



Meeting Minutes
Village of Glen Ellyn
Capital Improvements Commission
Regular Meeting
February 9, 2021
7:00 PM
Electronic Conference Call

Board or Commission: Capital Improvements

Date: February 9, 2021

Meeting: Regular

Called to Order: 7:00 p.m.

Quorum: Yes

Adjourned: 9:07 p.m.

Member Attendance:

Steve Szymanski	Chairman	Present
Joel Baldin	Commissioner	Present
Adam B. Biggam	Commissioner	Present
Joshua J. Cattero	Commissioner	Present
Arthur F. Foerster	Commissioner	Present
Michael M. Lindquist	Commissioner	Present
Steve Neurauder	Commissioner	Present
Rocco J. Zuccherro	Commissioner	Present
Steve Thompson	Trustee Liaison	Present
Richard Daubert	Staff Liaison/Professional Engineer	Present

Also Present:

Dave Buckley	Assistant Public Works Director
Julius Hansen	Public Works Director
Elisa Pollina	Recording Secretary
Tom Topor	Senior Civil Engineer
Phil Hutchinson	Civiltech Engineering
Kristin Kalitowski	Civiltech Engineering
Mike Folkening	Civiltech Engineering
Dan Anderson	Historical Society

A. CALL TO ORDER

The February 9, 2021 Meeting of the Capital Improvements Commission was called to order by Chairman Szymanski at 7:00 PM via Electronic Conference Call.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 12, 2021 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS COMMISSION MEETING

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES FROM JANUARY 12, 2021 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS COMMISSION MEETING

MOTION BY: Commissioner Lindquist

SECOND BY: Commissioner Biggam

RESULT: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL

D. CURRENT BUSINESS

1. *Central Business District Streetscape and Utility Improvements Project February 2021 CIC Meeting on Streetscape Design Elements:*

Engineer Daubert reports tonight we are back with some decision points for the CIC to review. The Village Board made some decisions with respect to some of the design elements (see attached memo). Engineer Topor and Civiltech will go over some additional designs elements that staff would like the CIC to give their input on. Phil Hutchinson from Civiltech goes over tonight's discussion objectives (see attached presentation). The objectives of tonight's meeting are to review the following: Decorative pavement band options, Crosswalk materials, Updated 3D renderings, Planter curb materials, Historic plaque options and tree species selection.

Decorative Pavement Band Options: Hutchinson reports we are seeking feedback from CIC on the two available options. Narrow Band Option 1 - 16" band of running bond course of 4"x12" brick, and Narrow Band Option 2 – 12" soldier course of 4"x12" brick. Hutchinson shows renderings of both options (see attached). The Development Committee reviewed these options and preferred Narrow band Option 1. Engineer Daubert asks the CIC for their input.

Commissioners Baldin & Biggam would be fine with either option. Commissioners Cattero, Foerster, Lindquist, Neurauter, Zuccherro and Chairman Szymanski prefer Option 1.

Decorative Crosswalk: Hutchinson reports that the Village Board would like to add brick pavers to the list of options for the decorative crosswalks. In talking to Whitacre Greer, it

was noted that the 4"x12" brick pavers in the furniture zone would not be appropriate to use in the crosswalks. We would instead use 4"x8" bricks of greater thickness which are stronger than the 4"x12" pavers. We would also use a wider header band to keep the bricks from shifting. Hutchinson shows renderings of brick pavers and decorative MMA crosswalks (see attached). He adds, we will look at other projects in the region (Batavia & Oak Park) to see how well the brick paver crosswalks have held up. But we are confident this could be done in Glen Ellyn. Commissioner Biggam asks if Public Works has any concerns with brick pavers and snow removal. Engineer Daubert adds there are some concerns with the pavers not holding up over time and that we may want to use tumbled pavers due to likely distress. Director Hansen adds we need to construct it as strong and durable as possible. We need to build it for the long term.

Commissioner Neurauter asks if there are any engineering issues using the brick pavers on raised crosswalks. Hutchinson replies, I don't think there will be any issues or restraints with those elevated areas.

Commissioner Zucchero asks what the cost difference between the 2 options is. Engineer Daubert replies we originally allocated \$325,000. The mix of MMA & plain crosswalks were last estimated at \$297,000; now with this design we are at \$370,000. This would be a ~\$45,000 increase to the project cost. Commissioner Neurauter adds, it appears that the brick pavers do have twice the lifespan as the other options and they may be more economical than MMA over time even despite their more frequent maintenance.

Commissioner Biggam notes concerns with the life of the pavers. Engineer Daubert notes it is hard to predict how they will hold up given the variability with snow events but that they will require considerable maintenance over time.

Chairman Szymanski asks what sort of maintenance will the pavers require after installation, my concern is the volume of traffic in GE and while the pavers look beautiful when newly installed, their appearance may degrade over time. Hutchinson replies fire clay brick does last a long time; you may have to power wash it to keep it looking good. Engineer Daubert notes that we need to be realistic that pavers are going to take a beating from traffic and snow removal operations and some will get broken; however, we are using the north shore blend with replacement pavers being readily available. Engineer Daubert elaborates that the pavers have a great aesthetic value though and that the Development Committee strongly supports them in the context of Public Works being able to maintain them. Chairman Szymanski asks what the cost difference is between MMA/Plain Concrete and Pavers. Engineer Topor notes approximately \$70,000.

Trustee Thompson asks if we still plan on including the Prairie Path crossing on Park to this project and if not, should we include it. Commissioner Cattero said we are doing 2 of the 3 (Prairie Path cross walks) we need to find a way to get it in. Chairman Szymanski notes we will poll the Commissioners on this item as we solicit input.

Engineer Daubert asks the CIC for their input on the proposed decorative crosswalk options.

Commissioners Foerster, Cattero, Lindquist, Neurauter, Zuccherro, Baldin, Biggam and Chairman Szymanski prefer the brick pavers and would like to include the crossing on Park Blvd (Prairie Path crossing). Commissioner Biggam noted he shares Engineer's Daubert's concerns with paver maintenance but supports them in the context of the stout design and Public Works being able to maintain them. Dan Anderson from the Historical Society prefers the brick paver crosswalks and would also like to see the Prairie Path crossing at Park included with the project as well.

Planter Curbs: Hutchinson reports the Village Board wants us to include granite and precast concrete as the two options. The granite would be in the core of the CBD bound by Anthony to the North, Hillside to the South, Glenwood to the west and Forest to the East. Outside of this area, precast would be the base bid material and granite would be an add alternate bid. The board would like to see how the bids come in. We could use granite throughout if the bids are favorable.

Historic Sidewalk Plaques: Hutchinson reports these plaques preserve and celebrate the history of the downtown. They emphasize historically noteworthy buildings and locations. There will also be additional information on the historic locations contained in a pamphlet and on a website. We have asked the Historical society to research potential historic locations and they have provided feedback to us. They have identified about 30-40 locations.

There are 4 options considered for the plaques.

Option 1: 12"x12" Granite Plaque, (Mesabi Black, Diamond 10 finish) Plaques to be centered in decorative pavement field.

Option 2- 16"x16" Granite Plaque: Granite color and finish to match planter curb material (Mesabi Black, Diamond 10 finish) Plaques to be centered in decorative pavement field.

Option 3: 5 ¼" x 12" bronze plaque on top of granite/precast curbing.

Option 4: Bronze Plaque mounted to post.

Engineer Topor adds, the Development Committee reviewed the options and preferred options 1 & 2. Option 3 was thought to be too small and Option 4 was too large. We met with key members from the HPC and HSS and they preferred options 1 & 2. The only question was the size.

Commissioner Baldin asks if they considered doing the plaques on pavers as the granite may be slick to walk on. Director Hansen asks if you could go with a rougher texture. Hutchinson adds, I did ask for slip-resistant granite. Dan Anderson reports I did speak with Troost Monument and they said you can have slip proof granite and still engrave on it. Anderson prefers the larger sized plaques (16"x 16") so additional information can be added and he likes the diagonal look better than the square. He also adds we can do more than 30-40 plaques. We plan to identify as many locations as possible and let the Village decide how many the project can support. The Historical Society will pick up the cost of the granite

plaques. Engineer Daubert noted that we will have to carefully pick locations for the plaques given we have other items to fit in the streetscape such as benches, planters, street lights.

Trustee Thompson asks could you use more wording on the square placement instead of the diamond. Anderson replies yes, but not sure that's important. We will put key information on the actual plaque and the printed material and website would provide more information. Engineer Daubert asks the CIC for their input on the Historic Plaques.

Commissioners Biggam, Cattero, Foerster, Lindquist, Neurauter, Zuccherro, Baldin and Chairman Szymanski prefer Option 2 -16"x16" plaques.

Hutchinson adds our next steps with historic plaques would be to present this information at the February 16th Village Board Workshop, commemorate the direction of the Village Board on the placement of the historic sidewalks plaques with the other streetscape design elements and continue detailed streetscape design with inclusion of the historic sidewalk plaques and coordination from the Historical Society.

Recommended Trees for CBD Streetscape: Engineer Topor reports we reviewed the tree list with the Environmental Commission and they support this plan and want us to diversify as much as possible. There is still a need to educate the public on why we are removing trees. Topor asks the CIC if they have any thoughts or comments on the tree list. Chairman Szymanski states we support tree diversity. He adds, 20-30 years from now will we notice that a plan was made (i.e.: continuity with tree size, leaves falling at same or different times etc.). Hutchinson replies we are making the urban forest better. We will pay attention to form and make the areas contextual. We are picking trees by location. It will be a lot different from what's out there now. Chairman Szymanski asks can we show extremes to make it easier to set the tone so residents know what is coming. Hutchinson states, yes we can show some graphics so people can visualize what it is going to look like. Engineer Daubert adds the more diversity the better it will be for the Village in the long run. Director Hansen asks, on Main Street can you put trees that are similar in structure and size. Hutchinson replies, yes we can and we are looking to do that.

Project Schedule: Engineer Daubert reports we continue to attend weekly construction schedule updates on Apex and are still waiting to hear back from COD on the Frida Kahlo exhibit. Based on that, staff is concerned about successfully advancing this project this year. We have reviewed all factors and Staff's recommendation to the Village Board will be the right time to advance this project is early 2022. Utility work would start as early as February. We are looking at the staging of the project and are working on putting together a detailed schedule.

Chairman Szymanski thanks the CIC for all their input tonight.

- E. TRUSTEE'S REPORT** – Trustee Thompson reports Gary Fasules was sworn in as the acting Village President. He will be finishing out Diane McGinley's term which will end in May after the Village election. The Village Board approved the dental office that will be going in at 414 Pennsylvania Avenue. The Village Board also approved the extension of \$5,000 COVID relief grants

for businesses. If you know of any businesses that are in need of the grant, please tell them that they should apply. There was a tree survey/health study at Panfish Park. As a result there will be some trees removed. A study will occur later to decide what to plant.

Trustee Thompson adds, we need to give a big round of applause to Engineer Daubert for his work on the parking garage. Engineer Daubert thanks management for having the confidence in him to handle this project once Bill Holmer who was the lead on the project left. We are on track to deliver the project in mid-April. As of right now we are tracking \$500,000 under the contract cost.

F. OTHER BUSINESS – None

G. PUBLIC WORKS REPORT – Director Hansen reports our staff has been working really hard in these harsh weather conditions to clear the roadways. We have already used all our salt and we have had to tap into our emergency stockpile. We have just ordered an additional 250 tons of salt. They are doing a great job. Chairman Szymanski thanks the Public Works staff for all their hard work.

H. PROJECT REPORT – (See attached report) Engineer Daubert reports we are getting ready for our upcoming construction season. We are working on the following: Utility and Roadway Rehabilitation on Phillips/Vine/Ridgewood, Hill Avenue Utility Improvements, Glen Ellyn/IL American Water Interconnect, Section 106 process for Train Station. Steve Warner is working on getting maintenance projects out to bid.

Chairman Szymanski adds we are looking for another Commissioner, if anyone has any recommendations please let us know. We are continuing to review applications.

I. ADJOURNMENT – Commissioner Zuccherro motions and Commissioner Neurauter seconds to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 9, 2021

Submitted by Elisa Pollina, Recording Secretary

Reviewed by Richard Daubert, Professional Engineer