

**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE  
REPORT FOR THE VILLAGE COUNCIL MEETING  
JANUARY 19, 2010 AGENDA**

SUBJECT:	TYPE:	SUBMITTED BY:
Sidewalk Matrix Update 2010	Resolution Ordinance ✓ Motion Discussion Only	Naneil Newlon, P.E. Director of Public Works

**SYNOPSIS**

A motion is requested to approve the 2010 Sidewalk Matrix.

**STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT**

The Five Year Plan and Goals for 2008-2013 identified *Top Quality Village Infrastructure and Facilities*. A supporting objective of this goal is *Improve Neighborhood Infrastructure Curbs, Gutters, Streets, Sidewalks, Stormwater and Drainage System*.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The Community Investment Program (CIP) allocates a total of \$245,000 in FY10 for new sidewalks, \$205,000 for construction and \$40,000 for professional services. The Council will be asked to award a contract for this year's work by May of this year.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approval on the February 2, 2010 consent agenda.

**BACKGROUND**

The Village of Downers Grove has been a leader in its efforts to improve access and safety for pedestrians. Over 90% of all public streets in the Village currently have sidewalks on at least one side. The construction of new sidewalks has been systematically prioritized and programmed based upon the Sidewalk Matrix. The Matrix includes such factors as volume and speed of traffic, connectivity to other sidewalk, proximity to schools and other destinations and cost.

The Transportation and Parking Commission (TaP) is charged with receiving, investigating, evaluating and reporting to Council on matters relating to the transportation, including sidewalks. To these ends, TaP reviewed revisions to the Sidewalk Matrix at its March 11, 2009 meeting. At that meeting, TaP unanimously approved the proposed 2010 Matrix with one modification – moving Oak Hill to the Unique Projects list. The Unique Projects list is a component of the Sidewalk Matrix which includes streets in the Village where it is recognized that there will be significant challenges and costs associated with sidewalk construction. These challenges include such factors as slope, available right-of-way and significant tree loss. Streets from two areas in the Village are included on this list at the recommendation of TaP, Denburn Woods and Oak Hill.

Since the Long Range Financial Plan process was already under way at the time of TaP's consideration, it was decided to forward this item to Council for approval after the new five-year CIP was created. Staff adjusted the annual projects based upon the funds allocated in each year of the CIP. This adjustment did not change the ranking of any segments.

The proposed Sidewalk Matrix, as revised for 2010, shows all but one, non-unique segments to be completed by 2017. TaP was advised of these changes at its November 11, 2009 meeting and had no objections. The segments proposed for construction in 2010 are:

<b>JANET/NORTHCOTT SEELEY/40<sup>TH</sup></b>	from Lacey from 40 <sup>th</sup>	To Belle Aire To Herbert To S. of Virginia
<b>NORTHCOTT SEELEY MORTON PROSPECT</b>	from 40 <sup>th</sup> from S. of Virginia from Herbert from Lincoln	To Janet To 40th To Chicago

Staff has begun an improved public outreach initiative which included a presentation to residents who will be affected by the proposed construction at the November TaP meeting. With input received from the residents staff is preparing a preliminary design and is planning to meet again with them in February.

In addition to the sidewalks planned to be constructed in 2010 from the Sidewalk Matrix, there is also \$1,474,000 included in the CIP for the Ogden Avenue Sidewalk Project. Staff will be working with the Illinois Department of Transportation on land acquisition along Ogden Avenue to allow for the construction of missing sidewalk through this corridor.

*The following information has been included in response to a Council request to address issues of walkability and safety related to sidewalks.*

There has been a growing consensus among the designers and users of transportation systems, from the federal to the local level that these systems need to be designed for all users. On February 24, 1999, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Administrator Kenneth R. Wykle, in a memorandum to FHWA field offices, stated, "We expect every transportation agency to make accommodations for bicycling and walking a routine part of their planning, design, construction, operations, and maintenance activities." Again, on February 28, 2000, Administrator Wykle sent a memorandum to the field offices in transmitting the new Design Guidance language called for in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21). The guidance, entitled "Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel: A Recommended Approach – A U.S. DOT Policy Statement on Integrating Bicycling and Walking Into Transportation Infrastructure," states that bicycling and walking facilities will be incorporated into all transportation projects unless "exceptional circumstances" exist.

Pedestrian infrastructure is important for several reasons. Studies have shown that the presence of sidewalks and other pedestrian improvements increase the amount of walking. Walking contributes to physical activity, reduces pollution, is an economical means of transportation, and has been shown to increase the "eyes and ears" in neighborhoods and contribute to a greater sense of security. Studies have also shown that the presence of sidewalks increases the safety of pedestrians. A limited number of studies have investigated roadway factors associated with "walking along roadway" pedestrian/motor vehicle crashes. In a 1996 study involving an analysis of pedestrian/motor vehicle crashes and exposure under various roadway situations, locations with no sidewalks were more than twice as likely to have pedestrian/motor vehicle crashes than sites where sidewalks existed. The presence of a sidewalk was found to have a particularly large safety benefit in residential and mixed residential areas.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Proposed 2010 Sidewalk Matrix  
TaP Minutes 3/11/09

**2010 PROPOSED SIDEWALK PRIORITY EVALUATION MATRIX**  
**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE**

**DRAFT - REVISED 11/20/09**

Sorted by SCORE and then GRADE SCHOOL FACTOR

PROJECT RANK 2008	NEW RANK 2010	LOCATION			Total Score	Major Factors								Minor Factors			Project Information					ESTIMATED COST	AMOUNT BUDGETED for CONSTRUCTION	SURPLUS (DEFICIT)			
		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 Factor	Length ( feet )	Est. Cost Per Foot	Total Est. Cost	Survey Work Complete				Sub water shed	SWS priority	
																											Length ( feet )
18	2010 CONSTRUCTION	1	JANET/NORTHCOTT	Lacey	Bell Aire	34	2	24	0	10	6	5	29	06/06/01	3	4	0	4	1,800	\$ 47	\$84,600	Yes	LA-C	MEDIUM	\$ 259,440	205,000	\$54,440
19		2	SEELEY/40TH	40th	Herbert	32	0	24	0	10	10	5	28	10/20/05	3	2	0	2	960	\$ 47	\$45,120	Yes	LA-C	MEDIUM			
20		3	NORTHCOTT	40th	S. of Virginia	32	0	22	-2	10	8	5	31	07/26/06	4	3	0	2	440	\$ 47	\$20,680	Yes	LA-C	MEDIUM			
21		4	SEELEY	S. of Virginia	Janet	32	0	20	-4	10	8	5	26	07/26/06	2	3	0	4	920	\$ 47	\$43,240	Yes	LA-C	LOW			
27		5	MORTON	Herbert	40th	30	0	24	0	10	8	5	28	06/18/01	3	2	0	2	800	\$ 47	\$37,600	Yes	LA-C	MEDIUM			
28		6	PROSPECT	Lincoln	Chicago	30	0	18	-6	10	4	10	23	07/18/01	1	1	0	4	600	\$ 47	\$28,200	Yes	SJN-E	HIGH			
29	2011 CONSTRUCTION	7	WEBSTER	59th	S. Limit	39	2	20	-4	10	10	5	34	10/26/07	6	2	0	4	340	\$ 49	\$16,660	Yes	SJS-C	MEDIUM	\$229,810	\$240,000	-\$10,190
30		8	CLYDE/WASHINGTON/60th	Main	60th Pl.	34	0	21.5	-2.5	10	10	5	29	06/11/01	3	2	0	4	2,370	\$ 49	\$116,130	Yes	SJS-C	MEDIUM			
31		9	WEBSTER PL.	59th	Washington	31	0	20	-4	10	10	5	15	06/12/01	0	2	0	4	540	\$ 49	\$26,460	Yes	SJS-C	MEDIUM			
32		10	60TH PL.	Main	Clyde	30	0	20	-4	10	8	5	22	10/26/05	1	2	0	4	580	\$ 49	\$28,420	Yes	SJS-C	MEDIUM			
33		11	59TH PL.	Webster	Webster Pl.	30	0	21.5	-2.5	10	8	5	24	10/26/05	1	2	0	4	260	\$ 49	\$12,740	Yes	SJS-C	MEDIUM			
36		12	62ND	Janes	Chase	29	0	17	-7	10	4	10	24.5	08/05/99	1	4	0	0	600	\$ 49	\$29,400	No	PR-F	HIGH			
37	2012 CONSTRUCTION	13	STERLING	Chicago	Davis	29	0	14	-10	10	4	10	24	06/26/01	1	0	0	4	1,540	\$ 50	\$77,000	No	SJN-E	HIGH	\$290,500	\$275,000	\$15,500
34		14	61ST	Osage	Grand	29	0	33	9	1	10	10	27.9	est.	2	2	0	4	400	\$ 50	\$20,000	No	SJS-F	LOW			
35		15	LEONARD	Hobson	63rd	29	2	21	-3	10	4	5	33.51	08/04/99	4	4	0	0	1,900	\$ 50	\$95,000	No	PR-F	HIGH			
38		16	LEE	Ogden	N. of Virginia	29	2	20	-4	10	4	5	32	08/15/00	4	0	0	4	1,500	\$ 50	\$75,000	Yes	LA-B	LOW			
39		17	GRANT	Lee	W.Limit	29	0	18	-6	10	8	5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4	470	\$ 50	\$23,500	No	LA-B	MEDIUM			
41	2013 CONSTRUCTION	18	40TH	W. of Morton	Seeley	28	0	21	-3	10	8	5	23	05/22/01	1	2	0	2	795	\$ 51	\$40,545	Yes	LA-C	LOW	\$266,985	\$275,000	-\$8,015
42		19	MEADOWLAWN	Main	Washington	28	0	20	-4	10	4	5	20	est.	1	4	0	4	860	\$ 51	\$43,860	Yes	PR-C	MEDIUM			
43		20	ELM	Rogers	Warren	28	0	26	2	8	2	10	22.8	06/16/97	1	3	0	4	240	\$ 51	\$12,240	No	SJN-E	HIGH			
47		21	62ND PLACE	Brookbank	Carpenter	27	0	29	5	3	4	10	26.32	08/04/97	2	4	0	4	620	\$ 51	\$31,620	Yes	PR-C	MEDIUM			
44		22	ELDON	Bunning	59th	27	0	20	-4	6	10	5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4	590	\$ 51	\$30,090	No	SJS-F	LOW			
45		23	60TH PL.	Clyde	E. Limit	27	0	20	-4	10	6	5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4	190	\$ 51	\$9,690	Yes	PR-C	MEDIUM			
46		24	MIDDAUGH	60th	62nd	27	0	20	-4	10	4	5	32	9/25/2001	4	0	0	4	400	\$ 51	\$20,400	Yes	SJS-A	MEDIUM			
49		25	BUNNING	Eldon	Fairview	25	0	27	3	6	8	5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4	1,360	\$ 51	\$69,360	No	SJS-F	LOW			
51		26	62ND	Fairview	W.Limit	25	0	20	-4	10	4	5	< 20	est.	0	4	0	2	180	\$ 51	\$9,180	Yes	SJS-K	LOW			
50	2014 CONSTRUCTION	27	61ST	Belmont	W. of Leonard	25	0	17	-7	10	4	5	33.1	05/24/00	4	2	0	0	750	\$ 52	\$39,000	No	PR-F	HIGH	\$318,240	\$310,000	\$8,240
52		28	CAROL	Lacey	Northcott	24	0	22	-2	10	6	0	29	06/06/01	3	3	0	2	670	\$ 52	\$34,840	No	LA-B	LOW			
53		29	DOWNERS DR.	Brook	Butterfield	24	10	53	5	3	0	5	< 20	est.	0	4	0	2	780	\$ 52	\$40,560	No	LA-I	LOW			
54		30	BROOK	Finley	E. Limits	24	6	34	10	1	0	5	38.8	02/25/99	8	4	0	0	2,380	\$ 52	\$123,760	No	LA-I	LOW			
55		31	VIRGINIA	Lacey	Northcott	23	0	20	-4	10	6	0	24	06/06/01	1	2	0	4	1,040	\$ 52	\$54,080	No	LA-B	LOW			
56		32	PRAIRIE	Florence	W.Limit	22	0	12	-12	10	8	0	< 20	est.	0	0	0	4	200	\$ 52	\$10,400	No	SJN-F	MEDIUM			
59		33	WALL PL.	59th	N.Limit	20	0	25	1	9	10	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4	300	\$ 52	\$15,600	No	SJS-F	LOW			

**2010 PROPOSED SIDEWALK PRIORITY EVALUATION MATRIX**  
**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE**

**DRAFT - REVISED 11/20/09**

Sorted by SCORE and then GRADE SCHOOL FACTOR

PROJECT RANK 2008	NEW RANK 2010	LOCATION			Total Score	Major Factors								Minor Factors			Project Information				Sub water shed	SWS priority					
		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 Factor	Length ( feet )	Est. Cost Per Foot	Total Est. Cost						Survey Work Complete	
																											Length ( feet )
62	2015 CONSTRUCTION	34	MIDDAUGH	Ogden	S.Limit	19	0	26	2	8	10	-5	< 20	est.	0	4	0	2	260	\$ 53	\$13,780	Yes	SJN-D	LOW			
57		35	HERBERT	Main St.	W. of Forest	21	0	28	4	6	6	5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	2	600	\$ 53	\$31,800	No	LA-D	HIGH			
58		36	60TH PLACE	Brookbank	E. of Carpenter	21	0	28	4	6	4	5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4	590	\$ 53	\$31,270	No	SJS-A	MEDIUM			
60		37	STATTON	Grant	Lincoln	20	0	28	4	6	4	5	24	07/18/01	1	2	0	2	600	\$ 53	\$31,800	No	SJN-E	HIGH			
61		38	KATRINE	Wisconsin	Curtis	20	6	30	6	3	2	5	33	07/25/01	4	0	0	0	1,000	\$ 53	\$53,000	No	SJN-G	LOW			
63		39	40TH	Washington	W.Limit	19	0	18	-6	10	8	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4	280	\$ 53	\$14,840	No	LA-E	HIGH			
64		40	62ND	Grand	W.Limit	19	0	14	-10	10	8	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4	160	\$ 53	\$8,480	Yes	SJS-K	LOW			
65		41	GLEN AVE.	Lee	E.Limit	19	0	20	-4	10	6	-5	< 20	est.	0	4	0	4	200	\$ 53	\$10,600	No	SJN-B	MEDIUM			
66		42	OTIS	Cumnor	W.Limit	17	0	20	-4	10	8	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	2	240	\$ 53	\$12,720	No	SJN-F	MEDIUM			
67		43	67TH CT.	Fairview	W.Limit	17	0	24	0	10	8	-5	< 20	est.	0	0	0	4	1,180	\$ 53	\$62,540	No	SJS-L	LOW			
68		44	60TH	Fairview	E.Limit	17	4	20	-4	10	6	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	0	240	\$ 53	\$12,720	No	SJS-K	LOW			
70		45	DAWN PL.	Stanley	E.Limit	17	0	20	-4	10	4	-5	< 20	est.	0	4	0	4	260	\$ 53	\$13,780	No	SJN-E	HIGH			
71		46	60TH	Puffer	Belmont	17	0	19	-5	10	2	5	19.5	08/05/99	0	0	0	0	260	\$ 53	\$13,780	No	PR-F	HIGH			
72		47	FLORENCE	Ogden	N.Limit	17	2	25	1	10	2	-5	< 20	est.	0	4	0	4	360	\$ 53	\$19,080	No	SJS-F	LOW	\$ 330,190	\$345,000	-\$14,810
69	2016 CONSTRUCTION	48	AUBREY	Maple	S. Limit	17	2	20	-4	10	6	-5	< 20	est.	0	0	0	4	1,440	\$ 54	\$77,760	No	?	MEDIUM			
73		49	WISCONSIN	Belmont	E.Limit	15	0	19	-5	10	6	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	2	740	\$ 54	\$39,960	No	SJN-G	LOW			
74		50	ROSS CT.	Carpenter	W.Limit	15	0	20	-4	10	4	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4	220	\$ 54	\$11,880	No	SJN-I	MEDIUM			
75		51	35TH	Pomeroy	W.Limit	14	0	18	-6	10	2	-5	29.9	04/08/99	3	0	2	2	320	\$ 54	\$17,280	No	LA-F	MEDIUM			
76		52	60TH	Brookbank	E.Limit	13	0	28	4	6	6	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4	570	\$ 54	\$30,780	No	SJS-A	MEDIUM			
77		53	PROSPECT	Sherman	S. Limit	13	0	18	-6	10	4	-5	< 20	est.	0	0	0	4	300	\$ 54	\$16,200	No	SJN-E	HIGH			
78		54	62ND CT.	Carpenter	E.Limit	12	0	28	4	6	4	-5	< 20	est.	0	3	0	4	200	\$ 54	\$10,800	No	PR-C	MEDIUM			
79		55	INVERNESS	Lomond	Janes	11	0	15	-9	10	2	-5	33.7	09/24/97	4	0	0	0	1,260	\$ 54	\$68,040	No	SJN-G	LOW			
80		56	JANES	Inverness	Wisconsin	9	2	30	6	3	4	0	< 20	est.	0	0	0	0	660	\$ 54	\$35,640	No	SJN-G	LOW			
82		57	KATRINE	Wisconsin	S.Limit	7	2	30	6	3	2	0	< 20	est.	0	0	0	0	360	\$ 54	\$19,440	No	SJN-G	LOW			
83	58	FOSTER PL	Valleyview	N.Limit	6	0	25	1	3	2	-5	< 20	est.	0	2	0	4	140	\$ 54	\$7,560	No	PR-A	MEDIUM				
84	59	WATERFALL PL	Valleyview	N.Limit	5	0	30	6	3	2	-5	< 20	est.	0	1	0	4	300	\$ 54	\$16,200	No	PR-A	MEDIUM	\$351,540	\$345,000	\$6,540	
81	2017	60	CENTRE CIRCLE	Brook	Brook	11	6	34	10	1	0	0	27.5	02/25/99	2	2	0	0	3,400	\$ 55	\$187,000	No	LA-I	LOW	\$ 187,000	\$345,000	-\$158,000
																	43,515	\$ 2,233,705	\$ 2,233,705	\$ 1,650,000	\$ 45,165						

Approved April 8, 2009

**TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING COMMISSION**

Minutes

March 11, 2009, 7:00 p.m.

Downers Grove Public Works Facility  
5101 Walnut Avenue, Downers Grove

Co-Chairman Wendt called the March 11, 2009 meeting of the Transportation and Parking Commission to order at 7:05 p.m. Roll call followed and a quorum was established.

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Co-Chairmen Gress and Wendt; Members Schiller, Stuebner, Saricks, Cronin, Van Anne, Barry

Staff Present: Village Engineer, Mike Millette; Transportation Division Manager Dorin Fera; Police Officer Sembach; Recording Secretary Megan Dugard

Visitors: Mr. Clarence Rak, 823 Claremont Dr.; Ms. Sandy Lietka, 755 Claremont Dr.; Ms. Judy and Mr. Harold Witkov, 718 Claremont Dr.; Mr. John Wray, 916 Claremont Dr.; Mr. Larry Ferries, 6954 Meadowcrest Dr.; Mr. Steve Dubman, 759 Ridgecrest; Mr. Bob Claes, 814 Claremont Dr.; Mr. John Kaderabek, 601 Claremont Dr.; Mr. Jim Wilson, 520 Claremont Dr.; Mr. John Kammerer, 7016 Blackburn Ave.; Mr. Bill Wrobel, 7800 Queens Ct.; Mr. Bart Davis, 507 Claremont Dr.; Mr. Don and Ms. Dianne Apel, 800 Claremont Dr.; Ms. Andrea Feldman, 1120 Oak Hill Road; Mr. Kris Shields, 1100 Oak Hill Rd.; Mr. C Reising, 612 Claremont Rd.; Mr. Charles Ivers, 7113 Osage; Ms. Lisa and Mr. Todd Woodman, 500 Claremont Dr.; Mr. Paul Jarose, 831 Claremont Dr.; Mr. Bob Schmid, 7109 Lyman; Mr. Andrew Cotter, 761 Ridgeview; Mr. Paul Salce, 1140 Oakhill Road; Ms. Deb Schuntzler, 431 Valley View Dr.; Mr. Ron Rodi, 425 Valley View Dr.; Ms. Nancy McGregor, 7204 Grand Ave.; Ms. Michele and Mr. Dennis York, 418 Claremont Dr.; Mr. Dave Fisher, 815 Claremont Dr.

Co-Chairman Wendt informed the commissioners and the public the meeting was being recorded on Village-owned equipment to aid in the preparation of the meeting minutes.

**APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 10, 2008 TRANSPORTATION & PARKING MINUTES**

**MR. SCHILLER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 10, 2008. MR. STUEBNER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE COMMISSIONERS APPROVED THE MINUTES.**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS - None**

**File #01-09 Sidewalk Matrix Update** – Village Engineer, Mr. Mike Millette referenced the updated Sidewalk Matrix in front of the commissioners. Staff was requesting approval of the last two years of the matrix, recalling for the co-chairmen that the approval of the Sidewalk Matrix traditionally occurred in March or April and that this commission had not yet been established last year to approve the matrix. Because Year 5 of the matrix did not occur last year, it was now reflected as Year 4. However, a Year 5 element of the matrix was created. Mr. Millette reviewed the history of the matrix and explained how the projects moved within the matrix. The matrix will be adjusted for the budget and conform to the Five-Year Community Investment Program. To date, Mr. Millette explained that the village was at about the 2012 construction season and the department would be heading into the 2013 season with no projected budget currently existing. He sees a larger part of the project list going into the 2013 budget plan with the remainder to be completed in 2014, given current funding levels.

Transportation Manager Mr. Fera explained some of the major and minor factors affecting the various sidewalk projects, noting the larger projects had a larger impact on the safety, communication, and coordination between other agencies. In addition, Mr. Millette explained how ranking and relative of importance played into the matrix as well a "uniqueness" category.

Mr. Saricks raised concern about how the matrix will play into the budgetary decisions and asked if the sidewalk program could be delayed to future years when the village's budget situation improved. Mr. Millette confirmed there were no regulations stating the village had to move forward on the sidewalk program but he did note that most of the commitments for the 2009 budget were made. Any shortfalls identified in the capital fund could be made up by deferring various projects. Mr. Millette explained that he believed the charge of this commission was to recommend the matrix based on the merit of the projects and not on the budget.

Co-Chairman Gress believed the recommendation could be made subject to the village council reviewing the matrix as a way to give back \$438,000 to the capital budget, if necessary. Mr. Millette believed the village council was aware of that. Other comments were raised that the commission wanted the matrix to be considered by the village council but let them know that this commission was amenable to deferring projects. As to the money spent to-date for this year's projects, Mr. Millette said a small amount of the work was already completed but would have to be redone for next spring. An explanation followed.

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

Mr. Paul Salce, 1140 Oak Hill Road, started the petition for the Johnson Woods Subdivision and conveyed that he had 31 out of 33 resident signatures against the sidewalks in the neighborhood and the village could save money by not installing the sidewalks. He requested that the Village Council, on behalf of the Johnson Woods homeowners, make a motion to place the subdivision at the bottom of the list. Mr. Salce encouraged the commissioners to visit the Johnson Woods Subdivision to get a view of its topography.

Ms. Chris Shields, 1100 Oak Hill Road, inquired whether this commission had the final say in the matter, wherein Co-Chairman Gress explained that the commission was a recommending body to the Village Council.

Co-Chairman Gress believed it was prudent for the Village Council to rank those projects where residents wanted sidewalks and then work the list down to those who did not. He reiterated the importance of the village budget being reviewed more regularly, given the state of the economy, and for this commission to listen to the community and convey it to the council.

**MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION TO CONDITIONALLY APPROVE THE SIDEWALK MATRIX WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS: THAT IF THE COUNCIL, DUE TO THE STATE OF THE BUDGET, IS CONSIDERING AREAS FOR EITHER DEFERRAL OR DELAY, THIS COMMISSION IS NOT OBJECTING TO INCLUDING THE SIDEWALK PROGRAM AS PART OF THAT CONSIDERATION, BUT THAT THIS COMMISSION IS MAKING THE SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION THAT THE PROJECT SLATED FOR THE 2012 CONSTRUCTION (PROJECT 48 - OAK HILL ROAD FROM SARATOGA TO HIGHLAND) BE MOVED DOWN IN PRIORITY TO THE BOTTOM OF THE LIST.**

**SECONDED BY MR. SCHILLER. ROLL CALL:**

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

**NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 8-0**

**File #02-09 Claremont Drive - Main St. to Fairview Ave., Permanent Traffic Calming Designs** - Mr. Millette provided a recommendation for permanent traffic calming along Claremont between Main and Fairview. After the installation of the temporary speed humps, various traffic counts, and neighborhood feedback, he stated staff made a determination to use a combination of speed humps, island medians, and bulb-outs. Mr. Millette walked the commissioners through the proposed traffic calming devices, starting at the west end of the project, noting that the resident comments were considered and steps were taken so as not to divert traffic onto adjacent roadway networks.

Mr. Millette indicated that staff would prepare construction plans for bidding this year with the project estimated to cost about \$60,000. A complete resurfacing would take place in 2010 and all bulb-outs created would be filled with top soil and sod. Some minor drainage work would also take place. Per the village forester's recommendation, small dwarf-type trees can be planted in the barrier medians on either side of Osage. As to the area of Fairmont and Lyman, Mr. Millette noted that it was an area where the speed reduction was the least as compared to previously. Yield signs were being considered at the north and south legs of the project.

Police enforcement statistics were confirmed for 2008.

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

Mr. Bob Claes, 814 Claremont, pointed out his home and discussed the challenges of pulling out of his driveway and wanted to know the control of westbound traffic on Claremont once the bulb-out was to be installed. He voiced his reservations about the installation and measurements of the street.

Mr. Don Apel, 800 Claremont Drive, was initially opposed to the proposal, but after reviewing the information before him, he supported the proposal.

Mr. Charles Ivers, 7113 Osage, asked if staff considered adding additional stop signs at Lyman and along Claremont at various intersections. He also asked about making turns around median barriers.

Ms. Diana Pell, 800 Claremont Drive, asked if the same proposal was done anywhere else in Downers Grove, which the chair indicated not to such extent. She shared concerns about motorists passing her on the right and continuing to do so after the installation of the calming devices. She asked if there was ever future potential for a stop sign at Claremont and Fairview or a stop light and Main and Claremont.

Mr. David Fisher, 850 Claremont Drive, supported staff's proposal and asked when construction would begin. Mr. Millette estimated bids going out possibly in May 2009.

Mr. Charles Iris, 1306 \_\_\_\_\_, asked if Claremont would be resurfaced.

Mr. Bart Davis, 507 Claremont, inquired about the height of the curb build-out and was concerned about drainage. Mr. Millette responded that the storm sewer in that area would be extended and an inlet would be added to the west side to address the drainage of water.

Ms. Nancy McGregor, 7204 Grand Avenue, believe the village was setting itself up for car repairs, since she witnessed cars bottoming out. She did not favor the dwarf trees. She also questioned how many of the tickets were issued on Claremont when the speed humps were installed.

Ms. Lisa Woodman, 500 Claremont Drive thanked staff for the proposed plan.

Mr. Clarence Rak, 823 Claremont Drive, has not seen any increase in speeding since the time he moved into his home 15 years ago. He was concerned about safety around the S-curve. He did not support the proposal.

Michele York, 418 Claremont Drive, supported the proposal and commended staff.

Mr. John Wray, 916 Claremont, appreciated staff's work in coming up with an action plan and supported it.

Mr. Jim Wilson, 520 Claremont, also supported the proposal.

Mr. John Kaderabek, 601 Claremont Drive, believed the speed humps would help. He noted that cars would not be able to park by him due to the roadway be constrained. He supported the plan.

A resident inquired if reflectors could be placed in the middle of the street delineating the lines or have reflectors added to the curbs.

Mr. Millette explained staff would evaluate the area based on ambient light.

Mr. Ron Rodi, 425 Valley View Drive, asked if the project was budgeted, to which the Co-Chairman Gress confirmed in the positive but explained the Village Council would determine the final answer. He encouraged the residents to attend the Village Council meeting on this matter.

A resident asked if a calming measure could be added at Claremont and Main, similar to the other one at Fairview. Mr. Millette stated the issue was looked at but possibly a rumble median could be added at a cost of about \$2000.

Mr. John Wray, 916 Claremont, stated there was a downgrade in that area and many people may end up on the median at that intersection. Discussion followed that it may not be feasible based on what was being discussed. Co-Chairman Wendt suggested the consideration be addressed in a motion.

**MR. STUEBNER MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND THAT THE PERMANENT TRAFFIC CALMING DESIGNS, AS PRESENTED, WITH THE MODIFICATION OF POSSIBLE RUMBLE STRIP AT THE INTERSECTION CLAREMONT AND MAIN STREETS BE CONSIDERED.**

**MR. SCHILLER SECONDED THE MOTION .**

**ROLL CALL:**

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

**NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 8-0**



**File #03-09 Parking Deck - Designation of “Compact Cars Only” Spaces** - Mr. Fera reviewed the various monitoring that took place at the deck since its opening. Over time, he explained that many of the larger vehicles have been parking at the end of the aisle which causes safety concerns for corners and turn areas. Approximately thirty-two (32) spaces are under consideration. Staff is recommending that those end stalls be converted to spaces for small compact cars but also be enforced by the village police. Per Mr. Fera, the signage has already been created. He reviewed how the stalls would exactly be painted to fit a car bumper to bumper. Mr. Saricks commented that the County building in Wheaton had similar stalls in its parking garage. Discussion followed that some form of entrance signage should be put in place to warn motorists. Mr. Fera concurred also stated promotional steps could be taken to communicate same to the community.

A dialog followed on whether there was a flaw in the original design of the parking deck to which staff could not answer but stated, at the time, the parking deck did meet current requirements. Discussion also was raised to have signage for motorists to have their vehicle fit in the box versus compact cars. Wherein Mr. Fera stated the definition would be for a “compact car” and vans would probably be excluded because of their size.

Co-Chairman Gress suggested that if this proposal were to go through, that an initial grace period be given to motorists, wherein Sgt. Sembach mentioned warnings would be issued for the first month. Co-chairman Gress also suggested placing signage on the pay boxes discussing compact cars.

**MR. SARICKS MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE DISPOSITION OF COMPACT CAR SPACES IN THE DOWNTOWN PARKING DECK.**

**SECONDED BY MR. SCHILLER.**

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

**NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 8-0**

### **OLD BUSINESS**

Mr. Millette said he received the authorization for the stop signs at Indianapolis and Cumnor. Details followed on the staff’s evaluation of the area. The commissioners thanked and appreciated staff’s efforts regarding the above traffic calming petition. Mr. Fera emphasized that the permanent calming devices as proposed on Claremont Drive were new to the village and, if successful, could be used village-wide.

Mr. Stuebner inquired about a report that Mr. Millette was going to provide regarding the Village Council’s latest recommendations. Mr. Millette reported that the Village Council approved this commission’s recommendations for Cumnor, Roslyn, and Florence and some follow-ups were made. As to having residential parking permits, staff did discuss the matter with the Community Development Director who thought the issue would best be discussed under the TCD-3 process. As to staff corresponding with the resident on Florence who was insulted by Luxury Motors car porters, Mr. Millette directed her to discuss the issues with the Village Manager. Mr. Millette also commented there were some other outstanding issues that remained with Luxury Motors.

**COMMUNICATIONS** - See staff's attachment from packet

**ADJOURN**

**MR. SCHILLER MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. MR. STUEBNER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:48 P.M.**

Respectfully submitted,

Celeste Weilandt,  
Recording Secretary  
(as transcribed by tape)