

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF THE
DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY
JULY 27, 2011**

MINUTES

ROLL CALL

President DiCola called the meeting to order in the Library Meeting Room at 7:32 p.m. Trustees present: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys (by phone), Loftus, Read, DiCola. Trustees absent: none. Also present: Library Director Bowen; Assistant Director Carlson. Visitors: Resident John Mochel; Resident Terri Williams, 5230 Blodgett.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Trustees reviewed the minutes of the July regular and special Board Meetings. It was moved by Loftus and seconded by Eblen **THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 13, 2011, THE SPECIAL MEETING OF JULY 6 AND 7, 2011, AND THE SPECIAL MEETING OF JULY 18 AND 19, 2011 BE APPROVED.** Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

PAYMENT OF INVOICES

Trustees reviewed the list of invoices submitted for payment. It was moved by Read and seconded by Greene **TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF OPERATING INVOICES FOR JULY 27, 2011 TOTALING \$21,541.15.** Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS

None.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON OTHER LIBRARY BUSINESS

None.

President DiCola requested that the New Business items related to the appointment of the new library director be moved ahead of Old Business in the agenda. There were no objections.

NEW BUSINESS

- Appointment of the new library director

It was moved by Greene and seconded by Eblen **THAT THE BOARD EXTEND AN OFFER OF EMPLOYMENT TO RICK ASHTON FOR THE POSITION OF DIRECTOR OF THE DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY WITH A START DATE OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2011 AND AN ANNUAL SALARY OF \$115,000.** Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

President DiCola expressed the board's happiness that Rick Ashton has accepted the offer, and how excited they are about him coming to join the library. Ashton brings a wealth of experience and is enthusiastic about coming.

Trustee Loftus wanted to extend an official thank you to the Bradbury consultants for doing a fantastic job of assisting the board with the national search and walking through the interview process with them. President DiCola said she thanked them in person and by email, and agreed that they did a great job of guiding the board without deciding for the board, and that they enabled the board to select the best person for the position from among a good group of candidates.

Trustee Read commented that it is a great tribute to Bowen that so many people were interested in the position and that the board found so many strong candidates wanting in comparison with the job he has done. President DiCola said she had thought it would be hard to replace Bowen and it was, but she thinks the board has found someone who can do a great job.

- Discussion of the transition of library directors

Since Bowen does not want a big farewell party, the trustees will take him out to dinner after his last board meeting on August 24. Bowen said he has received a number of calls and notes from people since the article about his retirement went out in the July/August issue of *Discoveries*. Carlson invited the trustees to the staff farewell party on Wednesday, August 17, 1:30-3:00 PM in the Staff Room.

There was some discussion of how to welcome Rick Ashton in September, perhaps with a Saturday afternoon open house reception in the Meeting Room or in the Art Gallery. President DiCola will find out which Saturday in September works best for Ashton and work with the administration to get a date in the Sept/Oct *Discoveries* and to plan a reception. Trustee Loftus suggested inviting him to join them August 8 for the Downtown Downers Grove historic photo unveiling walk and related library program on August 14. President DiCola said that Ashton had already declined an invitation to the August 14 program in the library out of sensitivity to overstepping boundaries with the current director, but she would extend an invitation for the August 8 downtown walk and let him decide.

Since the library is required to have a designated FOIA (Freedom of Information) contact and OMA (Open Meetings Act) contact and the library director has been both, Bowen suggested that the board designate the assistant director the interim contact for each. Carlson will be able to do the online training for each position before Bowen leaves.

It was moved by Eblen and seconded by Greene **THAT THE ASSISTANT LIBRARY DIRECTOR BE THE FOIA CONTACT AND THE OMA CONTACT.** Ayes: Eblen, Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

Trustee Read asked what kind of support the board might give the new director to make the transition smooth as is the board's responsibility after the search. President DiCola said it was a good question and that her recent meeting with Ashton to answer some of his questions and her offer to be available to assist anytime were steps in providing that support. Bowen said that he has always appreciated immediate calls or emails back from the current and previous board presidents when he has needed to discuss something with them. He suggested that this might be a good conversation at Ashton's first board meeting. Trustee Eblen said that Ashton has a lot of experience and has been vocal about his concerns so they may have confidence that he will seek support when needed.

At 8:00 PM Trustee Humphreys said good bye and left the meeting due to a problematic phone connection. Before saying good bye, he said he appreciated the board's indulgence in letting him participate by phone while in Canada, because he believes the process they have just been involved with is extremely important and he wanted the board to have a complete and unanimous vote on this choice. He thanked his fellow board members for making the process effective, and said they were honored to have had as many qualified applicants as they did. He said he appreciated the consultants' assistance and guidance, and he feels very optimistic for the library's future.

Resident John Mochel left the meeting at the same time. President DiCola thanked Mochel for joining them and for his participation and input during the search.

OLD BUSINESS

- Continue discussion of the 2012 Budget and Financial Plan

The agenda for this meeting was posted in the library and on the website and distributed to the media last Thursday. The agenda stated the budget is available for public examination on the website and in the local documents collection in the Reference Department. Since the board reviewed parts of the budget document at the last meeting and Bowen included a lengthy memo about the budget in the board packet for this meeting, he quickly reviewed the highlights.

The budget proposal includes a request for a 2011 property tax levy to fund the operating budget in 2012 of \$4,140,942. This represents an increase in the operating levy of 2% from the current operating levy. Combined with the building bond levy, the total increase in the amount of property taxes levied for the library as proposed would be 1.7%. This is an increase of about \$2.74 on a house with a market value of \$365,000. The proposed budget includes a 2% salary increase for staff, provides for increases of up to 15% in the cost of health insurance, and provides for increases in the payments to IMRF that began last year as part of the plan to restore the pension plan to full funding. The budget narrative explains the need for a substantial fund balance to pay for library operations from the beginning of the fiscal year in January until the first property tax collection in June, as well as a description of the major capital projects that are part of this plan.

For the current 2011 fiscal year, the revenue will be slightly greater and expenditures will be slightly less than projected when the FY2011 budget was adopted last summer. This will result in a fund balance of about \$3,500,000 to begin FY2012, about \$340,000 more than projected in last year's plan. Just over \$2,000,000 of that fund balance is needed to operate the library from January until the first property tax collection is available in July. The additional savings has been used to increase the amount budgeted for the major capital projects scheduled over the next three years.

The proposed FY2012 budget of \$4,620,396 is about \$30,800 more than was projected last year. The most significant increase in the proposed budget was an addition of \$50,000 in the amount budgeted for the RFID project. Reductions in other areas have offset part of this increase. After subtracting the funds needed to pay for library operations from January to June, the plan projects that the library will end 2012 with a true fund balance for contingencies of \$1,270,389. The goal has been to have at least 10% of the annual budget available in this reserve, so this reserve appears very healthy. However, with the capital projects planned for 2013 and 2014 along with the projected very low increases of the property tax levy over the next ten years, the reserve will drop below 10% by 2019 and will be seriously depleted in 2020, unless further reductions in expenditures are achieved over the next few years. The capital projects planned for the next few years are designed to facilitate the needed savings.

The construction budget fund is a separate fund from the operating budget fund. It contains funds remaining from the building renovation and expansion project. The library plans to use this fund to replace carpeting as needed. The library had budgeted to replace the carpet in the Children's Department in 2011, but the carpet is holding up well. As long as the carpeting is safe, it may make more sense to replace the carpet at the same time the second floor project is done, i.e., have the movers move everything thing at the same time. However, the funds will be available in the 2012 Construction Fund budget if needed.

Bowen asked the board for direction on how to proceed with the budget. If they are comfortable with the budget and property tax levy, it can be scheduled for approval at the next meeting. If they want changes, Bowen will bring back another draft at the beginning of August in hopes of having it approved at the August 24 meeting.

Trustee Loftus asked why not use part of the under spent funds from 2011 to meet the 2012 budget, rather than adding it to the reserve. He said this is an opportunity to recognize tough times. Why does the board believe 2% is what the library needs? Trustee Greene said the reserve is to be spent on RFID, second floor redesign, new phone system, roof replacement and other necessary major capital projects. Bowen said that with an aging building and big expenses coming up, the library will need the reserve. Trustee Eblen said that so many other libraries are failing because of living on the edge and then losing a revenue source. She was glad Trustee Loftus asked the question, but she would be reluctant to reduce the reserve. The consensus of the Board was that the proposed budget should be considered for approval at their August 10 meeting.

REPORT FROM THE ADMINISTRATION

On July 25 Bowen attended the annual meetings of the Joint Review Boards of the Ogden Avenue and Downtown TIFs. All taxing bodies that are affected by the TIF send a representative to be part of the review board. The Ogden Avenue TIF appears to be very healthy, but the recession is hurting the Downtown TIF. Increases in assessed valuation are not growing as projected, which is impacting the property tax revenue available to fund the TIF projects. Everything is fine for the near term, but things are problematic beginning about 2015. That does give the Village some time to look at alternatives.

TRUSTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

Trustee Read attended the Metropolitan Library System open house on June 22 and heard plans for RAILS, the new Reaching Across Illinois Library System.

ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF THE
DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY
AUGUST 10, 2011**

MINUTES

REPORT FROM THE ADMINISTRATION

At 7:30 PM the Board did not have a quorum to conduct business. Trustee Humphreys reported that he was stuck in traffic and would be about 20 minutes late. While the Board was waiting to achieve a quorum, Bowen gave his report from the Administration.

Bowen attended the meeting of the SWAN Governance Group yesterday. They reviewed revisions to the FY2012 budget as a result of the successful creation of RAILS, the new library system. The SWAN budget was based on the assumption that SWAN might have to become a completely independent entity and fund 100% of the cost of operating. At this point SWAN will be able to remain in the Burr Ridge location and part of the SWAN staff and their benefits will be paid by RAILS, the budget for SWAN will be revised to show these savings. For 2012 the extra funds will go into an operating reserve, rather than reducing member libraries' cost. RAILS is up and running, but it is running on the reserve fund that was brought to RAILS by the systems that merged. No funds for this year have yet been released by the State. The final funds from the year that ended in June must be distributed by December and it is not expected that they will be released any earlier, and there is no idea when funds for this year will be released. So funding for systems is still uncertain at best and SWAN will remain prepared to function as a completely separate entity if needed.

SWAN staff also reported on developments with the automated system vendors. The next generation of library automation systems is developing rapidly. Several vendors are developing new systems from the ground up, including Innovative Interfaces, the current vendor. This will be a migration to a whole new system, not an up-grade of the current system. SWAN expects to form a committee to begin the search for a new system in 2013, with the expectation of migrating to a new system by 2014. Some SWAN members have questioned the need to maintain a hefty reserve fund, but this development pretty much answers that question.

And, he said that he and Carlson would be meeting with the insurance broker on Friday to review quotes for the library's insurance that is up for renewal the first of October, and he hopes to have the board approve a proposal at the next board meeting.

ROLL CALL

President DiCola called the meeting to order in the Library Meeting Room at 8:05 p.m. when Trustee Humphreys arrived and there was a quorum to conduct business. Trustees present: Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read (by phone), DiCola. Trustees absent: Eblen. Also present: Library Director Bowen; Assistant Director Carlson. Visitors: none.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Trustees reviewed the minutes of the regular meeting of July 27, 2011. It was moved by Greene and seconded by Humphreys **THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 27, 2011 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED.** Ayes: Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

PAYMENT OF INVOICES

Trustees reviewed the list of invoices submitted for payment. It was moved by Greene and seconded by Loftus **TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF OPERATING INVOICES FOR AUGUST 10, 2011 TOTALING \$100,223.20 AND ACKNOWLEDGE PAYROLLS FOR JULY 2011 TOTALING \$169,850.26.** Ayes: Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS

None.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON OTHER LIBRARY BUSINESS

OLD BUSINESS

- Discussion and possible approval of the 2012 Budget and Financial Plan
- Discussion and possible approval of the 2011 property tax levy for operations of \$4,140,942

The proposed 2012 Budget and Financial Plan have been available for public examination on the library's web site and in the Local Government Documents Collection in the Reference Department for four weeks.

Bowen did a fairly detailed review of the proposed budget at the last meeting, and it appeared that the consensus of the board was to move ahead with the budget as it was proposed. At that meeting, the trustees did discuss whether it would be feasible to approve the proposed budget, including small raises for employees, without increasing the property tax levy to help fund it. There was a suggestion that the projected surplus from savings in the current fiscal year would off-set the loss of tax revenue.

Bowen believes this would be a mistake, but he believes that this idea came from the fact that the library appears to have a very healthy fund balance. He thinks the way the budget is presented to the public is very important, because it needs to be made clear that while the library does have a healthy fund reserve at the moment the reserve is needed for two reasons.

The first reason is that the Village fiscal year operates on the calendar year and begins January 1. Over 90% of the library's revenue comes from property taxes. The library must begin the fiscal year with a fund reserve equal to about half of its annual budget, simply to pay the bills from the beginning of the fiscal year on January 1 until the first property tax collection becomes available in July. This reserve is required to pay the library's actual expenses for the first six months of each fiscal year. It is not a surplus or an emergency or contingency fund. Bowen said he repeats this continuously because he does not believe that most Village officials are aware of this issue. Village funding comes from sales tax, which is relatively steady through-out the year. They never have to deal with the cash flow issue resulting from the gap between property tax collections.

The other reason that the library needs the fund balance is to pay for several capital projects that are planned for the next three years. The projects are intended to allow the library to operate more efficiently so that the size of library staff can be reduced through attrition in order to reduce expenditures in the future, before the surplus is dangerously low. Bowen thinks the board has done a commendable job of providing for these important projects, while keeping both past and projected future property tax increases very low.

To understand the "real" reserve, Bowen projected on a screen a spreadsheet of the projected Financial Plan without including the cost of the big projects that are scheduled for the next three years, and without including the funds accumulated in the reserve fund to pay for them. In the past the board has discussed possibly transferring the funds for the big capital projects out of the operating fund and into the construction fund, but decided not to do that in order to retain the flexibility to use the funds for other purposes in case of emergency.

The spreadsheet demonstrated how the fund reserve falls below the minimum 10% balance the board has strived for beginning in 2019 and continues to drop to a critically low level in the years beyond. This is with the 2% tax increase that is proposed for 2012 and with small property tax increases projected for future years.

The spreadsheet also showed the projection assuming a 0% tax increase in 2012. The reserve drops below the 10% in 2016 and is significantly below in 2017. And this still assumes modest increases in the tax levy in 2013 and beyond.

Bowen suggested that, rather than risk depleting the fund reserve before the library has completed the projects planned to help the library reduce costs, without seriously impacting services, it makes more sense to follow the plan and implement a small tax increase now. If costs are contained and the fund reserve grows more than projected in this plan, it would be extra money that could be used to abate taxes in the future.

Board members were predominantly in support of Bowen's reasoning and the need for the small 2% tax increase for 2012 due to the need to maintain the reserve. Trustee Read said he was in favor of Bowen's recommendation as a reserve should be available to carry an organization for a

few months if there is a disaster, and once the capital projects are paid for, the library's projected reserve never returns to a level that protects the library so that's why he is in favor of the 2% tax increase. President DiCola mentioned that the current reserve would only carry the library for two months. Bowen commented that the library is very lucky to be in DuPage County where taxes have been paid on time. This is not true in Cook and other counties where taxing organizations have had to borrow to pay operating expenses due to late payments. Trustee Humphreys said this is a key statement -- that the library has been very fortunate to receive tax revenue on time in DuPage County, but if this should change, the board as tax stewards should have a reserve to avoid having to borrow money to cover operating expenses while waiting for tax payments. Trustee Greene said that as the economy remains stagnant, the library may well see this occur in DuPage County.

There was some discussion of how much reserve the library should have. Bowen said some libraries keep six months operating expenses in reserve. The practice of the board has been to maintain at least a 10% reserve balance which at this time will cover only two months of operating expenses. Trustee Loftus said that they do not have to be so catastrophic about the need for the reserve. He is in support of the proposed 2012 budget but his concern is a lack of policy regarding the library's reserve—2 months, 4 months, or 6 months? The library has a small surplus from this year due to careful staff spending and Bowen's budgeting, and he would like to see the library take this year's surplus and apply it to next year's budget rather than putting it in the reserve fund. He said he can support the budget but not the levy. Bowen mentioned that there may be an opportunity to abate the levy in the future, and President DiCola remembered that the board has considered this in the past.

Trustee Humphreys confirmed that the total tax increase would actually be a 1.7% increase for the total operating and building bond levy which is an increase of only \$2.74 for a \$364,670 home (the average sale value of a Downers Grove home). He agreed with Trustee Loftus that although the library has had a reserve practice, the library may need a reserve policy and the board should have this discussion with the new library director. President DiCola agreed that it may be time to review the board's practice of keeping a 10% reserve balance. Trustee Loftus said that as a new person on the board, he may bring a different philosophy and would like to begin a discussion of a policy for the reserve; however, he did not want to derail this year's budget, and he thanked everyone for indulging his comments.

Bowen said that the library's single reserve fund is perhaps more transparent than having several different funds for pensions, capital improvements, etc. as some tax-capped libraries have created. Trustees Loftus and Humphreys agreed that it is better to continue with the flexibility of a single reserve fund.

It was moved by Read and seconded by Loftus **TO ADOPT THE 2012 BUDGET OF \$4,620,396 AND THE FINANCIAL PLAN AS PROPOSED.** Ayes: Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

It was moved by Read and seconded by Humphreys **TO ADOPT THE PROPOSED 2011 PROPERTY TAX LEVY OF \$4,140,942.** Ayes: Greene, Humphreys, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: Loftus. Motion carried.

- Continue the discussion of the transition of library directors

President DiCola reported that she had confirmed with the new library director Rick Ashton that there would be a reception for him to meet residents in the library lobby on Sunday, September 18 at 1:00 PM, and that staff were able to include this announcement in the next *Discoveries* newsletter which will be delivered to all Downers Grove homes the end of August.

NEW BUSINESS

**- Action to accept the donation of a memorial for past Friends of the Library
President Solon Gordon**

Bowen and Carlson met with resident Gordon Goodman, who wishes to make this donation, and Joni Hansen, President of the Friends of the Library, to discuss the donation. The Friends of the Library board also discussed it at their July meeting and are very pleased with the donation and hope that the library board will accept it. Bowen had informed Mr. Goodman that the total cost of the project will be approximately \$350 and Gordon and Nancy Goodman are very interested in making a donation that would cover the cost of the memorial.

It was moved by Greene and seconded by Humphreys **TO ACCEPT THE DONATION OF THE MEMORIAL TO SOLON A. GORDON FROM GORDON AND NANCY GOODMAN.** Ayes: Greene, Humphreys, Loftus, Read, DiCola. Abstentions: none. Nays: none. Motion carried.

TRUSTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

The next board meeting will start at the usual time of 7:30 PM but it will be short, so that after the meeting the board can take Director Bowen and his wife, Janet, out to dinner to celebrate his retirement.

Trustee Humphreys expressed appreciation of the minutes from the previous board meeting since he was unable to attend in person, and he apologized for arriving late to this meeting due to unplanned for traffic. He also announced that the Village of Downers Grove and the Downers Grove Park District will host a recycling event on Saturday, September 24, 2011.

ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

**TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION
Minutes**

March 9, 2011, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairman Wendt called the March 9, 2011 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

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

Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Chairman Wendt, Members Mr. Cronin, Ms. Van Anne, Mr. Saricks, Mr. Schiller, Mr. Stuebner, Student Repr. Robert Clark

Absent: Mr. Gress

Staff Present: Public Works Dir. Nan Newlon; Traffic Manager Dorin Fera, Police Sgt. David Bormann

Visitors: Mr. Jim Krusenwski, 853 Maple, Downers Grove; Mr. Bill DeCero, 5425 Washington, Downers Grove; Mr. Steve Scanlon, 5436 Lyman, Downers Grove; Mr. Matt Callaghan, 5420 Lyman, Downers Grove; Mr. Tony Milsted, 5432 Lyman, Downers Grove; Mr. Pete Tomcheck, 5310 Lyman, Downers Grove; Ms. Jen Watts, 823 Randall, Downers Grove; Ms. Jane Hagen, 5417 Webster, Downers Grove; Mr. Mike and Ms. Barbara Ruta, 5405 Webster, Downers Grove; Mr. Kevin Osterman, 5406 Webster, Downers Grove

Chairman Wendt explained the protocol for the meeting and reminded the public that the minutes were being recorded on village-owned equipment for transcription purposes.

APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 8, 2010 TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION MINUTES.

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 8, 2010 MEETING, WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. STUEBNER, SECONDED BY MR. SCHILLER. MOTION PASSED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

PUBLIC COMMENTS - None.

A change in the agenda followed, noting File #02-11 would be presented first, due to the large public in attendance.

2. File #02-11. Neighborhood Traffic Study. Dir. Newlon presented a PowerPoint presentation and discussed that the initial project began in October 2010 which was a new approach to looking at traffic as a "traffic system" versus looking at individual streets or intersections. The approach included reviewing travel speed, cut-through traffic, conflicts with pedestrian/vehicles, etc. and to treat it on a comprehensive basis. Another goal was to specifically review the intersection of Washington and 55th Street, due to history of accidents there and to consider what impact may occur if something is done at that location. The last goal of this study was to come up with recommendations which would improve intersection controls within the neighborhood. Dir. Newlon discussed the significant amount of resident input that

was received regarding this study. She envisioned the project to be completed sometime in May, 2011.

A quick review of some of the recommendations already being considered followed, including short-term recommendations (four-way control, upgrading yield signs to stop signs) and long-term recommendations (some of which may impact other areas) and recommendations which will involve additional costs. **Dir. Newlon** stated tonight's meeting would focus on receiving additional input from the public.

Traffic Manager Dorin Fera, presented the same PowerPoint presentation that was shown at the January 26, 2011 neighborhood meeting held at Whittier School, summarizing that attendance was very good (45 individuals) with well-received input. Staff was targeting the April 12th Village Council meeting to present the short-term recommendations for approval. Viewing his presentation, he noted that traffic volume and speeding were a concern on the streets, as well as cut-through. Speeding issues existed on Blodgett and on Fairmount. Crashes were identified at Washington and 55th, plus parking problems, and the turning of vehicles in a couple of locations were additional issues. A list of short-term recommendations followed, along with mid-term and long-term recommendations.

Asked how many of the last five (5) recommendations depicted need concurrence from DuPage County, **Mr. Fera** stated that four (4) of them do.

Mr. Fera referred to his exhibit to reflect the existing conditions and the future changes that will be made, noting that the public could view the exhibits in the room, after the meeting.

Dir. Newlon discussed the alternating stop pattern being proposed for the area.

Parking adjustments were also highlighted, specifically noting that the residents south of Randall will have less parking restrictions in order for the residents to park on their streets again. **Dir. Newlon** also reminded the commissioners that the Parking Deck did not exist at the time when some of the parking restrictions were implemented.

Changes for the bike route/pedestrian crosswalks were also reviewed. It was noted that some of the changes would not necessarily need more pavement, but instead more funding in designating lanes, i.e., striping and/or modifications to the traffic signals.

Dir. Newlon commented that the largest complaint being heard by staff was that people were running late for the train and there was heavy traffic and turns on Main and Maple. She explained that if the Village could help facilitate the traffic movement by keeping it on Main and on Maple, it would create less cut-through in the neighborhood. Per a question, **Dir. Newlon** clarified that there was a future recommendation to add turn lanes at Main and 55th and at Fairview and 55th, but probably five years away **Dir. Newlon** stated it was best if the Village work out the interim turn movements at Main and 55th to allow traffic to turn left at Main, per the county's suggestion.

Chairman Wendt asked if there was consideration about moving the issue further down to Lyman, etc., versus the holistic approach, wherein **Dir. Newlon** stated that was why she was seeking input tonight about this issue.

Dialog followed that the project should be broken down into phases for the Village Council.

Chairman Wendt asked for commissioner comments. For those recommendations listed in the short term, **Dir. Newlon** confirmed they were recommendations that would be under the

Village's control and once the recommendations were approved she envisioned they could be completed by this spring. For the mid-term recommendations, **Dir. Newlon** envisioned reaching consensus on those recommendations first (within the next two meetings), and if funding was available to go ahead either this year or wait until next year's budget.

A question followed on whether the consultant would explain the modeling since much information was before the commissioners. **Dir. Newlon** said a complete draft study would be provided to the commissioners and the Consultant would be coming before the commissioners. Again, she explained that Phase 1 would be an alternating stop pattern in order to stop motorists from speeding through the area, as recommended by the Consultant. Another question asked was whether the stop signs being installed were meeting all of the warrants to which **Dir. Newlon** explained that the area was being reviewed on a "system wide" basis versus an intersection basis, where warrants were required. Additionally, **Mr. Fera** explained that when he was reviewing the left turn accident patterns on Washington, they were occurring at all hours, all days of the week, and in every direction. Therefore, the proposed recommendation would be a permanent 24 hour/7 day week change.

Dir. Newlon explained that once the Phase 1 changes were implemented, monitoring would take place afterwards. **Ms. Van Anne** noticed that Randall Street was becoming a straight route from Washington to Elmwood, wherein **Mr. Fera** noted that the speeds there did not appear to be an issue. He clarified that in the final report, it will reflect that Blodgett has a higher volume than Benton because Blodgett is closer to Fairview. Also, Fairmont's traffic would be high because it was more of a through street, carrying more traffic north and south.

Chairman Wendt opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Tony Milsted, 5432 Lyman Avenue, was concerned about speeding on Lyman Avenue once Phase 1 was implemented. He and his fellow residents requested a stop sign on Summit and/or Farley due to the street being a clear shot north-south. As to parking restrictions on 55th and Lyman (west side) he said it was difficult to make a north turn when vehicles are coming south. He requested to review parking 200 feet from Washington or Lyman or the other streets because of the driveways. **Chairman Wendt** noted there was a required setback already.

Mr. Bill DeCero, 5425 Washington, stated that during rush hour he has cars backed up past his home. When someone parks on northbound Washington, cars cannot pass it due to the cars lined up trying to turn onto 55th Street.

Mr. Matt Callahan, 5420 Lyman, supported Mr. Milsted's suggestion of installing a stop sign at Summit or Farley, since Randall was too far down the street. Additionally, he saw that there would be a reverse stop sign at Randall and Lyman and traffic would then use Lyman as a cut-through since the stop sign would be going north/south. He stated children's safety was another concern.

Mr. Tony Milsted, 5432 Lyman Avenue, suggested adding more speed limit signs or reducing the speed limit to 20 mph.

Asked where the traffic was dispersing from the study area, after crossing to Maple Avenue, **Mr. Fera** stated he did not continue the traffic counts north of Maple Avenue but explained that more of it was heading towards Washington which then heads toward Ogden Avenue. However, he stated additional data could be obtained.

Mr. Steven Scanlon, 5436 Lyman (55th and Lyman), was concerned about speed and cut-through traffic. He supported a stop sign at either Summit or Farley. He asked whether there

was consideration to have a two-hour restriction for no left turns off of 55th down to Lyman in the morning/night rush hour.

Dialog followed that it was a DuPage County Division of Transportation (County) issue. **Mr. Fera** explained that the county will work with the Village, however, it will not implement signage until the Village has documentation reflecting the residents' complaints and reflecting what impacts the restrictions will have. **Dir. Newlon** believed this issue needed to be discussed more, and more data was necessary. In talking about the traffic on Main Street, she believed adding the left turn lanes would be beneficial but also stated the County was on board with the Village and appeared to support a partnership arrangement and fund most of the costs, but the project would take time because it involved grants and purchasing right-of-ways. Also, she was looking for ways to keep drivers on Main Street and on Fairview, and not cut through the neighborhood.

Mr. Bill DeCero, 5425 Washington, stated people continually come down Washington in his area to get across the tracks to get to Maple and not to the parking garage as everyone thinks.

Dialog followed by the commissioners that if Phase 1 was implemented and Phase 2 continued to be monitored, the study would be able to be fine-tuned so that a cut-through driver had no preference and that no time would be saved by cutting through a neighborhood. **Dir. Newlon** agreed.

Mr. Bill DeCero, 5425 Washington, lives three houses from 55th Street and always heads north and does not turn on 55th during rush hour. He stated he has asked drivers why they are making such a difficult left turn and suggests that they travel east.

Mr. Michael Ruta, 5405 Webster, on behalf of the 5400 block of Webster residents, stated that the residents do not believe Webster Street may have been adequately studied due to its uniqueness. He stated the residents filed a petition which was submitted to Public Works and other officials, which asks for a dead-end on Webster at 55th Street. While the study was proposing to make the street right-turn only onto 55th, the residents were concerned that the denied, no-left turn drivers would travel to Webster Street instead. Unfortunately, he said the sight lines off of Webster were not good and the speed on 55th was very fast. He referenced a number of crashes that occurred off of Webster over the past 15 years. He explained that the traffic heading westbound on 55th toward Main Street was primarily cut-through as was the traffic using Webster. Turning onto Webster from 55th or vice versa, was a bad situation. **Mr. Ruta** proceeded to reference communities with similar situations and where they installed dead-ends, i.e., the Villages of Westmont, Clarendon Hills, and Hinsdale. He cited the fact that many children live on Webster and that any future widening of the street posed a sight visibility issue due to one older home that sits close to the street already. He invited the commissioners to drive down the 5400 block of Webster.

Discussing the Webster dead-end issue, one commissioner recalled at a prior neighborhood meeting, the suggestion of installing a right-in/right-out pork-chop on Webster.

Mr. Ruta confirmed the residents preferred their street as a dead-end. He further explained the difficult maneuvering of the street as well as the safety concerns when vehicles are turning right onto Webster, i.e., they have to slow down considerably ahead of the street to make that turn. He discussed that hazards of the hill on 55th Street and the fact that when someone is turning right off of Webster and onto 55th, the cars traveling westbound on 55th approach unseen up the hill for approximately 3 to 4 seconds and by the time they are seen again, a driver has 4 seconds to make his/her right turn onto 55th Street, depending upon the speed of the westbound

vehicle. Asked if the residents considered having a Special Service Area installed, **Mr. Ruta** stated the residents would be willing to discuss that after hearing the cost estimates for same.

Mr. Kevin Osterman, 5406 Webster, asked what month the traffic counts were taken, to which **Mr. Fera** responded from the middle of October to the end of November 2010. **Mr. Osterman** noted that on Webster and Summit there was a backup of cars dropping off children at the nearby school.

Further comments from the commissioners included holding off the study's parking recommendations at this time.

A resident from the 5400 block of Webster reiterated the amount of traffic, speeding, and children coming into the area during certain times of the day. He emphasized that the entire block wanted Webster to dead-end.

Asked if the Village was allowed to close off the street, **Dir. Newlon** stated it would have to be looked at as well as reviewing sight lines, etc. It would require construction on the county's right-of-way.

A commissioner suggested that the dead-end issue be removed as a separate item and that the residents address it with staff. **Dir. Newlon** stated her concern was that the issue would arise again with the residents from other streets.

Mr. Ruta stated the Webster residents did review the requirements for the traffic calming process and also reviewed the fact that if the right-turn only changes get installed on Washington Street, some of the cut-through traffic will be those drivers who do not want to be stuck by the fire station, and will make a left down Summit. After the drivers understand they cannot turn off of Washington, they will cut down Webster. If Webster were to be cut off, he said the residents felt that it may decrease traffic down Summit as there was no advantage to turn onto Summit off of Main. Comments followed that traffic would travel to Washington or Lyman.

Chairman Wendt recommended focusing on Phase 1 at this point and forwarding the recommendation to the Village Council. Comments followed that Recommendation No. 3 should be left out but that a stop sign on Lyman be added at Summit. **Dir. Newlon** said the suggestion should be taken back to the Consultant in order to add it to the study as a formal recommendation. If adding a stop sign at Lyman and Summit were to be denied, one commissioner asked that the consultant explain why at the next meeting.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE #02-11, COMMISSIONER SCHILLER MADE A MOTION TO FORWARD TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL PHASE 1 (STOP AND YIELD SIGNS) OF THE PROJECT WITH THE ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATION OF THE STOP SIGNS AT LYMAN AND SUMMIT STREETS, AND ACCEPT THE SCHOOL CROSSINGS/PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS AS STATED. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SARICKS. ROLL CALL:

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

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0

3. File #03-11. Burlington Avenue BNSF Railroad - One Way Configuration. Mr. Fera briefly discussed there will a sign on Fairview that states the street becomes dead-end. Asked if more steps will be taken to stop the lane from going through, Mr. Fera explained that one of the options will be to remove the left turn lane on Fairview and have a sign at the intersection and another sign at Grant. Staff intends to convey this information at a public hearing meeting.

Commissioner Stuebner suggested closing the crossing at Maple since he knew that BNSF, the Dept. of Transportation and the Illinois Dept. of Transportation had funds and/or matching funds for such a project. Based on his calculation, there was \$265,000 in matching funds to close the crossing, re-route the traffic to Burlington, and sync the traffic lights and create left/right turns. Other commissioners noted that it was a large crossing and were not supportive of the re-routing.

The chairman entertained a motion.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE #03-11 MR. SARICKS MOVED TO ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATION, AS PRESENTED, SECONDED BY MR. SCHILLER.

MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0:

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

NAY: NONE

1. File #01-11. 39TH Street at Highland - No Turn on Red Restrictions. Mr. Fera confirmed that this intersection is under the jurisdiction of the DuPage County Division of Transportation (County) but that if the Village submitted an ordinance approving the proposed changes, the County would upgrade the intersection. Highland School was the nearby school that was being affected, as cars were not paying attention to the No Turn on Red sign.

Sgt. Bormann confirmed a crossing guard is out at the intersection but sometimes he sends officers there also because it is a difficult intersection for a crossing guard. The request was coming from the Police Department. Per a question, **Sgt. Bormann** stated the intersection at Prairie and Belmont was also difficult due to the on-going construction.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE #01-11 MR. STUEBNER MOVED TO ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATION AS PRESENTED, SECONDED BY MR. CRONIN.

MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0:

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

NAY: NONE

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Stuebner was asked by another commissioner if he received the information regarding the number of handicapped spaces in town, wherein **Mr. Fera** stated he had the information but not with him at tonight's meeting. He would email the information to the commissioners.

A question was raised regarding the Belmont Road grade separation project, as to who is responsible for striping Belmont Rd and the railroad tracks construction area, wherein **Dir. Newlon** stated it was Metra. **Mr. Cronin** voiced concerns about lack of signage and the lane confusion. **Dir. Newlon** stated she did speak to the project manager about the signage but said some costs were involved for additional signage. **Mr. Cronin** voiced concern about safety and asked **Sgt. Bormann** to go back and let him know if there were accidents occurring in the area.

Another question was asked if Warren Street would become permanently closed, wherein **Mr. Fera** and other commissioners stated that Warren would become an overpass with ramps to Belmont. **Mr. Cronin** found the construction there very interesting and suggested that it be documented. **Dir. Newlon** said she could arrange for a tour. Other comments followed regarding the bike overpass; separating the temporary road with cones or reflectors for lane division; and **Dir. Newlon** attending the coordination meeting. She will ask about signage and reducing speed in that area.

COMMUNICATIONS - None noted.

ADJOURN

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

Respectfully submitted,

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

**TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION
Minutes**

May 11, 2011, 7:00 p.m.

Council Chambers - Village Hall
801 Burlington Avenue, Downers Grove

Chairman Wendt called the May 11, 2011 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

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

Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

ROLL CALL:

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

Absent: Mr. Gress

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

Visitors: Mr. Jim Cottrill, 5505 Washington, Downers Grove; Mr. Dave Bormes, 5311 Washington, Downers Grove; Mr. Paul Simms, 5210 Blodgett, Downers Grove; Mr. David Wurster, 442 68th Street, Downers Grove; Mr. William Waldak, 1909 Willard, Downers Grove; Mr. Jason Hagen, 5417 Webster St., Downers Grove; Mr. Mike Ruta, 5405 Webster St., Downers Grove; Mr. Don Zebrauskas, 412 68th St., Downers Grove; Mr. Kevin Osterman, 5406 Webster, Downers Grove

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. William Waldack, 1409 Willard Place, Downers Grove, introduced himself as the Village Council liaison and made himself available to the commissioners. On behalf of the Village Council, he thanked the commissioners and staff for their hard work.

APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 9, 2011 TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION MINUTES.

Mr. Saricks noted a change on page 4, second to the last paragraph and clarified he was the one who raised the question in reference to some comments made at a previous Transportation and Parking Commission meeting and not a neighborhood meeting. **Mr. Fera** concurred. **MINUTES OF THE MARCH 9, 2011 MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. SARICKS, SECONDED BY MR. SCHILLER. MOTION PASSED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.**

1. File #04-11. 55TH at Webster Street Intersection - Safety Review. Traffic Manager, **Mr. Fera**, stated that the above referenced intersection was part of the neighborhood traffic study and was an intersection the residents felt was unsafe due to an issue at 55th Street. After staff did a site visit, took measurements, and reviewed the crash information, it was discovered that in every direction standing on Webster and trying to turn onto 55th Street, there was a sight distance issue. The grade to the east was steep. As a result, staff made a list of six (6) alternatives to address the issue at this intersection and referenced them in staff's report. Of

significant concern was the cost of any structural alternatives. **Mr. Fera** noted, however, that part of 55th Street was owned by DuPage County Division of Transportation (County DOT) and the county would have to be supportive of the chosen alternative. Staff was keeping the County DOT aware of this discussion.

Mr. Fera reminded the commissioners that tonight's presentation was for discussion purposes only. Asked if this matter was an addendum to the last neighborhood study or whether it was considered as part of that study, **Mr. Fera** explained that it is not an addendum to the study but rather, a revision to recommendations already in the neighborhood study. Additionally, he stated that areas along Washington Street would be considered with turn-type restrictions along 55th Street.

Mr. Saricks believed that a neighborhood meeting to discuss the various alternatives, including the cost sharing alternatives, was the next step. **Mr. Fera** explained that neighbors on Webster (from Summit to 55th) did submit a petition to close the street at 55th, which was one of staff's alternatives. However, he believed if the work could coincide with the County DOT's Phase I Study for Main Street, some of the areas under discussion could be included as part of the county's study and, possibly part of the County DOT's cost. **Mr. Saricks** concurred that the Village itself, had financial restrictions and believed for the project to move forward, it would have to be based on a cost share basis, but it would require knowing the costs and what the residents could commit financially.

Chairman Wendt also agreed that a dollar value needed to be placed on the various costs in order for the neighbors to discuss among themselves; other commissioners agreed.

Addressing Alternatives 4 through 6, **Mr. Saricks** inquired whether there was a plan to inform the neighbors of the problems that could develop for access by emergency vehicles into the neighborhood, to which **Mr. Fera** stated there would be an immediate impact of any physical closure. He explained a closure policy would require the adjacent streets to be included in the dialogue and support the plan. **Mr. Fera** strongly encouraged looking at the feasible options first.

Dialogue was raised that traffic volume for Washington Street was about 2300 vehicles and closing Webster Street would add traffic to other streets located east. **Chairman Wendt** stated it would be a burden on other residents in the village. **Mr. Fera** stated because Webster had access to 55th Street, making any change was significant and he hoped to hear from residents on Summit and Washington Streets.

Mr. Stuebner believed that shutting the street seemed the most drastic measure. He suggested using Alternative 1 since it already accomplished what Alternative 6 did without the concrete. A review of its effectiveness could follow after six months. He believed Alternative 2 would also accomplish the same goal. **Ms. Van Anne** commented that the operational design made more financial sense; however, knowing the County DOT was doing a study on 55th Street, she said it would not make sense to install something, specifically if it was cost-shared by the residents, only for it to get removed by the County DOT. She also cautioned the village that now it knew there was a problem at the intersection, and if nothing were to get done, liability could be involved. If anything, she believed a sign should be installed warning motorists of a sight distance issue.

Chairman Wendt supported a concrete right-turn in/out, thereby forcing drivers to drive a certain way. He agreed there was no money in the budget but commented the intersection has been a problem for the past 50 years and it needed to be addressed. Concrete was not that expensive.

Alternate 3 was better clarified by staff. In its report, it was noted staff mentioned that “it does not meet the required distances for any of the cases, including the right turn”, wherein **Mr. Stuebner** raised concern again about liability. Comments followed that the village attorney could research and offer a legal opinion on the matter. **Mr. Fera** would follow up with the village attorney on this matter. Dialog then followed regarding approximately five accidents occurring at or near the intersection within the past four years. **Police Sgt. Bormann** provided the physical details of those accidents with one actual accident associated with the Webster intersection.

Asked if there was a one-way southbound alternative, **Mr. Fera** said there was not but explained that part of the reason was that Alternate 2 allowed emergency vehicles from the fire station off of 55th to go north. It was noted in Alternative 5 that emergency vehicles would have access from 55th Street on a right turn but they would not have egress from Webster. Asked if there were sight distance issues coming off of 55th Street, i.e., eastbound, making a left onto Webster, **Mr. Fera** indicated there are no apparent sight issues. **Mr. Fera** reiterated the main issue between Main and Fairview was that the speed limit on 55th Street was 35 miles per hour and motorists were not expecting someone in front of them to turn onto the side streets.

Chairman Wendt opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Jim Cottrill, 5501 Washington, stated the residents have been trying for eight years to have what **Mr. Fera's** survey has determined, i.e., either to make a right turn only or dead-end the Washington Street crossing over. **Mr. Cottrill** stated he has had vehicles and motorcycles crash in his front yard, his fence replaced four times, and his parked car hit. He stated both the Webster/Main and Washington/Main intersections needed to be addressed simultaneously. He has previously sent photos of accidents to the village and will continue to do so. **Chairman Wendt** noted the village had information on the Washington/Main intersection.

Mr. Paul Simms, 5210 Blodgett, stated he looked at the entire area and asked why Webster was singled out, which he found out was the sight issues. He stated Fairmount, Benton, and Grand Streets also had sight issues and that, obviously, those streets with more volume had more accidents than Webster. As to cost-sharing, he understood that the neighborhood commission wanted to include everyone and not just those neighborhoods willing to come up with the money to close their streets off. He believed the matter had to deal with safety and not just paying for something. **Mr. Simms** cited other examples of signage that were not working.

Mr. Jason Hagen, 5417 Webster Street, questioned the accuracy of the accidents being reported at the village level and/or county level. He stated a resident, **Ellen Webb**, whom signed the petition, was hit turning left off of Webster onto 55th and he did not know if the accident was reported. Another accident on March 9th occurred and **Mr. Hagen** invited **Mr. Fera** to view the area of the accident. When he called the village and the county, there was no record of the accident. **Sgt. Bormann** recalled the accident, which was a 55th Street one-car accident. As to the cases in staff's report not meeting the sight distance requirements, **Mr. Hagen** inquired if there was a village regulation or precedent for this type of matter.

Chairman Wendt was not aware of any regulation except for the requirements in the MUTCD booklet. He empathized with **Mr. Hagen's** issues and stated the village was trying to address the situation and not purposely holding back information. **Chairman Wendt** also reminded **Mr. Hagen** that the village was a smaller town 45 years ago and vehicles were not driving as fast then.

Referring to the neighborhood traffic study, **Mr. Fera** explained that this being the first study undertaken, it encompassed a number of safety and operational parameters. This first

neighborhood was benefitting by receiving much more intense study that had not been done anywhere else in the village. He ascertained that when the Village completes studies in other neighborhoods, for certain other locations would also reveal substandard problems. Responding to **Mr. Hagen's** question, there was no specific industry guide to address the issue being raised. More details followed on how staff was trying to address the issue at hand given the resources it has.

Asked if sight lines were done for all streets in the study, Mr. Fera stated they were done by the consultant physically driving through the streets. Asked how Blodgett's sight lines were different than Webster's, **Mr. Fera** stated the village was aware of the sight distance issue with 55th Street between Main St and Washington Street previously, but there was little focus on Webster until the neighbors came forth.

Dialogue followed on how the initial neighborhood study began, the fact that the commission was learning about the issues as they were being raised, that this was the first of many studies, and that the County DOT had jurisdiction on some of the perimeter roadways. **Mr. Fera** reported the village was in discussions with the County DOT on this matter but also that the Village understood that if the proper process was followed and approved by the Village, then the County DOT was usually cooperative.

Asked what it would cost to complete the remaining intersections down 55th Street as a complete project, **Mr. Fera** responded that the Village would need to determine the exact scope of work to be done. He believed rolling all the intersections into one plan and presenting it to the County DOT made sense instead of doing each intersection individually. However, he cautioned that the County DOT may also have limited funding or have to do the project in phases due to budgets.

Chairman Wendt asked commissioners for a consensus on whether a recommendation for a study of the entrances to 55th Street from Fairview to Main Street be in order. Dialog followed by a commissioner that if the issue was sight distances from the side streets, would the County DOT consider making grade modifications at the 55th Street/Main intersection to increase the sight lines to the west. **Mr. Fera** could not confirm because he relayed the County DOT was just starting the Phase I study from Main to Fairview and he was not aware of what was included in the analysis.

Per a question, **Mr. Fera** was not aware if the Village of Westmont was experiencing the same issues. **Mr. Saricks** indicated he was struggling with the fact that residents on Webster (traffic volume of 150 vehicles) wanted to close their street, while other residents on Washington (traffic volume of 2300 vehicles) and Blodgett were asking how they were different than Webster. **Chairman Wendt** stated he was not in support of closing streets. **Mr. Fera** understood the dilemma, but explained Washington was a higher order collector street when compared to Webster Street. He also raised the point that other vehicles, such as postal, garbage, plows, etc., needed to use Webster Street and needed to be also considered.

A point was raised in dialog that if Webster was turned into a one-way street or if some other change occurred, an additional cost was incurred by the village for providing those services. How was that factored into a study and should it be factored into a study was raised.

Mr. Mike Ruta, 5405 Webster Street, thanked the commission and staff for their work and dialogue on this matter. He stated he saw two deficiencies with the study which may have been overlooked. While the vehicle volume was low, it was the speed of the cars turning off of 55th onto Webster (in either direction), especially when vehicles were trying to avoid the light. Mr. Ruta stated that fact was not discussed in case studies B1, B2, and B3. Also, while the

residents appreciated the discussion of the turns off of Webster onto 55th, **Mr. Ruta** argued that there was a sight issue from 55th heading east to turn onto northbound Webster and cars tended to speed up to cross the lanes to turn onto Webster, which was a local street and which was why he believed his street was different. He further commented on a neighbor who lived in the area for just under 50 years and whose late husband was hit by a car.

Chairman Wendt suggested not making any recommendation at this point since more work needed to be done as well as getting more questions answered. He thanked the residents for their input. **Mr. Fera** stated he would return after discussion with the County DOT on their plans but could not confirm a definite date. He agreed holding a public meeting in the Council Chambers worked best for the residents for the next meeting on this matter.

2. File #05-11. Traffic Calming - Cost Sharing Program for Village. **Chairman Wendt** thanked staff for providing a written report on this matter. **Mr. Fera** discussed a brief history of how this matter came about and described a possible village cost sharing program, as is done in other communities. He referenced the examples used in other communities, as they provided good questions for the Village to consider as it develops a cost-sharing program. Asked if there was a specific issue on 68th Street, **Mr. Fera** explained there was an issue on 68th Street from Fairmont to Fairview by the El Sierra Grade School, which was discussed at a neighborhood meeting, and not at the Commission level. **Mr. Fera** stated the issue was speeding on the street; 68th Street is similar to Claremont Drive in being a particularly wide street. Staff's intent was to narrow the street in specific locations and determine a smart design to keep traffic moving at a slower pace. However, village budget constraints became a factor which was when the residents suggested the idea of a cost sharing program. Estimates of the expected project cost were provided to the residents.

Discussing the Claremont Drive cost figures, **Mr. Fera** stated that staff's budgeted cost was \$94,000 (including drainage costs) but after some field adjustments, the actual cost was between \$65,000-\$68,000 for all material, labor, and construction costs. Similarities and differences between Claremont Drive and 68th Street were discussed.

Mr. Saricks suggested forwarding something to the Village Council since the village would continue to have funding issues and safety issues. If residents were willing to fund some of the projects, he felt the Village Council needed to convey to the commission some form of direction. **Mr. Stuebner**, however, believed not everyone along 68th Street would know what a Special Service Area (SSA) was or how it worked. He believed it needed to be explained to the residents in a neighborhood meeting, wherein **Mr. Fera** confirmed that would be the proper venue to start.

Conversation followed that certain aspects of the policy would need to be discussed by the Village Council versus the Traffic and Parking Commission, especially as it related to costs charged to the residents. **Chairman Wendt** favored putting a cost sharing package together for the residents, similar to staff's traffic calming package, thereby answering some of the typical questions raised by residents. It was suggested that a good starting point for staff would be the Prince Pond Special Service Area ("SSA"), since if offered different percentages presented in the plan based on the type of work and who was willing to pay for it. A variety of options were clearly spelled out in the plan. **Mr. Fera** concurred and believed the specifics would have to be clearly defined.

For his own clarification, **Mr. Fera** understood this matter would become two parts: 1) the village discussing and drafting a written policy and returning to present to the commission, and then 2) creating a Cost Sharing Procedural Packet for approval by the Village Council.

Ms. Van Anne disagreed with using an SSA for traffic calming purposes. Due to its nature and based on the Webster Street discussion, she believed the village was interfering with neighborhoods and the projects were more permanent. However, she was open to the discussion and seeing what would be proposed. As mentioned by **Chairman Wendt**, the budget was another consideration and the fact that the Commission did ask for direction from Public Works and the Village as to what the commission could present for residents who were frustrated with the wait being imposed for such projects. **Chairman Wendt** favored providing residents a “path” in which to get a project completed.

Mr. Schiller raised the question as to how other villages, such as the Village of Des Plaines, dealt with those residents who did not want to pay for the project and how was it enforced? **Chairman Wendt** acknowledged the concerns raised. **Mr. Fera**, however, explained, that in some communities there was the requirement of getting a higher percentage number of residents to get a project started, followed by a neighborhood process of meetings, presenting options, etc., and then needing even a higher percentage for final approval of the project. He envisioned a similar process for this Village. In response, **Mr. Stuebner**, raised concern that his neighbors could obligate him to pay for something that traditionally has been provided as part of his normal taxes in the village. He believed it was a philosophical issue. He also pointed out that a bond issue was very similar, except on a broader basis. Further dialog ensued on how the issue was raised and some of the challenges to the matter.

Mr. Fera reiterated that the traffic calming program was designed to be initiated by a neighborhood but that the village will continue to pursue the traffic calming interventions in the program, that will then be paid by the village. However, if the budget was not there, a waiting period would follow, and, if residents wanted to pay, then a mechanism would exist for those residents who wanted to pay.

Chairman Wendt opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Dave Wurster, 442 68th Street, reminded the commission to consider where the 68th Street residents started, noting that traffic speed was an issue for years. After widening the street, he said a traffic calming analysis by staff occurred in a meeting in 2009/2010. While he did not necessarily agree that cost sharing should be considered for traffic calming, he believed that when the analysis showed a speeding issue existed and 40 plus kids lived in a one-block area and a grade school existed, it became a safety issue. He cautioned that there have been close calls involving children due to vehicles speeding. He supported staff’s earlier mention of installing a “circle” as an option but did not know whether it was necessary or not. Functionally, he agreed with staff’s idea of installing speed bumps and appreciated **Mr. Fera** working with the residents and police in trying to find a resolution. **Mr. Wurster** commented on five accidents that occurred over the years. His suggestion to present the cost-sharing option was a “last ditch effort” because of staff’s budget constraints and limited police enforcement.

Mr. Wurster further discussed that if the matter came down to cost sharing, he and the residents would want to consider something to fund, but at a reasonable cost. He believed a \$60,000 project would be considered cost prohibitive. As to the above-mentioned concern about the percentage who do not want to fund a project, **Mr. Wurster** stated the question to ask was how many of those residents wanted traffic calming measures versus how many were willing to fund it because it could include surrounding streets. He understood not everyone could fund such a project and proceeded to explain how residents’ money could be set aside by a certain deadline, and if the funds were not met, they could be returned to the residents and the project would die. He agreed he would not want to be forced to pay for something he did not want or support. He believed that using asphalt was not a significant amount of money and was

cheaper than concrete. **Mr. Wurster** thanked the commission and **Sgt. Bormann** for their enforcement efforts.

Asked if there was any plan to use the speed humps for the neighborhood, Mr. Fera stated there was no plan. **Chairman Wendt** believed that installing the temporary speed humps would be a good way to see if the neighbors truly wanted them.

Mr. Mike Ruta, 5405 Webster Street, in speaking with his neighbors about an SSA, he believed the sentiment with residents on the SSA matter was that rarely was it seen that 50 percent of residents agreed on anything, as stated by **Mr. Schiller**. However, he believed if the issue came down to funding, the residents were willing to work with the Commission and the Village to move forward.

Chairman Wendt supported the good discussion and the comments made but wanted to forward something to the village council with staff drafting something and then returning to this commission. A general dialog followed.

Mr. Stuebner made a motion to recommend that staff draft and return to this commission a proposal to develop general steps to create a mechanism by which residents can participate in the funding for neighborhood traffic safety measures, seconded by Mr. Saricks. Roll call:

Aye: Chairman Wendt, Mr. Schiller, Mr. Stuebner, Mr. Saricks, Mr. Cronin, Ms. Van Anne, Mr. Clark

Nay: None

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0

Chairman Wendt suggested the commission revisit the 68th Street matter and that staff informally bring it before this commission, to which **Mr. Fera** was amenable. A question was raised if staff still had priority list of projects to address, to which **Mr. Fera** stated he did have the list. Staff was asked to forward that information to the commissioners.

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Fera stated that the new revenue units in the parking deck were functioning well. A few bugs in the system were quickly corrected by our Vendor. The pay by phone system was installed at Belmont Street and at Main Street and he was working with the parking oversight group to get the pay by phone system installed at Fairview Ave Metra Station, without the revenue units in place. The Village is looking at simplifying Level 5 of the Deck by expanding daily fee parking. The plan is to try and promote mid-day patrons to park at Fairview Avenue Metra station, where more parking spaces are available.

Updates followed regarding the downtown parking study, i.e., the consultant was selected and approved by Council. The kickoff meeting is approximately two weeks away. A complete cross-section of people will be questioned/interviewed for the study. **Mr. Fera** was asked to email the project scope document to the commissioners. He concurred.

On other matters, **Mr. Fera** reported the video traffic cameras at Main and Maple were replaced due to being obsolete. He hopes that next year there will be a connection made between Main and Maple to Fire Station No. 2, which will allow video coverage of the intersection. The Maple

BNSF Railroad alignment change will be starting soon, possibly in July. Also, at Main Street and 55th Street, the county will be installing additional signals to provide advanced eastbound left turns in the morning. **Mr. Fera** explained the changes and expected costs. At 2nd Street and Cumnor Street, a stormwater detention area is being installed due to area flooding, and will require a couple of buildings be demolished. **Mr. Fera** provided updates on the Belmont train station and Parking Lot H as it relates to temporary platforms and pedestrian flow in the area.

Mr. Stuebner stated he would like to see the impacts and performance of the neighborhood traffic study on the Commission agenda possibly in October/November of this year, with signage changes, and its impact on the neighborhood; Staff concurred.

COMMUNICATIONS

Regarding the letter to Illinois Department of Transportation's District 1 Engineer, Diane O'Keefe, **Mr. Fera** commented it was in the packet for reference purposes, and the intent is to re-authorize IDOT's Master Traffic Signals Agreement with the Village, which ends this June.

ADJOURN

MR. SCHILLER MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. MR. SARICKS SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

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

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
JULY 27, 2011 MINUTES

Call to Order

Chairman White called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

Roll Call

Present: Mr. Benes, Mr. Domijan, Ms. Earl, Mr. Isacson, Chairman White

Absent: Mr. Enochs, Ms. Majauskas

A quorum was established.

Staff: Stan Popovich, Jeff O'Brien

Also present:

Brad Gerace & Paul Gerace, Primo/J.W. Skutnik, Inc.,

780 W. Army Trail Road, Carol Stream, IL

Paul & Patti Henning, 5131 Belden Ave., Downers Grove, IL

Minutes of April 27, 2010

Mr. Benes moved to approve the minutes of the April 27, 2010 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting as presented. Mr. Domijan seconded the Motion.

AYES: Mr. Benes, Mr. Domijan, Mr. Isacson, Ms. Earl, Ch. White

NAYS: None

The Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting Procedures

Chairman White explained the function of the Zoning Board of Appeals, and reviewed the procedures to be followed during the public hearing, verifying with Staff that all proper notices have been published. He then called upon anyone intending to speak before the Board on the Agenda item to rise and be sworn in, as the public information portion of the meeting is an evidentiary hearing. Chairman White explained that there are seven members on the Zoning Board of Appeals, and for a requested variation to be approved there must be a majority of four votes in favor of approval. He added that the Zoning Board of Appeals has authority to grant petitions, without further recommendation to the Village Council.

.....

ZBA-02-11 A petition seeking a front yard setback variation for the property located on the east side of Belden Avenue approximately 160 feet north of Maple Avenue, commonly known as 5131 Belden Avenue, Downers Gove, IL 60515 (PIN 09-08-308-006). Brad Gerace, Primo/J.W. Skutnik Inc., Petitioner; Paul and Patti Henning, Owners.

Petitioner's presentation:

Mr. Brad Gerace of J.W. Skutnik, Inc., Carol Stream, Illinois stated that the Henning's came to his company when they purchased their home to consider a reconstruction of the existing screened-in porch that was in disrepair and not on a foundation. Mr. Gerace said they also noted that the front stoop was sagging significantly and would also be considered as part of the construction. He then displayed the design under consideration for the porch. Their goal was to provide continuity with the actual structure.

Mr. Gerace noted that under the Village's Zoning Ordinance, Section 28.1201 the petitioner may remove the existing screened porch structure, provide adequate support and rebuild it under the same guidelines. Their design for the porch addition meets the requirements. The front stoop and stairs may be removed and rebuilt according to the same Ordinance; however, they wanted continuity and are therefore seeking to extend the porch, which would require a setback variation.

Mr. Gerace used the design slides to show the existing structure and the proposed structure. Their intent is to extend the existing porch area to incorporate the front stoop, stairs and entrance to the home. The new porch will be an open porch, rather than screened in.

Mr. Benes asked what the reason for the petition was, and Mr. Gerace said they are requesting a front yard setback to allow for the extended stoop and staircase and reducing the front yard setback from 20 feet to 13.57 feet.

Ms. Earl asked if the screened in porch would be removed, or remain a screened in porch. Mr. Gerace replied that the new porch would be entirely open.

Chairman White asked whether the existing screen porch has HVAC and Mr. Gerace replied that it does not. The original owners built the porch. There is electrical on the exterior wall of the existing home, and there is heat as well. They will remove the electrical component from the screened area.

Ms. Earl inquired as to the age of the home. Mr. Gerace responded that it was originally built in 1910, and is currently owner-occupied.

There being no further questions and/or comments from the Board, Chairman White called upon Staff to make its presentation.

Staff's presentation:

Mr. Stan Popovich, Planner with the Village of Downers Grove, explained the petition before the Board, noting that the property is located in an R-4 Single Family Residential zoning district and is improved with an existing single-family home and a detached garage. The petitioner is seeking approval to remove the existing three-season porch and replace it with an open design porch that will extend to the north to incorporate the front steps and portico. The proposed 18-

foot northern extension of the front porch would replace the existing steps, stoop and portico, thereby increasing the non-conforming front yard setback. The Zoning Ordinance requires a 25-foot front building setback and a 20-foot open front porch setback. The Zoning Ordinance allows the replacement of the three-season porch in the same location; however, the proposed expansion of the porch would result in an expansion of an existing non-conformity, which is not allowed. The existing steps, stoop and portico could be replaced in the same location under the Ordinance.

Mr. Popovich stated that staff finds no unique circumstances, physical hardship or practical difficulty associated with the property that would warrant granting the requesting variation. The proposed porch represents a horizontal expansion of a legal nonconforming structure's footprint, which has not historically been permitted within the required setback. If the variation was approved by the Board, it could be construed as being applicable to all non-conforming structures in the Village that have no unique circumstance of physical hardship. Therefore, Staff recommends denial of the requested variation.

Mr. Popovich then reviewed the standards for granting variations, as shown on pages 3 and 4 of staff's report. Staff believes that standards 1-6, and standard 9 have not been met. Standards 6, 7 and 8 have been met. Mr. Popovich noted if the Board chooses to grant the requested variation that they include the condition shown on page 4 of staff's afore-mentioned report.

Mr. Domijan noted that the portico and front stoop could be replaced as is, and asked if the front stoop conforms to the new size for stoops. Mr. Popovich said it does conform. The Zoning Ordinance allows encroachment into required yards if the steps are no higher than four feet. Mr. Domijan asked if the existing portico was setback further from the front property line than the three-season room. Mr. Popovich referred to the plat which shows the portico is not as close to the front property line as the three-season room.

Ms. Earl said she measured the site and the three-season room and portico are about even and the portico does not extend out further than the three-season room.

There being no further questions of staff, Chairman White asked anyone who wished to speak either in favor of, or in opposition to the petition, to come forward. There were no responses.

Mr. Gerace then referred to the Zoning Ordinance 28.1201, Section 3 that states that a legal non-conforming structure may be reconstructed . . . as long as the existing non-conformity is not increased. He said the Hennings purchased the home for a decent yield. He added that when they met to discuss the construction, they considered the term "degree of non-conformity" to mean that it would not be closer to Belden Avenue. In their initial discussions during the purchasing stage, they discussed extending the porch straight out, and not closer to Belden Avenue.

Chairman White asked whether they have spoken with any of the neighbors regarding this proposed change.

Mr. Gerace responded that while working on the siding on the house, he did speak with

neighbors and they only asked whether it has been approved yet. The neighbors are aware of the proposed porch and the hearing before the Board.

Mr. Popovich said Staff received a few phone calls from neighbors in the condominiums across the street merely inquiring about the hearing. Staff received no complaints.

There being no further comments, Chairman White closed the opportunity for further public comment, and opened the discussion to the Board's deliberation.

Board Deliberation:

Chairman White asked the Board's preliminary thoughts on the petition.

Ms. Earl said this is a very old house, but the lot is situated strangely. She noted that the owners want to replace an existing closed-in area with a larger open area, and she thinks that is a good trade off. It is not a living space, but is an open space. She favors this request.

Mr. Isacson said this is an older house and the owners are seeking a way to preserve the house rather than remove it. He said that Mr. Gerace's final comment that they were looking to extend the porch, but not bring it further forward. Mr. Isacson said that is a good point. He added that he believes they are removing a portion that looks more like part of the house rather than a porch. If the intent of the Ordinance is to allow porches closer to the street, the proposal for extending the porch accomplishes that.

Mr. Domijan said he is struggling with this because the existing portico is the key. The addition was built some time ago and is non-conforming. They have an opportunity to go in the direction that the code specify, and if they reduce the width of the proposed porch from 5'-7" to 4', the porch is still functional. Fixing the façade is a great step for this property. With the decreased size, the whole thing would work. He would want to maintain the existing portico setback line.

Mr. Isacson questioned how the decrease would be comfortable. He did not think the Village would approve extension of the porch area. Rebuilding the portico and sun porch would have to be exactly on the same footing. Mr. Domijan responded that by backing the porch up, they would be moving closer to compliance.

Chairman White asked for clarification of the discussion, saying that the petitioner asked for a 13.57' setback. He asked Mr. Domijan what figure would he consider appropriate, and Mr. Domijan responded that if it was less than 5'-7" he could agree.

Mr. Benes said the three-season room was probably built before the Code was established and is legal non-conforming.

Mr. Domijan said they are only six feet short of the required 25'.

Mr. Benes said they are talking about several different things. The petitioner's solution is to request the 13.57' setback across the whole front of the building for uniformity, with no break.

He thinks Mr. Domijan is stating that should have a break along that front line.

Mr. Domijan responded that he was not saying they should have a break. He said that the façade with the change is an improvement for the property; however, he questions whether they have to expand or continue the legally non-conforming rating of the structure. They can get the same façade or any façade. He believes the existing portico line should have been considered as opposed to using the three-season room. He understands the motivation; however, they are looking toward expanding a legal non-conformity.

Mr. Benes said that this variation allows it to be conforming. Ms. Earl also said it would considerably open up the area.

Mr. Isacson said the proposal would open up the area of the existing three-season room, giving the appearance of openness to improve the appearance.

Mr. Domijan agreed; however, he said he did not think they must use the legal non-conforming footprint to its maximum encroachment to Belden Avenue. He doesn't dispute that this is an improvement.

Chairman White said he saw parallels with this and a house on Chicago that was approved for a breezeway through a variation. He noticed later that the whole house had been remodeled. This is a variation on the 20-foot porch setback, not the 25-foot house setback. He noted that the porch would be on a foundation. On the basic issue, he doesn't have a problem with this because they are trading "house area" for an open porch.

Mr. Domijan said that this property has the closest structure to Belden Avenue of any of the houses on the street.

Ms. Earl said that once the sun porch is removed, it will affect the square footage of the house, which adds up to dollars lost.

Mr. Domijan said the Board has the choice or option to look at alternatives to the requested variation.

Chairman White asked if the Board members felt they had an opportunity to express their feelings regarding this petition.

There being no further comment Chairman White called for a motion.

Mr. Benes moved that in case ZBA-02-11, 5131 Belden Avenue, the Zoning Board of Appeals grant the petition for a variation as requested, subject to the plans and drawings presented and the condition stated on page 4 of staff's report dated July 27, 2011. Ms. Earl seconded the Motion.

Chairman White clarified that this is an exception to the 20-foot open porch setback line, and not the 25-foot building setback line.

AYES: Mr. Benes, Ms. Earl, Mr. Isacson, Ch. White

NAYS: Mr. Domijan

The Motion to grant the petition carried 4:1.

.....

Mr. O'Brien said that the Village Council will continue its meetings on the Comprehensive Plan on August 16th.

Mr. O'Brien added that there is still one opening for the Illinois Planning Association training session in October, being held in Evanston. The deadline is Friday and the Village will assume the fee.

There being no further business, Chairman White adjourned the meeting by voice vote at 8:13 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Tonie Harrington
Recording Secretary