

Minutes
Village of Glen Ellyn Board of Trustees
Special Workshop Meeting
Monday, January 12, 2015

Call to Order

President Demos called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

Roll Call

Upon Roll Call by Clerk Galvin, Trustees Burket, Clark, Elliott, Ladesic, McGinley and O'Shea answered "Present".

Staff present: Village Manager Franz, Assistant Village Manager Stonitsch, Village Attorney Mathews, Finance Director Coyle, Director of Planning and Development Hulseberg, Police Chief Norton, Volunteer Fire Company Chief Bodony, Professional Engineer Minix and Planning and Building Zoning Official Kvapil.

Pledge of Allegiance

President Demos asked Trustee Burket to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Agenda Item E. - Proposed Fire Alarm System Requirements within the C5A Central Business District: (Presented by Planning and Development Director Hulseberg)

The Village Board requested an amendment be prepared to the Fire Code that would require all buildings within the C5A Central Business District (CBD) to be provided with an automatic fire alarm system. The amendment would exceed the Fire Code requirements and apply to some buildings that are not currently required by code to have a fire alarm system. A few buildings in the CBD have a code compliant fire alarm system, some have no system, and some have something in between.

The majority of the buildings in the CBD were constructed in the early 1900's prior to the development and implementation of current building and fire codes. The buildings are typically two or three stories, constructed of masonry exterior load bearing walls and wood roof and interior structural framing. While the exterior walls provide significant fire protection between buildings, the numerous door and window openings and combustible roof structures generate a significant risk of fire exposure and spread between buildings.

The downtown CBD is densely developed and these building were planned and constructed without adequate space behind and around the structures to allow for deliveries, trash storage and removal, maintenance, and parking. This restricts access for fire vehicles and complicates fire suppression for these properties.

These existing CBD buildings do not meet many of our current building, fire and zoning codes, however, the codes permit the continued use of these buildings without improvements and compliance with the new

codes provided they generally remain as originally legally constructed, and remain occupied and used as originally legally approved.

In 2001 the Village amended the building code to require an automatic fire alarm system in any commercial building without a fire sprinkler system when the existing building is significantly remodeled or altered or an addition is constructed. The requirement is triggered when the hard cost of the work exceeds \$15,000. This code provision does not require the hard cost of each individual project to be tracked over time, accumulated, and applied to the \$15,000 trigger. Therefore many small tenants move in and out of the same tenant space, with minimal tenant improvement costs, and do not trigger the requirement for a fire alarm system.

This building code amendment is successful in the C3 Service Commercial District (Roosevelt Road) and has required many fire alarm systems to be added in commercial buildings. However, the tenant improvement work typically associated with CBD buildings generally does not reach the scope and magnitude of this trigger. New tenants will often intentionally limit the extent of their proposed improvements, or make their improvements in phases under separate permits, to avoid the need to install a fire alarm system.

The cost of installing an automatic fire alarm system in CBD buildings will be highly variable based on the type of occupancy and size of the protected area and if any type of fire alarm system currently exists in the building. For larger buildings the cost may be in the range of \$2 to \$4 per square foot. For a small restaurant or store of 2,000 square feet or less, the cost would likely be in the range of \$2,000 to \$4,000. Another cost factor would be the scope of the fire alarm system requirements and standards established by the Village. These costs can be reduced utilizing new wireless technology that eliminates the high cost of running wiring to all devices within existing finished spaces. To further reduce costs, building owners could provide one fire alarm system capable of protecting the entire building that can be zoned for each tenant within the building. This will avoid the need for each tenant to provide a complete independent fire alarm system at a higher total building cost.

The Village of Glen Ellyn Fire Prevention Award Program provides monetary awards to property and business owners in the CBD who install a fire alarm system that meets the Village standards. The award can be as much as 50% of the cost of the fire alarm system, but not more than \$15,000 per business unit subject to the discretion of the Village Board and available funds. The installation of a fire alarm system also satisfies an eligibility requirement for the Downtown Retail Interior Improvement Award Program. This program provides monetary awards to new property and business owners and existing property and business owners who expand their facility.

Mr. Kvapil stated a rough cost estimate of \$3 per square foot. Director Hulseberg commented that with wireless technology the cost may be less. Trustee Elliott asked what the requirements would be for the proposed development of the Giesche property. Director Hulseberg responded it would be treated as any new construction.

Chief Bodony stated that only a dozen properties are code compliant now. Federal grants for sprinklers are only available for really historic properties. The goal is early detection. Manager Franz added that the Village Award program is only for commercial properties. Trustee Elliott suggested that feedback be sought from the Chamber of Commerce and the Downtown Alliance.

Trustee O'Shea suggested that when permits for renovations are applied for that the alarms be required at that time or when there is a change in occupancy. Trustee McGinley responded that she likes the idea of requiring this when there is a change in tenant but the responsibility has to be with the landlord.

President Demos asked Chief Bodony if he thought this was appropriate. Chief Bodony responded yes and added the landlord will have an added benefit with their insurance provider.

Trustee McGinley commented that asking \$2,000 is a lot of money to the downtown businesses. This is up to the landlords. The Village cannot be responsible for someone else's investments. We have to figure out how to place the expense where it belongs. Trustee Clark agreed and responded this is a balancing act and we cannot go too far down the road without implementing this.

President Demos asked all the Trustees to get there comments and recommendations to Director Hulseberg in order to revisit this.

Agenda Item F. - Feasibility Project Assessment of the Pedestrian and Vehicular Over/Under Passes in the Central Business District: (Presented by Professional Engineer Minix)

Over/Under Passes Feasibility Study Final Report Presentation Overview by Ms. Jennifer Mitchell, Senior Project Manager, HDR, 8550 W. Bryn Mawr Avenue, Suite 900, Chicago and Mr. Barry Kravitz, Vice-President, HDR and discussion of the final report by HDR Engineering on the project to assess the feasibility of pedestrian and vehicular over/underpass alternatives in the Central Business District and Taylor Avenue.

In January 2014, the Village Board authorized HDR Engineering, Inc. to conduct feasibility studies of alternatives to surface crossings of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks for both pedestrians and vehicles in the Glen Ellyn Central Business District. In addition, the consultant was to develop concepts to improve pedestrian accommodation at the existing Taylor Avenue underpass. The consultant completed preliminary studies, prepared a draft report, made a Board presentation in May 2014, developed additional alternatives for vehicular crossings as part of a brainstorming committee that included Trustees Ladesic and Elliott, and finalized their findings.

The completed report, "Feasibility Project Assessment of the Pedestrian and Vehicular Over/Under Passes in the Central Business District", can be found on the Village website:

<http://glenellynvillageil.iqm2.com/Citizens/FileOpen.aspx?Type=1&ID=1086&Inline=True>.

The report includes an Executive Summary. The consultant team presented their findings, costs, recommendations and implementation timelines, with most of the new information pertaining to the vehicular over/under pass topic.

The scope of the Over / Underpass Feasibility Study was divided into three main components:

- Evaluate possible corridors and locations for alternatives to vehicular railroad grade crossings in the Central Business District - Locations west of Main Street appear to offer the only opportunities for non-grade crossings in the CBD. Curvilinear alignment options from Glenwood to west of Lorraine were developed in the summer and fall of 2014 to mitigate traffic impacts, minimize land takes, and to dove-tail with future development. While no alternate is deemed as preferred, a grade-separation project is considered feasible. The currently estimated construction cost is about \$21 million for a vehicular grade separation
- Develop and assess alternates to the current pedestrian sidewalk configuration at the Taylor Avenue underpass - The report recommends a new pedestrian underpass located to the east of the existing opening, suitable for a 10-ft wide paved surface between Walnut and Willis. As a result of an application made in August 2014 using the HDR recommended configuration, the Village has been awarded an STP grant to fund 75% of the estimated \$2.4 million construction cost.
- Assess possible configurations and costs for implementation of a pedestrian underpass near the Glen Ellyn train station - Multiple alternatives were examined and assessed against criteria such as cost, tunnel length, loss of parking, Prairie Path impacts, multiple user access and travel pattern changes. The Western Alternative, estimated to cost \$6.6 million and featuring a spiral ramp on the south side of the railroad tracks, appears to offer the best combination of price and limited impacts, particularly related to parking loss.

Ms. Mitchell first discussed the vehicular grade separation at Lorraine with the roundabout at Western. The railroad would ask for the Prospect crossing to be closed. If you add a new crossing, the railroad will ask for one to be removed. Manager Franz responded that grant funds are tied to this.

Trustee O'Shea asked which is the best option. Trustee Elliott responded there is no easy answer. If there were an easy answer this would have been done years ago. Trustee Elliott added: how bad do we want this, it will be expensive and it will not happen without utilizing eminent domain. This will change traffic patterns and the contours of the downtown.

The Prospect underpass will have a huge impact. Regarding the Glenwood overpass, any clearance over the railroad tracks requires 23 feet. Trustee Burket asked which is the most realistic. Trustee Ladesic responded an underpass is better at Glenwood and Prospect and it can tie in with a development project at

the McChesney and Miller property. Trustee Burket responded that the development of the McChesney & Miller property may happen prior to an over/underpass being built.

Ms. Mitchell clarified that the Board does not need to make a decision based on the feasibility study. These are all options that can work; the Board needs to pick an option that is the best fit for Glen Ellyn. They should begin by choosing an area for consideration first.

Trustee McGinley questioned the engineering costs of 26% of the entire project cost. Ms. Mitchell responded that is not out of line due to the complexity of the project. Trustee McGinley responded that 26 % is unacceptable.

Trustee McGinley asked what the Board can do to move forward quickly, the last presentation was in May. Ms. Mitchell responded that all options provided are feasible. Trustee O'Shea responded the Board needs to pick an option.

Ms. Mitchell reminded the Board that any of the options can be built. The Board needs to decide is this a benefit to your community.

President Demos stated there would be no public comment at this time, this item will be back on the agenda and there will be ample opportunity for public comment.

Adjournment

At 7:27 p.m. a motion was made by Trustee Clark and seconded by Trustee Burket to adjourn. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Galvin,
Village Clerk