

VILLAGE OF BARTLETT
COMMITTEE MINUTES

April 7, 2015

President Wallace called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 7:46 p.m.

Present: Trustee Arends (via webcam), Camerer, Carbonaro, Martin, Reinke, and Shipman

Also Present: Village Clerk Lorna Giless, Village Administrator Valerie L. Salmons, Assistant Village Administrator Paula Schumacher, Assistant to the Village Administrator Scott Skrycki, Finance Director Jeff Martynowicz, Assistant Finance Director Todd Dowden, Community Development Director Jim Plonczynski, Assistant Community Development Roberta Grill, Building Director Brian Goralski, Public Works Director Dan Dinges, Public Works Engineer Bob Allen, Chief Kent Williams, Deputy Chief Patrick Ullrich, Deputy Chief Joe Leonas, Head Golf Professional Phil Lenz, Food & Beverage Manager Paul Petersen, and Attorney Bryan Mraz

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE

Rt. 59/Stearns Road Improvements

Chairman Camerer asked Community Development Director Jim Plonczynski to review the agenda item.

J. Plonczynski explained that the Board had requested traffic data and information relative to a signal at Norwood Lane. Brent Coulter and Chief Williams can answer any questions regarding that information. As you may recall, the original design for the project showed the dual left turn lanes and the barrier median. This is on the east leg of Stearns Road and Rt. 59, the new Walgreens right here (referring to exhibit), the daycare center, and Braintree Lane. There was some concern from the property owners and the Brewster Creek shopping center tenants and owner. The Mayor wrote a letter asking IDOT and DuPage County to reconsider the configuration of the access onto Stearns Road. The Mayor had originally asked for a turn lane to allow the left turn ingress/egress out of the shopping center across the new configuration. When IDOT and DuPage County engineers designed it, they didn't just do the left turn lane out accommodation, they reconfigured the intersection turn lanes and put an eastbound lane to allow you to turn north into the shopping center and the daycare center; they removed the dual left turn lanes and went down to one left turn lane. That caused some concern from the Village's traffic consultant and the Chief about the turning coming across the intersection at a high rate of speed, getting in this lane (referring to exhibit), and then turning into the shopping center. There was concern at the last discussion expressed by some of the Trustees about that movement, when the shopping center has an ingress/egress north on Rt.59 into the Walgreens and further north in the original entrance. We went back to IDOT and DuPage County and back to the original comments in the Mayor's letter, which reflected the ingress/egress but basically the egress from the shopping center to allow the left turn lane out to maintain that. Our traffic consultant worked with the County, and this median

(referring to exhibit) will basically be a barrier from the intersection eastward to about where the Walgreens property is at, then it will be a striped median, and you can turn left into the daycare center which is far enough away from the intersection, and then continue and turn left onto Braintree Lane.

Trustee Martin asked if a U-turn can be done from that location.

J. Plonczynski responded yes, you can still do a U-turn here and there (referring to exhibit). Also the County felt that the existing pork chop, at the entrance to the shopping center is not configured properly and it would need to be redesigned to prevent anyone from doing the left turn movement; it's not a movement that anyone should practice, but with the way the pork chop was, it was easy to do that. They would extend this lip here (referring to exhibit) so that it would prevent that left turn. It would truly be a right-in only and the left out would still be allowed to come across the new lanes of traffic and go left. The County still will insist on prohibiting the left out during the peak hours – the am and pm peak. This design is where we are at right now. We still have the Norwood Lane intersection with the traffic signal. Dan Dinges has put some cost estimates in the staff memo on the traffic signal and the necessary improvements at Norwood Lane, if the Board chooses to do that. Brent Coulter, Dan Dinges, and Chief Williams are present to answer any questions.

Trustee Reinke stated that Mr. Coulter had objections to the revised design plan; the second plan. He asked if that is a correct statement.

B. Coulter explained that he was concerned, specifically, about the left turn in and the loss of the dual left turn storage capacity going from two lanes westbound to just one lane.

Trustee Reinke asked Mr. Coulter his thoughts on the revised plan dated 2/26/15.

B. Coulter responded that one of the advantages it has over the previous version, is by eliminating that long left turn lane at Brewster Creek, we were able to maintain the dual left turns westbound to southbound at the intersection. That's important because the projected storage of those two lanes from the stop bar on Rt. 59 going east is roughly 125-130 feet with two lanes. With the single lane, that storage increases to about 270 feet. During most of the peak hour and some of the off-peak hour, with a single westbound left turn lane, Brewster Creek is going to be blocked from inbound or outbound traffic just because of the loss of capacity. It also lowers the level of service for that leg of the intersection from E, which is not the greatest but is tolerable, to F which is not very good to say the least. That's the advantage of the latest concept which has that big channelizing island that would prohibit left turns in, otherwise it would still allow the left turns out of Brewster Creek during the off-peak hours.

Trustee Martin asked what the intersection is rated currently.

B. Coulter responded that it is currently rated slightly below level of service D.

Trustee Martin stated that if we left it alone, it's doing better than any of the proposed designs.

B. Coulter explained that the overall intersection level of service is rated D. The east leg of the intersection operates at level of service E because priority timing is given to Rt. 59 not to the east and west legs of Stearns Road. He cautioned that because IDOT is treating this as a 3-R project, meaning repair, rehab, and resurfacing, even though they are adding lanes and upgrading signals, their design horizon is basically right now. The more we take away from what they have planned to do, the less capable we are of addressing the traffic needs five, ten or fifteen years down the road. That's concerning as a traffic engineer.

President Wallace asked, in terms of housing, where are more people going to move into, east of that intersection.

B. Coulter explained that in terms of traffic demand, most of the demand is going to occur on Rt. 59.

President Wallace stated that he has an issue with people bringing up increased traffic congestion in a particular intersection. Don't you have to look at the surrounding area and say, east of that intersection, is there any building where people could increase the population where it would increase the traffic?

B. Coulter responded that is part of the process. That process did not occur on this particular project, however, because of the way it was classified by IDOT. There was no looking ahead. He stated that he understands President Wallace's point and would agree that most of the traffic increase through the intersection is going to be on Rt. 59, but there's only so much green time available to serve all the traffic moving through the intersection. Because Rt. 59 is a strategic regional arterial, it's going to get the majority of green time in terms of intersection operation. Even if things stay the same on Stearns Road, but traffic increases on Rt. 59 over the next five or ten years, which is expected, conditions are going to worsen on Stearns Road. The concern is with a single westbound left turn lane, they're going to be much worse than they would be with the dual left turn lanes that IDOT had originally proposed.

Trustee Reinke asked Mr. Coulter's thoughts on the left turn into the daycare center parking lot.

B. Coulter explained that as Jim mentioned, we are further away from the intersection. The daycare circulation is one way – you enter from Stearns and you exit onto the Brewster Creek access drive. You can't enter the daycare from Brewster Creek, so the option that Walgreens and some of the other stores have in terms of their customers entering from Rt. 59, does not exist for the daycare because of the one-way flow through that facility. That's why, under either of the most recent two scenarios that modify the original dual left turn lanes scenario that IDOT came up with, there would be a left turn lane serving the daycare center.

Trustee Reinke asked if there are any safety concerns with that.

B. Coulter responded that there's a risk that you might get some shopping center traffic turning left and entering the shopping center if they can't make a left turn directly into the center of Brewster Creek. He stated that the access that exists to the Brewster Creek Shopping Center on Rt. 59, the right-in/right-out just north of Walgreens and full access further north and even Norwood at the extreme north, is sufficient to handle the demand that would enter otherwise with a left turn from Stearns into Brewster Creek. That is something to be thinking of. Someone asked if a U-turn is legal from that left turn lane that would be striped at the daycare center, and the answer is yes. You can make a U-turn there or you could make a U-turn, as originally planned, at Braintree with the barrier median if you wanted to go east and come back west to enter Brewster Creek or the daycare center at that point.

Trustee Reinke asked if Mr. Coulter is recommending the most recent plan.

B. Coulter responded that he has made his position clear from the very beginning at every public meeting, which is favoring the original IDOT proposal. The advantage in the most recent concept is that we are able to maintain the dual left turn lanes westbound. That means less cost to the Village if you ever have to go back to the original concept and close off by extending the barrier median across Brewster Creek and the daycare. It also means if we're going to allow left turns out of Brewster Creek, there's going to be more room and more times during the day, during the off-peak hours, where that left turn out is available because you are going to have two lanes to store westbound left turn traffic instead of a single lane. There is an advantage to the most recent concept that didn't exist with the second concept that was discussed at the last Committee of the Whole meeting.

President Wallace commented that DuPage County and IDOT have traffic professionals and thought that the prior plan was the approved one that we were looking at. Then, all of a sudden, we as a Village, second-guessed those plans.

J. Plonczynski responded yes. This is the one that they came back to us with after the letter that was written to maintain this exist out of the shopping center across there. They actually went a little further than just maintaining the exit. There was some concern at our last meeting and then that's where they went with this (referring to design).

Chairman Camerer asked if you could still cut across the striped area.

J. Plonczynski responded yes, the barrier starts right about there (referring to exhibit) and there will be a sign there saying no left turn, so you can cut right through the striped area.

Trustee Martin added that you can do that only at certain times.

J. Plonczynski stated that the County is insisting on that only during the non-peak hours.

Trustee Shipman stated that it is important to get the numbers on the Norwood traffic signal.

D. Dinges responded that in discussions with IDOT and Mr. Coulter, the signal alone at Rt. 59 and Norwood would cost approximately \$350,000. At the same time, we know we have issues on Norwood with Dunkin' Donuts drive-thru and doing work at the eastern end of Norwood going towards Braintree to restrict eastbound traffic. So, \$150,000 was added for the work on Norwood to help facilitate the signal at Rt. 59 and Norwood.

Trustee Shipman stated that IDOT wouldn't necessarily oppose it, but as far as they are concerned, it is up to the Village – they want nothing to do with it. And, the cost would be approximately \$500,000.

Trustee Martin asked if there is going to be a cut-out on one of the berms by Dunkin' Donuts to help traffic.

D. Dinges responded that we have looked at putting a right-in/right-out north of Norwood onto Rt. 59; that would help some of the traffic congestion that happens at that entrance. We have also looked at trying to reconfigure or widen the driveway that heads north off of Norwood into that area. Currently, the cars back up onto Norwood, so we would try to alleviate that at the same time. Once you put a signal there, you have to be able to manage all the traffic.

Trustee Carbonaro asked how the cost estimate went from \$350,000 to \$500,000.

D. Dinges explained that the \$350,000 is just for the signal work, and then there is the cost estimate for the roadwork on Norwood. Those are rough numbers – if we were told to pursue the construction, we could get more detailed figures.

Trustee Carbonaro stated that he thought IDOT offered to cover the cost of the electronics to synchronize the two lights.

D. Dinges responded that there is some discussion as far as interconnecting Stearns and Rt. 59.

Trustee Shipman asked Chief Williams for the crash information that was requested. Stearns and Rt. 59 is historically in that top tier of crash locations.

K. Williams responded that Rt. 59 and Stearns is usually number one.

Trustee Shipman stated that in the three years of research, there were 172 traffic crashes at that location.

K. Williams responded yes.

Trustee Shipman clarified that 20 of those, or a little better than 10%, were related to traffic movements into or out of Brewster Creek.

K. Williams responded yes.

Trustee Shipman clarified that 14 of those 20 were vehicles turning left out of the shopping center onto eastbound Stearns Road.

K. Williams responded yes.

Trustee Martin asked if any of those crashes were fatalities.

K. Williams responded not in the last three years, but consistently that intersection is number one for physical injury accidents and property damage. He clarified that he is referring to the intersection proper – right in the middle of the intersection of Stearns and Rt. 59. At the actual entrance, about 100 or so feet east of the intersection into the access to Brewster Creek, there are not so many physical injury accidents. It's the intersection itself, right in the middle, where there is the most concern – higher speed, a lot of movement, a lot of confusion, a lot of trucks, etc. The dual lefts have always been the answer as far as the Police Department is concerned.

Trustee Martin asked if we do the dual lefts, are we going to have the white lines to indicate to stay in your lane while turning going across Rt. 59.

J. Plonczynski responded that they usually put those in on the striping pattern on the street.

Chairman Camerer opened the meeting to the audience for comments.

D. Cortesi, 707 Fairview Lane, stated that he is also one of the general partners of the Brewster Creek Shopping Center. He stated that he was also one in the group that worked on a compromise and plan with DuPage County and IDOT. He stated that he was shocked to hear that Bartlett went back without telling us to ask for further changes. The compromise that we worked out was the best plan for the site. To get IDOT, DuPage County, residents, and the shopping center to agree on something is very difficult. He stated that there is virtually unanimous support among all the residents and commercial users for the compromise plan and letters have been sent in. He pointed out that we all endorsed and pushed Walgreens in the community. With the plan, you're entering by the garbage area and behind the building and circling around to get from Rt. 59 to the front of the Walgreens door. There's a certain amount of fair play that should be considered when dealing with a company like Walgreens. They should be able to rely on us to hold good for where we stood on those issues. IDOT and DuPage County thought that we were taking a situation that was okay, but making it safer. We had a plan that everyone was agreeing with. Why Bartlett went back is not understandable under any circumstances. The residents have been struggling for a long time to come up with a plan that would lower the traffic count. The current plan would increase the traffic count tremendously because if you go straight east on Stearns Road and realize that you can't make a left, where's the first place you are going to turn – Braintree Lane, the place where we are trying to lower traffic counts. The plan that was approved by DuPage County and IDOT and will be endorsed by all the commercial users and by the residents is the compromise plan. If there is any further planning, we would like to be involved and not hear about the day before it goes to the Committee of the Whole.

R. Lewis, 868 Braintree Lane, stated that about a year and a half ago, the residents of the Braintree/Norwood area stood in front of the Board and said they didn't think the new Walgreens was a good idea, but if the Village was truly willing to work in ways to reduce or eliminate traffic in the neighborhood, we would be okay with the Walgreens approval. Many of the trustees commented that it was the sentiment of the residents was well appreciated and committed to work with the residents to solve the traffic problem. Now is the time to follow up on that commitment. It is abundantly clear that at this point, any of the plans that have come into plan, including the most recent plan, will, in fact, increase traffic on Braintree and Norwood. The new plan, for instance, with no turn at peak hours, really allows the people that are visiting the mall area no way out, outside of cutting down through the neighborhood. Without a traffic light at Norwood and Rt. 59, that's really their only option. All the solutions seemed to be tied to adding the traffic light at Norwood and Rt. 59. It certainly is a very expensive proposition. He stated that he questions the additional expense beyond the traffic light, but would defer to the experts on that. However, the fact that it is expensive is something that, much like the improvements at the golf course, you have to make plans for the long term. Right now, a short term plan that doesn't include the traffic light only leads to increased problems in the future. There will be increased traffic at the entire area. As soon as there is development on the north side of the Oil Masters – increased traffic; soon as a new tenant moves into the old Walgreens – increased traffic; nothing decreases the traffic through the area. Mr. Cortesi is correct with the proposed new plan in that, if Norwood was not closed to that through traffic, people will come down to Braintree and cut through the neighborhood just to get back around. We think the signal is very, very important to the overall traffic in the neighborhood including completely closing Norwood, not just the one way. He stated that he would help coordinate an effort amongst the neighbors to help pressure IDOT and state politicians to try to figure out way to help with the funding as well as finding some fundraising type of campaigns to help pay for the closing of Norwood.

Trustee Martin commented that there is give and take with all the plans. The original plan had two lanes, then it was cut down to one lane for turning only and we were concerned about traffic accidents. The best plan is the one on the board, but it has to go hand-in-hand with adding the light at Norwood Lane. You can put up signs that read no through traffic but that's not going to do any good. He stated that he has been to the new Walgreens and entered off of Rt. 59 and did not see any garbage. It's not too hard to just circle around to the front entrance.

Trustee Reinke asked what staff would like from the Board.

Administrator Salmons responded that the actual document that will come to the Board is a letter of intent from the Board which commits to paying those items that we have asked for - \$47,000, for the interconnect, the bike path, and the sidewalk. But, as part of that they do want to know which of the options the Board thinks is the most viable because they want Bartlett's participation. If you pick the option that limits the access based on peak hour, they want a commitment that we are going to sign and enforce that. By default, in addition to the letter of intent, they want Bartlett to agree with one of the options or some other combination thereof that has come along.

Chairman Camerer asked what the timeframe might be.

Administrator Salmons responded that there isn't a set timeframe, but certainly they would like it as soon as possible. As a point of clarification, however, it is IDOT and DuPage that have come up with these different options. We didn't go back to them after the last one and say we want changes because the Board was still deliberating option one and option two at the time that IDOT and DuPage decided they wanted to come up with option 3. So, that's what you have here – three different options. Would you like us to look at some amalgamation of those that maybe has a chance of sending less people into the neighborhood? There ought to be some compromise that can do that, but provide the same level of safety; importantly, though, we keep the dual lefts throughout the intersection itself because as the Chief will tell you, when you talk about safety, that's the real key to this entire improvement.

Trustee Martin asked if a speed limit sign could be placed by the daycare center of 5 or 10 miles per hour. If we are feeding people in by Walgreens, we don't want them speeding by the daycare drop off.

Administrator Salmons asked if Trustee Martin was referring to the daycare private property.

Trustee Martin suggested that the Village encourage the daycare to put a sign up.

Trustee Shipman commented that he understands what everyone has said. He stated that this project has been one of the more challenging things to make a decision on because of Mr. Lewis' activity and his interest in what is going on. He stated that he also has a passion for the safety of all residents, but particularly when it comes to traffic safety, it is something that he is very interested in. This is one of those things where if you could turn back the clock and redesign the whole intersection, you would. But, unfortunately we can't, so we have to look at the different options and decide what works the best. Sometimes that is a very utilitarian point of view – where's the most benefit for the most amount of people. Sometimes that is a very targeted point of view. This is a difficult one. It is very hard to talk about this intersection and not talk about the intersection at Norwood Lane. They are kissing cousins and they have to be a part of the same package. He stated that he appreciated Dan's work on the rough numbers, but would encourage the remaining Board members and the staff to work on trying to make that something in the future because the residents have valid concerns. The traffic light on Rt. 59 and Norwood Lane is an important component to whatever is done at the intersection. That being said, he also has to put a lot of weight into what the experts have said. The experts are the Chief of Police and the traffic engineer as well as the IDOT and DuPage County experts and what they have told us about how the intersection should look. It's a difficult balancing act; it's not easy to make a decision. He stated that whatever the Board does, it needs to involve some traffic alleviation for that neighborhood, which would involve some type of signalized effort at Norwood Lane. Of the three versions, at this moment, he stated that he would favor the third one the most.

Trustee Carbonaro agreed with Trustees Shipman and Martin. He stated that the Board has to put a lot of thought into making a decision, however, there is an important part that we are missing. There are two daycare centers there – one on Stearns Road that currently has 100 children; that's roughly 100 drivers just for that daycare center and one

that is closer to Norwood Lane that has 110 children, all between the ages of 6 months and 7 years old. On a daily basis, there are two buses from each one of those daycare centers that take the children to different schools and pick them up. They don't go out Rt. 59, they don't go out to Stearns because they can't get out – they go down Braintree Lane. Out of the 210 children there, they are 210 family members that are driving down Braintree to get back to Stearns Road. Sixty percent of the people who have their children at the two daycares live in Bartlett. They have to go east on Stearns; maybe not all of them but a large majority of them. There is no safe way to left on to Stearns Road out of the egress at the Walgreens. We did make an improvement on the egress on Rt. 59; we made it wider so it would accommodate higher speed turns into the shopping center. There are two businesses there that can't get out and do their normal traffic to get out of the center. No matter what we do, if we don't do the light at Norwood, we are creating more traffic on Braintree Lane. The first option is probably the best one. It eliminates a lot of moving parts along Stearns Road but we would have to put the light at Norwood to give people a safe way, and the families picking up children, to go home safely for dinner. We heard statements that we have had this set up for 24 years and nothing has changed. Was the Dominick's there 24 years ago? There are a lot of things that weren't there and a lot of the egresses are grandfathered because at one point in time, Rt. 59 was two lanes with a soft shoulder. Now it's six lanes so the frontage road has encroached upon certain egresses where you are within walking distance to Rt. 59. There's too many moving parts too close to Rt. 59. He stated that the only choice he would make is the original plan where we don't allow a left turn there. He asked if there have been any fatalities at that intersection.

K. Williams responded no, not in the last three years of data.

Trustee Carbonaro stated that he did do some research and talk to the businesses there. The daycare center has little kids trying to get home and that's a big portion of the moving parts at that parking lot. He stated he would appreciate the Board taking that into consideration.

Trustee Reinke stated that he would like to see some further evaluation of what needs to be done at Norwood Lane and how those improvements would be funded. He stated that it seems the consensus is whatever option is adopted, the improvements at Norwood would be done as well. He asked for more research and a funding plan to do those improvements.

Administrator Salmons responded that staff will bring that information to the Board.

President Wallace suggested that the Board start thinking about this in stages where we do something and then see what the result is. No one really takes into account the fact that if we widen the Stearns portion of the road, maybe a lot of problems that we think are there now, will be solved. We should get something done, then see the result and if it's not working that way, move onto something else.

Trustee Martin asked the number of commercial parcels available north of Oil Masters.

J. Plonczynski responded that there really is just one parcel. The property looks big, but most of it is a wetland.

D. Cortesi stated that they didn't like the first IDOT option and then went for the compromise that if we did the compromise and it wasn't working, for whatever reason, the additional costs to go back to the original plan would only be \$20,000.

Trustee Shipman stated that the big issue with the second plan was the lack of two left turn lanes. And that's something that you can't change for \$20,000. You would have to re-engineer the entire intersection. What they may have been talking about is if we did this and didn't like it, you could fix it for \$20,000 but you wouldn't be able to send it back to a two left turn lane intersection.

J. Plonczynski added that it would be expensive because you would only have your one left turn lane and you'd go back to dual lefts. You would have to reconfigure the signals too. There was some talk that if this left turn lane into the shopping center didn't work (referring to exhibit), you could put barricades up here and just close this exit off and close this entrance (on exhibit).

There being no further comments or questions, it was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole to direct staff to get more information on the Norwood Lane improvements including a funding plan.

Trustee Arends left the meeting at 8:25 p.m.

President Wallace stated that the Committee meeting will continue with the review of the proposed 2015-16 budget.