SAYLOR	Saratoga	Main	39	0	20	-4	10	10	10	30	04/11/02	3	2	0	400	McCollum	4	1,220	\$35	\$42,700	S.W.	
11	11	WASHINGTON	59th	60th	39	6	20	-4	10	10	5	27	06/11/01	2	2	0	424	Seaspar	4	980	\$35	\$34,300	S.E.	
14	12	CURTISS	Belmont	Cornell	38	6	22	-2	10	6	5	36	02/28/02	6	3	0	1,977	Gilbert	2	2,150	\$40	\$86,000	S.W.	
27	13	VIRGINIA	Downers	Bell Aire	38	0	20	-4	10	8	10	32	02/28/01	4	2	0	847	Doerhoeft	4	700	\$40	\$28,000	N.W.	
29	14	61ST ST	Brookbank	Main	38	6	28	4	6	6	10	32	03/17/97	4	4	0	1,000	Seaspar	2	1,240	\$35	\$43,400	S.W.	
32	15	WEBSTER	55th	59th	38	2	20	-4	10	9	10	29.89	06/12/01	3	2	0	1,600	YMCA	2	1,760	\$45	\$79,200	S.E.	
41	16	41ST	Elm	Fairview	37	4	19	-5	10	6	10	30.5	10/12/99	3	2	0	1,000	Whitlock	2	2,440	\$35	\$85,400	N.E.	
43	17	FLORENCE	Maple	Chicago	37	2	20	-4	10	6	10	29	07/18/00	3	2	0	198	Hummer	4	1,440	\$40	\$57,600	N.E.	
44	18	DOWNERS	Ogden	Grant	37	4	20	-4	10	10	10	28	06/07/01	3	0	0	5,657	Doerhoeft	0	1,150	\$40	\$46,000	N.E.	
51	19	FOREST	Ogden	Sherman	37	2	24	0	10	8	10	23	08/21/01	1	4	0	1,695	Doerhoeft	2	220	\$35	\$7,700	N.W.	
76	20	BROOKBANK	59th	60th	36	2	16	-8	6	8	10	34	09/30/02	6	0	2	1,750	Seaspar	2	380	\$40	\$15,200	S.W.	
46	21	STONEWALL	Chicago	Warren	36	2	20	-4	10	4	10	32	07/10/01	4	2	2	1,341	D.G.Golf	2	1,920	\$40	\$76,800	N.W.	
57	22	LINCOLN	Middaugh	Linscott	36	2	26	2	8	10	10	28	05/11/00	3	2	0	3,500	Doerhoeft	1	360	\$35	\$12,600	N.W.	
23	23	BROOKBANK	Gilbert	Maple	36	4	22	-2	10	4	10	25	07/11/01	2	0	4	1,017	Gilbert	2	2,460	\$150	\$369,000	S.W.	
17	24	CARPENTER	59th	61st	35	6	28	4	6	6	5	36.66	09/08/99	6	2	0	254	Seaspar	4	1,680	\$35	\$58,800	S.W.	
54	25	LACEY RD.	Virginia	Ogden	35	2	24	0	10	4	10	32	06/27/01	4	4	0	3,926	Doerhofer	1	1,300	\$35	\$45,500	N.W.	
55	26	KENYON	Main	Lyman	35	2	18	-6	10	6	10	30.6	04/01/97	3	2	0	1,864	Barth Pon	2	1,260	\$40	\$50,400	S.E.	
56	27	2ND	Cumnor	Williams	35	8	24	0	10	2	10	30	N/A	3	0	0	2,203	Barth Pon	2	1,060	\$35	\$37,100	S.E.	
69	28	BLANCHARD	Main	Lyman	35	0	22	-2	10	8	10	28	06/04/01	3	2	0	1,158	Seaspar	2	1,260	\$35	\$44,100	S.E.	

# PROPOSED SIDEWALK PRIORITY EVALUATION MATRIX

## VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

### REMAINING VILLAGE MATRIX LOCATIONS

Rank on 2004 List	NEW RANK	LOCATION			Total Score	Major Factors								Minor Factors					Project Information				
						ADT	Street Width	Width - Lanes x 12	Ped. Clear.	Grade School	Continuity	85% Speed	Speed Count Date	Speed Factor	Ped. Generator	Sight Obstruction	Park Proximity	Closest Park	Park Factor	Distance ( feet )	RNFT Est. Cost	Total Cost (est)	Quadrant Location
		Street Segment	From	To																			
63	29	INVERNESS	Ashbrook	Belmont	34	2	25	1	9	4	10	36.43	06/07/00	6	2	0	4,717	D.G. Golf	1	1,260	\$60	\$75,600	S.W.
64	30	WISCONSIN	Walnut	Belmont	34	8	30	6	3	4	10	36	08/09/99	6	2	0	4,576	D.G. Golf	1	3,800	\$35	\$133,000	S.W.
22	31	CLYDE	Main	60th Pl.	34	0	21.5	-2.5	10	10	5	29	06/11/01	3	2	0	-	Seaspar	4	1,060	\$35	\$37,100	S.E.
33	32	OXFORD	Main	W.Limit	34	2	20	-4	10	10	5	29	04/11/02	3	2	0	1,200	McCollum	2	1,220	\$40	\$48,800	S.W.
30	33	CORNELL	Gilbert	Curtiss	33	8	22	-2	10	0	5	31.7	10/09/95	4	2	2	1,836	Gilbert	2	900	\$40	\$36,000	S.W.
67	34	CHICAGO	Wallbank	Seeley	33	4	28	4	6	8	10	30	08/14/00	3	2	0	5,209	Doerhoefer	0	600	\$40	\$24,000	N.W.
77	35	WEBSTER	Old Orchard	75th	33	2	20	-4	10	4	10	29	8/15/2001	3	2	0	2,400	McCollum	2	1,240	\$35	\$43,400	S.E.
81	36	PROSPECT	Warren	Franklin	33	2	24	0	10	4	10	28	est.	3	2	0	2,400	Hummer	2	600	\$35	\$21,000	N.E.
82	37	WASHINGTON	63rd	Weatherbee	33	2	20	-4	10	4	10	27	5/30/2001	2	4	0	3,000	McCollum	1	760	\$45	\$34,200	S.E.
90	38	8TH ST.	Cumnor	Williams	32	2	20	-4	10	4	10	33	08/07/01	4	0	0	1,864	Barth Pon	2	1,060	\$35	\$37,100	S.E.
91	39	73RD	Old Main	Baybury	32	0	20	-4	10	4	10	30	8/15/2001	3	3	0	2,200	McCollum	2	700	\$35	\$24,500	S.E.
42	40	JANET	Lacey	Bell Aire	32	2	24	0	10	6	5	29	06/06/01	3	4	0	2,000	Doerhoefer	2	2,260	\$35	\$79,100	N.W.
93	41	BROOKBANK	59th	N.Limit	32	0	22	-2	10	8	10	15	02/26/01	0	0	0	847	Seaspar	4	420	\$50	\$21,000	S.W.
19	42	PUFFER	Hobson	63rd	31	4	21	-3	10	4	5	32	05/24/00	4	4	0	8,530	D.G. Golf	0	2,480	\$35	\$86,800	S.W.
31	43	TRAUBE	Roslyn	E. Limit	31	4	22	-2	10	8	5	30	09/13/01	3	0	0	2,712	Hummer	1	800	\$35	\$28,000	S.E.
47	44	CORNELL	Chicago	Warren	31	2	21	-3	10	4	5	30	07/10/01	3	4	2	4,802	Doerhoefer	1	1,920	\$40	\$76,800	N.W.
49	45	SEELEY	40th	Herbert	31	0	24	0	10	10	5	29	06/18/01	3	2	0	2,542	Doerhoefer	1	800	\$35	\$28,000	N.W.
101	46	6TH ST.	Cumnor	Williams	31	2	20	-4	10	4	10	29	07/25/01	3	0	0	2,486	Barth Pon	2	1,040	\$35	\$36,400	S.E.
125	47	PROSPECT	Franklin	Warren	31	2	24	0	10	4	10	25	07/18/01	2	2	0	3,418	Fishel	1	900	\$40	\$36,000	N.E.
18	48	59TH PL.	Webster	Webster Pl.	30	0	21.5	-2.5	10	8	0	34.8	06/08/99	6	2	0	452	Seaspar	4	260	\$40	\$10,400	S.E.
130	49	SEVENTH	Cumnor	Williams	30	0	21	-3	10	4	10	31	07/24/01	4	0	0	2,062	Patriot's F	2	1,300	\$35	\$45,500	S.E.
107	50	4TH	Cumnor	Williams	30	2	20	-4	10	4	10	30	07/24/01	3	0	0	3,304	Barth Pon	1	1,040	\$40	\$41,600	S.E.
108	51	LINCOLN	Stanley	Sterling	30	2	20	-4	10	4	10	28	06/26/01	3	0	0	2,655	Hummer	1	300	\$40	\$12,000	N.E.
110	52	LINCOLN	Washington	Elm	30	2	20	-4	10	4	10	25	07/17/01	2	2	0	5,197	Fishel	0	460	\$40	\$18,400	N.E.
59	53	60TH PL.	Main	Clyde	30	0	20	-4	10	8	5	23	08/07/01	1	2	0	-	Seaspar	4	580	\$50	\$29,000	S.E.
60	54	WEBSTER	59th	S. Limit	30	0	20	-4	10	10	5	20	06/12/01	1	2	0	1,750	YMCA	2	340	\$50	\$17,000	S.E.
25	55	LEONARD	Hobson	63rd	29	2	21	-3	10	4	5	33.51	08/04/99	4	4	0	8,361	D.G. Golf	0	2,200	\$35	\$77,000	S.W.
83	56	62ND	Janes	Chase	29	0	17	-7	10	4	10	24.5	08/05/99	1	4	0	8,556	D.G. Golf	0	600	\$35	\$21,000	S.W.

# PROPOSED SIDEWALK PRIORITY EVALUATION MATRIX

## VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

### REMAINING VILLAGE MATRIX LOCATIONS

Rank on 2004 List	NEW RANK	LOCATION			Total Score	Major Factors								Minor Factors					Project Information				
						ADT	Street Width	Width - Lanes x 12	Ped. Clear.	Grade School	Continuity	85% Speed	Speed Count Date	Speed Factor	Ped. Generator	Sight Obstruction	Park Proximity	Closest Park	Park Factor	Distance ( feet )	RNFT Est. Cost	Total Cost (est)	Quadrant Location
		Street Segment	From	To																			
71	57	WEBSTER PL.	59th	Washington	29	0	20	-4	10	10	5	15	06/12/01	0	2	0	1,500	YMCA	2	540	\$50	\$27,000	S.E.
79	58	CHICAGO	Cornell	Lee	28	2	20	-4	10	6	5	29	09/06/00	3	2	0	5,762	Doerhoeffe	0	600	\$40	\$24,000	N.W.
80	59	CARPENTER	61st	63rd	28	2	28	4	6	4	5	28.6	07/30/01	3	4	0	621	Seaspar	4	1,200	\$40	\$48,000	S.W.
120	60	BRYAN ST.	Lincoln	Grant	28	0	26	2	8	6	10	24	07/17/01	1	3	0	3,333	DGN	0	580	\$35	\$20,300	N.E.
84	61	40TH	W. of Morton	E. of Seely	28	0	21	-3	10	8	5	23	05/22/01	1	2	0	1,977	Doerhoeffe	2	1,260	\$35	\$44,100	N.W.
85	62	60TH PL.	Washington	E. Limit	27	0	20	-4	10	6	5	<20	est.	0	2	0	-	Seaspar	4	320	\$50	\$16,000	S.E.
40	63	NORTHCOTT	40th	Janet	27	0	22	-2	10	8	0	32	06/18/01	4	3	0	2,118	Doerhoeffe	2	1,240	\$40	\$49,600	N.W.
143	64	61ST	Osage	Grand	27	0	33	9	1	10	10	27.9		2	2	0	2,175	YMCA	2	400	\$35	\$14,000	S.E.
92	65	HERBERT	Downers	W. of Morton	27	0	24	0	10	10	5	24.89	06/06/01	1	0	0	3,000	Doerhoeffe	1	600	\$35	\$21,000	N.W.
126	66	STERLING	Chicago	Davis	27	0	14	-10	10	4	10	24	06/26/01	1	0	0	2,005	Hummer	2	1,540	\$40	\$61,600	N.E.
99	67	LEE	Ogden	N. of Virginia	26	2	20	-4	10	4	5	32	08/15/00	4	0	0	3,500	Doerhoeffe	1	1,500	\$40	\$60,000	N.W.
16	68	CHICAGO/PUFFER	Puffer	Belmont	26	2	18	-6	10	10	-5	30.1	06/06/01	3	2	0	-	D.G. Golf	4	1,200	\$35	\$42,000	N.W.
102	69	VICTOR	2nd	55th	26	4	20	-4	10	2	5	28	08/08/01	3	0	0	2,147	Patriot's F	2	2,240	\$40	\$89,600	S.E.
131	70	PROSPECT	Lincoln	Chicago	26	0	18	-6	10	4	10	23	07/18/01	1	1	0	5,401	Hummer	0	600	\$35	\$21,000	N.E.
112	71	MEADOWLAWN	Main	Washington	26	0	20	-4	10	4	5	20	est.	1	4	0	2,100	McCullum	2	860	\$35	\$30,100	S.E.
65	72	61ST	Belmont	W. of Leonard	25	0	17	-7	10	4	5	33.1	05/24/00	4	2	0	8,615	D.G. Golf	0	1,120	\$35	\$39,200	S.W.
68	73	MORTON	Herbert	40th	25	0	24	0	10	8	0	28	06/18/01	3	2	0	2,288	Doerhoeffe	2	800	\$35	\$28,000	N.W.
50	74	GLENVIEW	Hitchcock	Curtiss	25	0	22	-2	10	6	5	27	06/13/01	2	2	0	5,486	Gilbert	0	540	\$35	\$18,900	S.W.
109	75	HICKORY TR.	Oak Hill Rd.	35th	25	2	18	-6	10	4	5	27	08/20/01	2	0	2	5,282	Doerhoeffe	0	1,620	\$45	\$72,900	N.E.
20	76	TURVEY RD.	Brookbank	Hawthorne Ln	25	2	20	-4	10	3	0	26	07/12/01	2	2	4	1,328	Gilbert	2	2,060	\$45	\$92,700	S.W.
58	77	SEELEY	Virginia	Janet	25	0	20	-4	10	8	0	26	06/18/01	2	3	0	1,215	Doerhoeffe	2	900	\$40	\$36,000	N.W.
137	78	ELM	Rogers	Warren	25	0	26	2	8	2	10	22.8	06/16/97	1	3	0	2,881	Fishel	1	240	\$35	\$8,400	N.E.
114	79	62ND	Fairview	W.Limit	24	0	20	-4	10	4	5	<20	est.	0	4	0	3,644	YMCA	1	180	\$35	\$6,300	S.E.
145	80	BROOK	Finley	E. Limits	24	6	34	10	1	0	5	38.8	02/25/99	8	4	0	13,247	Doerhoeffe	0	2,380	\$40	\$95,200	N.W.
122	81	BUNNING	Wanda	Fairview	23	0	27	3	6	8	5	<20	est.	0	2	0	1,525	YMCA	2	1,080	\$35	\$37,800	S.E.
118	82	MIDDAUGH	60th	62nd	23	0	20	-4	10	4	5	32	9/25/2001	4	0	0	2,000	59th/Main	0	1,700	\$35	\$59,500	S.W.
78	83	CAROL	Lacey	Northcott	23	0	22	-2	10	6	0	29	06/06/01	3	3	0	4,237	Doerhoeffe	1	1,040	\$35	\$36,400	N.W.
124	84	OAK HILL RD.	Saratoga	Highland	23	2	20	-4	10	2	5	25	08/20/01	2	0	2	6,186	Doerhoeffe	0	1,360	\$35	\$47,600	N.E.W.

# PROPOSED SIDEWALK PRIORITY EVALUATION MATRIX

## VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

### REMAINING VILLAGE MATRIX LOCATIONS

Rank on 2004 List	NEW RANK	LOCATION			Total Score	Major Factors								Minor Factors					Project Information				
		Street Segment	From	To		ADT	Street Width	Width - Lanes x 12	Ped. Clear.	Grade School	Continuity	85% Speed	Speed Count Date	Speed Factor	Ped. Generator	Sight Obstruction	Park Proximity	Closest Park	Park Factor	Distance ( feet )	RNFT Est. Cost	Total Cost (est)	Quadrant Location
88	85	PRAIRIE	Florence	W.Limit	22	0	12	-12	10	8	0	< 20	est.	0	0	0	-	Hummer	4	200	\$35	\$7,000	N.E.
139	86	DOWNERS DR.	Brook	Butterfield	22	10	53	5	3	0	5	< 20	est.	0	4	0	12,513	Doerhoeft	0	780	\$40	\$31,200	N.W.
127	87	60TH PLACE	Brookbank	E. of Carpenter	21	0	28	4	6	4	5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	-	Seaspar	4	260	\$35	\$9,100	S.W.
128	88	HERBERT	Main St.	W. of Forest	21	0	28	4	6	6	5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	1,554	Doerhoeft	2	600	\$35	\$21,000	N.E.
52	89	BROOK LN	Brookbank	E.Limit	20	0	20	-4	10	4	0	< 20	est.	0	0	4	1,892	Gilbert	2	340	\$35	\$11,900	S.W.
53	90	MEADOW LN.	Brookbank	S.Limit	20	0	20	-4	10	4	0	< 20	est.	0	0	4	2,231	Gilbert	2	700	\$150	\$105,000	S.W.
104	91	ELDON	Wanda	Grand	20	0	20	-4	6	10	0	< 20	est.	0	2	0	1,271	YMCA	2	560	\$40	\$22,400	S.E.
106	92	WANDA	Eldon	Bunning	20	0	27	3	6	10	0	< 20	est.	0	2	0	1,610	YMCA	2	280	\$35	\$9,800	S.E.
135	93	KATRINE	Wisconsin	Curtis	20	6	30	6	3	2	5	33	07/25/01	4	0	0	6,497	D.G. Golf	0	1,000	\$35	\$35,000	S.W.
136	94	62ND PLACE	Brookbank	Carpenter	20	0	29	5	3	4	5	26.32	08/04/97	2	4	0	1,836	Seaspar	2	620	\$35	\$21,700	S.W.
111	95	VIRGINIA	Lacey	Northcott	20	0	20	-4	10	6	0	24	06/06/01	1	2	0	4,632	Doerhoeft	1	1,040	\$35	\$36,400	N.W.
62	96	MIDDAUGH	Ogden	S.Limit	19	0	26	2	8	10	-5	< 20	est.	0	4	0	1,130	Doerhoeft	2	260	\$35	\$9,100	N.W.
119	97	LANE PL.	Carpenter	61st	19	2	28	4	6	4	0	26	07/25/01	2	3	0	1,242	Seaspar	2	1,000	\$35	\$35,000	S.W.
140	98	STATTON	Grant	Lincoln	19	0	28	4	6	4	5	24	07/18/01	1	2	0	4,096	Hummer	1	600	\$35	\$21,000	N.E.
72	99	60TH	Fairview	E.Limit	18	4	20	-4	10	6	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	2,750	YMCA	1	240	\$50	\$12,000	S.E.
74	100	WALL PL.	59th	N.Limit	18	0	25	1	9	10	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	1,500	YMCA	2	300	\$50	\$15,000	S.E.
144	101	ACORN DR.	Hickory Tr.	Oak Hill Rd.	17	0	18	-6	10	2	0	23	08/20/01	1	0	0	183	Doerhoeft	4	270	\$35	\$9,450	N.W.
146	102	60TH	Puffer	Belmont	17	0	19	-5	10	2	5	19.5	08/05/99	0	0	0	7,993	D.G. Golf	0	260	\$35	\$9,100	S.W.
94	103	40TH	Washington	W.Limit	16	0	18	-6	10	8	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4,096	Doerhoeft	1	280	\$35	\$9,800	N.E.
95	104	62ND	Grand	W.Limit	16	0	14	-10	10	8	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	2,825	YMCA	1	160	\$35	\$5,600	S.E.
96	105	GLEN AVE.	Lee	E.Limit	16	0	20	-4	10	6	-5	< 20	est.	0	4	0	3,954	Doerhoeft	1	400	\$35	\$14,000	N.W.
97	106	GRANT	Lee	W.Limit	16	0	18	-6	10	8	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4,576	Doerhoeft	1	400	\$35	\$14,000	N.W.
98	107	OTIS	Cumnor	W.Limit	16	0	20	-4	10	8	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	2,712	Hummer	1	240	\$35	\$8,400	N.E.
61	108	JACQUELINE	Gilbert	S.Limit	15	0	15	-9	10	2	-5	< 20	est.	0	0	4	-	Gilbert	4	580	\$60	\$34,800	S.W.
105	109	ROSS CT.	Carpenter	W.Limit	15	0	20	-4	10	4	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	565	Fishel	4	220	\$40	\$8,800	S.W.
123	110	HIGHLAND CT.	Highland	E.Limit	15	0	14	-10	10	4	-5	< 20	est.	0	4	0	1,892	Doerhoeft	2	460	\$35	\$16,100	N.E.
73	111	FLORENCE	Ogden	N.Limit	14	2	25	1	10	2	-5	< 20	est.	0	4	0	2,570	Whitlock	1	540	\$35	\$18,900	N.E.
75	112	WISCONSIN	Belmont	E.Limit	14	0	19	-5	10	6	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4,548	D.G. Golf	1	740	\$35	\$25,900	S.W.

# PROPOSED SIDEWALK PRIORITY EVALUATION MATRIX

## VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

### REMAINING VILLAGE MATRIX LOCATIONS

Rank on 2004 List	NEW RANK	LOCATION			Total Score	Major Factors									Minor Factors					Project Information			
						ADT	Street Width	Width - Lanes x 12	Ped. Clear.	Grade School	Continuity	85% Speed	Speed Count Date	Speed Factor	Ped. Generator	Sight Obstruction	Park Proximity	Closest Park	Park Factor	Distance ( feet )	RNFT Est. Cost	Total Cost (est)	Quadrant Location
		Street Segment	From	To																			
115	113	67TH CT.	Fairview	W.Limit	14	0	24	0	10	8	-5	< 20	est.	0	0	0	4,321	McCollum	1	1,180	\$40	\$47,200	S.E.
116	114	AUBREY	Maple	S. Limit	14	2	20	-4	10	6	-5	< 20	est.	0	0	0	4,576	Gilbert	1	1,440	\$35	\$50,400	S.W.
117	115	DAWN PL.	Stanley	E.Limit	14	0	20	-4	10	4	-5	< 20	est.	0	4	0	3,559	Whitlock	1	260	\$35	\$9,100	N.E.
86	116	DeWITT	Gilbert	S.Limit	13	0	16	-8	10	2	-5	< 20	est.	0	0	2	650	Gilbert	4	280	\$45	\$12,600	S.W.
87	117	HAWTHORNE LN.	Turvey Rd.	Brookbank Rd	13	0	20	-4	10	2	-5	< 20	est.	0	0	4	1,441	Gilbert	2	220	\$150	\$33,000	S.W.
121	118	60TH	Carpenter	E.Limit	13	0	28	4	6	6	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	-	Seaspar	4	260	\$35	\$9,100	S.W.
89	119	TURVEY CT.	Turvey Rd.	S.Limit	12	0	20	-4	10	2	-5	< 20	est.	0	0	4	3,051	Gilbert	1	440	\$150	\$66,000	S.W.
142	120	35TH	Pomeroy	W.Limit	12	0	18	-6	10	2	-5	29.9	04/08/99	3	0	2	8,333	Doerhoefer	0	320	\$35	\$11,200	N.W.
103	121	CORNELL	Curtiss	S.Limit	11	0	27	3	10	4	-5	< 20	est.	0	0	0	1,977	Gilbert	2	440	\$40	\$17,600	S.W.
129	122	INVERNESS	Lomond	Janes	11	0	15	-9	10	2	-5	33.7	09/24/97	4	0	0	5,451	D.G. Golf	0	1,260	\$40	\$50,400	S.W.
155	123	CENTRE CIRCLE	Brook	Brook	11	6	34	10	1	0	0	27.5	02/25/99	2	2	0	14,038	Doerhoefer	0	3,400	\$40	\$136,000	N.W.
132	124	62ND CT.	Carpenter	E.Limit	10	0	28	4	6	4	-5	< 20	est.	0	3	0	1,130	Seaspar	2	200	\$35	\$7,000	S.W.
133	125	BROOKBANK	Blanchard	S. Limit	10	0	28	4	6	8	-5	< 20	est.	0	0	0	2,627	Seaspar	1	80	\$35	\$2,800	S.W.
134	126	PROSPECT	Sherman	S. Limit	10	0	18	-6	10	4	-5	< 20	est.	0	0	0	4,321	Whitlock	1	300	\$35	\$10,500	N.E.
151	127	JANES	Inverness	Wisconsin	9	2	30	6	3	4	0	< 20	est.	0	0	0	5,790	D.G. Golf	0	660	\$35	\$23,100	S.W.
154	128	KATRINE	Wisconsin	S.Limit	7	2	30	6	3	2	0	< 20	est.	0	0	0	7,202	D.G. Golf	0	360	\$35	\$12,600	S.W.
150	129	FOSTER PL	Valleyview	N.Limit	4	0	25	1	3	2	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	2,373	McCollum	2	140	\$35	\$4,900	S.W.
153	130	WATERFALL PL	Valleyview	N.Limit	3	0	30	6	3	2	-5	< 20	est.	0	1	0	1,807	McCollum	2	300	\$35	\$10,500	S.W.



www.downers.us

February 16, 2005

*Governor's Hometown Award*  
**2003 WINNER**

**MAYOR BRIAN KRAJEWSKI AND COUNCIL MEMBERS**

**COMMUNITY RESPONSE**

**CENTER**

630.434.CALL (2255)

**CIVIC CENTER**

801 Burlington Avenue

Downers Grove

Illinois 60515-4776

630.434.5500

TDD 630.434.5511

FAX 630.434.5571

**FIRE DEPARTMENT**

**ADMINISTRATION**

6701 Main Street

Downers Grove

Illinois 60516-3426

630.434.5980

FAX 630.434.5998

**POLICE DEPARTMENT**

825 Burlington Avenue

Downers Grove

Illinois 60515-4783

630.434.5600

FAX 630.434.5690

**PUBLIC WORKS**

**DEPARTMENT**

5101 Walnut Avenue

Downers Grove

Illinois 60515-4074

630.434.5460

FAX 630.434.5495

**DEPARTMENT OF**

**SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES**

842 Curtiss Street

Downers Grove

Illinois 60515-4761

630.434.5595

FAX 630.434.5599

RE: P & T File #08-04

Review of Sidewalk Program – Sidewalk  
Summary Report

**Dear Mayor Krajewski and Council Members:**

On Tuesday, February 9, 2005, the Parking & Traffic Commission adopted the following motion:

**COMMISSIONER KREN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL:**

**Based on the discussions held between May 5, 2004 and December 8, 2004 by the Parking & Traffic Commission, staff understands the Commission supports the following changes to the Village's Sidewalk Program.**

- **Consider the Gap Sidewalk Program as complete and close this program.**
- **Remove sidewalk projects on State and County highways from the Village's Matrix.**
- **Support for Code change to collect sidewalk fees for new development (Completed).**
- **Support consideration for collection of sidewalk fees during annexation of properties to the Village.**
- **Support adding summer seasonal employees to develop GIS sidewalk database.**
- **Support annual vehicular traffic data for 25% of the segments on the Matrix,**
- **Eliminate the Sidewalk Cost Share Program as a separately funded program but continue to offer this cooperation through existing sidewalk construction programs.**
- **Amend the Sidewalk Matrix to eliminate two major factors (Pedestrian Volume and Existing Sidewalk), eliminate one minor factor (Street Lights), combine two minor factors into one factor (Roadside Sight Obstruction and Blind Hill Signs) and add one new factor (Continuity).**
- **Approve the updated 2005 Sidewalk Matrix, which now includes 130 project segments.**



www.downers.us

*Governor's Hometown Award*  
**2003 WINNER**

**COMMUNITY RESPONSE  
CENTER**

630.434.CALL (2255)

**CIVIC CENTER**

801 Burlington Avenue

Downers Grove

Illinois 60515-4776

630.434.5500

TDD 630.434.5511

FAX 630.434.5571

**FIRE DEPARTMENT**

**ADMINISTRATION**

6701 Main Street

Downers Grove

Illinois 60516-3426

630.434.5980

FAX 630.434.5998

**POLICE DEPARTMENT**

825 Burlington Avenue

Downers Grove

Illinois 60515-4783

630.434.5600

FAX 630.434.5690

**PUBLIC WORKS**

**DEPARTMENT**

5101 Walnut Avenue

Downers Grove

Illinois 60515-4074

630.434.5460

FAX 630.434.5495

**DEPARTMENT OF**

**SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES**

842 Curtiss Street

Downers Grove

Illinois 60515-4761

630.434.5595

FAX 630.434.5599

**COMMISSIONER STAPLETON SECONDED THE MOTION.**

**ROLL CALL: Aye: Mr. Carlquist, Mr. Wendt, Mr. Kren, Mr. Stapleton,  
Mr. Thurston, and Chairman Johnson**

**Nay: None**

**Motion Passed: 6:0**

Sincerely,

Ross Johnson, Chairman  
Parking & Traffic Commission  
**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE**

RJ/DF/md

P&T/2005/08-04/Recommendation 08-04



# Village of Downers Grove

## Official Village Policy Approved by Village Council

Description:	<b>Sidewalk Construction and Replacement, Priority Schedule</b>		
Res. or Ord. #:	<b>Res. 92-44</b>	Effective Date:	<b>10/19/92</b>
Category:	<b>Engineering and Public Works</b>		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	New Council Policy	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amends Previous Policy Dated:	<b>2/11/85 and 2/26/90</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Description of Previous Policy (if different from above):		
	<u>Sidewalk Construction and Replacement</u>		

### RESOLUTION NO. 92-44

A RESOLUTION AMENDING RESOLUTION 90-7 REGARDING THE PRIORITY SCHEDULE FOR SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT IN THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

~~WHEREAS, the Council of the Village of Downers Grove, (the "Village"), has heretofore determined that sidewalks are necessary and desirable to facilitate pedestrian movement in the Village and that it should, therefore, be the policy of the Village to encourage the construction of sidewalks in appropriate locations; and,~~

~~WHEREAS, sidewalks have not been constructed on all Village streets and the Council recognizes that it may not be necessary or feasible in the future to construct sidewalks on all such streets; and,~~

~~WHEREAS, the Council of the Village of Downers Grove has established by Resolution No. 85-6, adopted February 11, 1985, as amended by Resolution No. 90-7 adopted February 26, 1990, its policy on sidewalk construction and replacement in the Village of Downers Grove; and,~~

~~WHEREAS, the Village Council has now determined that the Sidewalk Policy should be further amended to set forth criteria for use of funds received in lieu of sidewalk construction.~~

~~NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Village of Downers Grove, DuPage County, Illinois, as follows:~~

~~1. That the policy of the Council of the Village of Downers Grove contained in Chapters 19 and 20 of the Municipal Code is to require construction of sidewalks as part of the public improvements to be completed by the developer in new subdivisions, and to require construction of sidewalks by a property owner constructing any building within the Village except for:~~

~~a. accessory buildings and reconstruction or remodeling of, or additions to existing buildings in any single family or two family residential zoning district; and,~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ b. \_\_\_\_\_ accessory buildings, reconstruction or remodeling of existing buildings, and additions to existing buildings which amount to less than 25% of the gross floor area of such building in all other zoning districts.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ That when required by the conditions established in Paragraph 1 of this resolution, sidewalk shall be constructed along the side of all rights of way abutting the property to the limits of the property, unless it is determined by the Village Engineer that actual construction is not required pursuant to the criteria established in Paragraph 3 hereof.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ That in lieu of constructing the sidewalk a contribution to the Village's sidewalk construction fund shall be required if:~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ a. \_\_\_\_\_ The right of way abutting the property is not an arterial street as shown on the Village of Downers Grove future land use map; and~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ b. \_\_\_\_\_ The installation of walk on such right of way, in addition to any existing walk, does not complete 50% or more of the side of the block of right of way on which such property is located.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ That in all locations meeting the criteria established in paragraph 3 of this Resolution, the property owner shall pay a fee equal to the cost to the Village per square foot for construction of the sidewalk abutting the property. Said fee shall be annually determined on the basis of the unit price for new sidewalk construction in the most recently Council awarded contract for Village wide sidewalk improvements.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_ That all fees collected shall be segregated into four separate accounts, each account representing one of the four quadrants of the Village with said quadrants being delineated by the Burlington Northern Railroad and Main Street south of 39th Street, and Highland Avenue north of 39th Street.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 6. \_\_\_\_\_ That the Village shall utilize all collected funds from each quadrant for new walk being built within that quadrant; provided, that the value of walk being constructed shall not exceed the amount of accrued funds. In the event that the available money collected within a given quadrant exceeds the value of new walk, such funds along with all accrued interest shall be carried over to future sidewalk construction contracts.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 7. \_\_\_\_\_ Any person aggrieved by any decision of the Village Engineer regarding construction of sidewalks abutting such person's property may appeal the decision within 30 days of the date thereof to the Plan Commission which shall hear and decide such appeal. Application for such appeal shall be in writing, accompanied by a one hundred dollar (\$100.00) application fee. The Plan Commission may either affirm the decision of the Village Engineer, or may reverse such decision.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 8. \_\_\_\_\_ That in the event that the Plan Commission as part of its final review of any plat of subdivision or planned development recommends that sidewalk not be constructed on any right of way within or adjacent to the proposed subdivision or planned development, the developer shall be subject to the requirements of this resolution for payment of a fee in lieu of sidewalk construction.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 9. \_\_\_\_\_ That the Village Council will consider constructing sidewalks in areas previously developed without sidewalks upon a recommendation of the Village Manager or Parking and Traffic Commission that a special need for such sidewalks appears to exist. In making such a recommendation, the Village Manager or Parking and Traffic Commission shall consider such factors and criteria as they consider relevant, including, but not limited to, the following:~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ MAJOR CONDITIONS~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ a. \_\_\_\_\_ The proximity to grade (K-6) schools.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ b. \_\_\_\_\_ The measured vehicular traffic volume of the adjacent street.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ c. \_\_\_\_\_ Pedestrian clearance width.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ d. \_\_\_\_\_ The measured volume of pedestrian traffic, both general and school related.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ MINOR CONDITIONS~~

- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ e. \_\_\_\_\_ The proximity of the area to a significant pedestrian traffic generator.~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ f. \_\_\_\_\_ Any roadside sight obstructions (Distance from edge of pavement to obstruction).~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ g. \_\_\_\_\_ The impact of sidewalk installation on the character of the area.~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ h. \_\_\_\_\_ Lighting in the area.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 10. \_\_\_\_\_ That recommendations for construction of sidewalks in areas previously developed without sidewalks may be made at any time, but shall be compiled annually and programmed for implementation over time, as appropriate, based on need and availability of funds, within the annual Five Year Financial Plan of the Village.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 11. \_\_\_\_\_ That in areas where sidewalks currently exist, it is the policy of the Village to replace hazardous or deteriorated sidewalks as funds become available, in accordance with the following priorities:~~

- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ a. \_\_\_\_\_ In Business Districts~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ b. \_\_\_\_\_ Adjacent to Railroad Stations~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ c. \_\_\_\_\_ Adjacent to School Property~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ d. \_\_\_\_\_ On designated School Routes~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ e. \_\_\_\_\_ Along other routes extending away from Schools~~
- ~~\_\_\_\_\_ f. \_\_\_\_\_ Along other streets upon the determination of the Village that the location or condition of the sidewalks warrants priority in replacement.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 12. \_\_\_\_\_ In cases where a property owner requests replacement of sidewalk adjacent to his property other than in the order of priority stated above, the Village may, based on its evaluation of the condition of the sidewalk, and if funding is available, participate in up to one half of the replacement cost, such cost not to exceed the maximum per square foot cost determined uniformly and annually by the Village Engineer or his designee.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 13. \_\_\_\_\_ In all areas, the Village will allow any property owner to replace the sidewalk adjacent to his property at the property owner's expense so long as the property owner or his contractor shall obtain the necessary permit from the Village.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 14. \_\_\_\_\_ That nothing contained in this Resolution shall prevent the Village Council, on its own initiative, from installing sidewalks or other types of pedestrian ways other than as provided herein where the Council, in its discretion, deems such action to be necessary and appropriate.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 15. \_\_\_\_\_ That all resolutions or parts of resolutions in conflict with the provisions of this Resolution, and specifically the provisions of Resolution No. 85-6 and Resolution 90-7, are hereby repealed.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ 16. \_\_\_\_\_ That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage as provided by law.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ Betty M. Cheever, Mayor~~

~~Passed: \_\_\_\_\_ October 19, 1992~~

~~Attest: \_\_\_\_\_ Barbara Waldner, Village Clerk~~

ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING PROVISIONS  
CONCERNING SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENTS**

BE IT ORDAINED by the Village Council of the Village of Downers Grove in DuPage County, Illinois, as follows: (Additions are indicated by **shading**/underline; deletions by ~~strikeout~~):

**Section 1. That Section 19.14.1. is hereby amended to read as follows:**

**19.14.1. Certain construction activities; sidewalk improvements required.**

(a) No person shall improve any parcel within the Village, except for accessory buildings and reconstruction or remodeling of or additions to existing buildings in any single-family or two-family residential zoning district, without first obtaining a sidewalk permit from the Director of Public Works.

(b) No person shall construct any building, except for accessory buildings and reconstruction or remodeling of existing buildings, or additions to existing buildings which amount to less than twenty-five percent of the gross floor area of such building, in any zoning district in the Village other than single-family and two-family districts, without first obtaining a sidewalk permit from the Director of Public Works.

(c) The permits required by paragraphs (a) and (b) hereof may be issued if one of the following requirements are met:

(1) If any street abutting the property on which such improvement or construction is to occur does not currently have an existing sidewalk and is depicted on the map or schedule on file in the Public Works Department of the Village as a street on which sidewalk construction is to be required, sidewalks shall be constructed along the entire street frontage of such parcel or the property owner shall pay a fee equal to the cost to the Village per square foot for construction of the sidewalk abutting the property, as such fee is determined annually by the Director of Public Works.

(2) If any street abutting the property on which such improvement or construction is to occur does not currently have an existing sidewalk and is not depicted on the map or schedule on file in the Public Works Department of the Village as a street on which sidewalk construction is required, the property owner shall pay a fee equal to the cost to the Village per square foot for construction of the sidewalk abutting the property, as such fee is determined annually by the Director of Public Works.

(3) If any street abutting the property on which such improvement or construction is to occur does not currently have an existing sidewalk that was constructed in the past as part of a Village construction program for which the adjacent current or previous property owner did not pay a fee for the sidewalk, the property owner shall pay a fee equal to the cost to the Village per square foot for construction of the sidewalk abutting the property, as such fee is determined annually by the Director of Public Works.

(4) In the case of a corner lot, the new sidewalk or fee paid for new sidewalk shall be for the sidewalk along the access side of the property.

(5) Any fees collected as required under the previous paragraphs (1), (2) or (3) shall be utilized by the Village for construction of sidewalks ~~as provided in paragraph (d) hereof~~ and said funds shall be deposited into the Village's Capital Projects Fund.

~~(d) The Village shall establish four accounts for sidewalk construction to be utilized only for construction of new sidewalks in the Village. One account shall be for construction of new sidewalks in the northwest quadrant of the Village, west of Main Street and of Highland Avenue, north of 39th Street, and north of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad tracks; one account shall be for construction of new sidewalks in the northeast quadrant of the Village, east of Main Street and of Highland Avenue, north of 39th Street, and north of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad tracks; one account shall be used for construction of new sidewalks in the southwest quadrant of the Village west of Main Street, and south of the Burlington Northern~~

~~Santa Fe railroad tracks; and, one account shall be for construction of new sidewalks in the southeast quadrant of the Village, east of Main Street, and south of the Burlington Northern railroad tracks.~~

~~(e) The Director of Public Works shall prepare and update annually a map or schedule of streets or portions of streets on which construction of sidewalks is to be required. In addition, the Director of Public Works shall administer the requirements of this ordinance and determine the streets or portions thereof on which sidewalk construction is to be required, pursuant to Village Council policy with respect thereto. Such policy shall be on file in the office of the Village Clerk and, together with the annually revised map or schedule, shall also be on file for public inspection in the Public Works Department of the Village.~~

~~(f) Any person aggrieved by any decision of the Director of Public Works regarding construction of sidewalks abutting such person's property may appeal the decision within thirty days of the date thereof to the Plan Commission which shall hear and decide such appeal. Application for such appeal shall be in writing, accompanied by a one hundred dollar (\$100.00) application fee. The Plan Commission may either affirm the decision of the Director of Public Works, or may reverse such decision. The procedure set forth in this paragraph shall constitute the only available administrative remedy for any person aggrieved by any decision of the Director of Public Works with respect to sidewalk construction and the determination of the Plan Commission on an appeal shall be the final administrative decision of the Village, from which any further appeals shall be to a court of competent jurisdiction. (Ord. No. 3288, § 2.)~~

**Section 2. That Section 19.14.2. is hereby added to read as follows:**

**19.14.2. Sidewalk Construction; installation in previously developed areas, requests for and replacement of.**

(a) Sidewalk installation in previously developed areas. The Director of Public Works shall prepare and update annually a map or schedule of streets or portions of streets on which construction of sidewalks is to be required. In addition, the Director of Public Works shall administer the requirements of this ordinance and determine the streets or portions thereof on which sidewalk construction is to be required based upon the availability of funds. In developing the annual map or list of streets or portions of streets on which sidewalks are to be constructed, the following factors and criteria shall be considered:

- (1) The proximity to grade (K-6) schools.
- (2) The measured average daily vehicular traffic volume (ADT) on the adjacent street.
- (3) The pedestrian clearance width.
- (4) The measured 85<sup>th</sup> percentile of traffic speed on the adjacent street.
- (5) The continuity of the new segment of sidewalk with the existing network of sidewalks.
- (6) The proximity of the area to significant non-park pedestrian generators.
- (7) The proximity to major and minor parks.
- (8) Any roadside sight obstructions and/or the existence of blind hills in the block limiting visibility of pedestrians on the roadway to motorists.

(b) Requests from property owners. In cases where a property owner requests installation of new sidewalk or replacement of sidewalk adjacent to his/her property other than in the order of the priority stated above, the Village may, based on the availability of funds participate in up to one-half of the cost of the new sidewalk, such cost shall not exceed the maximum per square foot cost determined uniformly and annually by the Director of Public Works.

(c) Replacement of existing sidewalks. In areas where sidewalks currently exist, the replacement of hazardous or deteriorated sidewalks shall occur as funds become available in accordance with the following priorities:

- (1) In business districts.
- (2) Adjacent to railroad stations.
- (3) Adjacent to school property.
- (4) On designated school routes.
- (5) Adjacent to parks.
- (6) Along other routes extending away from schools and parks.

Sidewalk Improvements

(7) Along other streets upon the determination of the Village that the location or condition of the sidewalks warrants priority in replacement.

**Section 3.** That all ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

**Section 4.** That this ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and publication in the manner provided by law.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

Passed:

Published:

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_

Village Clerk