Responses to Village Council Questions
June 3, 2025

Active Agenda: **MOT 2025-10783** A. Motion: Approve a Contract with Chicagoland Paving of Lake Zurich, IL for the Jefferson Avenue Reconstruction/Thornwood Intersection Improvements Project

1. *Please provide a copy of the pertinent portions of the AASHTO Guide to Bicycle Facilities.*

   The Active Transportation Plan was developed under the fourth edition of the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities. The staff report was based on section 5.2.2 (Shared Use Paths Adjacent to Roadways (Sidepaths)). This section covers multiple topics summarized in the staff report, such as potential conflicts, that sidepaths should not be considered a substitute for on-road accommodations for bicycles, as well as that children often prefer/are encouraged to use sidepaths when available due to separation from motor vehicles. Section 5.2.2 is attached below.

First Reading: **RES 2025-10788** A. Resolution: Accept the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report of the Village of Downers Grove for the Fiscal Year January 1, 2024 Through December 31, 2024

1. *Please provide additional information on a $745,000 grant and a $150,000 grant that were received in 2023 and not received in 2024.*

   The $745,000 grant amount was made up of the following grants:

   - $345,000 was the remainder of the State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (SLFRF) / American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) received from the Federal Government for COVID relief.
   - $400,000 was from the Department of Commerce & Economic Opportunity (DECO). These were appropriation grants from the Illinois General Assembly that reimbursed the Village for 2 different projects, the Forest Lot North reconstruction and the Downtown Business District crosswalks. Each grant was $200,000.

   The $150,000 grant was another DCEO appropriation grant through the Illinois General Assembly. It reimbursed the Village for the Sherwood Avenue Flood Mitigation project, paid for out of the Stormwater Fund.

   These grants were received in 2023 and not in 2024 because they were not competitive grants, meaning the Village did not apply for them. The various agencies appropriated the funds to the Village.

Attachments

- Section 5.2.2 of the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities

5.2.2 Shared Use Paths Adjacent to Roadways (Sidepaths)

While it is generally preferable to select path alignments in independent rights-of-way, there are situations where existing roads provide the only corridors available. Sidepaths are a specific type of shared use path that run adjacent to the roadway, where right-of-way and other physical constraints dictate. Children often prefer and/or are encouraged to ride on sidepaths because they provide an element of separation from motor vehicles. As stated in Chapter 2, provision of a pathway adjacent to the road is not a substitute for the provision of on-road accommodation such as paved shoulders or bike lanes, but may be considered in some locations in addition to on-road bicycle facilities. A sidepath should satisfy the same design criteria as shared use paths in independent rights-of-way.

The discussion in this section refers to two-way sidepaths. Additional design considerations for sidepaths are provided in Section 5.3.4. Utilizing or providing a sidewalk as a shared use path is undesirable. Section 3.4.2 highlights the reasons sidewalks generally are not acceptable for bicycling. It is especially inappropriate to sign a sidewalk as a shared use path if doing so would prohibit bicyclists from using an alternate facility that might better serve their needs. In general, the guiding principle for designing sidewalks should be that sidewalks intended for use by bicyclists should be designed as sidepaths, and sidewalks not intended for use by bicyclists should be designed according to the AASHTO *Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities* (*2*).

Paths can function along highways for short sections, or for longer sections where there are few street and/or driveway crossings, given appropriate separation between facilities and attention to reducing crashes at junctions. However before committing to this option for longer distances on urban and suburban streets with many driveways and street crossings, practitioners should be aware that two-way sidepaths can create operational concerns. See Figure 5-4 for examples of potential conflicts associated with sidepaths. These conflicts include:

1. At intersections and driveways, motorists entering or crossing the roadway often will not notice bicyclists approaching from their right, as they do not expect wheeled traffic from this direction. Motorists turning from the roadway onto the cross street may likewise fail to notice bicyclists traveling the opposite direction from the norm.
2. Bicyclists traveling on sidepaths are apt to cross intersections and driveways at unexpected speeds (i.e., speeds that are significantly faster than pedestrian speeds). This may increase the likelihood of crashes, especially where sight distance is limited.
3. Motorists waiting to enter the roadway from a driveway or side street may block the sidepath crossing, as drivers pull forward to get an unobstructed view of traffic (this is the case at many sidewalk crossings, as well).
4. Attempts to require bicyclists to yield or stop at each cross-street or driveway are inappropriate and are typically not effective.
5. Where the sidepath ends, bicyclists traveling in the direction opposed to roadway traffic may continue on the wrong side of the roadway. Similarly, bicyclists approaching a path may travel on the wrong side of the roadway to access the path. Wrong-way travel by bicyclists is a common factor in bicycle-automobile crashes.

6. Depending upon the bicyclist's specific origin and destination, a two-way sidepath on one side of the road may need additional road crossings (and therefore increase exposure); however, the sidepath may also reduce the number of road crossings for some bicyclists.
7. Signs posted for roadway users are backwards for contra-flow riders, who cannot see the sign information. The same applies to traffic signal faces that are not oriented to contra-flow riders.
8. Because of proximity of roadway traffic to opposing path traffic, barriers or railings are sometimes needed to keep traffic on the roadway or path from inappropriately encountering the other. These barriers can represent an obstruction to bicyclists and motorists, impair visibility between road and path users, and can complicate path maintenance.
9. Sidepath width is sometimes constrained by fixed objects (such as utility poles, trash cans, mailboxes, and etc.).
10. Some bicyclists will use the roadway instead of the sidepath because of the operational issues described above. Bicyclists using the roadway may be harassed by motorists who believe bicyclists should use the sidepath. In addition, there are some states that prohibit bicyclists from using the adjacent roadway when a sidepath is present.
11. Bicyclists using a sidepath can only make a pedestrian-style left turn, which generally involves yielding to cross traffic twice instead of only once, and thus induces unnecessary delay.
12. Bicyclists on the sidepath, even those going in the same direction, are not within the normal scanning area of drivers turning right or left from the adjacent roadway into a side road or driveway.
13. Even if the number of intersection and driveway crossings is reduced, bicycle–motor vehicle crashes may still occur at the remaining crossings located along the sidepath.
14. Traffic control devices such as signs and markings have not been shown effective at changing road or path user behavior at sidepath intersections or in reducing crashes and conflicts.

For these reasons, other types of bikeways may be better suited to accommodate bicycle traffic along some roadways.