

VILLAGE OF BARTLETT
COMMITTEE MINUTES

May 5, 2015

President Wallace called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

Present: Trustee Arends, Camerer, Carbonaro, Deyne, Hopkins, and Reinke,

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, Community Development Director Jim Plonczynski, Assistant Community Development Director Roberta Grill, Building Director Brian Goralski, Public Works Director Dan Dinges, Public Works Engineer Bob Allen, Deputy Chief Patrick Ullrich, Deputy Chief Joe Leonas, Head Golf Professional Phil Lenz, and Attorney Bryan Mraz

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE

Artis Senior Living of Bartlett, Final Subdivision & PUD/Site Plan – Lot 1

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

J. Plonczynski explained that this project has been in front of the Committee of the Whole in the past. Artis Senior Living is located on the east side of Rt. 59, south of Apple Valley Drive. It is a three-lot subdivision and the petitioner is asking for the final subdivision plat and to approve the site plan/PUD plan for the Artis Senior Living facility which will be on Lot 1. The project has gone through the preliminary approval, granted in 2014. It is a 74-unit senior facility with 38 parking spaces. (Site plan on exhibit) The Plan Commission recommended approval, subject to the conditions and findings of fact. A number of conditions are the engineering approval, landscaping approval, the right-in/right-out approval by IDOT, which is the ingress and egress to the site, list of permitted uses for Lot 2, bike path instead of a sidewalk, aluminum fence around the property on Lots 2 and 3, and signage which is reviewed separately. It is before the Committee prior to going on to the Village Board for a final vote.

Chairman Reinke asked for thoughts, comments, or concerns from the Board.

President Wallace asked why the location just to the north is so adamant about not granting access.

J. Plonczynski responded that we have tried and they have never really expressed an interest in doing anything. A prior developer, a number of years ago, got to “first base” with them, but he was going to pay for the entire access, redo the parking lot, as well as landscape the building that is to the north. It has changed in ownership and Artis has tried and they are not interested.

President Wallace stated that in reading some of the comments from the Plan Commission, he agrees that it is unfortunate that emergency vehicles have such a hard time getting in and out of there. There are comments that are pretty valid relative to getting out of there at the right-in/right-out only. However, as mentioned in some of the discussions, if it is a big enough emergency, they would just go over the grass.

Trustee Camerer asked if Artis would be open to more senior living facilities in that particular area.

J. Plonczynski explained that Mr. Hicks was directed to the site when he was interested and there are other sites in the Village. We have also directed other potential users to his property for Lot 2.

J. Hicks added that they are open minded about the uses but it would have to be something compatible with Artis, compatible with the neighbors and something that is approvable from a traffic and other standpoints. Theoretically, a senior-related use behind the facility would be welcome, but obviously subject to its ability to satisfy the very stringent performance criteria. He stated that he has received calls about the other lot, but wanted to get the Artis project approved first. At some point, someone will come in, in the context of the Village's code, asking for something approvable on the lot.

Trustee Camerer stated that the right-in/right-out has been a topic of discussion all along. He asked Mr. Hicks if he feels that is going to be an issue.

J. Hicks responded that it will not be an issue at all. Artis took a very careful look at that and it comes down to the fact that the residents of Artis don't drive. The trip generation is so small for the use. If you look at senior related uses, at one end of the density spectrum you have group homes of 8 to 10 residents; you've got life care communities with hundreds of residents and the ability to age in place. Artis specializes in a niche and our unit count is on the low end of that and our residents don't drive. No one has less interest in having any sort of traffic or transportation failure than we do.

Trustee Camerer stated that he comes in contact with many people who have a memory disorder and is pleased that Artis Senior Living is coming to Bartlett.

President Wallace added that seeing the end result with the right-in/right-out only, a senior living facility business is about the only type of a business that would be appropriate if that is the only access in and out.

J. Hicks stated that having worked in municipal planning and worked on both sides of it, Artis is well suited for the property. It's a property that begs to be developed, but given some planning missteps that predate everyone in the room, this is an opportunity to get past that to everyone's benefit.

There being no further comments or questions, Chairman Reinke forwarded the item to the Village Board for consideration.

Sanzeri's Subdivision Rezoning & Preliminary/Final Plat

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

J. Plonczynski explained that the item is a pretty straight forward two-lot subdivision that the Committee has seen prior to it going on to the Plan Commission for the public hearing on the rezoning from ER-1 to SR-2. It is a two-lot subdivision with one lot being 17,325 square feet and the other lot being 10,844 square feet. The minimum lot size is the lot size that it will be rezoned to. The Plan Commission recommended approval of the subdivision and the rezoning at their April 9th meeting. The petitioner plans on building a home on one lot and selling the other lot.

Trustee Camerer stated that the subdivision of the two lots was intentional. The petitioners set the parameters.

J. Plonczynski explained that the petitioners wanted to build a home on the bigger lot, so that set the parameter for the size of the home.

Trustee Camerer asked if the size of that lot was already determined or did the petitioners decide the size of the lot.

J. Plonczynski responded that it was based on their engineering design and the type of home they would like at that location.

Trustee Camerer asked if it likely that a smaller lot at that location will sell or will it just be a piece of vacant property for years.

J. Plonczynski responded that the lots that are there are pretty similar in size to what is behind it. Generally, the trend and character of the area is a pretty good size lot. He stated that he does not think the second lot will sit vacant for a long period of time.

President Wallace asked if there is a vacant house on the property.

J. Plonczynski responded that there are three buildings currently on the property; one was an old rental and there are two barns or sheds.

There being no further comments or questions, Chairman Reinke forwarded the item to the Village Board for consideration.

Rt. 59/Stearns Road Improvements

Chairman Reinke stated that the Village staff is looking for the Board to come to a consensus so that a resolution can be drafted, approved, and forwarded to IDOT and DuPage County.

Administrator Salmons stated that staff will review the last plans and try to answer any remaining issues relative to car counts and costs of signals. The Village's Traffic Engineer

Brent Coulter is present to help answer any questions. Staff is hoping the improvements plan can be finalized and forwarded to the Board with a letter of intent from IDOT.

J. Plonczynski stated he will put up the exhibit of the original design plan for the east leg of the intersection that IDOT sent to the Village. It includes dual left turn lanes and a barrier median across Stearns Road so there will be no access in or out to the Brewster Creek shopping center. Subsequent to that plan, there was input from the shopping center owner asking for the Village to speak out on their behalf to change the design for the east leg of the intersection. Subsequent to that discussion, there was a letter sent by the Mayor to IDOT asking for that. They tried to accommodate us and this was the first revision, reviewed back in March (referring to exhibit). This design is what IDOT and DuDOT came back with. It was a dedicated left turn lane that allowed access into the shopping center, into the daycare, and there was no barrier median and it reduced the dual lefts to only one southbound left turn lane. The design had to remain the same width in order to keep the geometry with the western side of Rt. 59. This design was supported by the shopping center owner and the commercial entities that exist at the northeast corner. It was not supported fully by everyone or the Village Police Chief and the traffic consultant raised concerns about the safety of crossing over all the lanes of traffic and queueing up and blocking the left turn lane, along with a number of other items. Subsequent to that, we came to a compromise design. The Village's traffic engineer, Public Works Director, and Village Engineer went back to IDOT and DuDOT and asked for a design that would be business friendly as well as be safer. That design is what was reviewed at the last meeting (referring to exhibit). It has a shorter in length barrier median from Rt. 59 to about the shopping center entrance. It does not have a left turn into the center, but it does preserve the left turn lane into the daycare center further to the east and also a left turn into Braintree. It allows for a left out of the shopping center eastbound during non-peak morning and evening hours. There is a two hour window in the morning and a two hour window in the afternoon. You cannot turn left during the peak times but you can during the non-peak hours. DuPage also wanted to see the pork chop at the shopping center design change and the radius change to make it a little harder to get in and out, but you can only come in right and leave left. This compromise was reviewed at the Board's last meeting. Additionally, we have to pass an ordinance prohibiting that left turn during peak hours. The shopping center owner and some of the commercial entities did not like the design. In the packet is a list of cost estimates for two alternatives requested by the Board; for the Rt. 59 traffic signal and subsequent changes to Norwood Lane if we choose to pursue the traffic signal as a separate project with IDOT. IDOT and DuDOT are requesting that the Village provide input on a preferred alternative design for the east leg of Stearns Road and sign the Letter of Intent dated January 23, 2015 prior to IDOT entering into the Phase III Engineering stage and finalizing the intersection improvement plans. In the Letter of Intent, the Village had asked for some other amenities for the intersection improvements – one is for emergency vehicle preemption devices which will cost the Village \$6,900; there is a sidewalk added to it for \$18,918, and a shared use path for \$16,905 to make our share \$42,723.

Chairman Reinke asked for any questions or comments.

Trustee Carbonaro asked the purpose of the crosswalk.

J. Plonczynski explained that the crosswalk is in the estimate for Norwood Lane.

Trustee Carbonaro asked if that is a requirement from IDOT.

J. Plonczynski responded that it is just an alternate. The consulting engineers decided to add that since there's some residents and businesses that people might want to walk to.

D. Dinges explained that it was put in as an option if IDOT were to require it or if the Village wanted the crosswalk. It would be something that if we were directed to move forward with the signal at Norwood, we would have to see if we wanted to go in that direction.

Trustee Camerer clarified that Norwood Lane and Stearns/Rt. 59 are two separate things. So the Board is making decisions with the intent of designating the preferred intersection for Stearns/Rt. 59.

Chairman Reinke asked if it would help if a straw poll was taken.

Trustee Deyne responded that is a good idea. He stated that he likes the staff's design on the intersection at Rt. 59 and Stearns, however, believes firmly that a traffic light at Norwood is needed, because there will be too much traffic going into the residential area. The Norwood intersection currently is really not safe. It's very difficult to turn left and go south on Rt. 59 from Norwood Lane. He questioned the cost of the signal at Norwood.

J. Plonczynski explained that the traffic signal at Norwood also includes Norwood improvements. Alternate 1 is \$620,000 and Alternate 2 is \$870,000.

Trustee Deyne questioned the \$42,000 estimate.

J. Plonczynski explained that estimate is for the Stearns Road preemption for the emergency vehicles.

Trustee Deyne clarified that the cost to put a traffic light at Norwood Lane is approximately \$600,000.

J. Plonczynski responded yes and that would be a separate project from the Rt. 59 project. IDOT has already said they will not include the Norwood light as part of the Rt. 59/Stearns intersection.

Chairman Reinke stated that is what seems to be confusing the conversation. In terms of structure, he suggested a straw poll over the design of Rt. 59/Stearns and then discuss the intersection of Norwood Lane and Rt. 59. He stated that he prefers the original design; the left hand turn lanes into the shopping center and daycare center are ill-advised. It's dangerous to turn across so many lanes of traffic. It's important to preserve the left hand turn lane, westbound on Stearns, and ultimately direct you southbound on Rt. 59. He stated that it is perfectly acceptable to enter onto the mall property from the access way that is just north of the Walgreens. The mall owner's concern about the back end of Walgreens not being the prettiest is understandable, but thousands of people see the

back end of Walgreens anyway. It's there; it is what it is. It then becomes problematic that perhaps we are dumping traffic onto Braintree Lane. He stated that he is firmly in favor of the original IDOT plan; it's the safest one. There will still be access to the shopping center; it's not going to live or die. He stated that he goes to the Walgreens and uses the back entrance because it's safer. He added that he will not be making the left hand turn off of Stearns under any circumstances. In terms of clarity, we have the original design, the revised design, and then the 2nd revised design with the striping. He suggested that the different designs be numbered in the future for easier review.

President Wallace stated that one of the things that is predicated the discussion is the potential for traffic to back up in a left hand turn lane going westbound on Stearns and taking a left turn onto Rt. 59. He stated that he looked at the traffic study numbers during peak hours. You can fit 7 cars in between Rt. 59 and the entrance to the mall. If you look at the traffic count, at any given time, there is not more than 6 cars stacked up there. If you have two lanes there, it is unnecessary. He stated that he has a tendency to favor the businesses in these situations. It's very tough to get in and out of malls and it is important for that extra 15 people to feel like they can get in and get out as quickly as they need to every week. That may not be a lot of people, but that could be the difference between surviving sometimes. We had the traffic engineer tell us that this proposal that up here right now (referring to exhibit) is safer than the intersection is right now. When the engineer says that this proposal that's up here now, approved by DuPage traffic, that says that this is the plan that is both business-friendly and a safer alternative to what is there now.

Chairman Reinke clarified that President Wallace is in favor of the first revised plan.

Trustee Arends stated that she agrees with President Wallace. She stated that she has never come out of Braintree and seen the need for two left turn lanes. It's hard to imagine that we should have that plan. She stated that she is in favor of the plan with one left turn lane.

Trustee Camerer stated that if the latest plan maintains the two left turn lanes, yet allows access into the childcare facility by making a U-turn, he would be in favor of that because it is a good compromise. With some patience, drivers can make a left hand turn into the shopping center and do the U-turn. It's fair to have the four lanes. He stated that he is in favor of the 2nd revised design.

Trustee Carbonaro stated that he hasn't changed his mind from all of the discussions. The original plan is not to be looked at whether it is business-friendly; it should be looked at if it is death-friendly. He stated that there are 200 children at the daycare centers that have parents picking them up on a daily basis. They all go down Norwood and they all go down Braintree. Why? Because they can't pull out left to go east on Stearns. The two busses that take the children from the daycare centers to the school that are east of the daycare centers go down Norwood to Braintree to turn left to go east on Stearns. Whether we put a left in or left out here, no one is going to use it because they can't get out. He stated that in rush hour traffic, most people don't have much patience. We have the possibility of having seven people back up to turn left to go into the egress. What happens to driver number eight and driver number nine? They get killed on Rt. 59. Left-

in, left-out – no. It's got to go. It's been a mess for 24 years. If the original plan wasn't a safe design, IDOT would not have given it to us in the first place. The only reason they changed it is because the Village asked them to. He stated that he is in favor of the original design because it is the safest and it is business and child friendly.

Trustee Hopkins stated that he is in favor of the original design. It's the safest for all the aforementioned reasons.

Trustee Deyne stated that he has worked with staff for a good number of years and has put a lot of confidence in them and the village engineers. He stated that based on the confidence that he has in staff, he would be in favor of the 2nd revised design.

J. Plonczynski summarized that there are 3 in favor of the original design, 2 in favor of the 1st revision and 2 in favor of the 2nd revision.

Chairman Reinke stated that it is far from a clear consensus, but the original has more votes. He stated that we will look forward to a resolution at the next Board meeting.

Trustee Arends suggested that before the Board decides on the separate Norwood issue, that staff obtain some traffic counts at north/south Braintree; east/west Norwood; east Norwood to north Braintree; and east Norwood to south Braintree. She stated that she wants to be sure that the people in Bartlett Lake Estates aren't the ones causing the traffic or being a major contributor. We need an actual count.

Administrator Salmons responded that staff will get those figures.

Trustee Camerer asked if the \$620,000 includes the modifications to the pork chop on Norwood as well.

J. Plonczynski explained that it includes a modification to the drive into the Dunkin Donuts.

Administrator Salmons added that it will provide for some widening for the egress for Dunkin Donuts but it does not provide for that pork chop.

D. Dinges added that it does include the restriction of eastbound traffic on Norwood to Braintree.

Trustee Camerer clarified that the Board isn't making a decision on that at this point. He agrees that a traffic study needs to be done at Norwood. If you talk about modifying Norwood, you have to start asking other people in the Bartlett Lake Estates for their input and involvement as well. We don't know the particulars of who is using Norwood as a cut-thru; if people are using it to get to Rt. 59 to go north on Rt. 59, that's a lot different than people using it just to go to McDonald's or Dunkin Donuts. If you shut down or modify Norwood, it has the potential to increase traffic down Braintree further and influence a lot of other people.

Trustee Arends stated that would be a huge undertaking and suggested that the Board look at the traffic counts first.

Trustee Camerer stated that as much as we want to help the people on S. Braintree, we also have to be fair to anyone else that might be influenced by the situation.

Chairman Reinke commented that we want public input and will look at traffic studies. One concern with the traffic light is unintended consequences. He stated that he wants to make sure that everyone is 100% comfortable with the idea that there may be some unintended consequences. Trustee Camerer has expressed that previously with living on Auburn Lane. One of the unintended consequences might be more traffic on Auburn Lane. It does make sense to take a holistic approach, but it also makes sense for the S. Braintree folks to be very firm in their opinions in that this is what they want to do. There is a huge financial cost and there is also some danger there. He asked how the Village will go about soliciting the public input.

Administrator Salmons responded that we will want to advertise the issue, make sure we have it online, on Twitter, but we may want to do some direct soliciting of addresses in that neighborhood to make sure we really do hear from people.

Chairman Reinke stated that the S. Braintree folks have done a good job of articulating their position to the Board. He suggested that the Board get more input and make a decision and not have it take six meetings. We'll get the facts together and make a decision.

Trustee Deyne asked if there is any grant money available for the traffic signal.

J. Plonczynski responded no.

President Wallace stated that with no disrespect to the new Trustees, he has a little bit of an issue with somebody that just started talking about this, putting in a weigh-in vote. We have been talking about this issue for a long time and the weigh-in vote – there's a lot of moving parts here. There are a lot of moving parts at this intersection and what has happened is they have just discounted the businesses at that intersection's request.

Chairman Reinke responded that both Trustee Hopkins and Trustee Deyne have been in attendance at a couple of the meetings and if they are comfortable, then they're comfortable. He stated that he can't speak for them.

President Wallace asked if the new Trustees were present when the representatives basically said that Walgreens stores, in similar situations, went out of business.

Trustee Arends stated that Mr. Cortesi has expressed his opinion. We always have to be conscience of how this will affect the shopping center. Why do you think we don't have the weigh-in vote?

President Wallace explained that the new Trustees haven't been through all these meetings. His vote cast is the deciding vote to go all the way back to the beginning.

Trustee Carbonaro commented that it could be partially the fault of the Board for weighing it out for six meetings. If it had passed on the 4th or 5th meeting, it wouldn't have happened.

Trustee Deyne stated that he had hoped the vote would have taken place prior to being sworn in.

President Wallace stated that he knows Bartlett is going to have some very disappointed business owners, because of the access going in and out of the center. If you think it's bad now, imagine the people coming over from the east going west, getting into the shopping center, not being able to turn left out; if there's any traffic at all, they have to wait for the traffic to clear to do the U-turn. People are going to do that one time.

Trustee Arends commented that perhaps it shouldn't be changed at all.

Trustee Carbonaro stated that they will then go down Braintree. That's why the Board needs to expedite the second part of the issue.

President Wallace responded that you think people will then go all the way to Norwood, take a left and come all the way back to Stearns to go home.

Trustee Carbonaro stated that he would rather do that than pull out into six lanes of traffic.

President Wallace disagreed.

Trustee Hopkins asked if the Village's traffic consultant has anything to say about the original design. He asked if Mr. Coulter objects to the original design.

Trustee Arends stated that that shopping center has a heck of a lot more accessibility than Bartlett Commons across the street, which is why they have had a difficult time in developing. She stated that she doesn't know what the answer to that situation may be, but people don't want to go into Bartlett Commons because people have to make a left hand turn east onto Stearns Road. Put that into the mix and maybe we shouldn't change anything at all.

J. Plonczynski invited Brent Coulter to address the Board.

Trustee Hopkins asked if movement of traffic in the shopping center is figured into a traffic study.

B. Coulter responded that the traffic study is the study that was done by IDOT as part of the intersection development – Intersection Design Study. Their primary focus was on moving traffic through the intersection of Rt. 59 and Stearns Road. They did not do any special studies of the Brewster Creek Shopping Center access. Their focus was on the main intersection. The safest and most efficient design to serve the main intersection is the original IDOT proposal which was the dual left turns and the barrier median on the particular leg of Stearns Road. That's how IDOT arrived at their original design.

Trustee Hopkins asked what Mr. Coulter's role was with the design.

B. Coulter explained that he did not do any design work. In terms of the original design, it was reviewed. He stated that he has said continually throughout the process that as a traffic engineer, whose primary focus is moving traffic and traffic safety, that he favors the original design. With that being said, we did look at the revised version #2, which would be the partial barrier median allowing left turns out. You can get into Brewster Creek but it would be a little further east with a U-turn going back and making a right turn into the shopping center.

Trustee Hopkins asked if Mr. Coulter did a study for the traffic movement in the shopping center.

B. Coulter responded that they have analyzed the operation of the main intersection and the impact of the various designs on the main intersection; the access to the businesses in Brewster Creek has been addressed by the business owners within the shopping center. We've done no special outside study of the Brewster Creek access per se. The issue the Board is debating is the impact on the businesses under the three different intersection design options. That is something that you have heard from the business community on and you can make your own determination based on your experience, but we have not done an economic study to determine the impact of a barrier median on business activity or anything like that.

Trustee Camerer stated that the DuPage County traffic consultants have good reason to suggest the alternate plan. He asked if Mr. Coulter feels that is a safe alternative as well.

B. Coulter responded that you now have three options on the table that both IDOT and the County have indicated that they would be willing to construct depending on the outcome of the Board's deliberations. Any of the options, as far as the State or County are concerned, are on the table and would be constructed when Bartlett indicates the preferred design.

President Wallace commented that therein lies the Achilles heel. He stated that he does not know about the rest of the people, but he has been at shopping centers where you have to do the U-turn and do the dance out of it and try to do a U-turn around it to try to get back to the direction you were going. That's essentially what we would be creating for that business. He stated that he adamantly disagrees with the barrier medians.

Trustee Camerer stated that at least with this option and in the best case scenario, we have an opportunity to turn in and a way to get into the shopping center, but without that, people will definitely go to Braintree. People going east on Stearns will decide they can't get in and go to Braintree to Norwood.

Chairman Reinke asked if anyone thinks it's dangerous to put all of the traffic that is going to turn left into the mall into the parking lot of the daycare center.

Trustee Camerer responded that it won't go into the parking lot.

Chairman Reinke stated that it will under the revised design. He stated that it also discounts access to Brewster Creek off of Rt. 59.

Trustee Camerer stated that this will cause more traffic to Braintree.

Trustee Carbonaro stated that if a left turn in and out is allowed, at 5:30 p.m., and you can't turn left out of there, where do you think they're going to go? Down Norwood to Braintree. It's irrelevant whether that's there or not.

Trustee Camerer stated that the four hours during the day aren't the only hours that we need to be concerned about.

Trustee Carbonaro reiterated that if they can't make the turn out, they are going to go down Norwood to Braintree. There is a second part to this and we are trying to fix five problems.

Trustee Camerer stated that he is convinced that the design will send more traffic down Braintree.

Trustee Arends stated that she leaves her house many times between the hours of 5:30 and 6:30 p.m., which is a peak hour. Even though it is 100 yards east of the shopping, she can still get out to turn left out of Braintree onto Stearns. There is not a constant parade on Stearns going west. It is no more difficult to turn left out of the shopping center than it is to turn left out of Braintree.

Trustee Carbonaro stated that he commented that no one can turn left out of the egress at Walgreens, not Braintree Lane. Whether they can make it or not, they will go down Norwood, down to Braintree Lane.

Chairman Reinke stated that at some point we have to determine whether or not further discussion is going to be fruitful.

President Wallace stated that he would like to hear from the business owner.

Chairman Reinke responded that we have heard from the business owner quite a bit.

D. Cortesi stated that regardless, people will make a left onto Braintree and come around once they realize they can't get through any other way.

Chairman Reinke asked if you're expecting them to make a U-turn in front of the daycare, why is it less likely that they're going to make a U-turn in front of Braintree.

D. Cortesi that the U-turn would be more functional. They won't like making a U-turn in front of Braintree either, but that U-turn would be more functional. They will recognize what is going on when the U-turn is at that location. But, Braintree is what they are used to; they would make a normal left turn lane so there is functionality to this plan. We did a traffic on the Brewster Creek Center when Walgreens was approved. That access drive exit was rated a "C" by KLOA, reviewed by Bartlett's traffic consultant. We are working

on something that is affecting our driveway. To cut off 20 businesses, they are going to be adamantly opposed to what you're doing. They threw out some compromises and we bought onto the first compromise. Walgreens wrote a letter strongly supporting the first compromise. Some people had more thoughts and they came up with the second compromise. The first plan, when it was introduced, was bad for businesses and residents and now we are back to that plan. There are incredible unintended consequences and it will be a disaster for the shopping center itself and a disaster for traffic and safety.

Chairman Reinke asked Mr. Coulter his thoughts on a U-turn in front of the daycare versus a U-turn in front of Braintree Lane.

B. Coulter responded that the turning path is essentially the same. What would happen under the 2nd revised design is that if someone were to make a U-turn, remembering that there is alternative access to enter Walgreens off the right-in/right-out driveway on Rt. 59, that serves any traffic that would otherwise make a left turn from Stearns into Brewster Creek. Assuming that someone doesn't figure that out and does get on Stearns eastbound and needs to make a U-turn to go back into the shopping center, it's likely that they would take the first option which is the left turn lane that would allow them to make a U-turn in the vicinity of the daycare center. From a physical standpoint of making the U-turn, they are probably equivalent of each other. But, if people do make the U-turn, they would probably choose the first option available which is near the daycare center. The daycare center drive is inbound only; there is not outbound traffic that would conflict with a U-turn at that location.

R. Lewis, Braintree Lane, stated that Trustee Carbonaro's comments make the most sense. This discussion keeps going on and on and it is really starting to lose a bit of common sense with some of it. The traffic is going to do nothing but increase over the years. This is a long term decision and we certainly feel, from all kinds of perspectives, that the traffic light at Norwood and Rt. 59 has to be paired with the intersection improvements decision. There is going to be all kinds of increased traffic as the Stearns Road bridge is complete with the four lanes being finished through the railroad tracks. The production of new homes and businesses west of Rt. 59 is going to increase traffic. The senior facility that was just approved with the right-in/right-out only is going to create increased traffic. There will be employees leaving that facility at rush hour coming down to the intersection of Rt. 59 and Stearns looking for a place to turn around if they have to head south on Rt. 59. That kind of stuff is going to continue to happen. You can do a traffic study on Braintree, but you are wasting the Village's and the residents' money to do that. You know right away where that traffic is going; it's coming through to McDonalds and Dunkin Donuts and coming right back. He stated that he followed a truck that turned down Braintree, stopped at Dunkin Donuts and was going to go back the same way. It is not cut-thru traffic trying to avoid the light, but there will be some of that traffic. It's time to make a very hard decision; it's a lot of money, no doubt, but for the long term, you have to put the traffic signal at Norwood and Rt. 59. If you don't put the light in, you are just creating a bigger problem. No matter what you do, you start to force traffic down Norwood, down through Braintree, and creating an unsafe condition for those residents and the children that live in the neighborhood. He stated that the neighborhood welcomes the busses with children and the parents picking up their children at the daycare centers.

But, if they have a light at the intersection that they can get out of, that would be great. In terms of the other residents in the neighborhood, certainly, their comments should be heard. However, if you look at what we are really asking, we are asking for if this is closed off, (referring to exhibit), they have to drive another 300 feet and take a right on Stearns to get to the shopping mall, not a huge inconvenience. If they need to get back to the neighborhood, they come out here to the light, they take a right and go right back down to Auburn; not a huge inconvenience. We are not putting out anyone by having them make a turn 300 feet sooner. He stated that the Board can make the decision right here, right now, today, and it won't be a bad decision.

Chairman Reinke stated that he is prepared to make a decision about the traffic light, but Trustee Arends and Camerer want more time.

Trustee Camerer stated that he has no problem with the traffic light, but does have an issue with the pork chop and stopping traffic from going down Norwood because, honestly, Mr. Lewis is making assumptions about how many people are going to McDonalds and Dunkin Donuts, without really knowing the numbers. Some of the traffic could be coming from the people in that very neighborhood, but it should be their right to come down that street if that's what they want. We need to talk to the other people before we shut it down to make a portion of the neighborhood happy. Obviously, we'd like to do something to help, but not at the expense of everyone else that live in Bartlett Lake Estates. You have to take those residents' thoughts into consideration. He stated we are trying to make Rt. 59 safer, and not being able to go back to the neighborhood and having to go out onto Rt. 59 is not safe. It's more complicated and it is a big deal. He reiterated that he has no issues with the traffic signal at Norwood, but is opposed to shutting down Norwood and opposed to making it one-way.

Trustee Deyne agreed with Trustee Camerer. He stated that we have to move forward, but is not clear on what direction to go.

Trustee Arends suggested that the Board wait on the decision to put the traffic signal at Norwood until a traffic count is done. As far as Rt. 59/Stearns Road intersection, the Board should make a decision on that right away.

Chairman Reinke stated that there will be a resolution before the Village Board and get a final say on the Rt. 59/Stearns intersection.

Trustee Deyne asked if the Board should package it all together.

Chairman Reinke responded that would make sense but if we need to get more information or if some aren't ready to make a decision about the traffic signal, then we shouldn't allow the traffic signal from preventing the Board from giving their input to IDOT. IDOT is waiting on the Village. With regard to the stoplight, if Trustee Arends and Trustee Camerer need more data, then we can come back to that issue.

Trustee Carbonaro asked the estimated start date of the intersection improvements.

J. Plonczynski explained that IDOT wants the Village's input so that they can go into Phase 2 Engineering which is the final design engineering. Then, they will bid the project and put it on the transportation improvement plan. It's about two years off.

Trustee Carbonaro asked if we have two years to make a decision before we actually make any changes.

President Wallace responded no, once you put the resolution together, they are going to bid that project.

Trustee Carbonaro stated that when IDOT starts the project, we have two years to decide what the Village is going to do at Norwood Lane.

J. Plonczynski explained that after it goes into the design phase, and IDOT is ready to bid the project, we will get an intergovernmental agreement called a local agency agreement and they will put the cost in there and Bartlett has to commit to that. It will include the \$42,000 and so far for Stearns and Rt. 59, that's all our share will be.

Trustee Deyne stated that in all fairness, he would like to request another two weeks to look at the project, in depth, and come into it with more information.

B. Mraz stated that the Board is not voting tonight; it's just a straw vote.

President Wallace explained that the Board is going to direct staff to put together a resolution. When we have discussion on the resolution at the next Board meeting that not everyone has agreed on, which means you will get a second look, we can, at that point, amend that resolution.

Trustee Deyne responded that is fine.

There being no further comments or questions, Chairman Reinke forwarded the item to the Village Board for consideration.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

NPDES Permit Special Conditions

Chairman Camerer asked Public Works Director Dan Dinges to review the agenda item.

D. Dinges explained that the Village's wastewater treatment plant has an EPA discharge permit, NPDES permit, and it expired January 31, 2015. The reason for that is that the Illinois EPA and U.S. EPA are setting limits for phosphorus on all wastewater treatment plants. The reason for that is phosphorus contributes to algal blooms, especially in the Gulf of Mexico and along the Mississippi River. All states have set this limit; with Illinois being one of the last to do this. The U.S. EPA has basically forced IEPA to set the limit. Our staff has been working with the DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup, a group consisting of all the wastewater treatment plants within the Salt Creek and DuPage River

watershed, along with Sierra Club and environmentalists, to improve the habitat along the DuPage River and Salt Creek. They have been negotiating with U.S. EPA and IEPA to give Bartlett time to implement phosphorus limits at the wastewater treatment plant. What is being proposed in the special conditions that have been worked with the DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup is Bartlett would not have a limit on the treatment plant for up to 10 to 11 years if we complete environmental projects, such as dam removal or all projects that would enhance the water quality and the aquatic life, along the DuPage River and Salt Creek. They have gotten it approved by the U.S. EPA and IEPA and are at a point where the EPA is getting ready to issue the NPDES permits. Downers Grove Sanitary District is going to be the first one to get their permit and the EPA expects communities with expired permits to follow within the next week or two. Bartlett is going to have to act fairly quickly and decide whether we are in or out. If Bartlett is in, there is the 10 to 11 years before the phosphorous limits would become effective. The cost for chemical treatment of phosphorous elimination is approximately \$250,000. The delay of implementing phosphorous removal will save the Village chemical and operating expenses of \$1.4 million over a 10 to 12 year period. If we don't go along with the special conditions that the DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup has negotiated, the EPA will give Bartlett three years to design and install phosphorus treatment at the wastewater treatment plant and begin paying the operating and chemical costs from that point forward. Staff has reviewed the special conditions and believe this is the most cost effective approach for us to pursue in implementing phosphorus removal and meeting the IEPA permit requirements.

Trustee Carbonaro asked what the cost will be to start implementing the removal in a few years.

D. Dinges explained that based on the Workgroup's plan, Bartlett would be paying approximately \$31,000 this year and then the payments increase to \$45,000, \$46,000, to \$70,000. Bartlett still has to determine whether chemical treatment or biological treatment of phosphorus will be the most cost effective. Biological tends to have a higher upfront costs but less chemicals. Chemical has lower upfront costs but you have the ongoing chemical costs forever. We need to look at that and determine what option is best. The Sewer Capital Budget includes \$275,000 which will include a facility plan update. The update will incorporate the special condition requirements of a phosphorus discharge optimization evaluation plan and feasibility study to determine the best method.

Administrator Salmons added that Bartlett has the opportunity, over the next 8 to 10 years, to spend \$31,000 up to \$70,000 as Bartlett's share of improvements to the Salt Creek basin and in that same timeframe, be able to put off the phosphorus problem, and save \$1.4 million, while we are doing good things to the basin and deciding whether we want to use chemicals or bugs.

Chairman Camerer commented that it is projected that in Fiscal Year 22-23, the annual dues and assessment cost is up to \$77,000 and will go up every year.

D. Dinges responded that this is the plan to get all the environmental projects done along the DuPage River and Salt Creek. After that, we would be implementing the phosphorus

removal at the treatment plant and that cost is yet to be determined based on what method is chosen.

There being no further comments or questions, Chairman Camerer forwarded the item to the Village Board for consideration.

President Wallace entertained a motion to adjourn the Committee of the Whole meeting.

Moved by Trustee Camerer
Seconded by Trustee Carbonaro

Motion carried.

President Wallace adjourned the Committee of the Whole meeting at 8:44 p.m.