Minutes
Special Workshop Meeting
Glen Ellyn Village Board of Trustees
Monday, November 16, 2015

Call to Order

President Demos called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

Roll Call

Upon roll call by Village Clerk Galvin, President Demos and Trustees Clark, Kenwood, Ladesic and O'Shea answered "Present". Trustee Elliott arrived at 6:13 and Trustee Senak arrived at 6:31.

In Attendance: Village Clerk Galvin, Village Manager Franz, Assistant Village Manager Stonitsch, Village Attorney Mathews, Finance Director Coyle, Assistant Public Works Director Buckley, Director of Planning and Development Hulseberg, Police Chief Norton, Deputy Police Chief Acton, Deputy Police Chief Holmer and Professional Engineer Minix.

Pledge of Allegiance

President Demos asked Chief Phil Norton to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Central Business District Pedestrian and Vehicular Over/Under Passes Feasibility Project Assessment: (Professional Engineer Minix)

Professional Engineer Bob Minix and HDR Consultants discussed the Feasibility Project Assessment of the Pedestrian and Vehicular Over/Under Passes in the Central Business District and present their report findings and additional/updated information as a follow-up to their January 2015 presentation.

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, and prepared a draft report presentation to the Village Board in May 2014. Following the initial Board review, the consultant developed additional alternatives for vehicular crossings as part of a brainstorming committee that included Trustees Ladesic and Elliott, and completed their report, "Feasibility Project Assessment of the Pedestrian and Vehicular Over/Under Passes in the Central Business District". The report includes an Executive Summary

On January 12, 2015 a special Board workshop was conducted wherein the consultant team attempted to present their findings, costs, recommendations and implementation timelines. Unfortunately due to time constraints and a variety of technical and scope-of-work questions, HDR was unable to complete their original presentation. As early 2015 marked a transition year for the Board, the continuation of the presentation was deferred to a post-election timeframe; the consultant will be appearing at the November 16 workshop to continue discussions on their findings. To prepare for the workshop, the consultant met with the project committee in late October. The November workshop will feature some new concepts, updated costs, funding source discussions and possible next steps.

To refresh and summarize the work and current project status, 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 stands out as superior and thus could be deemed as preferred, a grade-separation project is considered feasible. The currently estimated construction cost shown in the December 2014 report is $21 million for a vehicular grade separation; the consultant is currently reviewing this cost as some staff feel it is insufficient.

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. The Taylor Avenue Pedestrian Underpass project has progressed significantly in 2015 with a Phase I engineer (Benesch) selected. There will be no further discussion of this item by HDR in November.

Assess possible configurations and costs for implementation of a pedestrian underpass near the Glen Ellyn train station. Multiple underground 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 in the December 2014 report 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. HDR is currently assessing an overpass / pedestrian bridge option in greater detail and will present a concept plan - including a to-scale rendering - at the November workshop. HDR provided an illustration of this concept to staff following the recent consultant / committee meeting.

Staff is looking for some preliminary direction from the Village Board on whether to fund a Phase I engineering study to further evaluate the impacts of the different alternatives on both projects. If the consensus is to move forward with additional engineering work, we should add the estimated costs to the draft CY16 budget. With respect to the pedestrian underpass, if the Village Board directs staff to proceed with one or more of these options, meetings with UP and Metra should continue to determine their interest in funding assistance for this project. Staff looks forward to getting feedback from the Village Board on these concepts.

Ms. Jennifer Mitchell, Senior Transportation Engineer, HDR Engineering, Chicago, Illinois suggested selecting a study area and then go to Phase I. The approximate cost is $49 million. Grants are available for Grade Safety, Grade Protection and the Congestion Mitigation and Transportation Program.

The timing is as follows:

Phase I:	24 mos.
Phase II:	18-24 mos.
Phase III:	12-18 mos.

Trustee O'Shea asked which is the least expensive, an overpass or an underpass. Ms. Mitchell responded an overpass is less expensive. Trustee Ladesic asked when they should apply for grants. Ms. Mitchell responded as soon as possible. Some grants will only pay for the cost of construction. Trustee Ladesic asked if the UP will contribute. Ms. Mitchell responded they might as well as the ICC. Trustee Senak commented that the best case scenario the Village will be out of pocket $300,000-500,000; the worst case, the Village would pay all.

HDR Engineering suggested that train traffic will only increase in the future and that the UP may want a design that will accommodate a fourth track.

Trustee Senak asked if there data to suggest this would benefit economic development. Ms. Mitchell responded they were not asked to provide such data but can provide. TIF dollars may also be used for this. Trustee Clark asked if Federal and State funds could be used. Ms. Mitchell responded State, not Federal may be used. Congestion and surface grants are Federal. They would be working in coordination via IDOT.

President Demos expressed an interest in a pedestrian crossing at Park Blvd. or the train station with pick up or drop off on either side. Ms. Mitchell provided the following timing:

Phase I:	15 mos.
Phase II:	15 mos.
Phase III:	12 mos.

President Demos commented that this option is the least expensive and least invasive. Ms. Mitchell suggested they begin Phase I and select a consultant and apply for grants. Trustees Elliott and O'Shea expressed an interest in exploring alternatives. Trustee Senak expressed his concerns of the cost to the community and does not think the case has been made for safety or economic development.

A short break was taken from 7:04 p.m. to 7:11 p.m.

Police Facility Project Update: (Chief Norton)

Chief Norton and the Leopardo/Dewberry team led the discussion regarding the new Police Facility design, scope, and budget.

In 1973, the Village acquired 535 Duane Street from School District 41, to use as a Civic Center, which housed all of their administrative offices and included the Police Department. The Village President at the time, Frank Weidner, conducted the negotiations for the purchase and renovations of the new facility, and recently revealed that the police facility was always intended to be a temporary location.

Beginning in 2007, the Police Department began efforts to explore expansion or construction of a new police facility. In 2008, money was sought for a space needs analysis. Due to economic restraints, funds were not available until 2011. In November, 2011, a contract was signed with the architectural firm of Dewberry to provide a space needs assessment. In 2012, the results of their study showed current police space at approximately 11,000 square feet. Further, they recommended a police facility for Glen Ellyn of approximately 44,000 square feet. Recognizing the cost to build such a facility would be overly burdensome to the community, we began to reduce the recommended scope and were able to pare down to approximately 37,000 square feet.

The team of Leopardo/Dewberry was selected and signed a contract for the design and build of a new Glen Ellyn Police facility. Again, great effort was put into reducing the overall square footage to meet anticipated budget demands. Various groups of staff members comprised from management, the Police Department, Public Works, the Planning Department and the Village Links have met numerous times and spent numerous hours with the developer team over the past two months to reduce the overall design and construction costs. Multiple permutations of the plans have been rejected or reduced in scope. A final approximate square footage of 31,500 was arrived at to meet minimum programming needs and reduce costs as much as possible. This number represents a decrease from the original recommended square footage of 44,500 or 29%.

Project Scope and Budget During this process, every effort is being explored to add value to the proposed budget to build a viable police facility for the community for the next 50-75 years. In addition, due to the unique site location adjacent to a park, the Village Board has indicated that the project should enhance some basic park amenities that could be incorporated into the overall design. Therefore, staff has identified additional revenues and ways to control costs to further support the necessary project scope, including:

Additional Revenues:

¬ Seized funds will be utilized to enhance allowable expenses, such as secure jail facilities, Emergency Operations Center, evidence storage, etc.($1,200,000).

¬ Capital Fund improvements including water, sewer, stormwater, sidewalk, street, and parking improvements ($350,000-Estimate).

¬ Discussion of private fundraising to enhance a proposed community room.

At this point we are within a 1-2% of the draft budget, but the budget is still in flux. Given this stage of the process, we continue to be on track towards finalizing various design elements and balancing the project budget. Before moving forward, there are some significant decisions to be made including how to fund the community room and shooting range support building. Without the use of seized funds and the capital fund, further reductions would be necessary that could compromise the overall goals of the new facility. Below is a list of other changes being considered to balance the project budget:

¬ Elimination of the support building with some elements being incorporated in the main building

¬ Elimination of Community Room, with design to include the possibility of a future addition.

¬ A proposed redesign effort is being explored to eliminate the need for the fourth property.

Every effort has been made to design and cost-out as minimal a facility as practical, while maintaining viability for the future. Please remember site issues and changing construction costs are uncertainties that cannot be given precise dollar amounts. This preliminary budget discussion will be helpful to drive some decisions, but more discussion will likely be necessary to finalize the budget and project design.

Trustee O'Shea inquired about the parking lot being able to accommodate turnaround for a bus. Chief Norton responded they are being mindful of current use.

Trustee Clark asked about the range. Mr. Brian Meade, Design Director at Meade & Associates, responded that the training center building is 4,000 square feet; 3,000 is the range and 1,000 square feet has a vehicle bay and a canine area.

Trustee Senak stated they clearly contemplated future expansion, what about a full second floor. Ms. Leigh McMillen, Vice-President, Leopardo Construction responded that this building will be utilized 24/7 and that this is not planned for structurally. In order to construct in the future people cannot work below and the building would need to be vacated. This would be too disruptive to the first floor. There is room for future expansion within the footprints.

Trustee Senak asked what the maximum occupancy of the building is. Chief Norton responded 70 although we will never use that. Trustee Elliott asked if separate space is needed for EOC and roll call. Chief Norton responded that the 2 rooms have different functions. Trustee Ladesic asked about the current use of Clayton at the Civic Center. Chief Norton responded that is approximately 1,100 square feet. Trustee Ladesic responded that he sees the need for the roll call room and the EOC room at the new facility.

Trustee Kenwood asked about the workout room space. Chief Norton responded the officers are required to maintain a certain level of fitness.

With regards to exterior design palette's 1 & 2: Trustee Clark comments there is a lot of glass. Mr. Meade responded they are finding the right balance; they will reduce the glazing with sun shading horizontal elements.

Trustee Elliott stated the need to stay within the budget and asked to see a design for the original budgeted amount of $12 million. Trustee Elliott asked if the proposed range will be lead free. Chief Norton responded the range will not be lead free and that lead free ammunition costs 45% more.

Manager Franz responded they have identified an additional $1.2 million that can be used from the seized fund program. The Board may consider eliminating the support building, eliminate the community room and eliminate a design that would require the acquisition of the 4th property. Trustee O'Shea stated he would like to see a list of costs to date.

Ms. Angela Fanella, 179 Brandon, Glen Ellyn addressed the Board and thanked the Police Department for their quick responses to a recent event at District 41 and to state her opposition to the proposed police range. She stated the police range is an opportunity to endanger children if opened to the public. This will increase the amount of weapons being brought into the community and she does not want that.

Ms. Kathy Meier, 343 Philips, Glen Ellyn addressed the Board to state her opposition about the proposed shooting range. This is a concern; she just found out about it and is very concerned. Is this a public benefit, has there been a cost analysis, research or risk assessment?

Mr. Mike Colliander, 540 Longfellow, Glen Ellyn addressed the Board to state his opposition to the proposed range. Mr. Colliander, a member of the Capital Improvements Commission would like to see more facts and figures, but would like the Board to consider use of the new range at the College of DuPage.

The Board reached a consensus that another Workshop meeting was needed in order for the project to move forward.

Adjournment:

At 8:08 p.m. a motion was made by Trustee Kenwood and seconded by Trustee Elliott to adjourn. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Galvin,
Village Clerk